

2006

# English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama, by Mary Floyd-Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003 (Book Review)

Imtiaz Habib  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english\\_fac\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_fac_pubs)

 Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Habib, Imtiaz, "English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama, by Mary Floyd-Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003 (Book Review)" (2006). *English Faculty Publications*. 57.  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english\\_fac\\_pubs/57](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_fac_pubs/57)

## Original Publication Citation

Habib, I. (2006). *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*, by Mary Floyd-Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003 (Book Review). *Medieval & Renaissance Drama in England*, 19, 286-295.

is somewhat disappointing that this has the effect of obscuring one of the four nations.

Following on from the discussion of Spenser's attitude toward the idea of "Britain," the tenth and final essay, "Shakespeare's Ecumenical Britain," focuses on Shakespeare's attitude toward the accession of James VI and I. Reading *Troilus and Cressida*, *King Lear*, and *Cymbeline* against Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, Hadfield asserts that Shakespeare rewrites the history of Britain to engage with the issue of James's succession. In his analysis of *King Lear*, Hadfield observes the similarity between Lear and James to criticize or at least portray an anxiety over the actions of the king in the first few years of his reign. In his examination of *Cymbeline*, however, Hadfield suggests that Shakespeare is more positive in his portrayal of James (via his characterization of the eponymous hero), but he ultimately maintains that Shakespeare raises many questions about James's kingship, which can only be answered in the later years of the king's reign.

There is no conclusion to the book, which is a loss because it would have been an opportunity for Hadfield to discuss how the different interests of all ten chapters come together under the book's central theme of English literature and the "matter of Britain." Nevertheless, the essays included in this collection are individually interesting and important, and *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Matter of Britain* is a significant contribution to the debate on English Renaissance literature and the New British History. Hopefully future scholarship will continue to supplement, complicate, and challenge Hadfield's research by juxtaposing English literature with Scots, Welsh, and Irish writing of the period, comparing Catholic conceptualizations of the relationship between the four nations of the British Isles with those of Protestant writers, not to mention exploring the relationship between women's writing and the British question.\*

### Note

\*For an important contribution to this debate, see, for example, David J. Baker and Willy Maley, eds., *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). An earlier version of Hadfield's "Bruited Abroad" is published in this collection.

*English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*, by Mary Floyd-Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xii + 256. Cloth \$65.00.

**Reviewer: IMTIAZ HABIB**

Cued by Gail Kern Paster's success in her book *The Body Embarrassed* in reading early modern gender constructions through sixteenth- and

seventeenth-century humor theory, Mary Floyd-Wilson sets out in this book to do the same for racial constructions. Drawing on a range of classical, medieval, and early modern texts—concerning what she calls ethnological geohumoralism—Floyd-Wilson contends that people from Africa and the warmer southern regions were regarded by classical and medieval writers as wise and balanced in contrast to northern people who were felt to be barbaric and mentally undeveloped. This typological mapping, which put the Anglo-European at a disadvantage, was, in a series of complex moves by early modern Anglo-European thinkers, manipulated and rearranged to make the northerners more balanced, sensible, and well formed in contrast with southern (African) people who were thought to be physically and mentally inferior. This mapping is reflected in popular early modern English drama, and it was perpetuated, as Floyd-Wilson demonstrates, in a representative selection of early modern English plays and masques by Marlowe (*Tamburlaine the Great, Parts 1 and 2*), Jonson (*The Masque of Blackness*), and Shakespeare (*Othello* and *Cymbeline*).

