for sustained exploration of economic, social, cultural, or intellectual history. He has walked the battlefields, traced the routes of armies, and studied the weaponry and tactics of the period to good effect. His chapter on arms and armies is the most illuminating in the book and his descriptions of battle are clear. Unfortunately, they are a bit thin, as is inevitable when cramming a 116-year war into 291 pages of text, and his grasp of the psychology and motivation of the medieval knight is spotty. Thus, the advance of the French knights at Agincourt on foot and on too narrow a front is not discussed or explained fully. Even worse, lack of space or eagerness to escape the Shakespeare Syndrome has led Neillands to accept at face value Henry V's orders to kill the prisoners at Agincourt without bothering to evaluate—as John Keegan did in *The Face of Battle* (1976)—the intent and mechanics of so curious a project. Yet Keegan is not even cited in his bibliography, which exhibits some other startling omissions: no mention of Herbert J. Hewit's *The Black Prince's Expedition of 1355-1357* (1958), E. F. Jacob's *Henry V and the Invasion of France* (1947), or D. Seward's *The Hundred Years War* (1982). Even for purely military history, these should have been consulted, and anyone tackling the conflict at all needs every bit of help available in making sense of the family relationships and property transfers that gave rise to the military encounters.

These are a problem Neillands has not quite solved. Summarizing them in the allotted space requires an unusually cogent and vivid exposition, but when he is not writing of battles, his narration is too often plodding and perfunctory. Moreover, the dynamic of the evolution of these relationships accounts for the discontinuities of the conflict, and it is those—the hiatuses and changes in strategy—that give the war its shape and coherence. They are only clear when changing motivations of the participants are highlighted rather than obscured in the telling. Since the tactics changed little throughout the war until very near the end, concentrating on campaign and battle pieces produces too much of a sameness as though the war were merely a chain of similar incidents, like a lengthy necklace of well-matched pearls.

It is hard to fault Neillands for giving us a string of pearls rather than a diamond brooch. Students and teachers alike will appreciate his military expertise, the eight maps located exactly where needed in the text, the 17 black and white plates and seven color plates, and the endpaper genealogies of English and French dynasties. Still, for an account that is more successful in conveying the context of the conflict, try Jonathan Sumption's *The Hundred Years War: Trial by Battle* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. Pp. 672. $36.95).

Suffolk University Joseph M. McCarthy

Christopher Hill. *A Nation of Change and Novelty: Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990. Pp. xii, 272. $27.50.

Christopher (J. E. C.) Hill is the grand old man of Tudor-Stuart English historiography. Born just before the Great War, in 1912, and now four score years of age, his long and distinguished career was capped by what is perhaps the most coveted of all British academic prizes, the Mastership of Balliol College, Oxford from 1965-1978, from whence he gradually retired from academe. What makes Hill's career so fascinating is that for a generation he was the leading Marxist scholar of England's travails as it moved from the medieval to the modern age, 1500-1700. Indeed, until 1957 he was a member of the British Communist Party.

How academic respectability could issue from Marxist scholarship is nicely illustrated by this collection of Hill's essays for they reflect historical thinking that is wide-ranging, intellectually lively, and only slightly dogmatic. All, save one, "Governments and Public Relations: Reformation to Glorious Revolution," have already appeared in print in some form.

Teaching History 18(1). DOI: 10.33043/TH.18.1.29-30. ©1993 Richard Harvey

The others are: "The Place of the Seventeenth-Century Revolution in English History;" "Political Discourse in Early Seventeenth-Century England;" "Archbishop Laud's Place in English History;" "The World Revolution;" "Gerrard Winstanley and Freedom;" "Seventeenth-Century English Radicals and Ireland;" "Abolishing the Ranters;" "Literature and the English Revolution;" "The Restoration and Literature;" and "History and the Present."

The essay that best illustrates the enduring themes in Hill's research, as well as his strengths and weaknesses, is "Abolishing the Ranters." In many ways, what Hill seeks to do in this essay is, against today's revisionists, to defend the thesis that the English Revolution was a decisive moment in both English and world history, and that the Ranters—a loosely jointed radical movement of the 1640s that sought to overturn all of conventional political, social, and economic thinking—were representative of how revolutionary the revolution was, 1640-1660. Moreover, their ultimate failure, like that of the Levellers and Diggers, is seen as emblematic of England's failure to turn boldly toward a new, better future. How cogently one can argue that thesis when one's only sources are printed tracts is the question.

What Hill has always assumed is that, historically, politics and ideas are grounded in social and economic dynamics. While his earlier work was set within a rather crude Marxist framework (the English seventeenth century as that period in which lord-serf was replaced by capitalist-proletariat), his later work is much more sophisticated. More than that, his sources today are no longer exclusively state papers and parliamentary debates. However, what Hill has never paid much attention to is the question of gender or women's history in general. Nor has he ever been able to set aside his preconception of what should have happened in seventeenth-century England—a turning.

Still, Hill's work is of enormous importance in the historiography of early modern England. This collection of essays reminds us of how fine an historian he really is.

Ohio University Richard Harvey

Jeffrey Burton Russell. *Inventing the Flat Earth: Columbus and Modern Historians*. New York: Praeger, 1991. Pp. xiv, 117. Cloth, $12.95.

Not wholly unlike previous anniversaries of the European discovery of the Americas, the Columbian Quincentenary, now thankfully behind us, brought with it a cacophony of scholarly reinterpretations, intellectual, cultural, and social controversies, and myriad varieties of kitsch on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean and beyond. Once the flotsam and jetsam generated by this celebration is brushed aside, what remains is a serious body of largely historical writing and therewith a restimulated popular interest in world history. The brief volume entitled *Inventing the Flat Earth: Columbus and Modern Historians* by Jeffrey Burton Russell, a professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, is an example of this scholarship that also explores the broader global context.

In this essay, Professor Russell, the author of numerous works on medieval, intellectual, and world history and its teaching, seeks out the origins of the popular misperception that most of Columbus's European contemporaries believed the world to be flat. Russell emphasizes that it is of particular importance that the actual source of this historical myth be recognized because of its continuing appearance in many modern textbooks and historical studies, including Daniel J. Boorstin's Pulitzer Prize-winning *The Discoverers* (1983). The genesis and perpetuation of this view, which is not true, but widely believed, also touches upon questions about the nature of historical knowledge, truth, and honesty.