

with their parishioners. The “qualitative approach” (234) embraced here demonstrates such success regarding the clergy’s *agency* that a return to counting clergy to revise our sense of the Church’s *structure* might be useful too in future. The editors are quick to admit that pieces here focus on the Protestant clergy, and that more work is needed on their Scottish Catholic counterparts. One might add work needed on would-be preachers—readers, chaplains, teachers, even clerks—to flesh out the life- or career-cycle of many parish clergy, though admittedly evidence for these are scant. The introductory historiography, various approaches, and combined bibliography might make this collection serve as a *vade mecum* to such future studies of the early modern Scottish Church.

Chakravarty Urvashi. *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2022. xiv + 295 pp. \$65. Review by RAY BOSSERT, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

Early modern political polemics often relied on the trope of England as a nation of free persons, intolerant of slavery on its home island; but in what ways did English culture and society contradict this national self-image? And how might those structures, submerged under rhetoric of freedom, have contributed to the evolution of racialized human trafficking and trans-atlantic slavery? Urvashi Chakravarty probes these questions in *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*—a monograph that rewards the reader with essential concepts, unexpected evidence, and thought-provoking analysis.

Servants in early modern England wanted their role in the class system to be compatible with a belief that they still retained their native freedom as Englishmen. The title of the book points to ways English lawyers, dramatists, and others attempted to demonstrate that compatibility by distinguishing between a servant’s freedom and a slave’s bondage. Chakravarty argues these attempts are “fictions” by way of Derridean deconstruction. For Chakravarty, social conditions, slipperiness of language, and even illiteracy all undermine efforts to

preserve a freedom to consent that might not have ever existed to begin with. In deconstructing texts, Chakravarty considers how they could in turn justify if not create the emerging racialized slavery in English colonies.

In order to set its stage, *Fictions of Consent* delivers a valuable primer on servitude and racial history for the period. Chakravarty invites researchers to cast a wider net of less obvious sources when excavating the cultural history of slavery, and the book draws from an ecosystem of archival documents that are extremely useful and provocative—from pamphlets on the treatment of servants to actual contracts between masters and their subordinates. It provides a ready list of terms, images, and language and applies them as a framework of linguistic markers of service and servitude in thoughtful close readings. Readers will, no doubt, feel compelled to do the same when they return to primary sources.

Chakravarty's analysis follows a pattern: a juxtaposition of legal or epistolary evidence with literary works is followed by a deconstruction of language by way of etymology, especially in terms of the Latin used in Terence, which then leads to close readings of more literary texts. Chapters typically end by showing an example where the previous readings play out in terms of an early modern depiction of blackness. The five chapters suggest an evolution or "genealogy" of racialized servitude, beginning with livery and then moving through grammar schools, apprenticeship, consanguinity, and ending with indentured servitude. The book's epilogue applies its concepts provocatively to a sampling of eighteenth and nineteenth texts.

The first chapter focuses on livery, arguing that this system of relying on visual signifiers to denote class creates a fertile environment for moving that signifier from clothing to skin color (19). The reader is provided with a five-part taxonomy of livery: heraldic colors, badges or cullisons, apprenticeship, blue coats, and "cast" clothing. Those that wore livery experienced a paradoxical (one might say liminal) existence—it signified that they were bound to masters, but also gave them privilege, protection, and liberties based on those masters. Chakravarty notes that this was particularly valuable to actors, who relied on livery off stage, and frequently made

use of it onstage. Chakravarty concludes with a tantalizing example of the transition from clothing to skin from *The Merchant of Venice*, as the Prince of Morocco describes his skin as the sun's livery (43).

The second chapter observes various ways in which early modern English people living domestically might still have encountered slavery, bondage, and servitude. One significant source is grammar school where Latin assignments, particularly those of Terence, immersed English boys in a literary and theatric culture of slavery. Chakravarty goes further to assert that the experience of the pupil was compulsory and could often result in severe corporeal punishment (56)—therefore, the English pupil was essentially aligned to the slavery in his readings. For Chakravarty, ancient Terence primed young English minds to accept and enact forms of slavery in ways that would allow them to adopt its brutal form overseas.

