indeed, Davies points out that the German debate on witchcraft was focused to a surprising extent on English materials. After a conclusion, the book is rounded off with a series of useful Tables, not least those assessing the relative contributions of Glanvill and More to *Saducismus Triumphatus*.

There are various loose ends in the work where the author promises further study, especially concerning Glanvill's overseas influence and his links with the Presbyterian divine, Richard Baxter. I was also disappointed at how little attention is given to a key component of Glanvill's witchcraft book, *A Whip for the Droll: Fidler to the Atheist*, which might have raised a somewhat different agenda to that addressed here, and there are occasional errors: it is repeatedly stated that Lord Brereton was President of the Royal Society, evidently due to confusion with Viscount Brouncker. Nevertheless, there is much of value in this work, which all future students of Glanvill and his milieu will need to consult.

MICHAEL HUNTER
Birkbeck, University of London

doi:10.1093/ehr/ceaa096

Taming Capitalism before its Triumph: Public Service, Distrust, and 'Projecting' in Early Modern England, by Koji Yamamoto (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2018; pp. 336. £65).

Koji Yamamoto provides a reappraisal of projects and projecting in seventeenth-century England in which he shows how the English culture of improvement was critical to the development of capitalism. Rather than an overview of projects in general, the author uses specific case-studies to focus on the relationship between profit and public service and whether the two could be reconciled. In Chapter One, Yamamoto introduces us to some of the key ways he traces projects over the seventeenth century: the number of patents granted for inventions and the number of pamphlets whose title pages used the terms 'project' or 'projector'. The two combined data sets (as he calls them) point to two key surges in projecting across the early modern era: the 1630s–40s (the era of the Personal Rule) and the 1690s–1720s (Defoe's Projecting Age).

Yamamoto provides a history of English projects from the mid-sixteenth into the early eighteenth centuries, with an especial focus on the decades between the 1640s and 1710s. In Chapter Two, he shows how the negative stereotype of the projector emerged out of the reigns of the early Stuarts who granted patents and monopolies to raise revenue and to rule through prerogative. Yamamoto draws on literary texts as well as letters, petitions, rumours and songs, to show how contemporaries viewed projectors as 'ridiculous, deceitful, and evil' and how they were presented as pretending public service while actually cheating the public (p. 78). Chapter Three is a case-study of how projectors distanced themselves from this pejorative view. Using the example of the Hartlib circle, Yamamoto shows how those wanting to promote improvement had to respond to the venality of earlier projectors by emphasising the godly reform of their initiatives and de-emphasising personal profits. A useful comparison that Yamamoto could have made here is to contemporary attitudes toward usurers and usury, who also had to thread the needle between their economic utility and personal profitability.

One of Yamamoto's strengths is his familiarity with, and synthesis of, discrete historiographies. In Chapters Three and Four, he profitably weaves together the scholarship on the history of science and economic history. For example, he analyses Andrew Yarranton's Stour River navigation scheme in light of his position as a credible (technical) expert. Despite the backing of members of the Royal Society, approval of the navigation project was a long process involving many stakeholders and sides. The author's case-study of Yarranton also allows him to examine the interface between credibility and creditworthiness—two forms of credit that were necessary for inventions and innovative projects.

Yamamoto is clear that he differs from others who have studied projecting and improvement culture such as Joan Thirsk and Paul Slack, who promote more positive views of schemes and projectors. This author is cautious about celebrating improvement schemes and progress and thereby contributing to a Whiggish narrative of English exceptionalism. Rather, Yamamoto prefers to focus on the anxieties and, most of all, the distrust that dogged projects and schemers throughout the seventeenth century. By doing so, he shows how the projecting culture that emerged underwent transformation and, in his word, 'taming'.

