placed on individuals to be perfectly contrite and to be responsive to Luther’s message. Italians, however, heard mostly absolutionist preaching. Penitence was less frightening to them since they were taught to be confident in the sacrament, and they rejected religious reforms that abolished the source of their consolation. This is a stimulating argument and it merits further study. Thayer deserves thanks for making us aware of model sermon collections as sources, and her translations give a terrific sense of their tone and texture. She has also done a great service by illuminating the substantial differences in their view on penitence. All of this is presented in clear, economical prose (although the effect is marred by excessive repetition and sloppy proof-reading). There are, however, big problems with the methodology. First, Luther can’t represent the entire Reformation as Thayer has him do – for starters, his views on confession are markedly different from Calvin’s – and her summary of Luther’s views is deceptively static, implying (inaccurately) that they didn’t change over the course of his career. It is also unclear that counting editions published in certain places is an adequate way to measure regional influence. For England, Thayer notes nineteen editions of the ‘moderate’ Mirk’s collection but only one edition of each of two rigorist collections popular elsewhere. Yet when the early evangelicals Thomas Becon and Wilfrid Holme attacked sermon collections, it was three rigorist collections (including two not printed in England) that they named specifically, suggesting that they were well-known and influential. Her treatment of England generally is alarming: her maps identify it as primarily ‘Anglican’ by 1550, though a blob of ‘Calvinist’ dominance spreads roughly from Swindon to Scunthorpe. In spite of these problems, Thayer deserves praise for daring to think big and in so doing she has set the agenda for future research. Her methodology and conclusions need refinement, but she has sent us down an interesting and promising path.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE

ERIC JOSEF CARLSON


Nowhere in early modern Europe was mortality more starkly apparent than in the great cities, where deaths outnumbered births, a third or more of all individuals born probably died in infancy or early childhood, death knells and funerals were part of daily experience, and terrifying, unpredictable epidemics sometimes killed a fifth of the inhabitants, forcing the living to find new space for the legions of the dead.

London and Paris were by 1670 by far the biggest cities in western Europe. With over 450,000 inhabitants they were roughly equal in size. London had, however, grown far faster than Paris; much smaller in 1500, it was in 1670 about to overtake the French capital. Another clear contrast was that in London, Europe’s foremost Protestant metropolis, the Reformation had brought to an end the varied intercessory services of medieval Catholicism and the endowments and institutions that had supported them. In the light of these contrasts, the conclusions of Vanessa Harding’s long, richly detailed and vividly illustrated comparison of burial and funeral practices in the two cities are in some ways surprising. In both capitals the wealthy were able to buy themselves more elaborate funerals and monuments and
more desirable burial spaces (especially within the parish church). The immense pressure on space necessitated, and the turnover of families facilitated some re-use of graves and removal of memorials in both cities. In Catholic Paris, however, social differentiation was more marked than it was in London. The ‘privatisation’ of burial space through the creation of chapels and vaults was more extensive in Paris. The corpses of the Parisian poor and destitute were far more likely to end up in non-parochial graveyards and in pits than those of their London counterparts. So far as one can judge from Harding’s account, the survival of religious confraternities, some of which were ‘patronised by the élite and even by royalty’ (p. 246) did little to offset this inequality. In the English capital burial was better managed, social inequalities were less stark, partly because its parishes were far more numerous and for the most part much smaller than those of Paris. Traditions of participation and elective office were stronger in London than in Paris, and the English capital was also, Harding asserts, less class-ridden than Paris. Enmity between the Parisian Catholic majority and the Huguenots also made funerals and burials into sources of conflict and a means of restricting or excluding the widely hated minority. ‘In London, the gradual transformation of religious practice permitted a range of beliefs and allowed them to evolve at their own pace, within the framework of broad uniformity’ (p. 279). Catholic recusants proved easier to ‘ignore or exclude’ than did the Huguenots in Paris. Stricter religious dissenters also proved readier to withdraw from previously established burial spaces without contesting their use than did the Huguenots in Paris.

University of Reading

RALPH HOULBROOKE


Religious reform in Italy before and after the Protestant Reformation has been studied intensively for more than fifty years with few definitive results. Every study brings new components and insights, patterns are modified, historical fashions evolve, but major questions remain unresolved. Earlier studies emphasised thematic polarities: heresy became a favourite theme whether it was lay rebellion against the religious discipline enforced by the institutional Roman Church or theological responses to Protestantism; other polarities were perceived in socio-economic groups, or along a spectrum ranging from those who sympathised with Protestant insights to intransigenti who saw danger lurking in all reform. Thematic polarities were gradually overtaken by archival-based studies of groups and individuals. Inevitably, historians became more aware of family and group interests, and observed ambivalence, even irrationality, within spirituality, making for ‘safety-valve’ anticlericalism rather than heresy. Some historians observed connections between monastic contemplative spirituality and the lay spirituality of confraternities and civic religion, both groups engaged in a common search for holiness. Such intermingling of elite and popular pieties, and clear evidence of working relationships between local clergy and laity eroded historians’ distinctions between religious and secular to the point,
Bowd says, that the distinctions are more illusory than real. At the hands of Vicenzo Querini and his friends, this common spirituality made monasticism a potent force for reform, both pastoral and institutional. Querini was a patristic- and humanist-educated Venetian, familiar with Venetian impulses for church reform, acutely aware of religion and politics in other Italian cities, and a supporter of papal power. In 1511, aged thirty-three, he entered Camaldoli, retreating from active urban life into the rural solitude of the hermitage, but taking with him his partly secular vision of church reform in the outside world. Querini’s vision was based upon the personal reform of bishops, priests, monks and hermits, working to achieve high levels of scriptural knowledge, spiritual zeal and pastoral care. Their piety was to be continually guided by the studia humanitatis and applied to all human concerns. Bowd describes the practical development of Querini’s ideas from 1511, with lay piety moving in tandem with clerical reform, creating new personal and collective rituals and beliefs, and a new culture of piety so sober, reflective and devout that it might almost be called ‘Tridentine’ except that this change began with Lateran V, was under way before Luther’s Reformation, until it reached fruition at Trent a generation later. We are indebted to Bowd for his account of Querini’s vision and its contribution to reform before the Reformation. He has given new nuances to the older historiography of discontinuity and polarity with his emphasis upon continuity rather than discontinuity c. 1500–50, and by his argument that the Counter-Reformation papacy was sympathetic to Querini’s vision, and not simply repressive. Yet, as Bowd recognises, there was considerable discontinuity and conflict, and it must still be explained. I suspect that the new puritanism under Paul IV’s managerial style of ideology would repay investigation. This excellent book will lead us back into the archives.

University of Melbourne

BARRY COLLETT


JEH (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903238094

Mayer’s declared object in this volume is two-fold. His first purpose is to provide a manuscript finding list for scholars of Pole’s correspondence. In this he is completely successful, and has provided a most valuable source book for scholars of the English Reformation and Catholic Europe. His second, more debatable, purpose is ‘to provide the reader with all the information necessary to the interpretation of Pole’s correspondence’. Here one may ask whether such a claim can be sustained. Thus on the dust jacket the present volume is described as covering ‘the crucial turning point in Pole’s life’: his ‘break with Henry and the substitution of papal service for royal’, involving ‘a profound religious conversion’ which took Pole to ‘one of the defining moments of the Italian Reformation’ and, one may add, the early stages of the Council of Trent to 1546. Moreover, it is claimed that these letters are a source of insight into ‘the spiritual motives of reform’. The difficulty is that this interpretation, with which the present reviewer is in full agreement, is diametrically opposed to Mayer’s own reading of Pole’s letters and papers as a form of rhetorical self-description, posthumously continued by his biographers as a ‘mito di santità’.
Readers may now decide for themselves, and it is no exaggeration to insist upon the outstanding contribution which Mayer has here made in the first of three volumes to be completed by a fourth, biographical volume, which should make of the whole a landmark in European historiography.

A further question occurs to this reviewer concerning Mayer’s claim that Pole’s eighteenth-century editor Querini ‘probably … deliberately expurgated’ Pole’s letters. Nothing in this volume justifies that claim. The point is important because students who use Mayer’s calendar will still be advised to proceed, where indicated, to the printed versions in Querini, as a prelude to the further identification of the texts in the European archives. But not everybody can get to the European archives. Thus, if Querini ‘expurgated’ Pole’s texts, we need to know precisely where. The next two volumes may provide Mayer with an opportunity to take up this invitation.

DERMOT FENLON
BIRMINGHAM

Self-defence and religious strife in early modern Europe. England and Germany, 1530–1680.

JEH (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903248090

Here is a book that revisits an old Reformation dilemma in novel, worthwhile ways. What were early modern Protestants to do when they found themselves trapped between two biblical texts – the ‘obey those in authority’ of Romans xiii and the ‘obey God rather than man’ of Acts v.29? As the author makes clear, when subjects decided that their ruler was failing in his duty to promote true religion and stamp out heresy, they very rarely preached rebellion – even if their enemies endlessly said that they did. Talk of clashing ideologies or struggles against monarchical government is usually anachronistic and inappropriate: almost everyone wanted good old-fashioned order. Rather, legitimate resistance was routinely understood as a species of self-defence, only justifiable in extremis – at moments, for instance, when human law and authority had ceased to do their job. This book traces the development of such ideas in Germany, from the outbreak of Reformation to the Thirty Years War, and looks at how this tradition was transferred to a British context (the ‘England’ of the title is misleading, since one of the best sections of the book deals with resistance theory in seventeenth-century Scotland). It painstakingly analyses what the author calls the casuistry of self-defence, the decisions about precisely who in society might be allowed to raise their sword against the magistrate, about what issues were so important that their defence justified resistance. As the book makes clear, this was often a deeply academic, legalistic and rigorous pursuit. There is much that deserves special recommendation. The detailed analysis of German legal thought on self-defence which provided a context for Protestant theorising is fascinating. Specific sections on the thought of Johannes Althusius and Henning Arnisaeus, Thomas Bilson, Andrew Willet and David Owen are excellent. There are wise words of caution throughout the book – on the need constantly to bear in mind how the British and German environments differed (not least in the quality of their Reformations); against making sweeping generalisations about authority-loving Lutherans and more radical Zwinglians. And then there is the business of German
ideas being transplanted in Britain. Here, the relevance of this book begins to expand, as the author looks at the ways in which concepts of natural law and states of nature developed and shifted through the period. By the mid-seventeenth century, so we are told, there was talk of an inalienable right to self-defence that was operative even when good government and human positive law prevailed. This way, as the book’s forward-looking conclusion makes clear, lay Locke and the English natural law tradition – hardly something that Luther or Melanchthon would have welcomed.

