Moor’s repressed passions or provoke his innate savagery: it utterly transforms the Moor’s humors” (146).

It is in this chapter on *Othello* that the book’s only significant weakness seems apparent. That is, in its attention to regionally inflected humoral identity, *English Ethnicity and Early Modern Drama* tends to slight the importance of religious identity, especially in relation to the discourses of impressibility and vulnerability. Floyd-Wilson’s discussion of Iago’s Italianate “civility” makes virtually no reference to English concerns with apostasy, recusancy, or Roman Catholic conspiracies. Along with Reformation politics, the emergence of English mercantilism likewise receives scant attention here. Thus the history of developing racialism that emerges is compelling and important but perhaps too neatly delineated. *English Ethnicity and Early Modern Drama* does not promise a history of race in the West, but it would benefit from a more focused discussion of precisely how the shift from geohumoral ethnology to racialism matters in terms of socio-cultural relations. What kind of work did racialism perform that geohumoral ethnology could not? Might one simply argue for racialism as a reassignment of the roles apportioned by geohumoralism? These questions aside, Mary Floyd-Wilson’s study of English ethnicity offers an important contribution to the study of race in the early modern period. Its account of geohumoral ethnology is innovative and fascinating. Furthermore it offers an important supplement to Ania Loomba’s largely overlooked but nonetheless excellent study of *Shakespeare, Race and Colonialism* by indicating how seemingly archaic climate theory was remade to engage with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English anxieties in regard to historiography, politics, and the theater.

Somewhere along the way “affect” has become a noun. David Halperin uses it thus a dozen times in his preface to *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*: “The result is that the life of queer affect . . . never comes in for sustained, unembarrassed, analytic attention” (2). The sentence (and a good part of the preface) is thus muddled by what is an expression peculiar to psychology and begs for a little explanation on such short notice. Overall, the preface to the book is scattered and not of much help to the very fine essays that follow it. Halperin, who has done vintage work in gay studies, did not seem to expend much effort on the writing of this preface. On the other hand, George Rousseau, in his essay on same-sex attraction, painstakingly explains three neologisms that he has been refining for decades: “homoplatonic,” “homodepressed,” and “homomorbid.” He does not use the terms to characterize specific eras as one might expect (e.g., “homoplatonic” for the Classical Period), but he rather uses the terms to explain conditions of same-sex attraction that are prevalent when conditions exist for their presence regardless of century. Thus “homodepressed” is a useful approach to Thomas Gray as well as to Tchaikovsky. The Renaissance, of course, predates medical research on homosexuality so that most of Rousseau’s remarks on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries pertain to homoplatonic reflections in literature. Eventually, a reader presumes, both “homodepressed” and “homomorbid” will serve as investigative tools for Renaissance researchers. The scarcity of Renaissance gay texts, however, may limit the usefulness of Rousseau’s latter two terms, but one would hope that advances in understanding homodepression and even the more desperate homomorbidity could shed light on, for example, the Shakespeare sonnets or Barnfield’s pastoral lyrics. Rousseau’s essay is a valuable first essay in this collection.

Alan Stewart’s essay on A. L. Rowse reads like a book review of *Rouse’s Homosexuals in History*, until the last four pages when Stewart discusses the sexual orientation of James I. Similarly disappointing is George Haggerty’s short essay on eighteenth-century male love and friendship: half of the piece is a gloss on his book *Men in Love*, and the other half is a quibble over categories of
homosexuals established by David Halperin in “How to Do the History of Male Homosexuality.” This broadside prompted Halperin, by the way, to devote a three-page end-note reply to Haggerty. The end-note is as long as one third of Halperin’s entire preface. This flying simply gives the book a kind of “last minute” feel, and one would think that writers of prefaces would not engage so violently with a contributor to a volume. A reader suspects that both Halperin and Haggerty were solicited for the book based on their very excellent previous contributions to gay studies, not for their contributions to the present book.

A short testimonial to the memory of Alan Bray is followed in the book by a short essay by Bray himself on the tombs of men who were buried together in England. His research unearthed such tombs from the fourteenth century to the nineteenth century, and he spends his most valuable attention on the tomb of Cardinal Newman and Newman’s friend, Ambrose St. John. The essay is a taste of Bray’s forthcoming book, a posthumous work on the subject of pairs of men buried in the same tomb. The present essay reads with Bray’s usual clarity and is every bit as convincing as his earlier monumental work *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (1982). What John Boswell did for same-sex marriage with church texts (*Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*), Bray does here for church tombs.

One of the most valuable essays in the O’Donnell-O’Rourke book is Randolph Trumbach’s piece on the eighteenth-century male. It begins, “Around 1700 a profound shift began to occur in sexual relations between males in Western societies” (99). Although the assertion that homosexuality is a modern construct has become a commonplace, the assertion becomes clear only after reading an essay like Trumbach’s. Societies, Trumbach asserts, were divided by age rather than by gender until the eighteenth century, and indeed some Western societies did not discriminate sexual partners by gender until the beginning of the twentieth century. This is a most illuminating essay, which Trumbach ends with half a dozen pages on sodomy court cases, sparing us none of the details.
Dovetailing Trumbach’s work is Nicholas Radel’s exploration of servant-master relations in both real life (for which he uses the Castlehaven affair) and literary life (for which he refers to numerous English Renaissance satirists from Guilpin to Rochester). What the real and the literary have in common is the gradual erosion of silent servants so that what was once accepted as normal behavior (sex between master and servant) becomes legally problematic once the servant assumes a voice and protests his complicity in a same-sex act. Coke and other English Renaissance jurists had no trouble dismissing sodomy as inconsequential, argues Radel, until servants avowed willing participation in sexual relations with their masters, in which cases they threatened the social order by usurping a desire which traditionally could belong only to the ruling class. Although a modern reader might initially dismiss another visit to the Castlehaven case after Leah Marcus has mined it so effectively, Radel’s new focus on the servant Fitzpatrick rather than the Earl of Castlehaven brings new light to this old affair.

The final essay in the volume analyzes the eighteenth-century reception of Sappho via Ovid’s fifteenth epistle (Heroides). Of particular interest to Jody Greene are the years 1711-13 when English Sapphism peaked. Greene concludes that Sappho has been more abused than appreciated, and various hands have perverted Ovid’s Sappho, making her a vehicle for masculine readers to swing the Greek poetess into heterosexual alignment via either a prurient interest in Sappho’s sexual self-indulgence or an emphasis on her purported affair with the man Phaon. Of particular umbrage to Greene is the loose translation of Ovid by Matthew Stevenson for the Earl of Dorset, a translation that turns Sappho masturbatory as she is made to proclaim, “Grunting all day I sit alone.” It is curious that Greene does not refer in this regard to John Donne’s own rendering of Sappho who enjoyed herself, minus the grunting, over half a century before the Augustan Age.