“Jesuitware,” and how Jesuits sought to inspire Europeans who for lovely porcelain to also care for distant converted souls. Paolo di Rico and Marino Viganò discuss the portraits painted of members of the Japanese mission to Europe in the late sixteenth century.

Collectively, *Changing Hearts* does an excellent job of unraveling the tangled weave of: 1) the rhetorical aspects of Jesuit performances, 2) the unique role of textuality itself as a vehicle to virtuous action for both author and audience, as well as 3) positing the wide variety of audience reactions.

J. Michelle Molina

Northwestern University

molina@northwestern.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00702012-10

Andreas Abele, ed.

Jeremias Drexel, S.J., Iulianus Apostata tragoedia: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Frühe Neuzeit, 219. Berlin: De Gruyter 2018. Pp. xvi + 866. Pb, €149.95.

The Jesuit scholar, teacher, and, in his early days, playwright Jeremias Drexel (1581–1638) had a wide impact on the Catholic reformation within the German countries in general and Bavaria in particular. This was mostly due to his edifying and ascetic works such as the emblematic *Orbis Phaethon* (1629; 2 vols.), the *Nicetas* (1626, often reprinted) or the *Zodiacus christianus seu signa XII divinae praedestinationis* (1618, later reprinted and enlarged), the latter directly referring to and correcting the infamous *Zodiacus vitae* (1565; 1588) by the Italian “heretic” scholar Palingenio Stellato. Aside from some translations during the seventeenth century and the posthumous *Opera omnia* from 1680, more recent editions of his works were scarce. Consequently, his vast output and his particular importance for the history of practical theology and education are almost totally overlooked and forgotten. All the more important that Andreas Abele’s doctoral dissertation is dedicated to Drexel’s tragedy *Iulianus Apostata* (staged on October 16, 1608). By presenting one of Drexel’s most important plays (besides his *Triumphus Crucis*, staged in 1606), this edition enables modern scholars to read, evaluate, and contextualize the Jesuit’s work as a playwright for the first time. His plays were never collected and printed—unlike those of, for example, his fellow Jesuit Jacob Bidermann. The copious volume applies modern standards of editing early modern texts and makes available an important work for further historical, critical, and comparative research within the field of (neo-)Latin as well as German studies.

The play centers on a very interesting and rather delicate historical person: Flavius Claudius Julianus Augustus (332–63), or Julian “the Apostate,” the last Roman emperor to revert the official religion of the state to the old gods and subsequently to harass Christians. This learned and philosophical, but also arrogant and “contumacious” ruler has sparked the imagination of Christian writers from late antiquity to at least the nineteenth century. On a Catholic school stage around 1600, he could have represented quite a few things, depending on the “Counter-Reformation” perspective applied to the figure: the insanity of “heretic” rulers who oppress authentic Christianity as then witnessed in Lutheran and Calvinist territories throughout the Empire; a philosophical emperor who fosters religious plurality such as imperial cities like Augsburg that permitted Catholicism and Lutheranism to abide side by side. Which perspective Drexel favored can now be studied more thoroughly.

Far from merely presenting a thoroughly crafted, well translated (into German) edition and a copiously annotated commentary (419–739), the author introduces the study with an elaborate preface that sheds light on Drexel’s life and works as well as the genesis and diverse contexts of the play itself (22–121). Another chapter, an “analysis with a view to form and drama theory” (122–61), might spark the more specialized interests of scholars of German and drama studies. Of high value to scholars of Jesuit studies is Abele’s reconstruction of Drexel’s life and working methods from a number of archival, mostly manuscript sources. He extensively quotes, for instance, the manuscript *Vita Drexelii* (Life of [Jeremias] Drexel), probably written by his fellow Jesuit Laurenz Forer (1580–1659). This important biographical source remains unpublished and scandalously overlooked by most of the researchers in the field (24–34). By doing so, the author draws a fascinating sketch of a convert who became a Jesuit, a man of fragile health and great talent who during his studies and his career as rector of the Jesuit colleges in Munich and Augsburg and, from 1615, as court chaplain to the ruler of Bavaria often struggled with the fact that his frailty body could not cope with the intellectual efforts of his mind. (The 4,500 pages of his *Opera omnia* in the German version largely testify to Drexel’s astounding productivity.) Following Abele’s description, the reader can gaze into Drexel’s workshop. The author strongly argues that earlier Jesuit plays influenced this work. He cites specifically the anonymous *Theophilus*, Matthäus Rader’s *Stratocles* (27, 120, and 430–34), and Bidermann’s *Cenodoxus* (62–77). He relies on the correspondence between Drexel and his teacher Rader, who was incidentally also the mentor of the aforementioned Bidermann, to establish his thesis that earlier drafts of *Iulianus* were shared with Rader and probably even Bidermann (27, 34, and 62). Thus, the play itself is carefully situated within a larger discourse among Jesuit scholars on the form and style of Jesuit school drama as