Specifically, the book's argument as Floyd-Wilson helpfully lays it out in the introduction is that the English were always aware of their disadvantaged position in classical geohumoral ethnological taxonomy as a barbaric northern people, but that they cloaked it throughout the Middle Ages in a national originary myth of descent from Troy. As descendents of Brut the son of Aeneas, the English could lay claim to a superior position of Mediterranean people in a classical schema. This position, however, was eroded when England severed its ideological ties with Rome in the Supremacy Act of 1534, leaving the English to face their barbaric northern identity once again (14). It is at this point that early modern English natural philosophers, aided and cued by their continental colleagues, set about to alter their ethnic position by claiming first that Caesar's conquest of Britain had purified and ennobled them, and that they were further improved by following the best of foreign customs. But, because this argument (typically made by William Camden) left the English too dependent on and imitative of foreign cultures, a subsequent argument was constructed, exemplified in the work of Richard Verstegan (1605), in which English ennoblement and purification was to have occurred without the Roman conquest of Britain but owing to Anglo-Saxon immigrations. Fundamental to both these impulses is the English anxiety to separate their own barbarism from that identified with their opposite—the southern (African) people—who were, in turn, reconstructed in a more demonstratively negative fashion. Thus, "blackness" was "reinterpreted as a sign of depravity at the same time that English people's northern roots are the subject of great scrutiny" and "their own sense of ethnicity and scrutiny was in flux" (18–19). According to Floyd-Wilson, most contemporary studies of early modern racial formations, following Winthrop Jordan's path-breaking work, have "gloss[ed]" over, "obscure[d]" (5), and missed this

“ethnological history” (11). English public theater is the natural “lightning rod” for these “ideological concerns” and these contradictory geohumoral taxonomic rearrangements (17) because the English are, in their own description (as in Thomas Wright’s of 1604) like “stage-players” in their fondness for “aping and imitation” (17).

Within current studies of racial formations in the early modern period, this book offers an important new argument. It does so in two ways. First, Floyd-Wilson attempts to study early modern English racial formations not just descriptively, through an examination of modes of representational analyses, but also symptomatically, by studying the nature of racial formations and their origins as the constituents of a fundamental paradigm shift. And second, Floyd-Wilson locates such phenomena uniquely, in terms that are historically appropriate and not anachronistic, a rare virtue in current scholarly conversations on this topic. To be able to track and unpack the emergence of early modern racial thought within its own historical context (a prominently visible, long-running taxonomic humor theory well established in ancient, medieval, and early modern European cultural history) rather than in our own modern context (however necessary and unavoidable the latter might be), is to be able to claim for early modern English race studies a more legitimate space than it has hitherto been able to acquire. Such a space is crucial if such studies are to decisively change the received and routinely rehearsed fallacies about the color neutrality of the period. Furthermore, among competing current scholarly explanations for the formation of racial formations—the shock of expeditionary contact with physical and cultural difference (as discussed by Winthrop Jordan and Kim Hall), the rise of capitalism (discussed by Emily Bartels and Dymphna Callaghan), the growth of colonialism (a recurrent interest in the work of Ania Loomba, Jyotsna Singh, Imtiaz Habib, and Shanker Raman<sup>1</sup>)—Floyd-Wilson’s book begins to explore a startling new area, one closer to home, namely, the Reformation (14). Citing the Reformation as one of the causes of the emergence of derogatory stereotypes of black and colored people is a novel idea and a plausible one, since arguably the multifarious extent of the impact of the Reformation on the political and cultural history of sixteenth-century England is often not factored into contemporary early modern studies as significantly as it should be. Curiously, however, even Floyd-Wilson doesn’t make as much of this interesting connection as would have been desirable.

Among the book’s other strengths is its formidable repertoire of both well-known and obscure historical authorities. Extensive and repeated citations, and complex intricate analyses and counterpointing of these sources, establish the book’s dense backdrop of historical Anglo-European ethnic theory that serves as the burden of proof for its argument. If an initial chapter comparatively assesses in detail the nature of Hippocrates’ theory of somatic differences in his *Airs, Waters, and Places* and that of Aristotle in his *Problems*,

and then traces selectively the variable transmission of both schools of thought through Pseudo-Aristotle, Vitruvius, Pliny, Albert Magnus to Jean Bodin, Pierre Charron, Thomas Walkington, Giovanni Botero in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, another chapter traces the complex mutations of this geohumoral ethnic theory in the hands of Juan Harte, William Camden, Andrew Boorde, William Slatyer, Anthony Weldon, as well as of Edmund Spenser, Erasmus, Levinus Lemnius, and Thomas Wright. Yet another chapter invokes the writings of Marcilio Ficino, Hector Boece, Roger Ascham, Thomas Cogan, Nicholas Coeffeteau, Thomas Elyot, John Dee, Francis Bacon, Richard Verstegan, Thomas Browne, Robert Burton, and John Bulwer. If this sounds like a catalog it is because the works of these authors comprise sections of Floyd-Wilson's discussion that are an intense and exhaustive catechism of the history of European natural philosophy from ancient to early modern times.

