

awe-inspiring display of encyclopedic knowledge and verbal wit; the chapter is full of intriguing suggestions: Is “wine min Unferth” a pun by the *Beowulf* poet? What to make of similar uses of *wine* and *winr* by Anglo-Saxon scopos and Scandinavian skalds? More substantial contributions to the field include Fulk’s new and thorough edition of two short homilies, “The Capital Sins” (HomM 2) and “Lenten tide” (HomM 10). Brady’s essay on “swords of doomed inheritance” in *Beowulf* also stands out in drawing thought-provoking connections between the giant sword that Beowulf uses to kill Grendel’s mother, the Heathobard heirloom that will inspire a young warrior to avenge his father, and Wiglaf’s inherited sword. The concluding section on early Anglo-Saxon studies is perhaps the strongest. Bankert’s exploration of how Benjamin Thorpe’s work intersects with that of Joseph Bosworth showcases how much material remains to be studied with respect to this crucial period in the history of the field. Similarly focusing on the nineteenth century and calling attention to the heterogeneity of American Anglo-Saxonism, Niles tries to identify the anonymous author of the “non-racist essay ‘The Anglo-Saxon Race’” (293). This essay, published in 1851, strongly opposed those who would weaponize the study of Old English language and literature to promote a doctrine of “Anglo-Saxon” racial superiority. Niles makes a convincing case for Henry Wadsworth Longfellow “as a staunch promotor of the traditional values ascribed to the field of Anglo-Saxon studies at a time when racist ideologies were threatening to derail both that field of studies and the nation” (301). A welcome and timely study, indeed!

There are some easy criticisms to be leveled at this volume: the collection is far from cohesive; some contributions would probably not have been published in this form elsewhere; there is no index; it is unclear why only the contributions by Fulk, Szarmach, and Bankert have separate bibliographies, the contents of which are duplicated in the volume’s collective bibliography; and 90 USD is a rather high price for a paperback book. In addition, some readers may feel that some of the contributions are outdated or at least out of sync with important discussions in the field (the volume, published in 2021, opens with a brief editorial note that the contributions were written and submitted in 2014). Yet, there may be no better time than the present for the publication of such an inspiring display of collegiality as is offered by this volume. Different approaches are fruitfully brought together to celebrate the work of a generous scholar and the fresh insights offered by the experienced contributors demonstrate that the study of early medieval England has enough material and research avenues for many new generations of scholars to come. Accordingly, *Old English Tradition* raises expectations for more *Festschriften* in the future.

Thijs Porck 
 Leiden University
m.h.porck@hum.leidenuniv.nl

JORDAN S. DOWNS. *Civil War London: Mobilizing for Parliament, 1641–5*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2021. Pp. 326. \$140.00 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.146

In his thoughtful and engaging *Civil War London: Mobilizing for Parliament, 1641–5*, Jordan Downs tells the fascinating story of London during the Civil War era, which for his purposes is largely confined to the years 1641–1645. Drawing on a wide array of sources, he argues that while London’s civic leaders might on the whole have supported parliament during the conflict, Londoners had a variety of opinions on events that would profoundly shape subsequent English history. Building on some of the more methodologically sophisticated works of recent years, Downs focuses on the moments of mobilization through which significant numbers of

Londoners became engaged with national events. He succeeds in offering a new synthesis that allows historians of the period to move well beyond the highly influential work of Valerie Pearl from sixty years ago. Whereas Pearl emphasized the crucial role of London's radicalized elite, Downs demonstrates that humble Londoners were essential to the efforts of parliament to mobilize metropolitan resources for its war effort. Although London's support for parliament's cause was indispensable, the social and economic stresses the war placed on daily life contributed to fatigue and, in some cases, loud calls for peace. By focusing on subtle shifts in popular sentiment in the metropolis, Downs makes an important historiographical intervention.

Throughout *Civil War London*, he explicates the political mood of Londoners with reference to government records and to the ever-expanding output of the metropolitan presses. Downs reconstructs how, from late 1641 through the summer of 1642, providential rhetoric mobilized non-elite Londoners first to respond to the plight of beleaguered Protestants in Ireland and then to support parliament at the outbreak of civil war: "London was at the epicenter of the ideological shifts that were taking place" (45). Those London ministers and preachers who swam against the tide by insisting that attacks on royal authority threatened to bring divine judgment upon the city faced ejection from their positions by municipal authorities. Expediting that process in the summer of 1642 was the successful effort by more radical common councilors to remove Lord Mayor Richard Gurney, who consistently supported the king, and to replace him with Isaac Pennington, a staunch defender of parliament's rights. Under Pennington's leadership, the city government rapidly pressed its citizens—largely through the livery companies—to furnish loans of both money and military supplies to parliament's cause, further enlisting the (sometimes reluctant) support of ordinary Londoners for the war effort.

