

with prices, wages, and output limitation. Chapters on “Quality Regulation,” “Human Capital Investment” (mainly training and skill), and “Innovation” are particularly linked to issues that are often used to argue that guilds exerted a positive impact on social and economic development. The last chapter, “Guilds and Growth,” concludes that guilds “were never associated with economic success” (562).

Toward the end of her book Ogilvie comes to a scathing judgment. She introduces her assessment with the formulation of her question: “Why guilds existed so widely despite the fact that they acted as cartels of producers, manipulated markets, over-charged costumers, underpaid employees, stifled competition, oppressed women, imposed quality standards to please producers rather than consumers, limited access to human capital investment, and blocked innovation?” (581). Her answer is that guilds played such an important role “because they benefitted powerful and well-organized interest groups”—first, the guild masters themselves, and second, governments and political elites in general. And guilds disappeared when and where “the coalition between guilds and governments” broke down (583).

Such harsh assessments would have certainly pleased the many critics of guilds from late medieval times to the nineteenth century, but they contradict in strong terms the mainstream of recent scholarship in historiography and economics, particularly institutional economics. But Ogilvie’s arguments are so well established in empirical terms, and so thoroughly designed, that all those who harbor more friendly attitudes toward guilds will have serious difficulties refuting her conclusions. Moreover, Ogilvie is fully aware of potential counterarguments, takes them seriously, and presents and discusses them throughout the book.

All in all, this is a unique contribution to the history of guilds. Ogilvie has a pleasing inclination toward clear and unmistakable messages. This favors the awareness of similarities among guilds throughout the huge temporal and spatial reach of her study. Another great achievement is an elaboration on the enormous variations of almost all rules, norms, and practices presented in the book. Perhaps this aspect will have a particularly strong impact on future research, because it might inspire local and regional guild historians to put their findings into a wider context.

Josef Ehmer, *Universität Wien*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.29

*After the Flood: Imagining the Global Environment in Early Modern Europe.*

Lydia Barnett.

Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. xii + 250 pp. \$49.95.

---

Few topics are as debated in environmental scholarship as the Anthropocene, a proposed geological epoch that draws attention to the world-altering force of human agency.

Specialists in many disciplines debate when it started, critique its implicit assumption of universal culpability, and even question its existence. Yet in most circles, it is commonly understood that the Anthropocene idea is a product of modernity. It is hard to conceive of a concept more reliant on the expansive understandings of time and space that modern science provides. Yet in *After the Flood*, Lydia Barnett reveals that the idea has deeper roots than most suspect: roots that stretch back, she argues, into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Nor did the early modern notion of an Anthropocene depend exclusively on empirical, observational science. Instead, Barnett shows, “pious natural philosophers” drew on the biblical story of the Flood to imagine human action—and, more specifically, human sin—as a force capable of “ruining the climate and planet” (2–3). Most of us fear environmental collapse in our future; early modern Europeans believed that it had already happened in their past, and that they had to live with the consequences.

Just like today’s Anthropocene, Barnett claims, this was an idea with both implicit and explicit political power. Drawing on Ann Blair’s notion of Mosaic natural philosophy, Barnett shows that natural philosophers studied the Flood to unite European science and religion, and thereby repair the religious schisms of the Reformation. Yet many had a more sinister purpose. By hunting for evidence of the Flood scattered around the world, Barnett reveals that scholars sought to prove that every race and civilization descended from Noah’s migrating ancestors, which meant that all belonged within Christendom. And since it rendered everyone into a migrant and traced the origins of some migrants to supposedly less admirable cultures than others, the notion of a flood-degraded world stripped indigenous land claims of their legitimacy. Noah’s Flood, in other words, laid the groundwork for European empire.

These are themes that resonate in part because historians have so thoroughly reimagined early modern science as deeply entwined with empire and religion. Yet Barnett does far more than cover familiar ground. She stresses repeatedly that her aim is not to revisit increasingly tedious debates about who discovered what about the global environment and its causes for change. Rather, her goal is to show both that the idea of a global environment alterable by human agency is much older than most appreciate, and that this idea has had world-shaping political consequences. It is a powerful and necessary intervention, one informed by insightful reading in everything from environmental science to cultural studies. That it all hinges on early modern interpretations of one clear story—the legend of the Flood—imbues the book with impressive focus, given the broad intellectual terrain it covers. One is reminded of Beethoven’s talent for finding new variations on a simple melody.

At times Barnett pushes her argument a bit too far, although never in ways that undermine her core claims. The notion of a planet degraded by human action, for example, is not an early modern invention, as Barnett suggests, but rather an idea perhaps as old as agriculture—and certainly as old as ancient flood myths. More importantly, although Barnett seems to believe that early modern concepts of a planet degraded by human action

had little relation to reality, one proposed starting date for the Anthropocene is in fact 1610. The depopulation of the western hemisphere may then have reduced atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide by permitting widespread afforestation. There are reasons to doubt such claims, but certainly early moderns did profoundly alter and in fact degrade environments on a global scale, both purposefully and by inadvertently unleashing Eurasian organisms in previously isolated ecosystems.

Barnett unearths connections between shifting ideas of global environments and real environmental changes. She considers, for example, how a trend toward increasing precipitation provoked local floods and stimulated fears of a global deluge in late sixteenth-century Europe. One wonders, however, whether she could have pushed the argument a bit further. Did the contemporary onset of the Little Ice Age, a period of climatic cooling and associated precipitation extremes, stimulate new thinking not only about flooding but also about environmental extremes and the potential of human agency to bring them about? These caveats aside, Barnett has crafted a critical addition to the scholarship of both early modern and modern environmental thought. Clearly, the roots of today's environmental problems and ideas run deep.

Dagomar Degroot, *Georgetown University*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2021.30

*The Portuguese Slave Trade in Early Modern Japan: Merchants, Jesuits and Japanese, Chinese, and Korean Slaves.* Lúcio de Sousa.

Studies in Global Slavery 7. Leiden: Brill, 2019. xiv + 594 pp. €180.

---

Scholarship on slavery and slave trading in Asia is a scarce commodity in a field of study dominated by research on the Americas and Africa. Studies of European involvement with Chinese, Japanese, and Korean slaves are even rarer, a historiographic reality that makes Lúcio de Sousa's work on the Portuguese slave trade in Japan during the early modern era a welcome addition to our knowledge about slavery in East Asia and the nature and dynamics of the global traffic in chattel labor in which Europeans engaged between the early sixteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries.

This volume, the seventh in Brill's Studies in Global Slavery series, begins with a short introduction that includes brief discussions of existing scholarship on slave trading in Asia, the terminology that can complicate attempts to reconstruct the Portuguese trade in Asian slaves, and the book's structure. The first three chapters examine the Portuguese involvement with Chinese, Japanese, and Korean slaves during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Chapters 4 and 5 focus, respectively, on the Portuguese trade's reorganization during the early seventeenth century and the structure of Portuguese slavery in Japan. A sixth chapter reconstructs the life histories of individual Chinese and Japanese slaves, while chapter 7 explores the Japanese diaspora to Macao,