

questions unanswered. This is further the case in the sixth chapter, where the nuances of early modern scientific narrative are somewhat elided, as the different ways of encountering the world offered by looking through a telescope, reading a text, and examining a specimen through a microscope are rendered synonymous. At times Korsten tends toward a grand periodizing narrative of the kind he initially rejected, as in his treatment of the commonplace tradition and related list-making practices, here characterized rather unquestioningly as “medieval” (139).

A final pair of chapters return to drama, and the political role of the theater in particular. Charting the *theatrum mundi* metaphor through the Dutch Republic reveals (rather late in the day) that there are in fact many different Baroques at work here. An analysis of the relationship between the theater and the city, dating back to the Greek city-states, is provocative but needs to be more firmly anchored to the specific historical moment of the Dutch Republic. What we lose in clarity of focus in these closing pages we gain in accumulation of provocative insights; Korsten continues to introduce new theoretical models (such as Sarrajac’s model of retrospection) right up until the end, articulating his own “philosophical framework” for the study most explicitly in its final pages (179–80). In the astonishing breadth and vigor of Korsten’s method, we find a fitting analogue for the Baroque moment he surveys.

Hannah Crawforth, *King’s College London*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.180

*Holbein’s “Sir Thomas More.”* Hilary Mantel and Xavier F. Salomon.

Frick Diptych Series. New York: The Frick Collection; London: D. Giles Limited, 2018. 72 pp. \$17.95.

---

For the mansion he built on Fifth Avenue, the industrialist Henry Clay Frick acquired a portrait of *Sir Thomas More* by Hans Holbein the Younger, in 1912, and three years later he bought the same artist’s *Thomas Cromwell*. They can be viewed today where Frick originally hung them on either side of the fireplace in the sumptuous Living Hall of his house, now world-famous as the Frick Collection. *Holbein’s “Sir Thomas More”* is an elegant, lavishly illustrated volume that launches the Frick Diptych Series, in which an essay by Xavier F. Salomon, the Frick Collection’s chief curator, is paired with one by the celebrated historical novelist Hilary Mantel.

In his discerning essay, Salomon records that despite his pressing legal business, More sat for Holbein more than once in 1527, when both men were still rising in their careers. Holbein’s has been one of the best documented for any Northern European artist of the sixteenth century, not least for his creation of indelible images for Erasmus and Henry VIII, but Salomon provides fresh contextualization for his

artistry when he discusses the portraits Holbein painted in Basel, in 1516, of the mayor and his wife, who appeared ten years later as the donors in his great masterpiece, formerly known as the *Darmstadt Madonna*.

More's portrait belongs to Holbein's first visit to England, in 1526–28, necessitated in part by the iconoclasm that had begun in Switzerland as a result not of Martin Luther's emergence, as Salomon suggests, but rather of the influence of Basel's Huldrych Zwingli, whose early career was built on his friendship with Erasmus. Holbein took up residence in More's new home in Chelsea, where he executed portraits in chalk of the members of his household, as a preliminary to the large canvas he painted that portrayed More's family, which was lost in a fire in 1752. Salomon notes that the large family portrait was entirely exceptional, and nothing on this scale had been made previously for nonroyal families north of the Alps. The purpose for which the paintings were made is unknown. The portrait Frick purchased for a stupendous £55,000 is on an oak panel and might be independent of the larger work.

G. R. Elton, the renowned scholar of Tudor England, recorded that on a visit to the Frick Collection he stood before the splendid fireplace "above which Thomas Cromwell and Thomas More forever stare past one another." Elton was writing in 1980, in the long aftermath of Robert Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons*, which established More as the heroic martyr, a characterization Elton wished to challenge in his essay "The Real Thomas More?," which he placed in *Reformation Principle and Practice*, the festschrift for his friend and rival, Arthur Geoffrey Dickens. Sir Geoffrey concluded that he thought he understood Cromwell as a "plain, solid, straightforward man," but that More remained elusive, with his "subtle Machiavellian smile." Elton was left with a sense of More's "unplumbable ambiguity" (24).

His ambiguity is at the heart of Mantel's essay, "A Letter to Thomas More, Knight," which begins *Holbein's "Sir Thomas More"*—an artful address to More as if he were still alive to read it. Her "Letter" also appeared early in 2018 in the *Telegraph*. She describes the portrait as displaying a "sad, distinguished, aging, fiercely clever man," which permits the viewer to accept his "flawed humanity" (11). In contrast, Holbein painted Cromwell as "a thickset plebian" with all of the "intellectual curiosity of a boiled pudding." Too late, More learned "the lethal speed at which that man can move" (13–14). Although Mantel has been criticized for her unflattering characterization of More in her books *Wolf Hall* and *Bring Up the Bodies*, she has extended Elton's work into the popular realm with her tour de force narratives that marry fact with imagination. Elton had not wanted to explore in his festschrift essay the cause for which More died. Mantel does. More did not die for freedom of conscience, she argues: we tell that pious lie so that we can like him. Rather, More died in defense of the authority of "the man in Rome" and his church, traditions, and practices. They are "the consensus that holds Christian souls together" (14–15).

Although *Holbein's "Sir Thomas More"* is a beautiful little book, it is not readily apparent who its intended readers are. The two essays sit uneasily together, a little like the two portraits, gazing past each other on either side of Frick's fireplace.

Susan Wabuda, *Fordham University*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.181

*Emotion in the Tudor Court: Literature, History, and Early Modern Feeling.*  
Bradley J. Irish.

Rethinking the Early Modern. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2018.  
xii + 236 pp. \$34.95.

---

*Emotion in the Tudor Court* examines both the emotional culture underpinning sixteenth-century English court life and the body of scholarship treating early modern emotion, affectivity, and sociability. Much of the work that has characterized the affective turn in historiography and literary criticism of the period has been historicist, tracing the interrelation between Galenic humoral physiology and the sociopolitical and religious mores that shaped how early moderns understood their emotional states. *Emotion in the Tudor Court* pays tribute to the exploration of embodied emotion launched nearly fifteen years ago by Paster, Floyd-Wilson, Rowe, and Schoenfeldt, but ultimately Bradley J. Irish proffers a more expansive and self-consciously interdisciplinary trajectory for the study of early modern emotion.

One of the central questions *Emotion in the Tudor Court* takes up is methodological, asking what critical approach best facilitates analysis of early modern affective expression. Irish aims "not to historicize the features of emotionality in early modern experience, but rather to use features of emotionality to historicize early modern experience more broadly" (7). He approaches this methodological intervention by focusing each chapter on a major moment of courtly significance and a prominent emotion he associates with a key court figure. Chapter 1 treats literary portrayals of "The Disgusting Cardinal Thomas Wolsey" that employ images of disease, appetite, and bodily discharge to undermine Wolsey's influence on king and country by associating him with the affective state of disgust. Chapter 2 examines "The Envious Earl of Surrey," Henry Howard, whose self-styling and envious affiliation with King Henry's illegitimate son Henry Fitzroy trigger his downfall. Chapter 3 pivots between Robert Dudley, "The Rejected Earl of Leicester," and his nephew, the equally "Rejected Sir Philip Sidney," to explore how male courtiers situated at the head of vast patronage networks and born into social systems encouraging them to view political influence as their birthright managed political failure through the oppositional dynamics of courtly entertainment. The final chapter, "The Dreading, Dreadful Earl of Essex," underscores the affective register of dread as a collective emotional experience in late Elizabethan England by revealing how the last royal favorite,