

serious food scholar would find useful. The chapter on milk as a symbol of virtue in medieval times considers the meaning of milk as a breast food in an overarching religious context. Her exposition on the culture of the milkmaid in the eighteenth century is a much-needed and welcome addition to the literature on that social and economic role. In her chapter on milk as a curative in the nineteenth century's "age of indigestion," she brings milk into the context of history of medicine. Additionally, her chapter on milk as "good for everybody" in the modern era covers the effects of industrialization.

Sometimes, however, the larger meaning of the narrative is unclear. Reading page after page of painstaking research about the changing styles of milkmaid, or the rise of milk chocolate, one is continually fascinated by the careful marshaling of evidence but never quite sure where the details are leading. The topics are interesting as ways to organize Valenze's substantial research, but there is little overall structure to the book other than the specialness of milk through the ages. But why milk has been special in so many ways, for so long, remains unexplained.

This criticism comes in part from disciplinary differences between author and this reviewer. As a sociologist, I use historical evidence to frame and explain some larger aspect of social life. Looking across the disciplinary border, I see historians defending and expanding a different intellectual territory. There is a stronger commitment to give an account in which the primary research drives the story. However, a final chapter that mused in a more speculative way about why milk has played so many roles in so many societies throughout the historical time periods studied would have tied the chapters together in a way that made the book more of a unified whole.

The centrality of milk as a substance in the book belies certain facts that become clear when you read other histories of this food: that fresh milk is a very different commodity from aged products like cheese or the various fermented products that have comprised the majority of dairy consumption throughout the ages. Valenze characterizes all of this as "milk" whether fresh or preserved, physical or symbolic (as in the Virgin's wisdom). She emphasizes the specialness of several types of dairy products that she treats as a single item: milk; the fermented and aged commodities that were the predominant way milk was consumed before the industrial age are lumped together with fresh milk as one "global and local" story. This framing strengthens her claim that milk has been special throughout all periods, but she is really talking about different substances, all of which happen to begin with the cow.

But very much in Valenze's favor is the global aspect of the book. No history of milk has brought such a wide geographic lens to the topic. Most previous treatments (including my own) have focused on milk in Western culture. Valenze brings in both Middle Eastern and Indian milk histories—substantial, important and previously not studied in English-language works. The history of the rise of fresh milk dairying in India was crying

out for this broad overview. Much of the English-language work in this area had been piecemeal, and Valenze brings it together admirably.

In the end, this much-needed reference work fills in large gaps in the history of dairy substances, fresh or otherwise. No scholar will be able to write about milk without referring to this book from now on. Valenze makes a significant contribution to, and enhances the scholarship around, this substance.

E. MELANIE DUPUIS  
University of California,  
Santa Cruz

RICHARD LANDES. *Heaven on Earth: The Varieties of the Millennial Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2011. Pp. xix, 499. \$35.00.

This is an immense and wide-ranging book (a "craggy edifice," as Garry Trompf rightly notes in his blurb for the back cover); all attempts to review it must fail in view of its breadth, diversity, and ambition. Richard Landes's first "law of apocalyptic dynamics" is "Wrong does not mean inconsequential"; the second is "One person's messiah is another's antichrist." The first "law" is in fact not a universal law, but a powerful historiographic program of revision: just because chroniclers and historians since antiquity have correctly noted that apocalyptic hopes and/or fears have always been dashed does not mean that such hopes were unimportant, transitory, superficial or merely crazed, as most historians have assumed and continue to claim.

Landes's career as a scholar of millennialism began with a reassessment of the Truce of God and Peace of God movements of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries in Carolingian and Capetian France, around the year 1000 (during which feudal warlords were tamed and France was "blanketed by a white mantle of churches"). He has persistently argued that these episodes were mass movements of millennial enthusiasm, the core of which was elided and denied by clerical observers after the fact (or, in Landes's catchy phrase, after their collapse: *ex post defectu*), and then radically downplayed in all subsequent historiography. Such activity Landes considers to be the work of "owls" commenting disapprovingly on the disproven nonsense so recently crowed by apocalyptic "roosters" and enjoining all to settle down and sleep some more, as it is still night, not yet the heralded new dawn. Landes employs a bestiary of types based on a Talmudic story about a rooster and a bat waiting for the dawn, with the rooster wondering what is in it for the bat. The attempt to set up "ideal [animal] types" representing both apocalyptic prophets and (anti-apocalyptic, Augustinian) scholars is reminiscent of Jean de La Fontaine's *Fables*; it is also a novel move that places both prophetic doomsayers and scholarly naysayers in the same notional category, based on what seems like a tacit premise that scholarly claims to objectivity (or at least to stand outside the fray) are hollow. They often are, but this leveling move pre-selects both data and possible approaches to it.