Hartlepool

Jonathan Wright


JEH (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903258097

Lynne Long’s Translating the Bible is published as one of Ashgate’s New Critical Thinking in Theology and Biblical Studies. It has clearly been a labour of love for some time, and it has some merits: but ‘new’ it is not. Indeed, it is woefully out of date. The most recent books in the bibliography are one each by Anne Hudson and Christopher Haigh (who is persistently mis-spelled) dated 1993. It is unfortunate that such a well-intentioned book should show itself so unaware not only of all the work done in the last decade, but of essential studies before that.

Lynne Long intends a broad canvas, setting out, as her first sentence declares, to study ‘the phenomenon of translating the Latin Bible into English’, all in the context of literature, vernacular writing, printing and translation theories. She suggests that this activity will be new. It is not.

There is only space here for a few examples of unhappy deficiency. The hostile account of Wyclif does not refer to Anthony Kenny’s revealing monograph of 1985; does not explain that Purvey has now gone from the scene; does not refer to Anne Hudson’s much later superb work; and is silent about the definitive analysis of Wyclif Bible texts by Henry Hargreaves in 1969. The few pages on Tyndale are, perversely, about Thomas More, who is irrelevant to Tyndale’s achievement: her chief source for Tyndale is C. H. Williams, also in 1969: many scholars have written since.

The almost incalculably influential Geneva Bible after 1560 gets three-and-a-half pages, with no mention of most of its remarkable characteristics, such as its important revisions, or its hundred editions (not just reprints) in eighty years, or (and this is seriously important) the fact that the second half of the Old Testament, the difficult part, all poetry, was translated, brilliantly, by the handful of modest scholars in Geneva from Hebrew into English for the first time, a ground-breaking achievement to match Tyndale’s (he had been killed before he could get beyond 2 Chronicles). The rarely-reprinted 1582 Rheims New Testament, however, the Roman Catholic reply to Geneva (often peculiarly unintelligible in its Latinity, and not in fact at all influential in the making of the King James 1611 version, as is now
known), gets a fulsome six pages. Though of some interest, her final chapter on
translation theory is, in 2003, simply inadequate.

_The Bible in the Renaissance_ volume contains nine papers from a conference in
medieval legacy in Savonarola’s use of Scripture: Paulo Cardoso Pereira finds
similar origins for biblical _exempla_ in the plays of the Portuguese playwright Gil
Vincente – both figures being independent of Erasmus. The latter, as early and late
(and limited) _exegete_ of the Psalms, is the subject of a useful account by Michael
J. Heath. Michael O’Connor’s second essay unexpectedly reveals Martin Luther’s
opponent Cardinal Cajetan as a Bible commentator pressing equally for Scripture
and reform on the basis of the words and commands of Christ. There is much here
on which to ponder. Ceri Davies gives a valuable account of the Welsh Bible in
relation to Renaissance learning.

Henry Wansbrough writes a lively and generally balanced article on William
Tyndale. Himself a distinguished Bible translator, Wansbrough excels in giving
illustrations of Tyndale’s ‘staggering achievement’ as a pioneer translator from
Greek to English, working without precedent and yet influencing all that followed.
Wansbrough slightly exaggerates English readership before the 1520s, and is rather
over-bland in his treatment of the Church’s hostility to Bible reading after 1408 – the
burning alive of hundreds of Lollards for just that ‘heresy’ is barely noticed. On
the other hand, his twin shafts of influences on Tyndale, Lollardy and Erasmus,
strike home satisfactorily.

Two essays in the volume, however, need handling with care. Both are about
religion and authority in the later sixteenth century. Vincent Strudwick seeks out
‘English fears of social disintegration and modes of control, 1533–1611’. In such a
scholarly book, it is odd to find in this essay such defective references, lacking page
numbers. It is more than odd to observe the irritating ‘high table’ view of English
life, with an illiterate citizenry entirely dependent on being read to from large bibles
on lecetrons. Though he refers at one point to ‘lots of “pocket” copies’ (p. 140), he
has previously argued that ‘only large Bibles were printed’ (p. 139; see also Richard
Griffiths’s introduction, p. 5). This is not a slight mistake: it is a massive error.
Strudwik’s erroneous assertion of ‘the slow progress of the availability of the Bible
in English’ (p. 133; also supported by Griffiths) is contrary to every kind of evidence.
The standard reference tool of early modern publications, Pollard and Redgrave’s
_Short-title catalogue of books ... 1475 to 1640_ (revised Pantzer, 1986) has, under ‘Bible,
English’, nine double-column pages (vol. i. 86–95), an average of forty per page,
making a total of 382 editions of English Bibles printed after 1526, and well over a
million bought, in a population of around six million. (A further twenty pages of
printed Psalms give 600 more editions). Such evidence – and there is more –
invalidates Strudwick’s argument.

Luc Borot’s account of the Elizabethan _Homilies_, from an even loftier seat, is
flawed in the same way, but more so. To take one example of many: Borot,
extending quotation of Matthew xv.11, states (p. 167) that the next words were not
in the Gospels, but ‘penned by the author of the homily’ – hearers of the _Homilies_
were being deliberately confused. But those hearers (in fact, contrary to Borot’s
declarations, steeped in Bible knowledge) knew what Borot hasn’t bothered to
observe, that the 44 further words he quotes, far from being ‘penned by the author
of the homily’, come a few lines further down the page of Matthew xv (in a 1539
version). Again, his major point is invalidated. How can a scholar set out to write about biblical matters and get it so wrong?

The finest piece in the book is by John L. Flood. It is an account of most aspects of Martin Luther’s first German New Testament. For its thoroughness, accuracy and wisdom it is to be treasured. The figure of 100,000 copies printed in Luther’s lifetime (600,000 of the whole Bible) will no doubt startle some recent writers.

HERTFORD COLLEGE,
OXFORD

David Daniell


JEH (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903268093

In his reappraisal of the reign of Edward VI Stephen Alford aims to go beyond the institutional and administrative structures of the time, to remove ‘the straitjacket of bureaucracy’ and describe ‘how Tudor politics actually worked’. ‘English politics in the sixteenth century was not’, he writes, ‘solely, or even primarily, institutional.’ I can only applaud such sentiments. His emphasis is on the continuity and stability of the reign rather than the faction fighting, and on ‘the networks of kin, friendship and association’ within the polity. This is a book about political culture, and it illustrates some of the problems in the genre. After an historiographical account of the reign Alford moves to a discussion of kingship, seeing the fundamental weakness of the reign in the royal minority. Government relied upon counsel, but ‘counsel was fundamentally unsuited to the political conditions of minority – or at least counsel in its proper form.’ Alford means more than the obvious point that an under-age king could never wield the power of an adult monarch; but quite what he intends does not become clear. That is true of much of this book. Alford asks interesting questions, has valuable insights, and is genuinely learned; but his thought is often elusive. The most valuable parts of the book are the discussions of connections: the households of Somerset and the king; the contributors to the memorial volumes to Bucer and the Brandons; the commissioners in the trial of Stephen Gardiner. But the language here is imprecise. ‘The world of Edwardian politics and government was small – even incestuous – populated by men closely connected to one another: an organic, stable, governing elite of men sympathetic to the regime.’ Incestuous? Organic? If networks are so important, surely more discussion of the links between centre and locality is needed. Alford shows himself to be aware of this in his account of William Cecil and for a page or two follows it up. But there is no real exploration of the possibilities. The problem about networks is that discussions often become lists of linked names, and such lists do not make for enlivening or enlightening reading. Overall, the book needs a tighter structure: it too often seems like a collection of discrete essays. For instance, chapter iv is largely taken up with an analysis of two works: Bernadino Ochino’s A tragoedie or dialoge and Walter Lynne’s The beginning and endynge of all popery. It shows how the regime was committed to print and to the dissemination of Protestant ideas; but the connection with the general theme of the book is most of the time obscure.

NEW COLLEGE,
OXFORD

Penry Williams
The new series in which the first book under review appears, offers editions of the records of the Catholic–Protestant reunion colloquies that took place in Germany between 1540 and 1547, sponsored by the emperor. The conferences were held at Hagenau, Worms and Regensburg (1540–1), and again at Regensburg (1546) and Worms (1557). Comprehensive in vision, though necessarily selective, this edition provides diplomatically reproduced source texts, both German and Latin, true to the original. A minority of these, mainly theological memoranda, have been published already in other editions. The first apparatus of the notes deals with text markings, and the second apparatus, which is minimal, deals largely with language clarifications and some internal allusions. The project represents the posthumous fulfilment of a dream of Hubert Jedin. He saw the importance of what one might now call dialogue between theologians of Reformation Churches (for example Melanchthon, Bucer, Calvin, Brenz, Major) and the Catholic Church (for example Eck, Gropper, Pflug, Contarini, Morone, de Malvenda) in the 1540s, supported by leading political figures of the estates and cities, behind closed doors and in a relatively irenic atmosphere. The initiative represented a significant advance on the traditional, adversarial and sterile format of disputation. This was at a time of protracted waiting for a church council to materialise – it had been convoked in 1536 but did not meet until 1545. The work of the Council of Trent and its failure to reintegrate the western Church soon relegated the colloquies’ pre-emptive attempts at mutual accommodation to history and oblivion. The voluminous sources as a whole have not been readily accessible, so that – apart from among a handful of scholars – denial and the image of simple polarisation have vitiated received understanding of the Reformation up to the present day. General textbooks give little or no attention to the matter. The first volumes of the series present the rich material, from German (and Swiss) sources, connected with the Colloquy at Hagenau in 1540 at which justification was top of the agenda, and on which considerable progress was made. The introduction includes an historical account of the colloquy, a survey of the documentation and its threefold nature – official minutes (Gesamtakten), records from individual interested authorities, civil and ecclesiastical (Einzelaaktten), as well as substantive accompanying papers, such as reports, memoranda and correspondence (Beiakten) – and an outline of archival holdings and other editions in which some of the material is already published. This new series will constitute a major and indispensable resource for future Reformation studies concerned with the religio-theological core issues.

Thomas Brockmann’s welcome study examines in depth the issues surrounding the viability of a church council as appropriate for resolving the religious problems of the day. Originally a doctoral thesis at the University of Bonn, the book includes thirty-seven pages of secondary literature and 224 pages of primary sources. The
latter’s title pages are cited according to the formal criteria of all-inclusive bibliographical description. Necessary explanatory notes are often added to the citation.