Here, the text lays out a taxonomy of slavery, by way of Latin: the *servus* (captured in war, spared from death), the *mancipium* (property by way of transaction), and the *famulus* (household slave). Despite these distinctions, the chapter notes early modern English translations that often avoided the word “slave,” preferring phrases like “servant,” “page,” or “bondman” (54) in a kind of bowdlerization of literary servitude.

The chapter goes on to describe how English subjects would have been aware of or even victims of Mediterranean slavery—diplomatic processions featuring freed captives, documented accounts, petitions to raise funds for hostages, and, of course, the potential to find oneself captured by Mediterranean pirates or raiders. The chapter also includes discussion of the Ethiopian maid in Terence's *Eunuchus*, which Chakravarty sees as “the nexus between classical and contemporary racialized slavery” (75).

As with the previous chapter, all of this comes to bear on a Shakespearean text, this time *Othello*. Chakravarty focuses on Desdemona's tale of her mother's servant—whose name implies that she was herself of African descent, and how Desdemona then aligns herself with the black servant (88). For Chakravarty, this is evidence of the multivalent meanings of the word “family” to convey both one's kin and one's household servants.

The third chapter delves into the nature of early modern family and its roots in the *famulus*—the domestic slave. It shows how the early modern period was shifting the word “family” from a term for one’s household servants to a word meaning people connected by blood. For Chakravarty, this anticipates the idea that slavery will move from a condition of an individual to a condition of a race. The chapter pores over *Volpone*, in particular, Mosca’s description of the title character as the “true father of his family”—the “family” being his servants who (as Mosca implies) are also his actual offspring (101). Discussion of Mosca turns to the idea of the Roman parasites—the servant who is both close and stranger, foreign and familiar—anticipating roles of slaves in trans-atlantic texts.

Turning to *The Changeling*, Chakravarty teases out how Maussian gift economies create a sense of obligations between masters and servants that undermine the ostensibly voluntary nature of the relationships (118). *The Changeling* is significant to the argument because De Flores represents the potential for the servant to marry into the family that he serves and thereby unifying the bloodline—a frequent fantasy imagined in early modern literature.

From here, Chakravarty pivots to *The Fatal Contract*—a play in which a white aristocratic woman seeks revenge for an assault against her by posing as a male Ethiopian servant. The character delivers a speech where she imagines her male disguise reproducing with her female self, and producing a child of mixed race—bringing the servile black figure into consanguinity with the aristocratic white figure, but potentially marking the imaginary offspring in the process.

The chapter ends with literary examples of people being born with marks or born into slavery, culminating in the historical account of a how “a free Englishwoman who gave birth out of wedlock to a child who had been fathered by a black man would be fined, and could be indentured for five years; her child, however, ‘would be indentured until the age of thirty’” (130).

Chapter 4 analyzes a series of apprenticeship forms and contracts, and then compares them with indentureship contracts. Remarkably, the indentureships insist “upon volition” in ways that apprenticeships did not—which, for Chakravarty, signals an increased need to assert a performance of consent (145). This

free consent is problematic since illiteracy among servants makes claims of volition spurious (contracts frequently bear an X for the servant's signature and contain egregious and legally problematic typographical errors).

With the consensual nature of indentures undermined, Chakravarty deconstructs Milton's depiction of Eden to question how free Adam and Eve really are and how free they perceive themselves to be. This moves to a discussion of natality. First, the chapter notes that the first parents consider children when they describe their pressing need for extra labor, suggesting that children are imagined as a way of breeding servants. Later, they debate whether to reproduce if the offspring will be subject to the same punishment. The transferable nature of punishment through a bloodline prefigures the taint of slavery that will fall to slaves and their offspring in the next chapter (168).

Chapter 5 focuses on the *macula servitus* ("stain of slavery"). Terence's *Andria* and its translations show how the relationship between a master and a freed slave dooms the emancipated to indebtedness and continual threats of re-enslavement. Turning to *The Tempest*, the chapter questions the offers of freedom and threats of further enslavement that function as Prospero's tools to motivate Ariel (although Chakravarty asks why Ariel doesn't just fly away) (184). A provocative approach to Caliban observes how Prospero's lines "This thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine" ring with uncanny similarity to the Roman slavery ritual of *mancipatio* (188-189), although it is unclear if this is intentional or coincidence on Shakespeare's part.

