Kenneth R. Andrews. *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Pp. ix, 394. U.S. \$49.50 (paper \$16.95).

Since he began research on Elizabeth privateering some thirty years ago, K.R. Andrews has been in the forefront of the small but industrious group of English maritime historians of the Early Modern period. Rejecting the Anglocentric and methodologically narrow efforts of earlier generations, including Oppenheim, Corbett, Newton, and Williamson, Andrews hopes with this offering to replace James Williamson's standard treatment (*A Short History of British Expansion*, Vol. I) of 1945. In this effort, he stands on a wealth of post-war scholarship on maritime history and international relations of the period, employs a much broader breadth of vision and, by and large, he succeeds. *Trade, Plunder and Settlement* is an expansive, informed and articulate treatment, perhaps liable to bits of fine tuning or interpretive adjustment, but likely to remain a standard source for some time.

Andrews treats his three titular activities as the sequential objectives of English maritime activity during the period at hand. England's early prominence in European exploration (to c. 1510) fell victim to both a lack of royal interest under Henry VIII and a lack of financial support from a London commercial elite grown complacent with prosperity. When the commercial vagaries of the mid-century jarred this mercantile satisfaction, a search for new trading outlets – to the northeast and northwest, the Levant and Africa – gained private support and royal encouragement. Yet (though Andrews is vague about this) by the middle of Elizabeth's reign the merchants' goal seems to shift from the need to export English cloth to the even greater need to import luxury goods to please the domestic market. With this shift came the intense need to obtain gold and silver bullion by fair means or foul, first from Africa and then from South America. With increasing Anglo-Spanish animosity the means shifted as well, from trade to plunder, or at best a facile combination of the two.

Settlement proves both last and least of Andrews's triad, and came more as a strategic and commercial consideration than as an end in itself. Raleigh anticipated that a Roanoke colony would grow Mediterranean crops for an English market while providing Gilbert and Grenville's dream of an operations base against the Spanish to the south. Ironically, it failed in part because Elizabeth was too entangled with the Spanish in home waters, and because relief expeditions were more interested in plunder. Only in the seventeenth century did the lure of plunder yield to more organized and better-funded long distance trade, and only then were sturdier foundations for settlement forthcoming.

Throughout this sweeping, yet detailed work Andrews tries to relate maritime activity to domestic politics and international affairs on one hand and to economic considerations on the other. He best succeeds with the former. Though we do see the relation between commerce and exploration, and between financial backing and successful enterprise, Andrews tells us little of the impact of certain technological advances in shipping and ordnance, suffering here in comparison with D.B.Quinn and A.N.Ryan's commendable *England's Sea Empire, 1550-1642* (London, 1983). Equally serious but less excusable is the neglect of research

(especially Joan Thirsk's *Economic Policy and Projects, the Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England*, Oxford, 1975) describing the inter-relationship of changing consumer tastes, domestic manufactures, and overseas trade. When *Trade, Plunder and Settlement* goes to a second edition, which we have sound reason to anticipate, one hopes that these small blemishes will be removed. In the meantime, we can rely on Andrews for the most comprehensive survey of the subject yet available.

ROBERT TITTLER, *Concordia University*

John Orrell. *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Pp. xiii, 218, Illus.

With a brilliant series of articles and with the publication of *The Quest for Shakespeare's Globe* (Cambridge University Press, 1983) John Orrell established his eminence among scholars of Elizabethan theatre history. The publication of *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb* can only enhance his stature. Although a number of volumes now familiar to theatre historians have been published since 1973, the four hundredth anniversary of Jones' birth, the present book is the first to bring together from various sources those drawings by Jones and Webb primarily intended for the scenic drama – as distinct from the masque – from 1605-1665. And as Orrell writes, those drawings "form by far the richest vein of evidence about English playhouses of the seventeenth century, a period from which only the sparsest graphic documents have survived to illustrate the development of the stage" (xi). Such a vein of evidence requires the most meticulous care to explicate, and Orrell's generous treatment and attention to detail delight as they enlighten.

In the Introduction Orrell provides a brief general biography of Jones with specific attention being paid to those aspects of his work which form the later chapters of the book. Described too, and particularly useful, is Webb's association with Jones beginning in 1628 and continuing until Jones' death in 1652. It is to Webb that we owe the survival of a number of Jones' plans, be they originals or copies by Webb. And, through whatever circumstances, it was into Webb's hands that Jones' books and drawings passed after his death. Not only did Webb preserve the collection intact during his lifetime, but he also did some arranging of the drawings, especially plans, sections, and scenes designed for the production of plays.

Nine theatres, some newly identified, are treated chronologically in the book, and a separate chapter is devoted to each. The first is the theatre at Christ Church, Oxford, erected in 1605 for a series of academic plays attended by King James. Orrell is the first to identify correctly this theatre which is miscatalogued in the British Library as "some theatre, probably in Germany." In fact, the drawing has nothing to do with Germany at all. The drawing shows a theatre probably designed by Simon Basil, then Comptroller of the King's Works, and there were scenes by Jones which do not survive. Orrell presents all the known documentary evidence and arrives at a system of *periaktoi* such as Jones could have used for changing the scene three times during a single play. Although Orrell was not the