The introduction to the book identifies the major problem areas, substantive and historiographical, and explains the author’s procedure. Not a new study of the preliminaries to and functioning of the Council of Trent, the aim is more ambitious. Brockmann examines the entire span of controversial writings, German and Latin, of various genres, on the council issue published in the German-speaking world up to 1563, when the Council of Trent concluded. Analysis is not confined to works by Germans or German-Swiss – it includes relevant writings by those abroad that were published in the original or as translations in the German or Swiss domains. Altogether 526 writings have been identified. Of these, 179 deal exclusively with the council question, the rest are works of which parts are devoted to the theme. Statistically interesting is that two-thirds of the corpus are from the Protestant Reformation side.

Following the introduction is a look at the origins of the discussion in Luther’s appeal in 1518 to a general church council to settle doctrinal matters in which there is no obvious scriptural guidance. His early position resembled traditional conciliarism. But on denying the infallibility of a church council, arguing that the visible Church was a human, not divine institution, subject to, not over, Scripture, Luther initiated the concept of a church council with an authority that was only relative and provisional. This would make a council a consultative rather than an executive body.

The next chapter outlines contrasting Evangelical and Catholic concepts of a council in relation to theology, ecclesiology and convocation. The ‘last’ chapter (200 pages) could have been presented as three separate chapters, since it has a three-fold division. Overall it follows the historical evolution of the debate as it became increasingly polarised, reflected in the intensifying pamphlet warfare. Confessional fronts were not in terms of ‘for’ or ‘against’ a council, but rather ‘what kind of council?’, ‘under the auspices of whom?’, and ‘what is the nature of conciliar authority?’ The first section of this chapter traces developments in thinking from 1520 to 1532, the second from 1533 to 1545, and the last from 1546 to 1563.

This book does fill a surprising gap, surprising because of the centrality of the topic. By way of supplementary information Francis I’s abortive reunion initiative in 1533/34 in the hope of pre-empting a papal council, and involving consultations with Melanchthon, Bucer and Bullinger could profitably be alluded to as belonging to the sphere of debate. Further, some other Bucer writings have material on a church council, such as the conclusion to the Tetrapolitan Confession, and a chapter in his Defensio of 1534.

University of Glasgow

IAN HAZLETT


This lavishly-illustrated little volume, the product of a symposium for the Georgian Group, represents a useful contribution to understanding that most English of
architectural styles, late Gothic, both Survivalist and Revivalist. The range of its meanings is large. Gothic could be a symbol of conservatism in politics or religion—particularly when the expression had an oppositional tinge, from the Catholic recusancy of the Elizabethan period, through the Country Toryism or oppositional Whiggery of eighteenth-century politicians, to the reclaiming of past glories for Roman Catholicism by early Victorian Catholic noblemen. Often therefore it was much more serious in intention and expression than past studies of ‘Gothick’ indicated, although often snobbery or a desire to entertain were overriding concerns. Alexandrina Buchanan and Maurice Howard helpfully explore past and present commentary, still in a state of flux—not surprisingly, when in seventeenth-century Oxbridge, Gothic might indicate ardent support or acute suspicion of Archbishop Laud. The essay most likely to concern readers of this Journal, Timothy Mowle’s exploration of seventeenth-century Gothic church-building, is typically trenchant but also occasionally tendentious. Mowle is entitled to his opinion on the aesthetic inadequacies of Perpendicular Gothic, but his idea that church papists could still have been in a majority in Jacobean England is ludicrous, and his suggestion that some parish clergy as late as that period were celebrating Mass is almost equally implausible. He also misreads the churchmanship of Laud’s enemy Bishop Williams of Lincoln: such details make a good deal of difference to interpreting architecture’s meanings. Giles Worsley’s essay on Vanbrugh’s search for a ‘national style’ convincingly shows Vanbrugh’s affinity for Romanesque, although most of the specific models that Worsley identifies are in fact French. Terry Friedman recreates and elucidates one of the most remarkable of Georgian Gothic churches, Hartwell (Buckinghamshire), alas now reduced to a ruin, and Rosemary Hill revisits the aristocratic Gothic of nineteenth-century Roman Catholicism, making the interesting suggestion that its messages were more centred on the heterosexual family than was contemporary Tractarian Gothic. This is perhaps not surprising, given that the architects’ patrons were (or would like to have been) the current representatives of the Catholic recusant families who preserved the old faith: a contrast to the dominance of Anglo-Catholic architecture by the tastes of increasingly homosocial clergy. Hill’s suggestion that there were no Puritan antiquaries (p. 162) ignores William Lambarde of Kent, Matthias Candler of Suffolk and many of those involved in the first Society of Antiquaries and its attempted Jacobean refoundation.

St Cross College, Oxford

Diarmaid MacCulloch


Focusing upon the editions of Scripture published in the period between 1557 and 1582, Cameron MacKenzie’s book augments a large existing literature on the history of the vernacular Bible in early modern England. It seeks to use these versions to illuminate the religious and theological beliefs and values of the communities which produced them, as well as to highlight the extent to which the text of holy writ became a catalyst, mirror and vehicle for ideological controversy in the early Elizabethan era. While it cannot be said that this is an original enterprise,
MacKenzie’s discussion of the three traditions of translation embodied in the Geneva Bible, the Bishops’ Bible, and the Rheims New Testament does differ in emphasis and character from some earlier studies and surveys. However, not all scholars working in this field will find this analysis entirely convincing. This is a book which treats the topic of bible translation largely in isolation from its wider European context and which rather neglects the medieval, Lollard and humanist lineage of the debates which surrounded it. Doubts may also be expressed about more specific parts of MacKenzie’s argument. His portrayal of the Bishops’ Bible as a clear textual embodiment of royal, conservative and erastian Protestantism reflects a rather rigid and monolithic conception of the Church of England which shows little sensitivity to the diverging tendencies which coexisted within it and which, as Patrick Collinson and others have shown, leave their mark in some of the annotations to this edition. In chapter iv, MacKenzie assesses the significance of the multiple editions of the Geneva Bible which appeared from the press of the queen’s printer, Christopher Barker, between 1575 and 1582, suggesting that these represented a deliberate attempt by the establishment to identify the Church of England with international Reformed Protestantism and to partially accommodate Puritan criticism. Certainly the influence of Edmund Grindal and Francis Walsingham did create a climate favourable to the ethos of a translation nurtured in Genevan circles but MacKenzie tends to assume a unity of purpose in government policy which seems hard to sustain in the face of recent research on the competing priorities and objectives of the queen and her councillors. He also rather underestimates the capacity of this text to act as a kind of Trojan Horse. Chapter vii argues persuasively that the decision of the English Catholic leaders to publish the Rheims New Testament owed much to the circumstances of persecution in which they found themselves. But to insist that in doing so they adopted ‘a Protestant-like attitude’ (pp. 3, 183) to vernacular translation is seriously to misinterpret the significance of this initiative and to ignore the fundamental differences of opinion on the issue which continued to divide Catholics and Protestants in England. These chapters also suffer from a lack of awareness of the heated debates on this topic which took place at the Council of Trent, though they do usefully highlight the extent to which Gregory Martin and his colleagues employed humanist techniques of textual criticism and philology to defend the authenticity of the Latin text of the Vulgate. Despite its limitations, The battle for the Bible is a clearly written and solidly researched monograph which contributes something to our understanding of the politics of bible translation in the last sixteenth century.

UNIVERSITY OF EXETER

ALEXANDRA WALSHAM


Paul Avis, with his customary lucidity, has extensively rewritten the first edition of Anglicanism and the Christian Church (1989) to provide a ‘more reader-friendly and more useful … study resource’. His aim is to offer an interpretation of the Anglican understanding of the Christian Church: its foundation in the preaching of the
Christian Gospel and the sacrament of baptism, its identity in history and today; its relations with the Roman Catholic Church and the Churches of the Reformations; its ministry and government; its ethos and terms of communion. He argues for a coherent Anglican position or consensus on the nature of the Church. In pt 1 he shows how a distinctive Anglican ecclesiology was formed through the work of the Anglican Reformers, followed by Hooker and Field. Part II traces the consolidation of Anglican ecclesiology in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and suggests that, in spite of the emergence of distinct traditions within the Church of England, a consensus prevailed as to the character of Anglicanism as both Catholic and reformed. Part III traces the challenge presented to the prevailing consensus by the various High Church groups in the nineteenth century, and the opposition of Evangelicals and Liberal Anglicans. The final section reviews twentieth-century Anglican essays in ecclesiology and salvation, and the impact of ecumenism, and offers some suggestions towards formulating a ‘more authentic model for Anglicanism’. Recent work, especially on the Reformation and on the complexities of the nineteenth century are taken into account and woven into the story. There is considerable reference to original sources, and new ground is opened, especially in the neglected field of Anglicanism in the first half of the twentieth century. One might quibble with some judgements, for example the classification of Anglican writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as ‘The early Anglican Liberal Protestants’ and ‘The early Anglican Liberal Catholics’. This clarifies some issues, but risks underestimating the subtlety of thought, and breadth of sympathy of the writers discussed. Overall, however, the book does not live up to its title. It is essentially an insider’s account of Anglicanism, or more specifically the Church of England. There is little sense of the missionary dynamic that engaged the Anglican tradition with non-English cultures, or that a different polity emerged in the United States, which for 150 years has created tension within the communion. Nor is much attention paid to why Anglicanism has taken root not just in former British colonies, but in Korea, Mozambique, Angola and South America. While this is an exception-ally useful book for understanding the complexities of Anglican identity, the aims are more limited than the title indicates. Paul Avis impressively combines a grasp of the historical and theological issues of the Church of England, but there is a larger story to be told.

WILLIAM M. JACOB


A generation ago Johannes Wallmann brought out Philipp Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus which has established itself as one of the basic texts in the field; today he is the editor of the Beiträge zur historischen Theologie in which it appeared, and it is his pupil, Andreas Deppermann, who not only follows him into the Beiträge, works in his style and produces a self-conscious echo of his master’s title, but clearly intends to do for Schütz what Wallmann did for Spener. Spener, however, was credited with having launched the Second Reformation, and it was mainly a question of rescuing
him from the encrustation of legend which clung to him as to the early Methodists. Schütz, however, is known largely as an intellectual nuisance, who led a secession from Spener’s original Collegium Pietatis (as the Lutheran Orthodox always said someone would) and flirted with Labadists and Quakers. Can he be made to stand the Wallmann treatment? It is Deppermann’s claim that he can, and he makes out a very cogent case for the fact. In the first place, the early histories of Lutheran Pietism and Reformed Pietism have normally been treated separately; Deppermann meticulously explores an underworld of radical Pietism and mysticism in Reformed Frankfurt which Schütz took with him into Spener’s Lutheran Collegium. More than this, though neither Schütz nor Spener had a conversion experience in the Franckean or Methodist sense, Schütz knew what conversion was for he had been clawed back from atheism and taught Spener what he knew about the process. He developed a strict ethical system by meditative use of the Bible and got Spener off catechising on to the Bible in the Collegium. What irked him about the development of the Collegium was not that it was anti-intellectual but that Spener’s attempts to pacify Lutheran opinion by intensifying clerical control squeezed out the element of popular mutual edification. His devotion to maintaining the ideal of a Christian hermit within society as embodied in Baron Justinian Ernst von Welz is reminiscent of Wesley’s devotion to M. de Renty. Meanwhile a large part of his energy and resources were devoted to that remarkable network of radical publishing which made the official censorships look so heavy-footed, and to cultivating connections right across northern Europe, and, through Pastorius and the Frankfurt Company, America. A chiliast somewhat caught out by the delay to the Last Things, Schütz was one of many who put intensity of discipleship ahead of precision of doctrine. Deppermann’s distinguished book produces new information, blurs old distinctions, and provokes fresh thought at every turn. It is worthily in the tradition of Wallmann’s Spener.