The chapter concludes by investigating 1694 court records of Adam Saffin, who was contractually promised freedom if he served "cheerfully," a requirement which the master predictably claims was not met by the time of Adam's anticipated release. The language of his master suggests belief in a firm connection between racial identity and servitude, and even though the court ultimately ruled in Adam's favor, he retained his master's surname, which Chakravarty reads as a stain of slavery.

The forward-looking epilogue demonstrates later periods' continued use of Terence in texts discussing servitude and service, from polemical tracts to the poetry of Phyllis Wheatly. It looks at children's

literature depicting “happy” slaves who identify with their master’s family, even those intending to serve abolitionist aims, as evidence that the previous conceptions of service and slavery have become firmly embedded in conceptions of blackness. It is a powerful payoff as the reader, now trained to see the linguistic resonances Chakravarty sees, shares in the moment of discovery.

The book is provocative and useful, and the analysis is at its strongest when focusing on individual texts. It has some especially striking readings of canonical texts (the reading of Kent’s final line is especially noteworthy). Chakravarty is very effective at demonstrating how freedom was a fiction—an illusion—at least when enshrined in verbal signifiers.

Chakravarty offers a reasonable concession in the introduction: “I invoke this association not to conflate blackness with slavery, nor to attempt to ‘determine’ the provenance of racialized slavery. Rather, the suggestive temporal confluence here, I propose, posits the collusion of early modern fictions of consent ... with the fictions of race” (7). Some readers’ doubts might arise precisely from the reliance on “temporal confluence.” At times, the analysis can jump over 100 years from one paragraph to the next. Civil wars, changes of dynasties, shifting global powers, reversals of national religion occur offstage, but the text is less concerned with why texts emerged as they did or what they might have meant in their own context than how they might function in a larger diachronic (or pan-chronic?) understanding of service and slavery. Perhaps readers do well to perceive Chakravarty’s examples like pieces of prehistoric amber that capture stages of evolving fantasies of servitude, slavery, and race.

Likewise, the text’s enthusiasm for its subject has a tendency to reify early modern England into a singular entity. We are told “early modern England was no stranger to the spectacle of slavery” because of a procession that happened in London in 1637 (47). In the epilogue, we read that the book “strives to hold early modern England to account for the discourses of race and slavery that it authorized and amplified” (198). This language might appear to conflate over 200 years of discourse and experiences among radically different individuals, geographical regions, and institutions into a single national body. This reification might be at odds with

the text's intentions.

Chakravarty's approach is rooted in an admirable and laudable belief that the seemingly "quotidian" aspects of the period offer overlooked evidence. A reader might find themselves often thinking about more obvious works that might play a role (possibly a larger one) in the shaping of English notions of slavery. The Bible would have been as likely a source to encounter images of slavery and service as *Paradise Lost*, and would have been far wider reaching than Terence, but it is conspicuously absent (perhaps the most theological text analyzed is a brief section of the *Book of Common Prayer*).

Still, the omission of such works falls in line with Chakravarty's call "that we must disorient and disrupt the spaces and places where we search for the archives and genealogies of slavery" (49). The approach, which stands almost as a dare to colleagues, will hopefully inspire more researchers to follow the approach of *Fictions of Consent* to go off the well-trod path.

In sum, *Fictions of Consent* is a provocative, wide-ranging analysis that lays down a solid foundation for those curious about servitude and slavery in the period. It offers compelling close readings of canonical literature and historical texts. I predict its taxonomies will direct the way scholars and students recognize the kinds of service they see depicted in early modern works, and that Chakravarty's framework will generate new curiosity for the "quotidian" and lead to greater scrutiny of how the familiar might capture unexpected fossils in the evolution of English notions of race.

Frank Sobiech. *Jesuit Prison Ministry in the Witch Trials of the Holy Roman Empire: Friedrich Spee SJ and his Cautio Criminalis (1631)*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2019. xii + 539 pp. + 17 illus. + 2 maps. €60.00. Review by JONATHAN DURRANT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH WALES.

Frank Sobiech frames his study of Jesuit prison ministry to incarcerated witch-suspects as a multidisciplinary investigation into one of the most well-known works written about witchcraft in the early modern period, Friedrich Spee's *Cautio Criminalis* (1631). It