Additionally, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* demonstrates an uncanny effectiveness in terms of textual citation that consistently requires the reader to rethink familiar passages. The best examples of this feature are Floyd-Wilson's citations from *Tamburlaine, Part 1* (101–2) as exemplifications of how the title character reflects the paradoxical role of the eloquent barbarian challenging civilizations with which his historical audience, beset by “anxieties about their own ethnic identity” (96), would have identified. Tamburlaine's insistence on winning a verbal battle with Theridamas, and his success in doing so (in 1.2, as with Bajazeth in 3.3) validates Floyd-Wilson's claim of Marlowe's “set[ting] up [a] simple binary” (100). This emerges again in the examples of Tamburlaine's unchangeable emotional hardness against the caged Bajazeth (4.4), highlighted in both Zenocrates' incredulous outcries to him and in his stern affirmative reply to her (101); and this binary tendency occurs also in the closing lines of Tamburlaine's soliloquy (1.5) in which he states that the temptation of Zenocrates' beauty (just before battle) is something that his Scythian hardness can acknowledge, but can also subdue (104–5). Floyd-Wilson's handling of these familiar textual moments accomplishes a tight fit between play text and her context, which renders her critical perceptions sharply visible.

In Jonson's *Masque of Blackness*, and particularly in focusing on images of the English sun's powers (“His light sciential is, and past mere nature, / Can salve the rude defects of every creature . . . / This sun is temperate, and refines / All things on which his radiance shines” [ll. 226–35]) of “climatic influence and the civilizing effects of good government in a way that . . . recalls . . . geohumoralism” (117), Floyd-Wilson points out how the lines are directly reflective of both James I's own political writings and of Bodin's influence on him (117–18). Equally telling, in her *Othello* chapter (specifically 132–35), is the author's analysis of Shakespeare's memory of Jonson's Thorello in *Every Man in his Humour*, and also of the depiction of a jealousy

in him (from 1.4.211–25 of Jonson's play) that is recognizably Italianate rather than exclusively African. Consequently, as Floyd-Wilson points out, "Iago's strangely detached jealousy would have been more familiar to an English audience than Othello's violent metamorphoses" (133). The network of associations presented here carefully positions Floyd-Wilson's argument that the negative stereotyping of Africa and blackness in *Othello* coexists with an interested early modern English negative alteration of the typology of Italian/Mediterranean people who are privileged favorably (as ideally temperate) in earlier geohumoral hierarchy. And generally speaking, the discussion of *The Masque of Blackness*, like the one of *Cymbeline*, draws reasonable critical credibility by being framed within the political insecurities that surrounded the proposed Jacobean merger of England and Scotland.

Yet despite the attractions of wide historical scholarship and original literary readings, the book presents several troubling problems. First, the chronological ranges that her argument covers are confusing. Exactly when the northern Anglo-Europeans replaced their negative typecasting with a more favorable self-image, and correspondingly, rearranged their image of the southern/African people is unclear. The dates of many key texts cited by Floyd-Wilson, such as Huarte's in 1594, or Wright's in 1604, are too late to explain the racialization of black people already at work in Tudor England. Yet, at moments the author refers to the phenomenon as a late seventeenth-century development (85–86), and at others she claims that the phenomenon is signally marked in an early seventeenth-century play such as *Hamlet* (78–79). Moreover, the book is unaware of the numerous black people documented in Elizabethan London parish registers, legal records, and household accounts that comprise a bonded chattel population living in a legal no-man's-land below the level of slavery.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the book offers no reference to the social and cultural climate that enables Elizabeth's deportation of blacks from England, whom the monarch calls "those kinds of people," in 1596 and 1601. Of course, Floyd-Wilson's assumption, as that shared by some other scholars, is that there were few people in England in the sixteenth century, an assumption that is badly in need of qualification. Even if too great a precision of dates is neither possible nor desirable for following the kind of fundamental shift that is the book's object of study, an overexpedient connection between the claim for one historical source and that for a later or earlier one, as, for instance, the citation of Roger Ascham's apprehension in the 1570s of the encouragement of the imitation of foreign customs that Thomas Wright and John Milton articulate in 1604 and the 1650s respectively (14), or the easy linkage between Thomas Browne's and John Bulwer's ideas on humoral ethnicity in the seventeenth century and William Camden's in the sixteenth (82–85), or the simultaneous invocation of Bodin and Huarte's challenging of classical geohumoral taxonomy in 1566 and 1594 and Charon's affirmation of it in 1612 (73), might convey the impression of skewed