PETERSFIELD

W. R. WARD
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This volume combines an edited collection of Nuncio Silingardi’s correspondence and an analytical study of his career within the context of late sixteenth-century diplomacy, politics and religious reform. Haan emphasises the fact that Silingardi was a conscientious Tridentine reformer, associated with Charles Borromeo, and an experienced diocesan administrator, rather than a true diplomat. This partially accounts for the fact that his correspondence reveals him to be occasionally sidelined in negotiations between France and Rome, his place overtaken by more able diplomatic arbitrators like the papal nephew, Aldobrandini. However, it also explains the nuncio’s devotion to two important projects: the recall of the Jesuits to those areas of France from which they had been expelled in 1594, and the publication in France of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Silingardi was able to claim conditional success only in the first matter. His groundwork between 1599 and 1600 influenced Henri IV’s

In the summer of 1612 nineteen suspected witches were prosecuted at the Lancaster assizes and, in a related case, one at York. Ten were executed, making it one of the bloodiest witch trials recorded in English history. It is also one of the most celebrated and best documented. Yet before Robert Poole’s new collection of essays, emerging from a conference held at Lancaster in 1999, the Lancashire witches had escaped serious scholarly attention. Poole has worked the ten pieces into three thematic sections, each preceded by a helpful commentary. An introductory chapter by James Sharpe anchors the whole enterprise. The first section concerns the trial of 1612 itself. Stephen Pumphrey opens brilliantly with the idea that Thomas Potts’s contemporary account of the trial deliberately mirrored James I’s Daemonology in order to attract royal patronage. Literary manipulation is discussed further by Marion Gibson, who shows how Potts made the charges seem more plausible by exaggerating the coherence of legal proceedings. Jonathan Lumby delves into the family affairs of the magistrates and other accusers to explain their motives. Section two explores wider contexts, and points to fault-lines in the communities whence the accusations originated. John Swain emphasises the influence of economic pressures, and suggests that both posing as a witch and threatening to make witchcraft accusations could be a way of making a living. Tension over land and money, Michael Mullett argues, was compounded by a fractured religious culture: enduring Catholic traditions, post-Reformation spiritual uncertainty and a new wave of Puritan idealism. Kirsteen Macpherson Bardell concentrates on the omnipresence of popular magic in daily life, presenting the trials of 1612 as an extraordinary manifestation of a very ordinary way of seeing the world. The third section deals with literary memory. Richard Wilson suggests that Macbeth (1606) was, in part, Shakespeare’s attempt to associate witches with Jesuit conspirators, and so distance himself from the Gunpowder Plot. The sabbat was first mentioned in an English trial just six years later – at Lancaster. Alison Findlay draws attention to the Lancashire witch trial of 1634, which is less well-known but in its day inspired a smash-hit London stage play. In this era of Laudian reforms, witches were being linked not with Catholics but with disobedient Puritans. In the penultimate piece, Jeffrey Richards describes how the 1612 story was reshaped for a nostalgic Victorian audience by the ‘Lancashire novelist’ William Harrison Ainsworth. Finally, Joanne
Pearson follows these threads of memory through to the present day, arguing that Christian enemies of modern Wiccans and pagans are at least as likely to claim the lineage between modern and early modern witches as are New Age practitioners. As editor, Robert Poole is to be congratulated for ordering these essays into a volume which manages to be diverse without being disparate, and which remains sensitive to the significance of the Lancashire trials for the history of English witchcraft as a whole. All in all, *The Lancashire witches* is an essential read for specialists and advanced students of witchcraft alike.

**Churchill College,**  
**Malcolm Gaskill**  
**Cambridge**

---
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Dutch society in its golden age heyday never fails to fascinate and frustrate those who try to account for the crosscurrents in this mercantile, Calvinist republic that dominated the world economy. This important collection by some of the finest of historians of the seventeenth-century Netherlands illuminates the paradox of confessional diversity in a society highly influenced by a severe brand of Calvinism. Taken as a whole, this volume demonstrates the complexity of religious interaction in a multi-confessional society, yet it also points out how far we are from understanding the nature of religious toleration in the republic. Benjamin Kaplan shows that different groups constructed distinct meanings of toleration based on their religious identity. Historians now are slicing through these notions to get at the infrastructure of religious interaction. Taking a similar approach, Jonathan Israel argues that Spinoza’s *Tractatus theologico-politicus* should be read, not as a statement of toleration, but rather as a plea to authorities for freedom to philosophise. These essays make a compelling case for re-examining cultural constructions that encase descriptive texts about toleration. Essays by Willem Frijhoff, Judith Pollman, Joke Spaans and Pieter van Rooden call attention to cultural modalities that allowed for the coexistence of tolerance and intolerance in the republic. Frijhoff maintains that contrasting images of Dutch society arise from the tension between a state that adopted Calvinism yet organised collective life in ways that allowed for toleration. Pollman uses the fascinating example of a lawyer in Utrecht to demonstrate that an individual could function simultaneously as emphatic Calvinist in the public sphere and as magnanimous friend to dissidents in private. Spaans makes the case that deliberate religious policies of magistrates and management of confessional groups led to religious segregation within an overarching Calvinist regime. Traceing changes in treatment of Jews, van Rooden pinpoints the ‘social location of religion’, which ordered a society of religious differences through a hierarchy of privilege and exclusion. Thus, Frijhoff, Pollman, Spaans and van Rooden offer creative approaches to issues of public order and religious tolerance derived from the perspectives of anthropology and sociology. In three very useful pieces, Henk van Nierop, Christine Kooi and Maarten Prak examine different facets of the Roman Catholic condition. Exploring how Catholics fared in the layers of Dutch law, van Nierop...
shows that they used legal means in an attempt to counter legislation aimed at prohibiting Catholic worship. Kooi examines ways whereby Catholics circumvented legal proscription, through bribery, subterfuge and patronage. Prak suggests that Catholics had more to fear from common folk than political officials, since in economic distress, the resentment of gilds, eager to protect their interests, led to greater restrictions on citizenship rights for Catholics. These excellent studies indicate that the persistence of Catholicism had less to do with toleration than with Catholic ability to operate around the margins of society. Finally, an essay that stands alone, Samme Zijlstra’s contends that Mennonite leaders used toleration unsuccessfully to stem religious fragmentation. This outstanding collection of essays opens important lines of inquiry about religious toleration in the Dutch Republic.

Charles H. Parker
Saint Louis University
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Following on his substantial work Scottish Puritanism David Mullan has produced a collection of previously unpublished manuscripts relating to Scotland’s Presbyterian–Episcopal dispute of the 1620s and 30s. Religious controversy in Scotland 1625–1639 provides easily readable transcriptions of eleven documents, including works by Presbyterians Robert Baillie and possibly Samuel Rutherford, as well as Episcopalians James Wedderburn and John Guthrie. The sources of the authors’ biblical [etc] quotations have been tracked down with great care and meticulously cited. Three ideological strands are put forward in the editor’s introduction, which he uses to tie the collection together. First Mullan insists that Scotland participated intimately in a shared transatlantic/British religious culture, which he labels as ‘Puritan’. Secondly, throughout these texts, both Presbyterian and Episcopalian, there is a strong sense of the use of the Church Fathers in defending church polity. Most interesting is Robert Baillie’s ‘A discourse anent episcopacy’ in which he systematically refutes the use of the Fathers for supporting episcopacy. This work shows Baillie’s familiarity with Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Tertullian, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyprian and Theodoret as well as contemporary Catholic theologians, continental reformers and English divines. Mullan’s third point of connection is the shared fear of Rome held by both parties. However, according to Mullan, the Presbyterian party used this fear to their own advantage, producing polemics intended to convince Scotland’s burgeoning ‘Puritan’ community of an erroneous link between the Episcopal Church and Rome. This manipulation of the facts, he claims, overshadowed the Episcopalians’ own distaste for popery and allowed the covenanters to fall ‘prey to a conspiracy theory’ hatched by opportunists who craved the restoration of the Presbytery. Yet this assertion that Scottish Presbyterians exaggerated the ‘popish’ nature of episcopacy seems to be insensitive to the regression Presbyterians perceived in the imposition of bishops and high-liturgical forms into their Kirk. This is especially true in the case of the Service Book which, as Baillie points out, looked suspiciously like an ‘English mass-book’. If Scottish Episcopalians did sense that a Presbyterian conspiracy was afoot, the timing
of the introduction of the Service Book did little to abate fears of Roman ties. Furthermore, though heavily influenced by English writers, Mullan’s use of the word ‘Puritan’ paints an incomplete picture of Scottish divinity, since an alternative form of church government had already been chosen and waited to replace the bishops. Although Scotland shared much theologically with the Puritans south of the border, the same could be said of their Protestant neighbours across the North Sea, particularly in the Netherlands and France. While the model of describing early seventeenth-century Scottish Protestantism as Puritan may not be perfect, it does however begin to redress the triumphalist Presbyterian histories of the past. In conclusion, Mullan’s collection of documents and introduction serve two excellent purposes. First, his work brings to light the strong value placed upon the Fathers, particularly Augustine, by both Scottish Episcopal and Presbyterian divines. Secondly, the publication of primary sources widens the base of scholarship, providing access for individuals unable to visit archives in London or Edinburgh.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

S. SPURLOCK
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Theological method is the subject of these books on Roger Williams and John Owen, two seventeenth-century Puritans who were both committed to Calvinist theology and congregational polity. Byrd focuses on Williams’s biblical exegesis, and Rehnman on Owen’s theological prolegomena. Both have hitherto mainly attracted scholarly attention not as theologians but as controversialists and agents in important historical developments, Williams as embattled proponent of toleration and founder of Rhode Island, Owen as religious adviser to Cromwell and leader of dissenting Congregationalists after 1660.

