

also explore instances where cardinals acted in a particular function or held specific offices, such as papal legate, nuncio, or cardinal nephew. The complex institutional contexts in which cardinals operated remain key to understanding these figures. Hence, as the editors rightly remark in the introduction, the challenge is to combine the older but important institutional perspective with more recent approaches and methods in order to paint a fuller and more complete picture of early modern cardinals.

The individual chapters are written in an accessible manner and are suitable for the target audience of these companions—namely, both students and scholars. In a couple of cases the available source material has been described and explained (e.g., chapters 9 and 18), which is particularly useful for those aspiring to pursue the study of primary-source material themselves. However, since the source material is situated within a wider thematic framework, these chapters are interesting for more seasoned scholars as well. Some chapters are more descriptive and at times can be a bit enumerative, whereas others contain more original research and aim to construct an argument. However, apart from such differences, the chapters, while diverse in terms of their topics, methodologies, and perspectives, are consistent in quality and style. While the volume has a large bibliography and an index of historical persons, an index of topics would have been helpful in navigating a book of this size.

In general, the volume as a whole does a very good job of providing a historiographic overview, presenting the most up-to-date knowledge, and identifying remaining gaps in our understanding, thereby offering avenues for further research. The editors concede that, due to the lack of available experts, not all topics relevant to early modern cardinals could be covered. Although this is a shame, striving to create an exhaustive overview on virtually any subject tends to be more a dream than reality. The present volume is a worthwhile contribution to the existing scholarship on early modern cardinals and an ideal starting point for those who want to familiarize themselves with, or broaden their understanding of, this topic.

Jaap Geraerts, *Leibniz Institute of European History*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.66

*Maria in den Konfessionen und Medien der Frühen Neuzeit.* Bernhard Jahn and Claudia Schindler, eds.

Frühe Neuzeit: Studien und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur und Kultur im europäischen Kontext 234. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020. viii + 427 pp. \$149.99.

---

Jahn and Schindler have published an interdisciplinary volume that focuses on Mary, Mother of God, in the exciting time when different Christian denominations formed and revolutionary new media developed in Europe. Eighteen contributions, mostly in German, are dedicated to the topic. They go back to a conference that took place from

26 to 28 May 2017 in Gotha, Germany. The editors wanted to look at the function of Mary in the various processes of differentiation through which the denominations separated themselves from one another. In terms of time, the contributions span the late Middle Ages to the Enlightenment, from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. The volume fully meets its interdisciplinary goals.

The first contributions offer insights into the position of Mary within the different denominations in the early modern period, a position that is not always clearly identifiable. Based on the Judeo-Christian tradition (Beyerle), Martin Luther still saw Mary as an important *exemplum fidei* (Steiger). A study of calendars from the sixteenth century shows that Marian feasts still existed among Protestants (Gruhl). More critical tones were struck in Tübingen by the Lutheran pastor Johannes Caesar, who attacked Catholic Marian piety in his polemical book *Mariolatria* (1613), in which he also dissociated himself from Reformed Protestantism's complete rejection of Mary (Illg). Ben-Tov provides an exciting perspective by looking at Mary in the scholarly European translations of the Qur'an, in which Islamic Mariology finds itself fragmented in the mirror of the Western Enlightenment. Orthodox Christian Marian devotion seemed similarly alien to many Latin European scholars, since information was provided only by travelers or migrants from Eastern Europe (Saracino).

Further contributions are devoted to antagonisms in dealing with Mary. As wife and mother of the Holy Family, she was stylized across denominations as the ideal of the obedient housewife (Friedrich). That Catholic theology was not uniform is shown by a controversy in the seventeenth century about the legitimate veneration of Mary, challenging the narrative of the internal uniformity of individual denominations (Tricoire). A further example of such a differentiation is the Marian inscriptions found in the women's convent in Herford, which had become Protestant. For the Herford nuns, their coat of arms adorned by the Virgin Mary was a sign of the continuity of their history despite changing from Catholic to Protestant (Schaller).

An equally differentiated picture must be drawn of Mary in the Protestant musical tradition. Martin Luther kept parts of the Marian song traditions, such as the *Magnificat* (Wiesenfeldt), and Mary did not disappear from the Protestant cantatas of the eighteenth century either (Jahn). The volume convincingly shows the connection between Marian devotion and its nondenominational reception in literature. After the Council of Trent, an increased devotion to Mary in spiritual practice occurred in Catholic mysticism (Büchner); she, for example, is a motif in Queen Margaret of Navarre's plays, which reflect the theological ideas of the author and the ideals of female spirituality (Millet). Mary is also a motif in Petrarch's canzone "Vergine bella" (Föcking). The famous Roman poetess Vittoria Colonna, trying to achieve a balance between Protestants and Catholics, also dealt with Luke the Evangelist's portrayal of the Mother of God in her sonnets (Fliege). Although the Jesuit Order was initially Christocentric, Mary plays a central role in the Latin poems of the Jesuits Johannes Bisselius (Wiegand) and Jakob Balde (Kühlmann). Schindler's analysis of Bernardo

Zamagna's *Elegiarum Monobiblos* (1768) reveals a modern adaptation of classical pictures of Mary, and could be described as a new facet of dealing with Mary in the Enlightenment.

A comprehensive index fills out the volume. Perhaps the Catholic perspective could have been considered more in some places to complete the picture. Mary as a country's patron saint, for example as *Patrona Bavariae*, emerged in the early modern period—a theme that would have offered a broader research spectrum, including state formation and nation building. Marian sanctuaries, as researched by modern cultural studies and ethnology, could also have been mentioned. Nevertheless, the volume contains a truly great variety of contributions that together work well in questioning historiographic narratives, opening new perspectives on a classical theme, and stimulating reflection as well as further research.

Markus Christopher Müller, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.67

*Cajetan's Biblical Commentaries: Motive and Method.* Michael O'Connor.  
St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Leiden: Brill, 2017. xvi + 302 pp. \$174.

Thomas de Vio (Cardinal Cajetan) is too often remembered only for his failure to convince Martin Luther to remain in obedience to the established church. However, he was more creative and intellectually engaged than that. His treatment of Thomism, which is best found in his commentary on the *Summa theologiae*, was more than mere repetition of the Angelic Doctor's teachings. He felt free to disagree with the Thomistic orthodoxy of his day. This very creativity drew the ire of Sylvester Prierias and other fellow Dominicans, whose idea of Thomism was narrower. Similarly, Cajetan embarked in the 1520s on a sustained engagement with biblical texts. His motivation, as O'Connor rightly argues, went beyond the polemics exchanged between Luther and his foes. His motivation included the renewal of Christianity, and he did not hesitate to retranslate and comment on the biblical texts. Cardinal Cajetan treated most of the New Testament and large parts of the Old. In this he drew creatively on the original languages, which is exactly what he had done in interpreting Aristotle. When he died in 1534 he left behind the beginning of a treatment of the text of Isaiah. In between, he wrote answers to the Lutherans and treated the marital problems of Henry VIII.

Cajetan's exegesis led him to criticize the Latin Vulgate without abandoning it. Moreover, his emphasis was on literal interpretation of scripture, rather than pursuing the various spiritual senses past exegetes had expounded. This, in turn, put him outside the mainstream of Catholic biblical scholarship that flourished in succeeding centuries. That did not mean a divorce from papal authority, the ecclesial context, or a hard line of emphasis on *sola scriptura*, typical of much Protestant scholarship in his time. Instead, as