


bishoprics. On the one hand, the refashioning of such artifacts reflects a pragmatic approach, the reuse of valuable materials, employed within a new religious context. On the other, as Sarah Tarlow has noted, the meaning of the survival and incorporation of Catholic material culture into Protestant settings can be ambiguous. Religious materials carried “symbolic weight,” with “old meanings” potentially affecting the new (see “Reformation and Transformation: What Happened to Catholic Things in a Protestant World?” in Gilchrist and Gaimster, *The Archaeology of the Reformation*, London: Routledge, 2018, 108, 115). Ladick’s reflection on such objects as “physical touchstones of communal and familial memory” enhances our understanding of both change and continuity in the religious material culture of the churches of Norfolk and of the uneven path and pace of the English Reformation more broadly (160).

The trajectory and pace of England’s Reformation has been hotly debated. The duration of a Long Reformation, as Nicolas Tyacke, Jeremy Gregory, and others have helpfully pointed out, may reside in one’s definition of Protestant (N. Tyacke, ed. *England’s Long Reformation*. London: Routledge, 1997). Ladick concurs, noting that by the seventeenth century, fragmentation among Protestants left the “godly reformer who sought to strip the altars bare” and the “Anglican who desired to restore the liturgical glory of the medieval church within a distinctly English fashion” continuing to engage with reform (25). Ladick observes that the “poor and uneven spread of Protestantism” renders determining an end date difficult and sees the chronological conclusion in 1660 of his current study as perhaps too limiting (25). He proposes instead future research through the overthrow in 1688 of James II as an appropriate bookend, the “spectre of Roman Catholicism being restored by predilection of a monarch” offering “historical symmetry” with Henry VIII (163). Ladick’s close reading of the church fittings of Norfolk offers a welcome opportunity to study continuity and change and to consider “regional disparity or some degree of commonality in regards to how the Reformation unfolded” over the course of extended periods of reform within the early modern English church (163).

Susan Guinn-Chipman 

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, Colorado, USA

doi:10.1017/S0009640723001142

***Nicolaus Mameranus: Poetry and Politics at the Court of Mary Tudor.* By Matthew Tibble. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions 220. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2000. Xii + 389pp. €157 cloth.**

It is probably fair to say that the name of Nicolaus Mameranus, the sixteenth-century Imperial Poet Laureate, is not one with which many early modern scholars of Mary I’s England are familiar. Yet, in many ways, that is the central point of Matthew Tibble’s *Nicolaus Mameranus: Poetry and Politics at the Court of Mary Tudor*: namely, that a whiggish approach to Mary I’s reign still dominates, and it is time to recontextualize it within the concerns of the Holy Roman Empire.

Hailing from Luxembourg, Mameranus was created poet laureate as one of Charles V’s last acts as emperor in October 1555. Mameranus took this position seriously,

resulting in some mocking of his self-aggrandizing approach, though Tibble suggests this was a deliberate ploy by the poet as he sought to rehabilitate the position. The following chapters really get to the meat of Tibble's argument that Mameranus viewed England's new queen as leading the campaign to reassert Catholicism in northern Europe after the spread of Protestantism. For Mameranus, England was a new center of Habsburg activity, with any child of Mary and Philip destined to rule there and the Spanish Netherlands. In his keenness, he even suggested they should exercise an old English claim on the French throne.

In his portrayal of the marriage, Mameranus presented it as an equal endeavor. Against the slurs of Spanish dominance by Mary's enemies, Mameranus emphasized the queen's political status in his Latin poems and writings, eschewing more traditional depictions of the marriage to show a co-monarchy of equality. Although avoiding insult to his Spanish audience required a careful balancing act, Tibble suggests that Mameranus actually portrayed the union as following the usual Habsburg style of governance, so provides the historian with a more accurate depiction than those laden with anti-Mary polemic. In his fourth chapter, Tibble takes particular aim at the idea that 1557 represented an *annus horribilis* for Mary, as meekly following her husband's catastrophic military led to the loss of Calais and the start of the reign's rot. Consulting Mameranus's writings, Tibble instead finds his subject praising the Catholic reform happening before his very eyes and bearing testament to the ongoing strength of Mary's authority, solidified by tactics such as Philip sitting on the side reserved for the bride or the queen during Holy Week and Easter liturgies. Tibble also detects mutual suspicion between English and Spanish courtiers as opposed to outright Hispanophobia, even if some things never change, Mameranus having being appalled by the heavy drinking habits of the English.