Two recent interests in scholarship, the importance of the Bible in American culture and modes of biblical interpretation as a key to unlock past mentalities, inform Byrd’s volume. He begins with a bibliographical introduction aptly entitled ‘The modern quest for the elusive Roger Williams’, a principal burden of which is that Perry Miller’s assertion that Williams’s radicalism was rooted in his typological reading of the Old Testament was mistaken. Byrd maintains that typological reading of the Old Testament as prefiguring New Testament antitypes was common among Puritans, and that it was not Williams’s difference in exegetical methodology, but simply his alternative interpretation of key biblical texts that became the basis for his rejection of coercion in religion. Both Williams and his opponents interpreted biblical characters and events as exemplary models for behaviour and policy, but differed regarding what behaviour or policy they exemplified. Thus Williams emerges from Byrd’s analysis not as an isolated figure but an active participant in an ongoing Puritan discussion that included William’s separatist predecessors, from whom he borrowed much. But Byrd agrees with Miller’s conviction that Williams’s thought
was rooted in theology. Byrd surveys Williams’s exegesis of relevant Old Testament passages, the gospel parable of the wheat and the tares, Pauline references to magistracy (Williams felt kinship with the persecuted Paul), and the book of Revelation, arguing that Williams turned against the Massachusetts establishment texts they had used to buttress their authority. Using these biblical passages, Williams defended a view of toleration more radical than that of earlier separatists. The upshot of his exegesis was that for Williams the Massachusetts establishment was complicit, like its ‘type,’ Nebuchadnezzar, and its model, the ‘whore of Babylon,’ in ‘Christendom’s’ alliance of religion and the state, an alliance which led to war and persecution. In a final chapter Byrd shows that Williams also rejected the notion that nations other than biblical Israel could be covenanted with God. According to Byrd, Williams believed that his opponents’ wrong notions about religious toleration stemmed from their mistaken biblical interpretation (p. 85). This book nicely illuminates the biblical exegesis of Williams and his opponents, but leaves doubtful whether Williams and his opponents derived their ideas from the Bible or simply discussed their differing social visions in biblical idiom. But the strong religious motivation of both sides is clear enough.

Owen as well as Williams moved in radical Puritan circles in London in the 1640s, and supported toleration then and after the Restoration. But Owen, always worried about heresy, had a more limited view of toleration than did Williams. For Owen was above all a theologian committed to Reformed orthodoxy, and it is as such that Rehnman considers him. Particularly utilising Owen’s seldom mined *Theologoumena pantodapa* (1661), though drawing on many other works in the huge Owen corpus, Rehnman examines Owen’s ideas about the nature of theology, natural and supernatural theology, faith and reason, belief and evidence, and his ‘federal’ structure for theology. In the process Rehnman works with themes explored in the writings of Richard Muller on Protestant scholasticism and confirms assertions made by Carl R. Trueman about Owen’s theology (*The claims of truth: the Trinitarian theology of John Owen*, 1998). Foremost among these assertions is that Owen cannot properly be understood apart from the general development of Reformed scholasticism and its roots in medieval scholasticism. Rehnman applies this to Owen’s prolegomenal theology, illuminating it with analysis of the arguments of medieval and Reformed scholastics where they paralleled or seem to have influenced Owen on these points. He establishes Owen’s dependence on continental Reformed theologians, particularly Franciscus Junius, his extensive use of classical and patristic sources, and his frequent reliance on Aquinas and later Thomists. Rehnman also thinks that Owen drew on the revived Aristotelianism of the Renaissance, but that his employment of Aristotelian terms and distinctions did not distort his theology. Indeed, this Aristotelianism gave to Puritan theologians such as Owen a greater philosophical and theological sophistication than they would otherwise have had. Rehnman calls attention to a number of points of considerable interest in Owen’s theology, such as his discussions of revelation as progressive and of the limitation of knowledge that accompanied the human nature of Christ. But Rehnman insists that Owen never departed from a Christocentric and practical theology, and sees him as much less speculative than were medieval scholastics.

This is a helpful book, learned, precise and generally persuasive, but I do have a few misgivings. First, there is insufficient context for Owen’s theological work. Owen’s theology was often shaped by polemics against opponents: Church of England
Arminians who thwarted his advance in Church and University, sectarians and Socinians who thwarted a consensual Cromwellian Church, and finally (to Owen) a graceless Anglicanism that thwarted Protestant unity. Only when Owen seems contradictory, for example on the role of reason, does Rehnman provide context, noting that Owen defended reason against Roman Catholic Fideism and denigrated it when attacking Socinians. Greater context for the writing and publishing of *Theologoumena* might also have been helpful – how did the timing of its publication relate to Owen’s retreat from ecclesiastical influence? A second misgiving is that occasionally Rehnman tries too hard to fit remarks of Owen into the Procrustean bed of medieval and reformed scholastic discussions. But Rehnman is to be applauded for presenting Owen as a complex and sophisticated thinker who deserves to be placed among the important theologians of the Christian tradition.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Dewey D. Wallace, Jr.


*JEH* (54) 2003; DOI: 10.1017/S0022046903378091

The seventeenth-century French ecclesiastical historian Le Nain de Tillemont is best known in the anglophone world for Gibbon’s reliance on his sixteen-volume compilation of source material for the development of the Church down to 600. Tillemont had digested ‘with incredible patience and religious accuracy’ (*Decline and fall*, iii. 374 n. 41) the massive works of the church Fathers; Gibbon believed that Tillemont, ‘whose inimitable accuracy almost assumes the character of Genius’, provided a safe base for arranging ‘scattered atoms of historical information’ (*Memoirs*, 147), as well as convenient access to material that his sceptical mind found unappealing. This collection of twenty-nine contributions, to mark the third centenary of Tillemont’s death, probes the realities behind this image of a precise and bland transcriber of vital evidence. Tillemont was not in the forefront of the polemics of the Port Royal School, but the Jansenist dispute and his experience of the reign of Louis XIV coloured his interpretations of the position of the Church in late antiquity and its relations with imperial power (see Hervé Savon on Tillemont’s assessments of emperors at pp. 277–96, and Paul Mattéi on the relations between Cyprian and Rome at pp. 231–47). Tillemont emerges as a very thorough historian, quite advanced in his attention to prosopography and chronological precision, but also conditioned by his religious views: the Cappadocian Fathers are treated with great sympathy, since their combination of literary ability, sanctity and attention to local duties offered a model for a reclusive intellectual, whereas heretical Arians and Nestorius are presented with less understanding. The religious concerns of pagans are scarcely recognised, and Julian remains firmly ‘The Apostate’. As with recent bicentenary celebrations for Gibbon, this volume demonstrates the advantages of constructing a dialogue between specialists in the author’s own time and in the subjects of his work. Perhaps the main benefits are for the ‘modernists’ and
historiographers, since the expert unpicking of specific historical interpretations can be tied to contemporary issues, whereas for late Romanists Tillemont’s labours have been overtaken by the availability of new texts (for example substantial material in Syriac), significantly improved editions and more flexible approaches, but the latter should also reflect on the inevitable links between even a ‘genius’ and his times.

Michael Whitby


With books and articles here, conferences and seminars there, and with a limited edition of his bust currently available, it is difficult to avoid John Wesley in this year which marks the tercentenary of his birth. There is, therefore, something perversely cheering in the fact that while Dr Ralph Waller, a Methodist minister who is principal of that citadel of liberal theology, Harris Manchester College, Oxford, offers a personal portrait of Wesley, another Methodist minister, G. T. Eddy, in his admirable study of the Presbyterian ‘Arian’, John Taylor of Norwich (1694–1761), dispenses a doctrinal antidote to the evangelical Arminian. Both authors introduce their subjects in thematic fashion. Thus for Wesley we have his home life, his student days, the Georgia adventure, his conversion, his dealings with the Moravians and Whitefield, his preaching and the opposition thereto, the theological and matrimonial strife which he endured and engendered, his social concern, and his last days. About Taylor’s early years much less is known, but Eddy is able to refer to his education at Whitehaven and Findern academies and his ministry in rural Lincolnshire, before concentrating upon his Norwich pastorate, his Hebrew scholarship, his doctrinal writings and controversies (especially those with Wesley), and his tutorship at the Warrington academy. Whereas Waller writes (albeit with reference to primary and secondary sources) for those who know little of Wesley and wish to know more, Eddy addresses those who enjoy unpicking doctrinal squabbles over such topics as original sin, and can bear a substantial amount of lucidly-expressed intellectual history, not least that concerning Taylor’s rebuttal of Hutcheson’s approach in moral philosophy. If Waller presents popular writing of a high order (neither hagiography nor the currently fashionable debunking), Eddy, by placing Taylor in his intellectual environment, and by showing that and how Taylor exemplifies that moral critique of untoward theology which is a lasting benefit of the Enlightenment (pace present-day ‘Enlightenment-bashers’), has made a significant contribution to the burgeoning field of eighteenth-century English intellectual history. His third appendix, though not exhaustive, shows how the original sin debate has percolated down the years to our own time; scholars will particularly welcome the fifth appendix, which comprises transcriptions of eighteen of Taylor’s letters to George Benson. Between them these books remind us that if Wesley thought that the world was his parish, some were more than a little determined to question the doctrinal manifesto in the interest of which he staked his claim. Eddy’s book reminds us that one person’s ‘catholic Christian’ is another person’s ‘silver-tongued Antichrist’, and this in turn prompts
the rueful reflection that there is nothing new under the ecumenical sun. For all their disagreements, Wesley described Taylor as ‘That great man’. With Eddy’s thorough and careful work in our hands we are in a better position than ever before to evaluate that judgement.

Milton Keynes

Alan P. F. Sell


This book is a translation of Professor van den Berg’s essay, published in Dutch in 1971, translated with some additions and further references and a substantial introductory essay by Professor Gunter. In 1738 Wesley passed through the Netherlands on his way to the Moravians at Herrnhut. As an old man, however, he had a kind of working holiday in the Netherlands in 1783, followed by a further visit in 1786. These contacts plus correspondence (notably with the Mennonite doctor Johnannes de Koker) attracted little scholarly attention until van den Berg’s essay which included much detail on people Wesley encountered. Though Wesley had little impact on Dutch religious life, apart from a few individuals, his visits are of interest partly for his admiring comments on Dutch social characteristics, partly for the light thrown on Dutch Mennonites and Moravians. Though marginal to mainstream church life, it was among practical evangelical Pietists of this kind that Wesley, mellowing in old age, found affinities even to the point of identifying living examples of his favourite doctrine of perfection. Van den Berg sees these folk as foreshadowing the later Dutch evangelical Réveil. Gunter’s introduction concentrates on Dutch Calvinism, with a detailed discussion of the Council of Dort. Given his hostility to Calvinism, it was fortunate that Wesley only encountered moderate versions of it during his visits, but Gunter argues that in any case Wesley’s ‘Arminianism’ was closer to Arminius’ own modified Calvinism than is often recognised.