The unfolding military campaigns of the closing months of 1642 revealed fissures in the ranks of parliament's supporters in London. Downs emphasizes that petitions from Londoners bolstered the support among some in parliament for a negotiated settlement with the king, and he shows how, in the early months of 1643, the City's leaders attempted to represent the complex attitudes of the citizenry. Charles mistook openness to a negotiated resolution for an opportunity to isolate the more militant Londoners, leading him to overplay his hand by insisting that seven prominent citizens—including Mayor Pennington—be arrested for high treason before he would consider a truce. This demand, which recalled his failed effort the previous year to seize five members of parliament sheltering in the City, served only to galvanize support for rebellion. Pennington and his allies intensified their pamphleteering and petitioning efforts to engage popular sympathy for their cause and to marshal metropolitan resources in the service of an all-out military campaign against the king. Downs convincingly identifies this as the key period when "City militants . . . hardened their resolve in light of the king's charge of treason against the seven Londoners" and "zealous Londoners pushed harder than ever to transform their City" (127).

As went London, so went parliament. Hopes for a negotiated settlement of the conflict dimmed throughout the spring, culminating that June in the circulation of competing loyalty oaths that forced Londoners to choose among irreconcilable options. Downs concurs with David Como's assessment that attempts at the mass mobilization of Londoners in support of calls for parliament to press ahead for a military victory set the stage for the creation of the New Model Army eighteen months later (*Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War* [2018]). He differs with Como in arguing that the greatest significance of agitation for a general rising was its fostering, through petitioning, of a popular engagement with politics, albeit one that succeeded with the guidance of the civic elite: "they had delivered their desires from the streets of the metropolis to the very chambers of Westminster; their actions dictated the course of metropolitan politics and, by extension, the civil war" (215). That is not to suggest that London opinion was unified; rather, throughout the remainder of the war ongoing divisions regularly revealed themselves as sermons, pamphlets, petitions, and demonstrations expressed a variety of views on religious differences and weariness with the

costs of the conflict. Although many of parliament's supporters attributed the spectacular victory at Naseby to divine intervention, it was carried out by an army that was to a great extent staffed and funded by Londoners.

Downs deftly narrates a complex story, writing with a confidence earned from many years of research and analysis. He acknowledges that he is entering a well-populated field, but his historiographical interventions advance the conversation among scholars. He has produced a work that will be a touchstone for studies of Civil War London—indeed, of Civil War England—for many years to come.

Joseph P. Ward 
Utah State University
joe.ward@usu.edu

Theresa Earenfight. *Catherine of Aragon: Infanta of Spain, Queen of England*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2022. Pp. 251. \$34.95 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2023.154

Theresa Earenfight's engagingly written and impressively researched book, *Catherine of Aragon: Infanta of Spain, Queen of England* (2022), participates in a radical shift in writing about Catherine of Aragon. If the twentieth century saw only one significant biography of Catherine, Garrett Mattingly's 1941 *Catherine of Aragon*, the twenty-first century has witnessed at least seven—by David Starkey (2003); Luis Ulargui (2004); Julia Fox (2011); Patrick Williams (2013); Amy Licence (2013); Giles Tremlett (2016); and Michelle L. Beer (2018). This list does not include combined biographies of Henry VIII's six wives. Such extensive biographical interest raises the question of what Earenfight's biography might have to offer. Quite a lot, as it turns out. Earenfight states that the book is “neither a conventional biography nor an event-based history” (18); instead, she uses a multidisciplinary lens to identify and analyze the many material objects and geographical spaces associated with Catherine, along with information that they convey about the people with whom she exchanged material objects and letters. Earenfight focuses her chapters on what she calls “portraits” of Catherine during significant periods of her life. Each chapter begins with an overview of the main events during the period, then considers Catherine's state of mind, her community of acquaintances, and material goods and spaces associated with her. Although earlier biographers—particularly Tremlett and Williams—have called attention to some of these objects, none has undertaken such thoroughgoing archival work on them.

The introductory chapter presents Earenfight's focus on material objects, with emphasis on the ways in which Catherine's Spanish legacy was reflected in the luxury goods and clothing that she brought with her to England. Earenfight also discusses attempts to erase material evidence of Catherine after the annulment of her marriage in 1532. In chapter 2, Earenfight discusses Catherine's girlhood in Spain from 1485 to 1501, with emphasis on the geographical spaces that she occupied, including traces of the Islamic legacy in Spain. Earenfight pauses as well at descriptions of royal celebrations. Throughout the chapter, she discusses the influence of Catherine's family and attendants on her. In chapter 3, which covers the period of 1500 to 1509, Earenfight brings the reader to Catherine's voyage from Spain to England, along with the ceremonies attending her short-lived marriage to Arthur, Prince of Wales. Earenfight gives far more detail to the five-month travel from Granada to London than have previous biographies. Earenfight goes on to trace familiar discussions about the deterioration of Catherine's wealth and mental health after the death of Arthur, adding to this discussion the significance