Landes's core complaint about historians is that we have been unreasonably unwilling to contemplate the often indirect evidence of millennial and apocalyptic movements in the past because they left so few traces—as owls effaced the evidence and laughed roosters to scorn. One of Landes's most prominent critics, the distinguished French medievalist Dominique Barthélémy, has repeatedly insisted that there is no (written) evidence for a mass millennial/millenarian movement around the year 1000, nor for a great “mutation” or change in Western society as a result. He is in prestigious company, with Jacques Le Goff and Jean Deleumeau. In his introduction, Landes reiterates his argument that the sources are not absent, but rather that they have written apocalyptic fervor out of the record. It can be seen, like subatomic particles passing through a medium, not by direct observation, but by the traces it (unintentionally) leaves. The mainstream of medieval history has rejected this as an “argument from silence,” but Landes's claims continue to animate debate and interest even in that relatively stuffy and conservative field, and his ideas do have legs.

Some of his theories' reach can be gauged in the introduction to this book, where Landes lays out a full-blown typological model for what the title already proclaims: understanding “*the* Millennial Experience.” Landes has turned away from his original academic specialty to address episodes and examples of mass millennial movements with apocalyptic messages (i.e., movements seeking some radical amelioration of life on earth, and seeing it as imminent) outside the Jewish and Christian traditions, which he characterizes as especially, even pre-eminently millennial (a term he equates, functionally, with millenarianism). The participation of many millions of non-Christians in (catastrophic) millennial movements, from the reign of Akhenaton through the Taiping, Xhosa cattle-slaying, Papuan cargo cults, and various secular movements that he reads as millennial, such as the French Revolution, Marxism, Leninism, and Nazism as well as contemporary post-Christian and non-Christian movements would then prove Landes's rather modestly formulated thesis that “the emotional drives that underlie perfectionist social thinking, whether secular or religious, whether monotheist or polytheist or a-theist, share important dynamics” (p. xvii). This is as close as Landes gets to a causal analysis based on any factor exogenous to millennial traditions or discourse and a shared proclivity to apocalyptic fervor across the ages. Mainly, he is content to observe (or rather, to select) and to classify, while sharpening his pencil for other arguments.

Landes has been arguing the main points sketched in the first section (88 pages) of this book for the past twenty years, first to fellow medievalists in scholarly books and articles and at a major conference at Boston University's Center for Millennial Studies in 1996, then to political scientists, scholars of religion, anthropologists, sociologists and media studies people, and more recently to broader audiences over the internet, in the

media, and now in this book. I have been a close observer of Landes's work. I participated in that 1996 conference and co-edited the proceedings, which were published by Oxford in 2003. I therefore find myself in a particular fix: I know Landes and his work very well, agree with much of it, and I am also a medievalist; but I am as much a “splitter” as he is a “lumper” (as Charles Darwin, Jack H. Hexter, et al. have put it).

The first problem I have with this book is that while I know Landes's arguments and methods well, I have no scholarly expertise whatsoever on which to judge his readings of the disparate (non-Western) phenomena listed above as examples of millennial movements. Knowing his previous arguments well might even disqualify me as a judge of his arguments here. The second is that while I agree with Landes's plea to look not just at the “official record” but also for and at “hidden transcripts” that may be our only indication of the passage of a millennial phenomenon, I am not at all convinced that the results of such (re-)readings can be arrayed against traditional (positivist) history in such a way as to persuade anyone who does not already share some of Landes's approach. Ironically, it may well be that only those of us who doubt the referential reliability of language and the systems it structures and reflects (and thus come in for some sustained postmodernist-bashing in this book) are willing to follow Landes into his trenchant critique of positivist rules of evidentiary validity. My third problem is that Landes's readings of phenomena that are widely separate in time, place, and culture may be valid, but I am unable to judge. As a series of intellectual experiments, they are elegant, plausible, and frequently parallel my own ideas about popular culture, “vernacular” religion and theology, and about the blinders worn by many traditional historians. But any theory reduced to sufficiently simple terms can be used to account for a very wide variety of phenomena.

What does it mean to say that Xhosa cattle-slaying (appeasing deities so as to drive out white settlers), cargo cults, Heaven's Gate, and Nazism share fundamental structures? By Landes's account, all millennial movements start when a prophetic figure finds a following, then starts a waxing curve leading to buy-in by a larger audience; they crest as the apocalyptic prophecy reaches its critical moment, followed by a period of intensification via deferral (the date has passed, but that means only that true believers must redouble their efforts/piety/donations); and they inevitably end in disappointment, disillusion, and often even catastrophic violence born of the “cognitive dissonance” produced by failed expectations. This seems to reflect what one normally sees in millennial movements, but it does not yet constitute a set of criteria by which to judge what is a genuinely and primarily millennial movement, as opposed, say, to something motivated by other causes.