Manchester

Henry D. Rack


In June 1841, Jean-Claude Colin, founder of the French Society of Mary, burnt his papers. This created a major lacuna for the late Donal Kerr, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Maynooth, in producing his study of Colin. He had, however, the beautifully ordered documentation of the society itself in the Origines maristes on which to work, and has written an exemplary account of Colin’s early life as the product of his time and place. Thus Colin’s religious fervour had its background in the turbulent years of the Revolution, when his devout father had to hide in the woods and barns from revolutionary officials, while the re-establishment
of the Church in the neighbouring cathedral city of Lyon occurred under the ægis of Napoleon’s uncle, Cardinal Fesch, and the society took form as a body of diocesan missionaries in the Bugey mountains, in the heyday of these missions after the Restoration. The society was inspired by a vision of the Virgin by another Jean-Claude, surnamed Courveille, who had to be dismissed in the end for sexual immorality, and by the cult in Lyon of Notre Dame de Fourvière, which was restimulated by revolutionary persecution. The society can also be seen as the outcome of the reorganisation of the French seminary system; it reflected the ultramontanisation of the French Church in reaction to Napoleon, and nearly succumbed to the liberal ultramontanism of de Lamennais. Kerr does wonders in sorting out the complications both of the society’s early history and of Colin’s original aspiration to contain the whole Church, through an order embracing priests, brothers, sisters and the laity. This last proposal encountered opposition in Rome, condemnation of the society seems to have been averted almost by accident, and papal approval in 1836 occurred by another accident, as a straight exchange for shouldering the mission to the vast new Pacific diocese of Oceania, the beginnings of which form the climax of this book. It is only sad that Professor Kerr did not live to write the sequel on the rest of Colin’s life, in another volume as profound and as sensitive as this one, and as comprehensive of French Catholic history as a whole.

University of Durham

SHERIDAN GILLEY
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In 2000 John McManners opened a sealed packet of documents preserved at All Souls: ‘The Shipley Case’. The resulting ‘essay’, brisk and judicious, is ‘my last archival adventure’. McManners is interested in more than the basic story. However, here is the bare plot. One afternoon in October 1808 a nineteen-year-old employee of Parker’s bookshop in Oxford visited All Souls with books for Charles Shipley, Fellow, aged twenty-six, recently priested, son of the dean of St Asaph. Back at the bookshop the youth, Charlie Slatter, complained that Shipley had kissed him, explored inside his breeches and said ‘I would like to frig you’. Nine months later, after a complexity of academic and family commotion, the matter went to trial by jury at the Oxford assizes. The charge against Shipley was intention to commit anal intercourse. After eight hours (not reported in the press, but dramatically described by McManners) the jury took ten minutes to find Shipley not guilty. But All Souls was keen to exercise its own jurisdiction. Shipley was deprived of his fellowship. He felt (and McManners sympathises) that the college showed ‘a too ardent zeal to maintain the dignity of their society’. He appealed to the college visitor, the archbishop of Canterbury, Charles Manners-Sutton. After a year of legal wrangling about the powers of the visitor the appeal was rejected – in November 1810, more than two years after the initial incident. Shipley became a parson in Dorset, married, had children, and died in 1834. McManners’s character sketches of Charles Shipley and Charlie Slatter are done with consideration and sympathy. Charlie had gone to London after the trial, and in November 1809 was sentenced at the Old Bailey to two years hard labour for stealing books. Once a New College chorister, Charlie had
lived in London when he was sixteen, lodging with a commercial traveller said to be notorious for ‘unnatural vice’. One of his brothers, once a Magdalen chorister, now deputy organist at St Paul’s Covent Garden, had caused scandal in Warwickshire by his relations with a schoolmaster. The eldest brother, now a Gloucestershire parson, had been the object, when a choirboy at New College, of amorous approaches by a chaplain there, who was reprimanded. The father ran an Oxford hairdressing and billiards saloon. There is no mention in the documentation of a mother. Fear was expressed at the time of the assizes that ‘the lower class of townspeople in Oxford’, always ‘spiteful against gownsman’, would believe in ‘the oppression of the Shipleys over a poor innocent boy’.

**Cambridge**

H. C. Porter
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Geoffrey Milburn’s study of Primitive Methodism, the strongest point of growth in nineteenth-century Methodism, is part of an Epworth Press series called *Exploring Methodism*. The series is meant for use in discussion groups and is unillustrated, which in this case is a pity. Geoffrey Milburn, who knows his subject well, sees the history of Primitive Methodism as a success story, and there is much to be said for this approach. When Primitive Methodism became one of the founding members of the present Methodist Church in 1932, it brought with it more than 1,000 ministers, 13,000 lay preachers, 4,356 chapels and 220,000 members. Between about 1810 and 1900 what began as a local, rural revivalist movement in Staffordshire had grown into a national denomination, its rapid consolidation symbolised by the organisation of a small but viable overseas missions section in the 1880s, and the expansion of its ministerial training college in Manchester between 1880 and 1892. Much of this reorganisation, as Milburn makes clear in his unsentimental sketch, had depended on the great generosity of a wealthy late Victorian businessman, Sir William Hartley, who remained loyal to the society in which he had grown up, but who wanted to remodel the Connexion as a sophisticated, urban part of the Free Churches, which were then enjoying a moment of unusual social and political influence. Hartley meant well, as did the distinguished biblical scholar, A. S. Peake, who provided the educational impulse at the ministerial level, but this social and cultural transformation worked better in the towns than in the countryside. Early Primitive Methodism had put down roots in agricultural, fishing and mining villages, where the chapel became the heart of what was still a premodern religious culture, and what Hartley and Peake had to offer – a cautious blend of Liberal politics and Liberal Protestantism – failed either to sustain these close communities or to replace them with a ‘modern’ equivalent. Sophistication had its price, and there is no sadder sight in modern Methodism than a village in which the boxlike roadside chapel has been ‘modernised’ into a ‘country-cottage’. In contrast, the Salvation Army, the last but not the least of the Methodist movements, found and developed a modern role in the relief of human misery and disaster, and retained its independence.

**Bristol**

John Kent
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Charles James Blomfield (1786–1857) was the most influential prelate of his generation, ‘the Church of England here on earth’, according to Sydney Smith. Despite several biographies and the credit accorded him in surveys of nineteenth-century church reform, Blomfield’s life and career have never been adequately examined. Hailing from a respectable East Anglican family of gentry, merchants and farmers, he established his academic credentials by election to a fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge. In outlook moderately conservative and High Church, Blomfield was appointed bishop of Chester in 1824 through the influence of his patron William Howley, and wasted no time in setting about the reform of his unwieldy diocese. Clerical standards were improved, strict discipline was exercised and the spiritual and academic standards of those seeking ordination were raised (Irish candidates were banned altogether from the diocese). Throughout this period, Blomfield remained active in London clerical and political circles. He participated in the debates in the House of Lords, most notably in opposing passage of Catholic Emancipation, and he remained (despite his opposition to non-residence in the diocese of Chester) incumbent of the wealthy parish of St Botolph, Bishopsgate. This proved no disadvantage to his career, however, and in 1829 Blomfield was translated by Wellington to the larger diocese of London (succeeding Howley, recently elevated to Canterbury). Here, his enormous energy and reforming zeal came into their own. The new bishop could soon be found serving as chairman of a wide variety of councils and commissions and founding (and serving on) a number of voluntary societies. Blomfield’s most enduring legacy, however, lay in the area of church reform. Facing a national crisis over the issue, in 1835 Peel established two semi-independent commissions (after 1836, the Ecclesiastical Commission) to consider reforms in the allotment of church revenues. With his confidence and natural talent for leading men, Blomfield soon came to dominate the proceedings, prompting Vernon Harcourt, the ageing and easy-going archbishop of York, to remark, dryly, ‘Till Blomfield comes, we all sit and mend our pens, and talk about the weather.’ Blomfield also set in motion extensive reforms in his own diocese, especially in the area of church extension, nearly 200 new churches being built and endowed during his episcopate. Johnson’s lively, engaging and enthusiastic treatment of his subject is a treat to read. Blomfield’s personality and achievement are well brought out – though it could perhaps have been put into perspective by recognising recent work which qualifies the picture of church reform as commencing in the 1830s and suggests a longer pedigree, running back into the late eighteenth century. From time to time the author’s political and economic views intrude into the narrative, and there are also some minor factual errors which would have been prevented by more careful editing. Still, this is a welcome addition to the historiography of the nineteenth-century Church of England, which one hopes may prompt further, specialised studies of aspects of the bishop’s life and work.

FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Phoenix, ARIZONA

GRAYSON CARTER
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The title suggests ‘England, 1640–60’, but the place of publication indicates quite another civil war, though one certainly in good measure a religious conflict, too. Preceded by a series of Revivals, north and south, ‘the war between the states’ saw both sides claiming God on their side – always an awkward situation. If the north had the Battle Hymn of the Republic, the south had its own (rather less melodic) version. Northwards the war was seen, Aamodt suggests, as ‘a prelude to the main event, Armageddon’, while further south was glimpsed a vision of the Apocalypse. There was to be punishment for sin. God was working his purpose out. The choice was whether to help or to hinder that process. Here there were certainly echoes of the English experience. In Pennsylvania we come across Ironsides and Round Heads. For the confederacy Stonewall Jackson, ‘the Moses of the south’, led his troops in prayer, trusting in God to keep his powder dry. Lincoln’s role was seen by himself and others as also more than somewhat apocalyptic. Slavery became a sort of touchstone, commanding close biblical interpretation. For the south the peculiar institution was a God-given dispensation, blasphemy to question it. The north was inclined to see it as ‘the cause of all our sorrows’. Going to its tents, each side went to its texts as well. All this and its associated imagery Aamodt contemplates thoughtfully, supplementing her own text with a broad selection of songs and poems and with a score of compelling graphics. She argues convincingly that for neither side was the outcome satisfactory. Defeat dispersed the heroic millennarianism of the confederacy, but victory, which took a long hard time coming for the republic, proved a mixed blessing. Contemplating a painful rebirth for the nation, Lincoln observed that just as ‘the prayers of both [protagonists] could not be fully answered, [so] that of neither has been fully answered’.