well as philosophical discussions. At least in the first act Drexel uses arguments and motifs from the Renaissance re-birth of ancient stoicism as proposed before 1600 principally by the Dutch scholar and convert Justus Lipsius (1547–1606). Within this movement of “neo-Stoicism” or “Lipsianism” concisely described by Abele (46–57), Jesuit scholars played a crucial role by reconciling the moral philosophy developed by Lipsius mainly from Seneca’s writings with Christian asceticism (57–61). Jesuit thinkers supplemented the oppression of affects and (negative) emotions as recommended by a Stoic sage with an unwavering trust in God’s providence. Thus, it should come as no surprise that Abele describes Julian in Drexel’s first act as almost Seneca himself (74f.) and highlights the influence of Lipsius’s *De constantia libri duo* (1584) not only on Drexel’s play but even on his whole intellectual life (cf. e.g. the sources, 60n75).

Analyzing the play itself against this philosophical backdrop, Abele sets out to show how Drexel’s “main character displays a high degree of psychological depth and complexity which strongly influences the play’s dramatic conflict” (20, my translation). And he does so quite convincingly: until the first scene of the second act, Prince Julian seems to be able to balance perfectly his learned intellectual capacities and philosophical viewpoints, which strongly represent Stoic moral doctrines with Christian ethics. Differing from a tradition that dates back to Gregory Nazianzen and his treatises against Julian and that usually dismisses Julian’s display of moral integrity as mere hypocrisy, Drexel shows a main character pledging himself to humility, poverty, and chastity, even on the verge of entering into monastic life. Compared to, for example, Bidermann’s *Cenodoxus* whose main character is a hypocrite throughout the whole play and rightfully damned to hellish torments at the end, Drexel’s Julian seems, at least at the beginning, like an example of a good ruler who is able to harmonize moral philosophy put forward by Stoicism and Christian humility and asceticism. Given the contemporary endeavors of Jesuit authors to apply exactly the same harmonizing tendency to Lipsius’s neo-Stoicism, and given Drexel’s lifelong fascination with this author, his Julian starts out as the epitome of Christian Stoicism. But the following four acts display the consequences of all his philosophical learning put to a bad use. What was inconspicuously lacking in the first act, an explicit expression of Christian faith on Julian’s part, emerges into the now emperor Julian’s full-blown support for the old gods, as he states at the beginning of the third act (III, 1, 963–76; pp. 274f.). Hence the Christian virtues are transferred to supporting characters, mainly the martyred victims of Julian’s outrage (78–82). Unlike some Jesuit plays that largely make use of allegorical figures such as Fides (Faith), Constantia (Consistency) or Conscientia (Conscience), Drexel mainly clings to human characters with a telling elaboration towards the end: the Christian Theodorus and Julian himself

are visited by their respective guardian angels (“Theodorophylax” in IV, 7, 1893–919; pp. 344–47, and “Julianophylax” in V, 1, 2003–51; pp. 354–57) to either support Christian steadfastness in the face of execution or to divert the emperor from his pernicious path. And in the fifth scene of the last act the reader even gets a glimpse of Christ himself on his throne of justice who reluctantly condemns Julian after intense pleas from his victims’ part and a pessimistic diagnosis from Julian’s guardian angel (V, 5, 2231–319; pp. 372–79). Hence Julian is dragged to hell by demons at the end just like Bidermann’s *Cenodoxus* or a certain Faust in Georg Bernardt’s *Theophilus*. But this happens for different reasons than in the mentioned plays: Neither unfaltering arrogance (*superbia*) nor the iniquitous strife for wisdom (*curiositas*) cause Julian’s demise but rather a freely made decision for the old (false) gods and the stubborn refusal to repent (as recommended by the guardian angel). In this respect, Drexel’s play manages to highlight the importance of a free decision for the right path, a decision perfectly harmonious with the Ignatian *discretio spirituum* and at the same time the author stresses the freedom of human will as opposed to the Lutheran doctrine of vindication. At the same time, Drexel hints at the possibility of a truly Christian Stoicism through a consideration of Julian in the first act. This aspect of the play alone may convey its poetic, philosophical, and theological implications and mark it as an important contribution to the extant editions of Jesuit school drama.

Abele’s work conscientiously follows modern standards of critical editions with a detailed report on the state and condition of the manuscript, rules of transcription, and helpful explanations of historical figures, saints, names, etc. Translating neo-Latin literature is by no means easy, and Jesuit poetry or drama may even prove to be particularly challenging in terms of style, phrasing and the amount of allusions to classical or contemporary texts. The editor copes with all these problems and produces a precise and lucid text for German speaking readers. Difficulties, obscurities or specific allusions as well as Drexel’s primary sources are thoroughly explained in the extensive commentary. The introductions to every scene enable the reader to keep the whole play and its structure in mind while dealing with specific aspects of scenes or even single lines. This comprehensive, thorough, and scholarly edition sets high standards for anyone contemplating a similar project. It offers excellent material a potential selected English edition of Jesuit school drama should not ignore.

Jost Eickmeyer

University of Hamburg

Jost.eickmeyer@uni-hamburg.de

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00702012-11