even further, she turns to the relatively new field of material studies to explore the book as a material object in the historical context around 1600.

Aside from reviewing Jesuit collection practices in great and immensely informative detail, Schmitz reviews work on collections by other orders and associations such the Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, as well as cathedral, university, and monastery libraries. Beyond the interest of learned and literate individuals and associations, she also affords us a quick glance at books as booty and as objects of military and occupational strategies. We read that, shortly before the Mainz occupation by the Swedish army in 1632, the Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus ordered all collections to be reviewed for selected volumes that would be transferred to Sweden. Field Marshall Wrangel’s printed booty still forms a significant part of the contemporary holdings of Skokloster Castle in the vicinity of Uppsala. Books were also plundered from private homes along with furniture and other movable items. To this day, 450 books in the Uppsala University library can be identified as having been acquired in this way.

The study closes with a review of the movement of books in the seventeenth century, specifically the exchange of books among private book owners. We read about specific books, and the persons who gave and who received them. This leads us to the last important topic in this amazing study, namely the significance of books and book movements among the educated Mainzer elite. A final page is devoted to a brief outline for future studies on the basis of the material explored here. The inspiration for such work is obvious for anyone who engages with this learned and well-written exploration of books in the lives of the citizens and associations of early modern Mainz. Schmitz ends her study with an extensive book list. Regrettably, the book is missing an index.

Gerhild Scholz Williams, Washington University in St. Louis
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.43


The PLRE series offers useful shelf-reader access to the libraries of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century book owners. Drawn from probate and other short-title lists, these edited bibliographies often necessarily approximate specific authors, titles, editions, or translations. They nevertheless frequently challenge unqualified scholarly assumptions that ideas and texts were simply in the air and abuzz in the popular imagination from their first appearance in print. While certain predictable genres predominate (e.g., bibles, psalms, Foxe’s martyrology), other now-canonical literary
works are scarcely in evidence; Shakespeare appears in but five entries across all of PLRE’s 279 inventories.

Some of these books were inherited rather than bought, nor can scholars safely assume they were actively read or endorsed by their named owners. Few lists reveal anything of marginal annotations, provenance marks, or distinctive bindings. Book owners or law clerks rarely exceeded expectations, often providing the barest bones of bibliographical detail in these compilations. Abstract descriptions of manuscript books frustrate their proper identification, regardless of their potentially unique scholarly value. PLRE nevertheless offers compelling evidence of precisely who owned and had access to which Renaissance books when. The predominance of clerics, lawyers, university dons, and gentry in past volumes yields here in volume 9 to a more diverse and salutary dramatis personae, including a merchant adventurer, churchwarden, apothecary, cooper, clothier, diplomat, and a half-dozen women.

Surprises abound, beginning with the strikingly unclerical library of the hardworking Elizabethan privy council clerk Armagil Waad. The scale of Waad’s natural philosophical collection is breathtaking, even presenting shades of John Dee’s famous contemporary library; Waad, in fact, owned two copies of Dee’s own so-called hieroglyphic monad tract. Geminus’s *Compendiosa anatomie*, a seminal Vesalian English imprint, appears with folios of Vesalius’s monumental *De fabrica* and its extremely rare “footpath” epitome (as Vesalius termed it). Several midcentury astrological ephemerides are augmented by Reinhold’s determinedly Copernican Prutenic tables. An impressive nine titles by the polymath Girolamo Cardano appear alongside four by the medieval *doctor illuminatus* Ramon Llull. Such diversity contrasts sharply with the uniformly courtly and Francophone library of the Catholic Edward Arundell, with perhaps one exception: “an old Chronicle of parchment in miter which was the Lady Lumley’s.” This terse reference offers a rare bibliographical connection between two of the great Elizabethan Catholic families—the Arundells of Cornwall and the Fitzalans and Lumleys of Arundel Castle and Nonsuch Palace.

The 1590 inventory of the London apothecary Edward Barlow’s 180 books is rich in *materia medica*, admirably reflecting the universalist collecting theme common among members of his profession. (Nearly all of the first great printed Renaissance *Wunderkammer* books—e.g., Imperato, Besler, Calceolari—were by apothecaries.) By comparison, the 1627 inventory of the London cooper Samuel Rowlands communicates nothing of his day job, but much of his avocation as a satirical poet-pamphleteer. Among his several fellow earthy wits appears the clerk-cum-epigrammatist Henry Parrot’s *Young-whelpe of the olde-dogge*, and George Wither’s troublesome *Abuses stript, and whipt*. It is tempting to speculate that the two eponymous references—“Overberries” and “Sr Tho: Overberis”—might denote Rowlands’s own illustrated broadside, *Sir Thomas Overbury, or, The Peysoned Knights Complaint* (1614), though the editor prefers his *A Wife, Now a Widowe*. Would such inventories have omitted pro forma the titles of single-sheet imprints? The final entry, “seven
manuscripts or written books half full,” exasperates since the apparent sole survivor of that trove contains this very same Rowlands inventory (Houghton MS Eng 247).

Of the women’s libraries, two are drawn from visual evidence: the legible spines in the 1646 Great Picture triptych of Anne Clifford, countess of Pembroke, and her mother Margaret, countess of Cumberland. Memento mori religious meditations reflecting the genre of allegorical family portraits include Moore’s *Mappe of Man’s Mortalitie* and Cuffe’s *Ages of Man’s Life*. Far more personal is the painting’s select canonization of Elizabethan and early Stuart literati: Fulke Greville, Sir Henry Wotton, John Donne, Ben Jonson, George Sandys, and George Herbert. Nearly all were fairly recently deceased and bore direct familial and patronage connections to the Cliffords. This index of native English literary taste does possess Continental flair, including John Florio’s au courant literary translation of Montaigne—which was twice mentioned in Anne’s diary as having been read aloud in company. This multigenerational Clifford library group portrait contrasts with the several separate private chamber library inventories by the diarist Elizabeth Isham. Compiled for herself, her sister, and her mother (ca. 1645, 1648, 1649), they are heavily devotional and fiercely Protestant, and apparently distinct from the greater family library at Lamport Hall, where several are today preserved. (These may be profitably compared with the separate chamber inventories of the Catholic Brome sisters in PLRE vol. 8.)

The most substantial booklist belongs to the best-traveled Englishman of the early Stuart period, the diplomat Sir Thomas Roe. His 1647 inventory of 455 titles reveals much about a man on the move. Mercator’s *Atlas* and another likely bespoke “book in folio of maps” are unsurprising, much as his nine eminently portable pocket Elzevir “Republics.” Philip Palmer’s meticulous detective work on Roe nonetheless provides a vital, travel-intensive library catalogue that predates by over a half-century the famously vast collection inventories of the travel writer Edward Browne and the philosopher John Locke.

Earle Havens, Johns Hopkins University
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.44


This is a study of the efforts of Cardinal Marcello Cervini (1501–55) and his collaborators to publish Catholic religious scholarship intended to rebut Protestantism. It has been argued that the Catholic Church had a restrictive attitude toward the printing press and that it relied on preventing the publication and distribution of Protestant works. Sachet demonstrates that some members of the papal Curia viewed the press