 Üniversity of Exeter

IVAN ROOTS
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This enquiry analyses how and why festivities for St Patrick’s Day varied across Ireland, Britain, Australia, Canada and the United States. Cronin and Adair use the celebrations to investigate the attitudes of the Irish at and – more strikingly – far from home. Their close researches into particular episodes show the range of preoccupations. Festivities in Melbourne immediately after the First World War were deemed to smack of blatant anti-British feelings, orchestrated by the ardently nationalist archbishop, Mannix. Meanwhile, De Valera, Mannix’s hero, used the festival to broadcast topical homilies. Official records, effectively exploited by the authors, reveal faltering efforts to promote tourism through the stage-managing of Irishness. Soon it was realised that the saint’s day fell inconveniently early in the year. Ministers solemnly contemplated moving it in order to boost the number of visitors to Ireland.
The book is at its best when covering the commemorations of the last hundred years. A longer look at eighteenth-century practices would uncover early evidence of functionaries in Dublin Castle cashing in by selling over-priced Patrick’s crosses to the important. Archbishop King of Dublin jibbed at surrendering to this patriotic extortion. Protestant patricians happily gave their servants the day off to go to patterns. At these devotions, booths sold refreshments and geegaws. Employers also tipped the favoured, so that they could buy their ‘Patrick’s pots’. As in the twentieth century, the festival was already associated with food, drink and conviviality. These features invite comparison with the other religious and civil celebrations from the eighteenth century onwards. St Patrick had to compete with saints such as Andrew and David, as well as the days sacred to Christ and the Virgin Mary. In particular, the revival (or invention) of the elaborate rituals of Corpus Christi in the 1920s, timed in a more clement month, may have overwhelmed Patrick’s tide. Then, too, the coincidence of the failed rising of 1916 with Easter made that season particularly resonant for Irish Catholics.

One of the findings of Cronin and Adair is that enthusiasm for Patrick was stronger among Nationalists than among Unionists. They also detect a trend towards secularisation. Their journeys across continents show interesting contrasts. In Canada, despite the rivalry of the Orange Order, the cult of St Patrick seems to have been used early and successfully to bridge rather than to widen divisions. The strength of French Catholicism encouraged a fusion of differing traditions: Patrick after all remained popular as both a Christian and place name in France. Another telling comparison is between the vigour and inventiveness of exiles in lauding Patrick and what happened in Ireland. Only belatedly, in the mid-1990s, did Dublin import many of the rituals – and indeed the personnel – from America, now apparently the custodian of the canon. Yet Irish celebrations, while influenced by commerce, fashion and local troubles, may exhibit greater continuities than the authors suggest. It is in the nature of the evidence that the eye-catching and contentious leave the most legible record. Religious worship has remained central to the day, despite the recent spectacular drop in routine church attendance. Sociable recreations, such as the Patrick’s Day races at Cloyne (Berkeley’s bishopric) and the exuberance of kermesse, persist. These entertainments may not be impromptu, but not all are contrived paddywackery. This lively study may sometimes smack more of green Guinness than of the traditional fare of boiled bacon and champ. In tracing the wetting of the shamrock (whether refrigerated, flown in or sham), it does more than whet the appetite.

HERTFORD COLLEGE, T. C. BARNARD
OXFORD


This is a study of Alfred Loisy’s Modernist works which pays particular attention to his intellectual development in the context of the complex ecclesiastical and political circumstances of his day. Throughout the book Loisy is seen as attempting to steer a
middle way between radical historical criticism and traditional if chastened Catholicism. Making much use of unpublished sources and displaying a detailed knowledge of the French intellectual and educational scene of the late nineteenth century, Hill succeeds in showing how Loisy maintained a consistent approach to the study of history from the 1880s. Loisy’s scientific method shows marked continuity with some of his forebears, including Renan, although he continued to believe that some compromise with Catholicism was possible until he was eventually driven out by the Roman authorities. Hill shows how Loisy’s critical approach to history brought him into conflict with his teachers from the very beginnings of his career. For Loisy, the modern spirit of autonomy could be combined with the moral force of the Church, whereas for his opponents it was little more than a symptom of a general weakening of the Church’s authority over the whole of life. The strongest parts of this study are its detailed discussions of now forgotten theologians which vividly portray the astonishing control over theological debate and historical truth by an increasingly threatened hierarchy. The political and ecclesiastical conflicts over authority form a fitting final chapter which places the papal denunciations of Modernism, as well as Loisy’s excommunication, in the context of the separation of Church and State in France: the web of theological and political intrigue is well drawn out. One particularly fascinating discussion is of Prince Albert of Monaco’s efforts to have Loisy made a bishop. The conclusion emphasises the integrity of Loisy’s mediating project which sought to modernise the Church by making it a moral force in modern society, but freed from its dependence on a supernatural world-view long since displaced by modern science. Since this freedom for critical enquiry required a state freed from its enslavement to the Church, Loisy was bound to enter into bitter conflict with a hierarchy afraid of losing control to the secular state. Although the analysis could at times be more penetrating, Hill has clearly shown the contours of a debate which is characterised by quite incompatible notions of authority and which still awaits a final settlement.

RIPON COLLEGE CUDDESDON, MARK D. CHAPMAN OXFORD
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From the later eighteenth century, and more especially since the mid-nineteenth century, the German Protestant Churches and the various German states have collected extensive statistics of religious practice and affiliation. These have been used in a piecemeal way both by contemporaries and by recent historians, including not least Lucian Hölscher, Professor of Contemporary History at Bochum. In this monumental series of volumes, Hölscher and his team of assistants provide the first systematic compilation of the statistics, mainly from the period 1880 to 1930, but extending backwards in some cases to 1850 and forwards to 1945. While the largest body of figures concerns participation in communion, there are more limited series
relating to church-going, marriage, baptism, funerals, voting in church elections, and the numbers of those changing their religious confession, or becoming konfessionslos. In some cases these figures are only available for the whole of the Landeskirche, but in many cases they are broken down by church district. The communicant numbers often separate male and female. The statistical tables are illustrated through numerous maps, both of Germany as a whole and of each state or province. In a brief introduction, Hölischer reviews the history of research on religious geography in Germany, and notes its relatively underdeveloped state by comparison with France. He describes some of the main patterns which the statistics reveal. Most discussion has focused on the proportions of Protestants participating in holy communion – regarded as the supreme indicator of Kirchlichkeit (attachment to the Church). The usual assumptions have been that Protestant religious practice was in general decline from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth, but that the south remained more pious than the north, the countryside more so than the towns, and Protestants living in the diaspora more so than those living in all-Protestant districts. Hölischer shows that while each of these orthodoxies contains a measure of truth, all are over-simplified. Participation in communion did decline, but other forms of religious practice were fairly stable, and the proportion of funerals with the religious ceremonies substantially increased between 1860 and 1930. Regional patterns were more complex than any simple north-south divide. A belt of high participation ran through the middle of Germany from Franconia and Hesse up to Hanover, with intermediate levels in the south-west and east, and low levels not only in the far north, but also to the west in the Rhineland and eastward in Prussian Saxony. The levels were generally low in the cities, but similar regional patterns can be seen, with communions being most numerous in Munich, Stuttgart and some of the Ruhr towns. The biggest decline in urban religious practice came not in the era of industrialisation, but in the eighteenth century. And differences were stark not only between town and countryside, but between different rural districts. In 1910, the year for which Hölischer provides a nationwide map of participation in communion, there were 140 communions per 100 members of the Protestant Landeskirche in rural Wetter (Hesse-Kassel) and a mere 6 in the city of Kiel. But second to bottom, with 7, was another mainly rural district, Jever (Oldenburg). The idea that Protestants were more pious in the diaspora works for old-established Protestant minorities going back to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but not for areas of recent migration.

The heart of the book lies in the maps and the statistics and most of their meanings remain to be explored. The regional differences in French Catholicism are well-known and have been extensively analysed; but the equally startling regional differences in German Protestantism, though known, have hardly begun to be explained. Moreover the figures collected here reveal aspects of German Protestantism that have been seldom recognised. For instance, they illuminate the complex dynamics of the relationship between Protestants and the Third Reich. 1933–4 saw a slight rise in communions, a large return to church membership by the konfessionslos and also significant numbers of conversions of Catholics to Protestantism. But then from 1935 to 1939 communions dropped by more than a third, and in the years 1937–9 record numbers left the Church. One can also measure the impact on religious practice of World War I (clearly very considerable) or of urban growth in the nineteenth century (probably less than has been assumed),
and the extent of the gender gap – growing in the early twentieth centuries and widest in the cities. Several of the tables throw light on inter-confessional relations. When a Catholic wedded a Protestant, each partner came under pressure to marry and have the children baptised in their own church. Hölscher suggests that the local majority confession was usually able to mount the most effective pressure, and over Germany as a whole the numbers of Catholics joining the Protestant majority always exceeded those moving in the opposite direction. And has anyone before even noticed, let alone discussed, the huge regional variations in funeral practices in the nineteenth century? Of Protestants dying in Bavaria in 1862, 98 percent had a religious ceremony at their funeral but only 30 percent did so in Braunschweig. Above all, the fact that much of the data is available both for long periods of time and for quite small units of population means that many questions can now be approached with a new degree of subtlety and precision. These beautifully produced volumes provide an essential tool for political, social and cultural, as well as religious historians.

University of Birmingham

Hugh McLeod
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In this slender volume Andreas Franitza provides a detailed account of the Hildesheim cathedral chapter in the period between the concordat with Prussia in 1929 and that in the West with the German state of Lower Saxony in 1965: a period of nearly forty years which, of course, witnessed the failure of the Weimar republic, the rise and collapse of Hitler’s dictatorship, and the success of German democracy in the post-World War II Bonn republic. For all the controversy inherent in the Church–State relationship within these varied regimes, Franitza’s account is none the less restrained to the point of dullness. He presents his material accurately and soberly, with due regard to its legal complexities and ambiguities. For that reason we learn much about the Hildesheim cathedral chapter’s organisational structure, its endowments and their management, its officers and the procedures for their appointment, its administrative practices and the traditional rights exercised by its members, even the procedural guidelines followed during the selection of a bishop. Despite his impressive ability to unravel the complexities of canonical rules and regulations that apply in the case of the Hildesheim chapter, however, Franitza never transcends the narrow confines of an arcane and arid canonical discussion to explain the moral concerns and political dilemmas faced by church leaders in Hildesheim amid dramatic changes of political allegiance. These are significant issues, and one wishes that Franitza had devoted more attention to them. Had he done so he might have broadened the appeal of his work. As is stands, however, this book will be of limited interest to a handful of canon lawyers.

