

elements and the ages of man. Hogarth knew his tropes, like a good ancient, but he treated them with the respect of a modern.

An additional, but not less interesting, example is historian Andrew Jainchill's "The Political Thought of Henri de Bollainvilliers Reconsidered." Jainchill shows how in the late seventeenth century Bollainvilliers used pre-Merovingian Franks to paint the contemporary French absolute monarchy in a negative light. The Franks/French had gone from heathen heroes in a Homeric tradition to corrupt egotists. Bollainvilliers indicated that the Church and clerical privileges were the central reasons for this decline. This allows for interesting comparisons with other countries and contexts. On a general plane, the notion of a glorious or virtuous past, later gradually tainted by external influence, is a common trope in national history writing. More specifically, the Church and the priests were common culprits in Enlightenment-era history writing. However, the connection to the Long Quarrel is weak and comes across as somewhat forced.

To summarize, Jainchill's article illustrates both the strengths and the weaknesses of *The Long Quarrel*. Every article is well written and certainly useful for future research, but together they do not form a convincing whole. The value of all the particular parts is, however, strong enough to make it easy to forgive this shortcoming.

Henrik Ågren, *Uppsala University / Uppsala universitet*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.620

Translationsanthropologie: Philologische Übersetzungsforschung als Kulturwissenschaft.
Regina Toepfer.

Neue Perspektiven der Frühneuezeitforschung 7. Hannover: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2022.
72 pp. €9.

This slim book appears in the series *Neue Perspektiven der Frühneuezeitforschung* and provides a rationale for systematic research on early modern translation. In the first sections, the author traces a succinct argument for how the cultural turn in *Germanistik* in the 1990s called into question the canonical national model of literary studies, and how it was easier to move beyond that model in the case of *Altgermanistik*, since the latter had always deployed a more expansive view of what constitutes its object of study. The trend to look for broader sociohistorical contextualization took over readily enough in *Germanistik* at the expense of the older, belletristic approach; and yet, the author contends, the many publications championing this change fundamentally lacked an interest in translation, a vital phenomenon in early modernity. Hence Toepfer's careful argument for augmenting the cultural studies paradigm with a more explicit engagement with translation. This also presupposes the concomitant cultural turn in translation studies, which stipulates, as Toepfer says, "As long as translations are not treated as

texts in their own right with their own hermeneutical, aesthetic, epistemic and historical specificity, their potential for cultural studies remains unutilized" (12).

The author's own choice of conceptual approach may surprise the anglophone reader: *Translationsanthropologie*, an anthropology of translation that draws inspiration from the historical anthropology tradition. This particular move might reflect the tepid reception of translation studies that literary scholars in Germany have shown, while sociology and anthropology have found the concept of cultural translation far more useful—though to an extent, Toepfer admits, that verges on diluting translation to a metaphor (16). At heart is the familiar invocation of Clifford Geertz's "thick description" methodology, which runs opposite to the Gadamerian hermeneutic of "a real blending of horizons" that overcomes the tension between the historical text and the present (23). Instead, Toepfer points to a quasi-ethnographic method that accepts the alterity of the early modern text at the outset, and most importantly, ceases to fetishize the translation's faithful reflection of the source text as the main focus and criterion of study. Essentially, the real fun begins when the translation ceases to mirror its source and instead conveys the values and characteristics of its own time.

One might object that the invocation of anthropology could suggest a drive towards using individual translation texts as ways of reconstructing societal values and structures at a general level, essentially as cultural informants in the sense of anthropological fieldwork. This would run counter to the trend in Anglo-American translation studies to see in the work of the translator the value of individual agency, particularly by scholars such as Lawrence Venuti, who has often sought to foreground the invisible role of the translator in the West. But this key difference speaks to a broader tension between German "culture studies" (*Kulturwissenschaften*) and Anglo-American cultural studies, where the latter has often focused on the vindication of the marginalized, while the former looks to cultural systems detached from a desire to inspire transformative social action.

It would seem, however, that in Toepfer's case we are dealing more with a difference in degree than in kind here. While her contention remains that translation does indeed reflect the social imaginary as well as the concepts and norms of the time, she defines the desire of *Translationsanthropologie* as "to recognize and grasp in translations those human properties that are characteristic [*kennzeichnend*] for a particular epoch, a concrete context, a specific cultural situation, and a *historically socialized individual*" (22, my emphasis). Hence, the individual is not factored out, but construed at the center of concentric rings of cultural analysis. Proof that she hasn't tossed out the individual translator lies in her specimen analysis of Simon Schaidenreisser's *Odyssea* (Augsburg, 1537/38), which she examines in thematic detail against its Latin source text(s) and Homer.

In her analysis, Toepfer chiefly offers observations on themes such as the invocation of the muse, the concept of the hero, religious ideas, female agency, political processes, and moral judgment, but more in relation to early modern German culture than Schaidenreisser's personal agency or agenda. As such, Toepfer's method tends to treat

the translator as a contemporary everyman. For those in need of convincing, the book makes a solid case.

Richard H. Armstrong, *University of Houston*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.630

World-Making Renaissance Women: Rethinking Early Modern Women's Place in Literature and Culture. Pamela S. Hammons and Brandie R. Siegfried, eds.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. xvi + 304 pp. \$99.99.

The driving conviction of *World-Making Renaissance Women* is that “a well-rounded version of literary history” would take stock of women’s participation in the formal conditions of literary worldmaking (13). To begin this project, the collection offers “discrete, illustrative examples” of women’s writing that shaped genres, impacted histories, and imagined worlds both large and small (3). The need for this work is self-evident; since the publication of Nelson Goodman’s *Ways of Worldmaking* (1978), few major works seriously consider women’s participation in early modern worldmaking. One notable exception, Mary Baine Campbell’s *Wonder and Science* (1999), suggests possibilities by reading Margaret Cavendish and Aphra Behn alongside Francis Bacon and Giordano Bruno. Building on this work and others like it, this collection offers new readings on women’s participation in shaping early modern literary transmission, temporality, science, religion, politics, and domesticity. The organization of the collection into four separate sections is suggestive without being overly prescriptive; several themes thread their way cohesively throughout the collection.

The collection’s commitment to form underwrites the breadth of genres it covers. Lara Dodds’s chapter on Cavendish illustrates this commitment well, asking a question that echoes throughout the collection: “How can we understand women’s writing within categories created by a male-dominated profession that does not acknowledge the gendered nature of its values?” (147). Her own answer—that we reevaluate Cavendish’s “antipathy to form” as concealing “a highly developed understanding of [its] affordances”—illustrates the critical reassessment of women’s writing that many of the chapters offer (136).

Several chapters explore form in relation to geopolitical space, including Elaine Hobby’s contribution on Behn’s *The Emperor of the Moon*, in which the settings of Naples and the moon provide a “refuge from . . . the reign of James I and VII” (200). Marion Wynne-Davies questions the “small, domestic space” critics often associate with closet drama, instead uncovering an expansive conception of space that liberates sexual politics and regenerates war (89). And Suzanne Trill’s contribution explores