Marxist theory taught that class interest and class conflict were the keys to unlocking most social phenomena, and over the past 150 years, thousands upon thousands of Marxist, Marxian, and *marxisant* readings of everything and everyone from Gilgamesh to Howdy

Doody have insisted that everything comes down to class conflict, and if we ignore it, we will fail to understand the basic grammar of all history. Landes never makes so grandiose a claim, but his unwavering focus on millennialism, encapsulated by his gesture to *the* millennial experience, suggest something analogous.

Throughout history, as Landes puts it, apocalyptic “roosters” have prophesied imminent change (whether the perfection of the world, or its demise in fierce Judgment), and Augustinian “owls” have sought to discredit them, usually by reference to past disappointments, but also by reference to reason, “common sense” or their own interests. Landes would, one senses, have us be Augustinian in our own lives, but respond to the crowing of roosters with attention to the underlying causes and dynamics: the point being that today’s apocalyptic panic might be tomorrow’s Leninism, Maoism, or Nazism. To the extent that Landes’s book carries a broader message about how to deal with millennial movements, this point is most welcome. Denial and refusal to listen to such movements rarely produce good results, and often have to be hushed up or excused afterward.

The two most active millennial apocalyptic movements now, according to Landes, are “global jihad” and “anthropogenic climate change.” Landes observes (without citing any systematic evidence, though it rings true) that those who are most concerned by the rise of one of these are typically indifferent to the other—suggesting that they are merely contemporary articulations, on the Right and the Left respectively, of some pre-existing millennial deep structure. I lack the expertise to judge the validity of his claims about either phenomenon, as I suspect most readers of this journal will. My response is much the same as to the rest of the book: these are intriguing theses, laid out with passion and intellectual vigor, and based on broad reading and interest, but are they rigorous arguments, or are they vigorously essayistic, journalistic, and interpretive (however knowledgeable)? I am not sure I am qualified to adjudicate even that question.

Most of Landes’s work on material outside his original field of medieval Latin Christendom relies on secondary scholarship conducted by others, and on the acceptance and use of grand narratives composed by scholars who may, in fact, be just as much prey to the Whiggish teleologies and presentism, and other forms of blindness, that Landes so rightly denounces elsewhere. Reliance on others’ scholarship is necessary to cross boundaries and compare phenomena, but it also limits the possible scope, validity, and precision of any claims or arguments one might be able to make. Landes takes millennialism as primary, and that accounts for most of this book’s strengths and weaknesses. He assumes that if he finds things that look millennial in other cultures, he can call them millennial. While I am perfectly willing to admit that they might be, I am not convinced that millennialism is a universal cultural mode and I do not think that Landes has used a scholarly approach capable of proving that it is.

There are far too many mistakes that copyediting

should have caught. Many phrases and book titles cited in the notes are in foreign languages, a sign of Landes’s immense reading. Unfortunately, anything not in English or French has generally been run together or had extra letters added. This seems to be a consistent glitch, and was probably caused by overzealous software. Oxford: turn it off!

Finally, Landes thanks me in the preface, and pays me a compliment (that I have “combined rigorous training with an imaginative mind”). I accept the compliment and toss it back: my rigorous training makes me skeptical about many of Landes’s claims in this book and I would urge a bit more epistemological modesty, even if it came at the price of clarity or public appeal. My imagination urges me to approve Landes’s ambition and taste for experiment, for breadth, for a well-turned phrase, a striking image, and for challenging existing orthodoxies, and to await the next installment in what has been announced as a series of books, specifically a study of Western millennialism.

ANDREW GOW

*University of Alberta*

WAYNE E. LEE, editor. *Empire and Indigenes: Intercultural Alliance, Imperial Expansion, and Warfare in the Early Modern World*. (Warfare and Culture Series.) New York: New York University Press. 2011. Pp. vii, 295. Cloth \$80.00, paper \$28.00.

This volume is devoted to the comparative study of how colonial powers and indigenous subjects and non-subjects managed their relations in the early modern world. The regions examined included Russia’s southern frontier, the Ottoman frontier in the Balkans and the Arab lands, colonial India under the British East India Company, North America, Angola, Dutch Guiana, and Brazil under Portuguese-Dutch contestation. The themes explored include the role of trade, diplomacy, and religion in structuring relations between colonial rulers and indigenous peoples. The authors take a special interest in the phenomenon of “ethnic soldiering”—the recruitment into colonial military forces or allied military formations of indigenous peoples valued for fighting skills adapted to the special conditions of warfare on colonial frontiers. By focusing on these themes they are able to offer a more nuanced and critical understanding of such concepts as military revolution and conquest.

Editor Wayne E. Lee’s introductory essay suggests taking as a model for comparison and contrast the Spanish conquests in Mexico, Peru, and other parts of the New World, since they demonstrated early on to other European powers how it was possible for a European military force small in numbers and with declining advantage in tactical surprise to achieve effective “conquering” power by exploiting the divisions between indigenous peoples. He sees this Spanish model of reliance on allies and ethnic soldiers as being repeated in several other regions of the western hemisphere. However, he acknowledges that this model