

irrevocably bound, but it falls short of ensuring his unequivocal devotion. We find more triumphant forms of addiction in the enraptured lovers of comedy. Among the drunken revels of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, Olivia forsakes her addiction to melancholy in order to embrace an all-consuming romantic passion. Her choices might appear misplaced—after falling into unrequited love for Viola/Cesario, she accidentally marries Sebastian, an utter stranger—but Lemon suggests that the resulting union becomes an epitome of erotic self-abandon, all the more powerful because of its leap of faith.

Olivia succeeds where Faustus fails, at fully relinquishing herself to devotion. Not all characters who follow her lead, however, find themselves rewarded. All-consuming love becomes catastrophic in *Othello*, which joins *Twelfth Night* in juxtaposing erotic passion with uncontrollable drinking. As Lemon shows, however, Shakespeare identifies Othello's error not in his overwhelming love for his wife, but in letting himself be persuaded to retreat from this devotion, which he fatally redirects toward Iago. Unlike Faustus, he achieves a full capitulation, but he fails to sustain it. Yet even complete surrender is not always enough. In both parts of *Henry IV*, Falstaff's affection for drinking masks a deeper devotion to Hal, the cornerstone of their shared tavern conviviality. Falstaff's loyalty remains constant, but Hal fails to reciprocate it, and eventually betrays his friend utterly. Falstaff's downfall may be less terrifying than Othello's, but its pathos similarly reflects the error of his misdirected commitment.

Lemon's final chapter expands the book's generic and chronological boundaries to consider depictions of drinking rituals in lyric poems stretching into the Restoration. As she shows, writers offered sharply varying responses to health toasting, the obligatory ritual of drinking to the health of friends, mistresses, and monarchs. As in the previous century, some condemned socially pressured drinking, but others saw surrendering self-control in honor of drunken oblivion as a praiseworthy sign of devotion to community. For these writers, generosity and participation represent higher values than order, control, and productivity. These priorities might seem at odds with the Calvinist, protocapitalist early modern world we think we know. Lemon movingly shows the unexpected contours of a moral landscape in which dissolving the self is a higher achievement than fortifying it.

Tanya Pollard, *Brooklyn College and The Graduate Center, CUNY*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.355

Theatre and the English Public from Reformation to Revolution.

Katrin Beushausen.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. xiv + 298 pp. \$99.99.

The year 1642 looms large in studies of both England's theater and its public sphere, but for very different reasons. For theater scholarship the closing of theaters in that year

is the terminus of the (extended) age of Shakespeare; political studies contend that the deregulation of the printing press following the outbreak of the Civil War was the means by which English publicness came into being. In her ambitious *Theatre and the English Public from Reformation to Revolution*, Katrin Beushausen challenges this consensus, and argues that theater and political debate were intimately entwined in the Interregnum. The prohibition of 1642, after all, was a temporary measure. Plays were performed between 1642 and 1660. New plays were circulated in pamphlet form, drawing on theatrical forms that predated the beginnings of the Civil War. Theatricality framed political debate. Figures as disparate as John Milton and William Davenant called for a reformed “public theater” to educate and engage the people in political life (or, alternatively, serve as a means of control), while political pamphleteers deployed theatrical form to castigate the opposition (by presenting them as affected, distant, hypocritical) and to promote an agenda (ironically, often by adopting self-consciously dramatic personae like the Fool). The Interregnum, then, was far from devoid of theatrical performance, and its theatricality was not confined to the stage; printed matter and political actors drew on theatrical convention and, as it were, staged political debate by imagining and then appealing to an audience long conversant with the cultures and styles of English theater.

In the first two chapters, Beushausen traces the prehistory of this convergence of theatricality and the public, arguing that it manifested at moments of transition (the accession of James I) or religious controversy (the break with Rome, the Marprelate Controversy, the William Prynne trial). These convergences were temporary but bore witness to peculiar instantiations of public spheres founded less on the circulation and cultivation of rational thought, as per Habermas, but marked rather by appeals to the passions. Drawing on notions of theater as a transformative site, a commonplace in both screeds against and apologies for the theater, commentators forged public spheres by appealing to their audience’s emotional responsiveness. Beushausen argues that these temporary spheres cohered in the Interregnum, when a wider circulation of commentary drew on conflicting arguments about the theater (as either corrupting or moral) to frame political debate. Affective appeals could be highly effective, but they also could unleash responses that exceeded their authors’ expectations. Davenant, who emerges as one of the book’s key figures, recognized this: his early calls for the ban’s revocation, when he posited a reformed theater for a wide audience, were later tempered by recognition that a people’s theater could be a dangerous place; he subsequently argued for an apolitical theater for elite audiences (a theater we know as the Restoration stage).

Theatre and the English Public is thorough, perhaps overly so: sections of the book get bogged down in historical narratives that meander away from the book’s key claims (in particular, sections on Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne and public appeal; on backgrounds to the English Civil War; and on Hobbes); other sections are dutiful to historical debate without furthering an argument. It is not clear if there is a difference between the theatrical (implying a clear connection to theatrical form, content, styles, and sites of

performance) and the performative (which may not have any connection to the stage): the (repeated) raising of the royal standard in 1642 may have been highly performative, and Beushausen's reading is attentive to how reports of the raising repeatedly describe how "moved" the crowd was; the valence of calling this event "theatrical" is less clear, and while the episode is included to strengthen the overall argument, instead it weakens it. Despite its flaws, the arguments at the heart of *Theatre and the English Public* are convincing, and the book as a whole successfully reframes debates about the relationship between theater and its publics. It makes visible the ways in which theatricality constituted the public sphere while it also made appeals to the passions unpredictable and even dangerous.

Gavin Hollis, *Hunter College, CUNY*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.356

The Literary Culture of Early Modern Scotland: Manuscript Production and Transmission, 1560–1625. Sebastiaan Verweij.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. xviii + 304 pp. \$35.

The notion that early modern Scotland was an intellectual and cultural backwater has long influenced scholarship. Recently, Giovanni Gellera, Alasdair Raffe, and Steven Reid have challenged this conclusion to show that Scots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries contributed to and engaged considerably with contemporary philosophical and theological trends. Sebastiaan Verweij makes a significant contribution to this scholarly movement by illuminating the vibrant manuscript literary culture that flourished in Scotland between the reformation of 1560 and the death of James VI in 1625. Verweij dismisses the idea that Jacobean Scotland could be characterized by its cultural bleakness. On the contrary, literary pursuit and manuscript transmission were lively and extensive, demonstrating both the vitality and distinctiveness of early modern Scottish literary culture.

Verweij employs a conceptual framework that investigates three places of manuscript production and consumption: the royal court, the urban center, and the regional locale. These sites provide the book with its structure, with three chapters devoted to courtly manuscript culture, followed by two chapters on urban literary pursuit, and two on regional centers, often aristocratic provincial homes. This framework also underscores the distinctiveness of early modern Scottish literary culture. Whereas vernacular manuscript production and exchange in England were based in the universities, Inns of Court, and theaters, Scotland's universities did not feature as hubs of manuscript transmission, while the kingdom lacked legal schools and theaters. When compared with England, the unique environments that cultivated literary production in Scotland highlight the diversity of literary cultures in early modern Britain.