or manipulated evidence. Likewise, to quote Carl Linnaeus's negative human classifications of Africans from his 1758 edition of *The System of Nature* as proof of the "complex history of ethnological significance" two centuries earlier (86) is to make questionable the integrity of the evidentiary narrative itself.

There is also some question as to whether the author's theoretical texts are too arcane to be a factor in early modern English quotidian thought, which arguably is more intimately affected by common travel accounts and the popular experiences of overseas venture capital trading expeditions. A clearer and more careful relationship between the provenance of the learned and of the demotic might have been helpful in making the effects of such a shift fully credible. Also, the very density of her citations of historical authorities, which frequently approach mind-wearing proportions, both in the repetitiveness of her invocation of them and in her dizzy maneuvering between them (as in the three chapters in part 1), convert what could have been their compulsive effectiveness into what may be construed as special pleading. The book's two-part structure makes its project somewhat of a deductive one, in which the evidentiary data of the popular stage is fitted into an already constructed framework, rather than the other way around.

The consequences of these difficulties emerge in later chapters where her assertions sometimes strain credulity; and unfortunately, the chapters on the *Masque of Blackness* and *Othello* contain numerous examples of such opacities. Examples taken from Jonson's masque include the rather desperate derivation of the word "faithful" in Niger's speech between lines 122–25 as "referr[ing] simultaneously to the southerners' capacity for divine contemplation and the fixity of their blackness" (125). Moreover, the author also asserts that "*The Masque of Blackness* presents the *imagined* possibility that the Britons have inherited, from ancient African influences, the revered subtlety of inward blackness" (128; emphasis added). If "imagined possibility" here refers to her earlier invocation of John Twynne's fantastic history of the ancient Welsh being colonized by dark Phoenicians (124), Floyd-Wilson is silently transferring that Welsh history onto the English.

In the *Othello* discussion the reader encounters assertions such as the following: Desdemona's ethnicity is up for debate (153); Iago is like the Turk (153); Othello is a portrait of the English, and the Englishman/northerner's changeability—which was his geohumoral marginalization earlier—is now an admirable trait (156–57); the "force of Iago's hostility towards Othello outweighs our impulse to condemn him" (158). A summary paragraph describes the chapter's argument thus:

In other words, the play aims to validate the northern complexion while forgetting its origins in a tripartite geohumoral system . . . the English sought out the constancy associated with blackness and the wariness of Italianate inwardness in their

effort to counter those qualities of their natural complexion that were construed as excessively effeminate: impressionability, inconstancy, naivete. *Othello* answers back that the incorporation of blackness . . . necessarily destroys the inherent virtues of a white complexion. (158)

So, is *Othello* assisting in the English geohumoral rearrangement of its negatively marked northern temperament or is he resisting such a rearrangement? Other similarly opaque assertions are given—such as the statement that in *Titus Andronicus* (2.3), when Aaron tells Tamora that he is ruled by Saturn and not Venus, he is “explicitly” disclaiming sexual desire according to classical geohumoral theory (43–44). But this, unhappily, turns the striking originality of Floyd-Wilson’s textual analyses into narrowly based and unconvincing critical hobbyhorsing. In fact, Tamora’s liaison with Aaron, which ruins her and Rome’s imperial order, projects in this, and in many other early modern English play texts, the African’s alleged sexual riot and civic treachery.<sup>3</sup>

The reader also encounters a disturbing looseness in the use of terms fundamental to the author’s argument. For instance, it is unclear (to this reviewer at least) exactly what the term “southern” stands for. Is Italy—which is south of England, but north of Africa—southern or northern? How is England, which is south of Scandinavia, northern (93)? How credibly can Marlowe’s Scythian Tamburlaine, a central Asian, be understood to be a northerner (89–91), even to the geographically confused popular Elizabethan imagination? Or how believably can “the Moor’s [Morocco’s in *The Merchant of Venice*] frustration with the determinism of geohumoralism” be seen to “mirro[r] what the English felt themselves” (43)? To be sure, many of these contradictions are embedded in Floyd-Wilson’s source texts, but the manner in which Floyd-Wilson appropriates them and draws intellectual profit from them is also contradictory and confusing.

