

avoids the aesthetic bias of New Critical readings, there is a certain tendency in his argument to elicit fairly general claims from relatively limited textual material. These structures become most obvious when he attempts to define the entire “literary category” of early modern “soul-address” (123) from a close reading of Shakespeare’s Sonnet 146. His reading of Shakespeare’s imagery in combination with religious disciplinary writings neither does full justice to the complex and contradictory biblical, classical, and Petrarchan associations of the metaphors involved, nor does it sufficiently illustrate the chapter’s far-reaching theoretical claims about the early modern lyric creating a triangular “deictic space” (234) drawing the reader “into the performance of the scene of self-discipline that it scripts” (157). This falls far short of, for example, Angelika Zirker’s carefully argued book-length analysis of the inherent theatricality of Shakespeare’s and Donne’s lyric versions of the soul.

Conversely, Davies is at his strongest when he reconsiders a specific text, Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, through the lens of a specific historical context. His fascinating rereading of Hamlet’s ghost within the discourse of early modern experimentalism and its reception of classical atomist notions of vacuity ingeniously connects *Hamlet*’s scientific subcurrents to its affinity with traditional *vanitas* literature and early modern discussions on kingship and divine providence. This last chapter is a showcase of just how much new and original insight may be gained from Davies’s method of closely interrogating early modern materialist revisions of the soul and, through the medium of literature, bringing them into dialogue with the very concepts they purportedly challenge. It provides, however, also a necessary reminder that, even though similar questions concerning the soul may continue to be asked over the periods, the answers provided in each instance, far from reflecting an “experiential category apart from local cultural configurations” (23, quoting Robert N. Watson), cannot but always be historically and culturally inflected.

Gabriela Schmidt, *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.501

*Lives of the Great Languages: Arabic and Latin in the Medieval Mediterranean.*  
Karla Mallette.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021. viii + 240 pp. \$105.

---

This book is a welcome tribute to the cosmopolitan language, the linguistic vehicle of the premodern man of letters, epitomized here by Latin and Arabic. As such, it serves as a counterpoint to a number of modern assumptions about language that are intimately linked to the rise of nation-states. In essence, modernity posits an overlap between territory and mother tongue, the latter being used as the normative language of literature, and it both overlooks the possibility of a break between written and oral registers and conceives of the mother tongue as a natural, directly accessible device for all speakers.

Cosmopolitan language does not comply herewith, nor does it claim exclusive rights to identity: it is above all relational and intersectional (10). Mallette dwells on these aspects of language in four sections through a series of vignettes that follow so-called language workers of premodern times—with a focus on the Abbasid caliphate and modern Italy—in their engagement with Latin and Arabic. After all, a distinctive feature of the cosmopolitan language is complexity, and it is in light of the desire and effort to learn it that Arabic can be labeled as dead, just like Latin.

But although the human biology metaphor is repeated far beyond the book's title, Mallette warns of its inadequacy in describing cosmopolitan languages (which do not live or die but are refreshingly posthuman). Moreover, these are metaphors that lend themselves to making the leap to polemical genetic arguments, for which some recent examples are provided (175). The human dimension goes behind the scenes and so, too, do the protagonists in the vignettes, who merely serve to highlight some aspects of language. Yet many of Mallette's arguments live on by the grace of the narratives' appealing main characters, who even become tales themselves (126), couched in the author's witty language, full of turns of phrase and expressions that straddle academic and literary style. Indeed, poetics have a specific weight in her argumentation, denoting both poetry (many "texts created in language" [4] are by poets), and the arts more broadly, with Aristotle's *Poetics* as a central subject in some chapters.

Mallette addresses the concept of the cosmopolitan language as a personal choice (part 1: Bashshār b. Burd, Petrarch) and its use as a vehicle for those who willingly or unwillingly become nomads, as a carpet to shelter under, to admire, or as a path or grammar to follow (part 2: Dante, Sībawayhi, 85). She unpacks the paradox of the cosmopolitan language as self-sufficient and yet dependent on multiple registers of a network of languages (parts 3 and 4). Here, Mallette highlights linguistic changes through translation following the *Poetics*'s particular uses of the Arabic term *ḥikāya*, and the later Italian tradition (Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus, Ibn Rushd, Petrarch). This inquiry serves to forward a broader theoretical claim concerning the neologism *hikaya* to denote the layers of meaning, the rhizomatic forms connecting past and present, which are encapsulated and sometimes revealed by the cosmopolitan language.

The author could have done more work on the relationship between the vernacular languages and Arabic (as illustrated using Latin). Combining what, according to Mallette, behaves as another Mediterranean (the Abbasid caliphate) with the Mediterranean itself—for example, by using the poetry of the Iberian Peninsula—would have complicated a linguistic scenario that now seems to fit the argument seamlessly. This might have also contributed to the discussion of the lingua franca for which, as the author points out, the evidence is scanty in the premodern period. Finally, the present reviewer cannot but note that Adorno's characterization of Beethoven's late works as fragmentary and a patchwork of conventionalisms—as a "catastrophe" (40)—goes against the grain of most musicologists' and musicians' sensitivities. Beethoven's works are generally seen as revolutionary, personal, philosophical, and

abstract, transcending the social: think of the (cosmopolitan?) humanism of *Alle Menschen werden Brüder*. Many other composers wrote at their best late in life (Mozart, Schubert, Mahler, Janáček, etc.), so one wonders if Mallette is right in her use of “Adorno’s adjectives” which, besides, “don’t describe Petrarch’s late style perfectly” (41). This stimulating study makes use of a range of concepts and linguistic tools but, above all, and true to its name, it offers a literary journey through the lives of Latin and Arabic, to the delight of those already familiar with linguistic research’s finer and often more arid points, and surely also of an interested educated public.

Mònica Colominas Aparicio, *Rijksuniversiteit Groningen / Max-Planck-Institut für  
Wissenschaftsgeschichte*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.488

*Positive Emotions in Early Modern Literature and Culture.*

Cora Fox, Bradley J. Irish, and Cassie M. Miura, eds.

Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2021. xii + 226 pp. \$130.

---

Ever since the grand theories of Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche, we humanists have focused on “the hermeneutics of suspicion,” as Paul Ricoeur put it. Consciousness is false; we are driven by dark impulses barely known to us; every social action is a symptom of a submerged, antagonistic play of power. Hence, the histories of early modern emotions have so far focused on the melancholic varieties of pathologies that mark the tremors of the soul and the disquietudes of the body. And in literary studies at large, Lauren Berlant’s *Cruel Optimism* (2011) and Sianne Ngai’s *Ugly Feelings* (2007) have had an enormous impact in articulating our early twenty-first-century structures of feelings.

Yet for every scholarly trend there comes along an equal and opposite countertrend. As the feminist Sara Ahmed has signaled, there is now a “happiness turn.” In the after-shocks of multiple and continual planetary crises, we care much more about therapy, consolation, and the well-being of the self. Thus, the editors of this most interesting and original volume—Cora Fox, Bradley J. Irish, and Cassie M. Miura—make the case for how a sustained attention to the “positive emotions in early modern literature and culture” might be good for us; since, after all, we can trace the genealogy of so much of our contemporary world to early modernity. This smartly conceived and deftly executed collection is therefore a very much welcomed and substantial contribution to affect studies.

How does one cultivate, represent, and propagate pleasure? Richard Strier’s “Happy Hamlet” starts off the volume by arguing that we’ve got the reading of the melancholic Dane all wrong. He’s not sad by nature at all, but actually quite happy, were it not for the circumstances that befall him. Likewise, for Miura, Robert Burton’s *The Anatomy of*