Ultimately, for Tibble, Mameranus was writing transnational literature and adapting his work for different audiences. He convincingly portrays Mameranus as coming from the world of mid-century humanists, prizing a strict moral code to create a virtuous prince as the national leader. These ideas he repackaged for Mary, though notably toning down his previous advice on the role of secular authority within the church. However, his core advice remained the same: she should set the devotional tone for her people. Steering clear of theological controversy, he advocated Mary be a model of devotion to bring about a rejuvenation of Christian spirituality in the nation.

In a particularly significant chapter, Tibble explores how Mameranus viewed Mary in terms of the nascent Catholic Reformation. He had his own thoughts about how to advance this, having seen at first hand events in Germany, particularly Cologne, and the Netherlands, and it is interesting that Tibble highlights Mameranus extolling similar ideas to those of several significant figures within the Marian church such as the Dominican, William Peryn. Mameranus also made an impact in patristic scholarship, taking aim at inaccurate Protestant translation techniques. All this shows engagement with the Catholic Reformation, but I am less sure about the implied influence he had on the Marian regime in this area, even though Mameranus seems to have been on the same page as some of the Marian reformers. Nevertheless, Tibble's main point is important: Mameranus saw the gap between the aims and the reality of how well that plan was advancing, making the wider historiographical claim that it is difficult, therefore, to argue that England invented the Catholic Reformation.

Tibble's final chapter brings us back to his main point: situating Mary I within the wider Habsburg world. In this recontextualization, he finds Mary given full honor following her death, with the same preacher giving the funeral sermon of her, Charles V,

and Mary of Hungary, the text subsequently being printed by Christophe Plantin. For Tibble, this underlines that Mary I was viewed as a full partner in the Habsburg fight to restore the Catholic faith.

In many ways, Tibble uses Mameranus as a tool through which to shed light on the Marian reign. Indeed, the reader is thrown into the mix somewhat, and a little more potted biography of Mameranus may have helped orientation. Overall, though, Tibble convinces in his approach of using Mameranus as a source to re-position Mary and her reign. For this reviewer, slightly less persuasive is Tibble's insinuation of Mameranus as a Catholic Reformation champion. He instead comes across as someone with one foot in the past of humanism and another tentative one in the future of full global Catholic Reformation, a man about to be swept away by history, a sense, to be fair, Mameranus may have even recognized himself. That being said, such a consideration should not detract from the very interesting and important argument of this book and its wider historiographical claims. Tibble hits back at scholars who only judge Mary through English eyes rather than those of universal Christendom and the Habsburgs. Ultimately, he makes the much-needed case for putting England back in the Holy Roman Empire.

James E. Kelly
Durham University, Durham, UK
doi:10.1017/S000964072300077X

***The Early Modern Invention of Late Antique Rome.* By Nicola Denzey Lewis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2020. xvii + 426 pp. \$44.99 hardcover.**

The Early Modern Invention of Late Antique Rome tackles two important questions: *how* and *when* did Rome become a singularly sacred space? Rather than take on the history of the entire city, Nicola Denzey Lewis focuses in on the spaces of the dead, the catacombs, and martyrial shrines at the edge of the city's urban core—locations that would become central to the formation of Rome's identity as a center of early Christendom. Although the geographic boundaries are confined to the catacombs and Saint Peter's Basilica by necessity and methodology, the book maintains an expansive chronological breadth, first from the third to the sixth century, and then again from the sixteenth to the nineteenth. Through these periods, Denzey Lewis interrogates both the events of late antiquity that led to the creation and elevation of these spaces; their later early modern reception, rediscovery, and re-interpretation following the Counter Reformation; and the subsequent development of attempts to center Rome in the history of the early church.

As a whole, Denzey Lewis presents cogent arguments for both the mechanisms of change and the chronology of Rome's transformation, in dialogue with current archaeological and historical writing, as well as the long historiography of Rome's sacred origins. She begins with the first rethinking of Rome's Christian cemeteries as sacred places in the fourth and fifth centuries, in which objects and rituals were employed to transform their meaning. In these periods, pagan temples still demarcated the