Another troubling term is “interiority,” which seems to change definition throughout Floyd-Wilson’s text. Is it to be understood in the argot of classical and medieval geohumoralism as a designator of a particular southern sensibility (which is what the book implies in most places, including in the passage from 158 cited above); or does it mean subjectivity in the vocabulary of modern analyses of early modern cultural development (which is what it seems to suggest on 178 in the following statement: “This is not to say . . . that any of these figures possess a deep interiority”)? Furthermore, one of the lingering aftereffects of the book is an uncertainty about what the expression “racialized” or “racialism” means. The author’s definition of racialism “in its earliest and most rudimentary form” as that which “detached people’s complexions from their traditional humoral significance” (142), seems to be more a justification of humoral epistemology rather than an interrogation of it. Here a plea of historicism will not suffice. It doesn’t matter what the logic

of that epistemology is; the question is: what does it do? Is the attempt to readjust the position of the northern/English in classical geohumoral ethnic taxonomy that produces racist impulses, or is it “emerging racist impulses” that disrupt geohumoralism (79)? That is, is racism extrinsic to geohumoralism or a part of it? There is ultimately a real question about the extent to which humoralism and racism can be assumed to be the same thing, a question exacerbated by the fact that Floyd-Wilson makes no attempt to locate her construction of geohumoral ethnology in terms of some recent discussions of early modern English notions of race, such as Margo Hendricks’s important survey essay, “Surveying Race.”<sup>4</sup>

Overall, the book’s project is marked by a subtle but perceptible defensiveness in its author’s approach to the subject of race in the English early modern period. Running throughout the book are regularly repeated cautions about English racial identity during the early modern period: “We need to reinterpret the Englishmen’s encounters in West Africa with the understanding that their own sense of whiteness and ethnicity was in flux” (18–19); “we should also be cautioned against infusing blackness with racialized characteristics without recognizing the necessary rearrangement of knowledge that preceded the production of ‘special categor[ies] of humankind’” (45); “it would be overtly hasty, however, to identify their discourse as racist” (73); the “conventional argument about” Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness* “overlooks entirely its implicit appeals to modern ethnology, which maintained that white northern complexions were in humoral terms as intemperate and barbaric as the burnt complexions of Ethiopia” (118). These anxious warnings merge with, and are reflected in, Floyd-Wilson’s sense of the Anglo-European sense of self and its constructions of *whiteness*, in which historical Africans or people of color serve only as discursive proxies for her overall argument. The book tries to deflect current scholarly conversations on blackness and black people during the early modern period by concentrating on whiteness and *its* struggles. In a subtle sense, this makes it seem as if the author’s overall heuristic move is to try to consolidate, if not regain, the high moral ground for traditional early modern Anglo-European cultural history from the onslaughts of the current scholarly “unpacking” of gender and race.

In the final analysis, “geohumoral ethnology” maybe too distant, decayed, and abstract a category by which to describe the othering of racial construction, whether our analyses are based on nonvisible ideological difference (faith narratives, living practices) or on observable physical stigmata, both of which occur visibly in early modern Anglo-European history (especially in terms of popular responses to the deadly threat of the Ottoman Turks and the growing cultural baggage produced by and deployed in sustaining the predatory transoceanic venture capital trading enterprises to the south, east, and west). The book’s failure to connect the variable narrative of ethnological geohumoralism to that of the equally erratic narrative of English slavery *be-*

fore the slave trade (in the sixteenth century transitions from *villeinage* to indentured servitude and apprenticeship)—and which has the unfortunate effect of confirming the contemporary fallacy of believing that the slave trade sprang up full-grown in the later seventeenth century—weakens the effectiveness of its argument. Simply “humor”-ing race in the early modern period, in other words, may diffuse and reduce its deadly material consequences. The author’s basic point—that early modern England’s negative constructions of people of color are the product of the former’s own insecurities—may resonate with some readers, but its potential for apology should not be foregrounded. The human and material devastation that followed that construction during the next three hundred years cannot be undone simply by apologizing. Thus, while being an impressively learned book that affirms the necessity of revising our knowledge of the early modern period, and that tries simultaneously to contribute to such revisions in an original way, the book might be more appealing to readers who feel uncomfortable in discussing racial formations in the early modern period than to those who wish to confront unambiguously the origins of modern Anglo-European racial thought.