University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

Ronald J. Ross
Clemens August Graf von Galen was a member of the Westphalian aristocracy, very conscious of his family’s traditional upholding of the political, social and religious values of this milieu. Its most notable characteristic was the creation of a protective enclave for Catholics, which enabled them over the centuries to survive the persecutions and political pressures of their opponents, both Protestant and secular. The conservative leadership of such men as von Galen lamented the unravelling of the feudal–aristocratic structure of society, as also the loss of the First World War, and the rise of Communism. The advent of Nazism was at first greeted as promising a restoration of Germany’s national greatness. But von Galen, like others, was soon disillusioned, and retreated to the Catholic bastion to defend his heritage. Beth Griech-Polelle has little sympathy for this position. Instead, she believes that the Catholic leadership was blameworthy for its readiness to come to terms with the Nazi state in the 1933 concordat, and for its failure to mount a more militant defence of the Nazis’ victims, especially Jews. In this view she follows a number of earlier English-speaking historians, going back to Gunter Lewy in 1964. Her indictment is therefore not new.

Von Galen, she asserts, failed to use his moral authority to address issues beyond those affecting Catholics. In their desperate attempt to preserve Catholic organisations, while maintaining their loyalty to the German state, the bishops failed to defend the rights of all human beings. She describes von Galen’s desire to keep Catholic values alive by preserving Catholic institutions as a not very ambitious or creative goal. And she sees his famous 1941 sermons as self-centred and limited protests, even while he continued to urge overall loyalty to the Fatherland and prayed for its victory over Communism. In fact, she claims, on euthanasia, von Galen carefully waited until the Protestant clergy had protested first. But such counterfactual history runs the risk of losing sight of the realities of the situation in Nazi Germany, where Catholic priests and laity were being imprisoned, or even executed, on the flimsiest of pretexts. The ‘smell of fear’ was something none could escape. Von Galen’s courageous sermons, delivered in the expectation that he would be arrested immediately, may with hindsight seem insufficient. At the time, coming at the very moment of Hitler’s greatest military victories, they were an astounding act of defiance. And were seen by the Nazis as such. This case is based on an extensive and well-informed reading of the secondary literature, though apparently without using any new archival sources. Griech-Polelle’s idealistic expectations of church leaders, and of von Galen in particular, may not, however, be shared by all readers. More realistic, perhaps, was the 1945 opinion of a British Foreign Office official, who assessed von Galen as ‘the most outstanding personality among the clergy in the British zone … Statuesque in appearance and uncompromising in discussion, this oak-bottomed old aristocrat. … is a German nationalist through and through’. This is surely a truer epitaph.

JOHN S. CONWAY

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

‘We educate the child!’ (‘Das Kind bilden wir!’), Hitler’s imperative in a programmatic speech to the Nazi political leadership assembled in the Ordensburg, Sonthofen, on 23 November 1937, cited by Bookhagen in his second volume on Protestant childcare in the Third Reich, underpins Scholder’s earlier conclusion (1982) that the year 1937 was very significant for the relationship between the Nazi state and the Christian Churches. Hitler decided that the latter were unlikely to accept Nazi racial doctrine; his policy so far of limiting their influence in the Nazi Volksgemeinschaft was therefore insufficient; the Churches had to be annihilated in the long term. Symbolic was the way the inclusion of annual Hitler birthday congratulations for the first time in the April 1937 issue of the journal, Die christliche Kinderpflege, did not prevent its suppression in May 1941. Bookhagen is to be congratulated for a very impressive work of scholarship on the Protestant voluntary charitable agencies run by the Innere Mission, and for explaining how they responded to National Socialism before and after 1937. The biographies at the end of both volumes, and two indexes of names and subjects in this second volume are exemplary and will be invaluable to further research. However, an addition of 1,127 pages to the 647 of volume i (reviewed this JOURNAL li [2000], 198–9) needs to be questioned. There is simply too much to absorb. The reader is not helped either by Bookhagen’s sesquipedal sentences. Perhaps it is best to treat this two-volume work as an encyclopedia given its excellent reference apparatus. There are fascinating sections ranging from official thinking on childcare in the Party and in these Protestant charitable agencies, on the mind-boggling bureaucracy and procedure which care of the child seemed to involve under dictatorship, on the obfuscation of legal process in the so-called ‘dual state’, on the illustrated literature for the child to look at, to the changing statistics of Party and Innere Mission childcare. Bookhagen suggests in this sorry tale of Protestant childcare accommodation on the whole, what one party functionary euphemistically called ‘Kurskorrektur’ (p. 393) at a meeting of Nazi welfare agencies at Weimar in March 1939, that Nazi indoctrination failed in the end in wartime. The Party could not cope with the mounting problems of childcare posed by the demands made on manpower by total war and the destruction caused by Allied bombing raids. Party agency in-fighting and a poor working relationship between Party (Gau) and local government institutions (Land), ensured the survival of these Protestant childcare agencies. These grim times also drove the Innere Mission away from the idea of working alongside the institutional Church and back to the order of service of the parish church in much the same way as wartime exigency did with liturgical revival in Catholic and Protestant Germany. An official annual parish Sunday School (Kindersonntag) inaugurated in 1939 on the second Sunday after Easter (Misericordias Domini) and its accompanying penny-farthing Bildblatt depicting Jesus the Good Shepherd, became extremely popular in the war years, though a ‘honey-sweet Jesus’ was considered ‘kitsch’ by some clergy as a contrast to the ‘Führer’ and to the household misery of the catastrophic winter and spring of 1943–4 (pp. 325, 768). The Bible in pictures sold well too. Bookhagen also prints the contents, extraordinary for its time, the spring of 1941, of a proposed wartime New Testament ABC
in pictures (pp. 517–23) based on the Old Masters from Rogier van der Weyden onwards. Depressing is Bookhagen’s conclusion (p. 864), that official concern expressed by both Protestant and Catholic senior churchmen in 1937 for the future of the Kindergarten did not lead to any solidarity in the defence of Christian childcare thereafter. Charitable work and its defence continued in separate worlds.

NICHOLAS HOPE
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Dialog und Zeugnis. Interkonfessionelle Kontakte und Konflikte einer Freikirche in der DDR.


This little book about an even tinier religious community in the former DDR, written by one of the leading protagonists, is full of interest; indeed it is a sign of the times. The Seventh Day Adventists pre-1939 were not a large group in central Europe, and were mostly stranded in the east by the division of Germany. Here they suffered dreadfully from the consequences of war, enforced mass migration, the hostility of the Red Army and the obtuseness of the government of the DDR. They were of course used to obloquy. Often abused by the Nazis as Jews because of their Sabbath observance, they could expect to be treated by the large Churches as ‘sects’ or even as ‘alien growths’. The government of the DDR kept a grip on their efforts to rebuild and on their devotional literature by controlling access to building materials and paper. Yet by what must have been heroic sacrifice and effort they got their seminary at Friedensau going again, and eventually won it recognition as a Kirchliche Hochschule. This progress was aided by two things, one of which is the theme of the book, and the other, the sporadic attempts of the government to build up dissenters against the establishments, is not mentioned at all. All the Churches were in the toils, and hard times engendered a new generosity of inter-church relations. The CDU coached them in the coded language required in the press – never refer to the ‘godless’ (that is the party badge of honour) – ‘scorners of salvation’ will get by; never use the word Angst (in the official view no-one in the DDR has anything to be anxious about). Privation was eased by the sense of escaping from the ghetto. Alas! national reunion provided an altogether harsher climate for inter-church relations. Thus this book is in many ways an essay in nostalgia; there are signs even of belief in the DDR peace propaganda; altogether a serious problem should the Second Advent be further delayed.

PETERSFIELD

W. R. WARD
This important book will cause scholars of recent Russian church history fundamentally to reappraise a whole series of people and issues which have seemed established history for fifty years. Tatiana Chumachenko shines new light on Stalin’s compromise with the Russian Orthodox Church in 1943 and the next decade up to his death. She provides extensive new information on the Council of Russian Orthodox Church Affairs (CROCA), minutes of which are in the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF), and the role and career of Georgii Grigor’evich Karpov, its first organiser. Then – perhaps even more surprising – there is a reconsideration of received opinion on the opposition of Patriarch Alexi (Simanskii) and Metropolitan Nikolai to the new anti-religious measures which the Soviet government introduced from 1958. After twenty-five years of open persecution by the Bolsheviks, Stalin received the surviving bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Kremlin on 4 September 1943. The concessions he made are conventionally seen as a reward to the Church for its patriotic support in the war against fascism. Chumachenko sees this meeting as the introduction of a new policy, already carefully worked out, to involve the Church in promoting a favourable image of the USSR in post-war Europe. CROCA was to execute this. Karpov and the organisation which he headed until his removal in February 1960 are usually seen as the organ of power through which the KGB exercised its control over the life of the Church. However, Chumachenko argues that the reality was far from that simple. Karpov, despite his own NKVD background, appears as a functionary, yes, but a fair-minded one, who treated Patriarch Alexi with humanity. Perhaps his portrait here is too rosy. Karpov’s lament on his removal from power, retrieved from the archives, is a moving document (pp. 162–3). CROCA did, for fifteen years up to 1958, use its limited powers in an effort to ensure that local anti-religious agencies did not overstep the bounds of legality, but Karpov’s successor, V. A. Kuroedov, knew no restraints in his efforts to liquidate the Church, under the aegis of Nikita Khrushchev. Patriarch Alexi appears in the literature to date as a weak man, powerless either to evade the web which Stalin wove around him or to oppose Khrushchev’s persecution. Letters he wrote to Karpov and minutes of their meetings survive in the archives. This book quotes several examples of his unambiguously defending the rights of the Church, especially when the new persecution began to take effect. Most important, Alexi denounced this in a speech at a reception in the Kremlin in February 1960. Metropolitan Nikolai was a complex character, immensely proud of his role as ‘foreign minister’ of the Russian Orthodox Church. He, too, defended the Church, but the authorities terrorised the Patriarch into dismissing him. The book stops before the death of Nikolai (13 December 1961), a bare week after the end of the Third General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, at which the Russian Orthodox Church had been admitted to membership. Chumachenko’s text makes it all the more likely that Nikolai’s death was (as has long been suspected) an act of murder. The new ‘ecumenical stance’ of the Church was a sham, concealing systematic
violation of religious liberty by the regime. But to have embarked on a study of these new circumstances would have demanded a second book. Chumachenko writes with an objectivity which conceals passion and is well translated.

Keston Institute,

Michael Bourdeaux
Oxford