Yamamoto does not just focus on elite responses to projecting; he also tries to get at plebeian views through songs, broadsides and petitions. He skilfully draws the reader through the Parliamentary debates on several projects and shows how MPs weighed the competing interests of local petitioners who were affected by schemes involving natural resources. By examining what he calls the 'tortuous processes of negotiation', Yamamoto shows that projects sometimes went forward not because of belief in them but despite doubts about them. He also points out that projectors themselves came from across the social spectrum—for instance, Andrew Yarranton began as a Worcester linen draper before becoming a celebrated promoter. Until the final chapter, however, the projector is assumed to be male. A few tantalising examples of female projectors fleetingly appear—Ben Jonson's Lady Tailbush, or Lady Villiers, for whom the infamous projector Giles Mompesson worked—but the author only explicitly includes women when he gets to the 1690s and notes that they became involved in projecting by owning shares in joint-stock ventures.

Yamamoto adds to the chorus of voices who are finding that the Restoration era was a key period for the economic changes that enabled what we call the Financial Revolution. He shows that while Charles II could have taken projecting back to what it was under his father, instead, his reign became the era of 'collective taming of England's projecting culture' (p. 175). In the Restoration era, improvement became the new watchword and projects were less associated with religious reform and instead focused on public or state improvement. The government treated projects with caution, monopolies were not allowed, and negotiation was required to get approval for a scheme. Distrust and caution toward projectors led to them pivoting from projects that succeeded through compulsion or penalties and toward schemes that relied on encouragement. So, instead of compelling the English people to plant fruit trees in order to establish a domestic cider industry, John Evelyn and John Beale promoted the benefits of orchards and encouraged elite men to stand as examples of agricultural improvement. Even wives could get involved by

profitably making 'bush-wine' or 'shrub-wine', using sugar from the West Indies to boot. Improvement would benefit all, according to 'writers who found a powerful leverage for improvement in the public's desire for emulation and consumption' (p. 217).

Yamamoto's history of projecting culminates in the Financial Revolution. In Chapter Six, he differs from scholars who see the origins of modern financial capitalism in the trading of shares in joint stock companies in the 1690s. Instead, the author posits that such joint stock ventures were the 'climax of the early modern history of projecting' (p. 229). In the 1690s, patents and ventures boomed, and, while this was not new, the method of funding was: the public could now be involved by subscribing capital to ventures and owning shares in the schemes. The negative image of the projector now began to overlap with that of the stock jobber (more work is needed on this). To guard against such stereotypes it was necessary for projects still to claim that they contributed to the public good—whether through helping employ the poor, encourage domestic industry, or balance trade against the French.

There is much more here than can be covered in a short review. I recommend this book to anyone interested in early modern England's road to financial capitalism. It does not hurt that Yamamoto's book is engagingly written (especially the introduction, which playfully posits alternative titles for the book).

AMY M. FROIDE
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

doi:10.1093/ehr/ceaa097

The Republic of Arabic Letters: Islam and the European Enlightenment, by Alexander Bevilacqua (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap P. of Harvard U.P., 2018; pp. 340. $35).

In 1744, a version of Voltaire's play *Le fanatisme, ou, Mahomet le prophète* opened on the London stage. The English title, *Mahomet the Impostor*, neatly captured a view of Islam common in the middle of the eighteenth century. Founded by a charlatan, this view held, Islam at best preyed on superstitious credulity and, at worst, actively incited violence and war. As Alexander Bevilacqua shows in this superb and timely new book, however, this was certainly not the only view in the Age of Enlightenment one might plausibly hold about Christianity's greatest religious competitor. Voltaire wrote his play, after all, in full knowledge of George Sale's 1734 *Koran,* a work that offered generations of readers, well into the nineteenth century, not only a well-wrought vernacular version of the Arabic original, but also, in its learned commentaries, a broadly sympathetic account of Islam, its Prophet, and its holy book.

Sale's Qu'ran translation was an important node in what Bevilacqua calls the Republic of Arabic Letters. From *circa* 1650 to 1750, an eclectic group of erudite Europeans took seriously for the first time the literature and religion of the Arabophone world. Beyond translation, these projects included: the collection of Arab language manuscripts from around the Mediterranean; engagement with, and translation of, Qu'ranic commentary (*tafsir*); the collection and republication of Arabic poetry and history; publication of new histories of the Islamic world; and much more. This literature would make