

Parrish does not always fully explain the motivations of political actors, especially when they were suspected of bold-faced Jacobitism. Why a Nonjuror would display Jacobite sympathies in a North American environment, where nothing concrete could possibly be done to promote the interests of the Stuart family, remains a bit of a mystery. Religious affiliation and inherited political culture are only partial answers, because British attitudes were not simply transferred across the Atlantic: they were altered in various ways by colonial realities. A Nonjuring minister in England could imagine himself to be in substantial harmony with the views of the Anglican majority, but in most of the colonies, a Nonjuror was a dissenting voice within a minority denomination. He may have been serving what he saw as the true church, but he was not doing much good for the Stuart cause in Boston or Philadelphia or Charleston, which suggests that his motives were at the very least complicated.

In addition, as Parrish acknowledges, every colony had different political conditions, and the interplay of Jacobitism with anti-Jacobitism was not the same in each. Nowhere was the Jacobite threat simply invented, but it was often enhanced for political effect, as in the case of New York under the aggressively Whig governor Robert Hunter. The clamor over the seditious publications of John Checkley in Massachusetts was intensified because he represented an Anglican menace to ruling Congregational authority. In South Carolina under Queen Anne, most strangely of all, a governor who was a former Nonjuror, erstwhile ally of James II, and promoter of Anglican dominance faced off against a Scots Episcopalian clergyman who believed colonial government had no business in laying down rules for religion. Either could have accused the other of Jacobitism, although the governor had more recently avoided the oaths. What effect this and other extraordinary colonial blowups may have had on the ideological origins of the American Revolution is not addressed in this book but remains something future historians might care to consider.

Paul Monod  
Middlebury College  
[monod@middlebury.edu](mailto:monod@middlebury.edu)

JOSHUA BYRON SMITH. *Walter Map and the Matter of Britain*. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017. Pp. 254. \$69.95 (cloth).  
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.106

The development of the Matter of Britain in Latin literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has seen a number of notable treatments in the last few years, positioning authors such as Geoffrey of Monmouth, Gerald of Wales, and Walter Map as privileged mediators of Welsh literary material and themes to audiences in England. Joshua Byron Smith's *Walter Map and the Matter of Britain*, the first book-length study on Walter Map, presents a significant contribution to this conversation. It is of significance not least in its assessment of the double reputation of Walter as the author of *De nugis curialium* and the putative author of the *Lancelot-Grail Cycle*. Although the latter possibility is certainly understood to be spurious, Smith observes its fundamental plausibility to early readers of French romance: Walter is precisely the type of author whom one would expect to be associated with Arthuriana.

Following the statement of his thesis in chapter 1, framed as an overview of the relationship between "Wales and romance" (11–36), Smith's analysis begins in earnest in chapters 2 and 3, with a detailed study of the text of *De nugis* as it appears in the fourteenth-century Bodleian Library, Oxford, Bodley MS 851, the only manuscript in which *De nugis* survives. The Bodley text, with its problematic readings (not least the apparent integration of incongruous, and often inaccurate, glosses into the main text), is reconceptualized as an attempt, after

Walter's own day, to impose some manner of unity on "what might best be understood as five separate works in various stages of completion" (39). Smith draws our attention to a series of revisions and rewritings, which might tell us much not only about Walter's literary practice, but the fundamental literariness of his work. This context is brought to bear on analysis of Walter's tale of the British king Herla, in chapter 4, which exists in both a long and a short form in Bodley 851, suggestive of a revision process. In this episode, Smith notes, Walter manufactured his own British legend, a variation on the *translatio imperii* of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae* (1136), featuring a hero whose name was not Welsh yet may—to English eyes—have looked plausibly so (98). Walter's entire exercise here might be understood much like the false attribution of the *Lancelot-Grail Cycle*—an exercise in plausibility. Smith incorporates an interesting political reading of Walter's revisions to the tale of Herla, beyond its largely well commented upon satirical function. More might have been said here in relation to the tale's potential as a response to perceived ambitions for Welsh re-conquest, which is touched on briefly, although certainly this is not Smith's principal interest in his analysis.

In the consideration of Walter's *De mugis* at an intersection between Welsh historical-literary materials and English literary culture, it is cheering to see that unthinking assumptions concerning the Welshness of Walter's sources in his British-set tales are avoided. All too often, as Smith observes, certain literary themes (not least those concerned with the supernatural) are designated as markers of Celtic source traditions (99). Yet certainly, as Smith explores in chapter 5, there were genuine elements of Welsh—or rather Latin-Welsh—material known to Walter, circulating in a cross-border clerical culture, in which we might situate Gerald of Wales also. The Benedictine Abbey of Saint Peter's in Gloucester presented a particular site of accretion of Welsh material during the twelfth century. Smith provides examples of the likely reception of Welsh *vitae* at the house, although he proceeds with due caution as to the precise nature of the circulation of texts through ecclesiastical networks in the southern Welsh March during this period. Of particular interest is his treatment of Walter's fairy narrative of Wastinus Wastiniauc, often understood as a literary reworking of a Welsh tale in oral circulation. Building on earlier scholarship by Brynley Roberts, Smith notes the place of personal names, and naming strategies, in the anecdote in common with Welsh-Latin *vitae*, suggestive of Walter's consultation of written sources (131–39)—although, quite rightly, the author is wary of any blanket assertions about the source of the tale (if indeed there is one).