### Notes

1. Winthrop Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Towards the Negro, 1552–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968); Kim Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Emily Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation and Marlowe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993); Dymna Callaghan, *Shakespeare without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); Ania Loomba, *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1989); Jyotsna Singh and Ivo Kamp, *Travel Knowledge: European “Discoveries” in the Early Modern Period* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Imtiaz Habib, *Shakespeare and Race: Postcolonial Praxis in the Early Modern Period* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2000); Shankar Raman, *Framing “India”: The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001). An important compendium of such discussions is Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, eds., *Women, Race and Writing in Early Modern England* (New York: Routledge, 1994). In her index Floyd-Wilson misrepresents Jordan’s first name as William (251).

2. Such records number nearly three hundred at current count, and that is at best a provisional number. They come from nearly every level of early modern English society and government. Full discussions of these records will appear in my forthcoming book, *Imprints of the Invisible: Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500–1676*.

3. See for instance the attributes of Webster’s Zanche in *The White Devil*, Marston’s Zanthia in *Sophonisba*, Beaumont and Fletcher’s Zanthia in *The Knight of Malta*, Massinger’s Zanthia in *The Bondmen*, Rowley’s Fydella in *All’s Lost by Lust*, and Fletcher’s Kate and Egla in *Monsieur Thomas* and *The Spanish Curate*, respec-

tively. See my essay "'Hel's Perfect Character' or the Blackamoor Maid in Early Modern English Drama: The Postcolonial Cultural History of a Dramatic Type," *Literature Interpretation Theory* 11 (2000): 277–304.

4. Margo Hendricks, "Surveying Race," in *Shakespeare and Race*, ed. Catherine M. S. Alexander and Stanley Wells (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1–22.

**The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580–1720**, by Gerald MacLean. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Pp. xxi + 267. Cloth \$59.95.

*Reviewer:* PALMIRA BRUMMETT

There is an element of theatricality inherent in MacLean's text, which presents the tales of four travelers and a funeral. Each tale is staged for a particular audience; and the author writes himself subtly into the drama as a latter-day traveler, reliving the sites of his subjects' sojourns. "*The Rise of Oriental Travel*," according to the author, "retells the stories of four journeys into the Ottoman Mediterranean undertaken by Englishmen during the century before there was a British empire. It is a study of English people encountering Islamic cultures, and so it is also necessarily an enquiry into the global formations of Englishness itself" (xiii). The journey itself, however, its narration, and the personalities of the narrators are the key foci here. As MacLean notes, he has tried, "to recreate, as far as possible, the sense that travel writers themselves seek to create of discovering things as they go" (xvii). Thus the author provides a narration of the narratives, accompanied by substantive historical and literary contextualization. The narrative flow works internally, within each tale and throughout. Each travel account (those of Thomas Dallam, William Biddulph, Henry Blount, and Mr. T.S., accompanied by an epilogue on the disposition of the remains of Lady Anne Glover) is treated as a discrete whole and could thus be detached for class use. Each segment provides a variation on the English travel narrative, while numerous artful allusions to the other segments weave the separate tales into a clear and compelling whole.

MacLean begins his work with a prologue (a translated excerpt from Mustafa bin Ibrahim Safi's history, *Zübdet üt-tevarih*), an argument (delineating his main points), and a preface (relating his own interaction with the text, the development of his approach, and his rationale for revisiting the sites of the travel tales). In this latter section, he describes himself "not simply as a literary biographer investigating authors, but also in some sense as a biographer of the books themselves" (xviii). The author goes on to note that he regards "with caution all claims to know what an historically remote person actually felt. However, the books they wrote survive and, in some sense, so too do the