and regeneration (237–38, 303–11). When Vos strays from the themes of freedom and contingency, however, his arguments become somewhat unfocused. When he describes what he calls Scotus's position on the "structure of election," for example, he oddly neglects to outline the obvious parallels between Scotus's *signa rationis* and their later use in debates between supralapsarians, infralapsarians, Amyraldians, and Arminians. Vos's arguments can seem a tad too jaunty at times. He argues that Scotus's open Trinitarian notion of God is opposed to the closed, merely monotheistic, conception of Thomas Aquinas (163, 177, 395–96); in doing so, though, he insists that Aquinas denies God's freedom to create (396–97). Surely this is unfair to Aquinas. Vos consistently exaggerates the differences between Aquinas and Scotus, and *The Theology of John Duns Scotus* is the worse for it.

Theologians of the Society of Jesus sometimes made the same mistake. As often as not, they noticed that Aquinas and Scotus were speaking at cross purposes. In some cases, though, they took what was best from both doctors and synthesized their teachings. One gets almost no sense of this in Vos's study of Scotus's theology, and readers of *The Journal of Jesuit Studies* might not find it helpful for this reason. Vos, in short, presents Scotus's theology for a modern, ecumenically-minded audience of Reformed theologians. His Scotus is not a Protestant, but neither is he the theologian who proved so influential to later Catholic theologians, especially in the Society of Jesus.

Trent Pomplun

Loyola University Maryland

RPomplun@loyola.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00601012-12

Jennifer Neville

Footprints of the Dance: An Early Seventeenth-Century Dance Master's Notebook.

Leiden: Brill, 2018. Pp. 285. Pb, \$135.00.

In her newest book, musicologist and dance historian Jennifer Neville has made a substantial contribution to our knowledge of early seventeenth-century dance and its social and political importance in the towns and cities of Western Europe. The dancing master of her book's title was a Frenchman teaching and choreographing in Brussels, whose working notebook has survived. We do not know his name, or how his notebook got from Brussels to Sweden, where it was acquired by the Kungliga Biblioteka of Stockholm in 1880. Most likely written from 1615 to 1619, it has never been studied in detail

until now. Neville presents it to us in depth, with photographs of seventy-seven pages of the manuscript's specifically dance-related material. Of particular interest for readers of this journal is the light *Footprints of the Dance* casts on the ballets produced at Jesuit colleges of the pre-suppression era.

Performance dance in our own time has little importance outside the theater. But in the time of the notebook—as in Western European culture from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries and in Jesuit teaching—ballets were understood as more than an art form. They were significant statements of social and political reality and coherence, as well as expressions of the dancers' intellectual and moral qualities, and their ability to communicate physically. Upper bourgeois and noble men and women were seriously judged—personally, socially, and in terms of general competence—by their ability to dance well. To understand this, it helps to remember that upper class social dancing and performance used the same dance vocabulary, and social dance itself was often performance. At court balls, one or two people danced while the rest of the court watched—and judged. Neville reminds us that long before the Brussels notebook (and before the Society of Jesus existed), dance was considered the “physical embodiment of moral and political order” as Thomas Elyot wrote in his 1531 *Book of the Governour* (36). He was following Cicero, one of the humanists' most revered “ancients” and a staple of Jesuit rhetorical teaching.

The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Jesuit colleges produced plays and ballets throughout the school year. From 1604 to its closure in 1763, the Brussels college alone produced about 1,200 plays (56). The 1604 edition of the widely produced 1597 play *Crispus*, by the Jesuit Bernardino Stefonio of the Roman Jesuit college, included ballet figures for sixteen dancers (37).

However, Neville also cites *Annali* records for “the Jesuit seminary in Rome” and the “spectacles performed by their students every year from 1565 until 1647. For some of these productions dancing is mentioned” (59). The Society of Jesus did not have seminaries, and students in formation were not called seminarians. The Roman Seminary of the notebook period educated future diocesan priests. Post-novitiate Jesuits in formation studied as a separate group within Jesuit colleges, including the Collegio Romano. Jesuits, whether in formation or professed, did not perform publicly in plays or ballets. It also seems to me unlikely that diocesan seminarians would have performed publicly. Perhaps the spectacles recorded in the *Annali* were performed at the Collegio Romano by lay students.

The Brussels notebook includes a list of ballet titles, several ballet plots, and schematic drawings of what were called ballet figures. Figures were precise geometrical arrangements of dancers, and a basic tool of period choreographers. Some figures show dancers arranged as letters of the alphabet,

presenting the names or initials of a production's patrons or those honored by it. Also included are music for ballet *entrées*, and music and verses of popular court songs, *airs de cour*, used in ballets. The notebook includes significant musical detail, but like much—though not all—of dance writing of the time, says little about specific dance steps.

Surprisingly to us, the notebook also includes instructions for making fireworks, because pyrotechnics were, and continued to be, a normal part of court and public ballets. A drawing of the courtyard of the Paris Jesuit college of Louis le Grand, for example, shows the stage set for the 1682 play and ballet celebrating the birth of Louis XIV's grandson, with fireworks launched from the courtyard.

The notebook also has complete and precise directions, with illustrations, for a man demonstrating the use of a soldier's pike. Danced combat was frequent in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century ballets at court and in public ceremonies, and was sometimes used in Jesuit ballets. The notebooks' pike instructions suggest that danced combat may have been done with pikes as well as swords.

Neville suggests that the ballet master of the notebook, besides teaching in his school, may have worked on ballets for the royal court in Brussels, the Brussels Chamber of Rhetoric, and the Brussels Jesuit college, one of eighteen Jesuit schools in the Low Countries by the early seventeenth century. For their productions, Jesuit colleges regularly hired secular dancing masters. Neville's mention of the Chamber of Rhetoric and its ballets provides additional context for Jesuit pedagogy relating rhetoric and dance, using classroom work and public verbal presentations to teach the rhetoric of the voice, and public ballet performances to teach the rhetoric of the body.

Of interest for future Jesuit ballet research, Neville suggests that there was a relationship between the creation and use of early seventeenth-century emblems, puzzle-like pairings of visual images and words, and ballets. In the Jesuit colleges, emblems were constantly created by students and teachers, and hung as decorations for verbal rhetorical displays, dramas, and ballets. The Jesuit emblems have been studied, but I am not aware of extensive study in relation to the college ballets.

Dancing masters wrote many dance instruction manuals from the late fourteenth century to the late eighteenth century. But the anonymous Brussels manuscript tells us something of how an early modern dancing master *worked*. The school was in his house or in rooms rented for the purpose. Music was also taught there, and Neville concludes that he hired other dance and music teachers, since the manuscript's writing includes a variety of textual and musical hands. In addition, male and female students signed their names in

the notebook and from their signatures, they were Flemish, German, French, English, Danish, and possibly Swedish. Sometimes the master noted their social positions: “four German barons,” “the vicomte,” and “the princes of la sau” (114, 116). Occasionally an occupation is given, as when the chancellor or treasurer of Brussels began lessons. The date a student started lessons was recorded, which tells us that January and February, just before Carnival—with its many danced celebrations—were two of the school’s busiest months. The manuscript also includes recipes for a cough remedy and burn ointment (possibly because of handling fireworks), directions for fumigating a house during a plague, and advice on making wheat grow in poor soil.

Though the notebook does not reveal the dancing master’s name, it lets us see him at work in his profession, city, and time—and even hints at his concerns and fears. He becomes not only a part of dance history, but a person we glimpse and begin to imagine. Neville’s opening his notebook to us is a gift to dance research.

Judith Rock

Independent Scholar

wingrock@att.net

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00601012-13