The author's conclusions emphasize the importance of Latin literary transmission in the development of the Matter of Britain—a departure from a problematic thesis that, as Smith notes, has proven particularly enduring: of Breton minstrels as the primary transmitters of British material into England and France. Smith sketches out this broader context in chapter 6, providing a succinct expression of a very strong hypothesis in scholarship on Marcher writers of this period: a direct connection between Latin authors, with Welsh affinities, and the development of the Matter of Britain during the twelfth century. In this respect, Smith's conclusions are certainly not novel; as he writes, "To suggest that the educated classes of two neighbouring yet linguistically distinct medieval peoples were able to exchange historical, literary and legal material through the medium of Latin is on par with suggesting that medieval people may have been familiar with cattle" (158). Rather, his research adds further color to an emerging picture of literary transmission during this period, explored with scholarly rigor.

*Walter Map and the Matter of Britain* is an impressive book that draws on considerable expertise in the study of Welsh and Latin literature. Its concluding assessment of the vogue for unthinking Celtic-source hunting in scholarship produced in the context of English literature departments is perhaps a little sweeping. Accordingly, there are some striking absences from the bibliography—not least, the collaborative and more nuanced works on insular multilingualism that have appeared in the past few years (we might think of the collections edited by Elizabeth M. Tyler; Judith A. Jefferson and Ad Putter; and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, for

starters). Indeed, Smith's work stands in an interesting dialogue with scholarship in this area—for certainly, he makes a strong claim for the value of high medieval Latin literature as a source for study in the historical dissemination of Welsh materials in England.

Victoria Flood  
*University of Birmingham*  
[v.flood@bham.ac.uk](mailto:v.flood@bham.ac.uk)

MICHAEL TALBOT. *British-Ottoman Relations, 1661–1807: Commerce and Diplomatic Practice in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017. Pp. 256. \$120.00 (cloth). doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.107

Michael Talbot's study of British-Ottoman relations in the long eighteenth century is a well-researched, well-written, and detailed analysis of diplomacy in its varied forms and in context. Talbot assesses the evolving diplomatic practices of the British ambassador in Istanbul and the ways in which those practices intersected with finance, law, and cultural accommodation. His sources, highlighting correspondence and petitions, are predominantly English, juxtaposed to a selection of Ottoman narratives and archival documents on commerce and foreign affairs. Importantly, Talbot provides Ottoman Turkish glosses for critical terminology, and includes selected texts in both their English and Turkish forms. He argues that the British conformed to Ottoman diplomatic practice in order secure their commercial objectives while the Ottomans sought British friendship (*dostluk*). As the eighteenth century progressed, however, that system began to rupture.

Individual chapters progress logically and provide significant details on the form, nature of, and responses to British-Ottoman diplomacy. In the introduction Talbot lays out his approach and outlines the historiography and types of sources employed. He points up “the importance [for the English] of conforming to Ottoman values and practices for the benefit of trading subjects and not simply for state politics” (15). Talbot emphasizes the task of the early British ambassadors as, above all, “to serve and protect the merchants and their commerce” (23). This is not a new argument, but Talbot provides a systematic picture of the setting up of a diplomatic system via the granting of privileges and the appointment of consuls. He treats the Capitulations as an evolving set of commercial agreements that provided a framework for a complex set supplementary practices, commands, and legal negotiations.

Talbot's analysis of the office of ambassador has interesting resonances to the role of the *baile* in Eric Dursteler's *Venetians in Constantinople* (2006). He divides ambassadorial appointments into four phases between 1660 and 1807, from an early period, when Crown and Levant Company jockeyed for control, to a final phase, when the ambassadorship was dominated by career diplomats primarily attuned to peace negotiations. A key point here is that the Ottomans, like the British, “far from pursuing some supposed ‘Islamic’ diplomacy, took a pragmatic approach to foreign relations” (67).

British customs ledgers and other financial documents serve to provide insight into trade volume, goods, exchange rates, and commercial income and expenditures. Talbot notes a gradual decline in the volume and value of British trade by the mid-eighteenth century and a resurgence at century's end. He juxtaposes accounts of British ambassadors trying to maintain a suitable level of financing for the embassy with those detailing the struggles of Ottoman ambassadors abroad to receive their required subsidies. Talbot highlights the predicament in the 1795 case of Robert Liston attempting to cover the costs of supporting a large household and provide the requisite displays of British “magnificence” on subsidies that were half what was required (99).