

permet de saisir de façon très détaillée la représentation de la société que se faisait un Italien de cette époque, les principes qui déterminaient pour lui la hiérarchie sociale (la souillure, notamment) et aussi des idées subversives qu'il pouvait laisser transparaître par son recours à l'humour et au paradoxe.

L'article intitulé « Inventing Braudel's Mountains » nous rappelle fort à propos que les historiens, eux aussi, font preuve de subjectivité. Adoptant un ton délibérément iconoclaste, S. K. Cohn jr. démonte un à un divers lieux communs véhiculés au sujet des sociétés montagnardes, notamment dans l'oeuvre de Fernand Braudel. En se servant de registres fiscaux des Alpes florentines, il note que les habitants des petites communes haut-perchées fuyaient leurs villages non pas pour aller s'établir dans les plaines, et non pas à cause de la dureté de la vie en montagne, mais bien parce que l'oligarchie de Florence voulait leur faire porter un fardeau fiscal injustement élevé. Voilà qui jette un éclairage cru sur le problème des relations entre la ville et la campagne à la fin du Moyen Âge. Les autres articles qui composent la troisième et dernière partie des mélanges tendent également à souligner l'acuité de la question fiscale dans l'administration des villes. Que ce soit en Castille, en Angleterre ou en Italie, des tensions graves divisaient les citoyens à cause de l'impôt et des modalités de son prélèvement. Là encore, les villes qui protestaient au roi de leur trop grande pauvreté employaient ce terme de « pauvreté » sans référence à des critères fixes.

Par l'originalité de leurs démarches, par la diversité de leurs problématiques et de leurs méthodes, par leur désir d'interpréter les faits à travers le regard des contemporains, les chercheurs qui ont contribué à ce recueil témoignent de l'influence toujours stimulante de David Herlihy.

Lucie Larochelle  
Université d'Ottawa

Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts, eds. — *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Pp. xx, 372.

Through a host of articles and reviews and a handful of crucial books, Patrick Collinson has dominated the field of Elizabethan religious history. On the occasion of his 65th birthday, a stellar list of contributors presents a marvellous *Festschrift*. The breadth of the collection reflects Collinson's own interest in anthropological and sociological methods, as well as his core devotion to ecclesiastical history and religious politics. The volume also includes a very useful bibliography of Collinson's writings by Susan Wabuda. While all of the essays are mentioned here, several may be of especial interest to readers of this journal.

Keith Thomas scrubs away some common misconceptions in his piece on "Cleanliness and Godliness". The very early Christian emphasis on internal purity alone and disregard for the cleanliness of the body waged a long argument against the growing association of physical cleanliness and spiritual purity, based on the

idea that the body, as God's vessel, should be kept clean. Puritans thus denounced long hair ("a fit harbour for lice and vermin", p. 63) and perfumes and cosmetics because they simply covered uncleanness. It might be noted that this view extended beyond puritans. Joseph Hall (a bishop) also insisted that "much ornament is no good sign: painting of the face argues an ill complexion of the body, a worse mind." Yet Thomas argues that religious pressures should not be "given sole credit" (p. 66) for changing people's personal habits; preachers still associated vanity or effeminacy with too great a concern with bodily cleanliness. Secular grounds of manners and health were also important. Cleanliness symbolized deference and social distinction as well as industry and good order. It was also a way of overcoming the disgust which was increasingly felt at certain bodily functions. While bathing had generally been seen as a "sensual indulgence or as a medical procedure" (p. 59), and only visible outer garments needed to be clean, by 1800 "clean clothes were no longer regarded as an acceptable substitute for clean bodies" (p. 59).

Anthony Fletcher reassesses "Protestant" ideas of marriage in popular conduct books. In an altercation with some of his "more assertive female parishioners", William Gouge, a puritan preacher, reasserted his "biblical fundamentalism" which told him that at the "heart of the social order was gender order" (p. 167). Patriarchy, for him, continued to be a "fundamental presumption", that is, "an order of creation" (p. 162). The difficulty was to balance the husband's authority with his duties to his wife, the wife's obligations of reverence and obedience with her right to Christian respect and partnership. Fletcher suggests, from recent biblical scholarship, that Paul's epistles set out a "new approach to marriage which would effectively reform the patriarchal structure of his day" (p. 173) in the direction of mutuality. Yet he sees Paul as being "too radical" for the "conservative" seventeenth-century commentators who did "not go by any means all the way with him" (p. 175). Does this presuppose the eternal correctness of a twentieth-century reading of Paul, in the current context of a Christian church under some considerable degree of "gender pressure"? Did seventeenth-century commentators read Paul in this way and then consciously reject his advice? The conduct books took a fairly open, "though functional" approach to (hetero-) sexuality, not stressing procreation, asserting the fundamental importance of sexual relations for good health and as a preservative against adultery, though also warning that "excess" could bring weakness and boredom with one's partner. In all, the approach was "very straightforward, direct and unrepulsive" (p. 177) and "entirely positive" (p. 176), thus cutting through "Augustinian objection to sexual pleasure" (p. 179). Fletcher concludes that this message of "real mutuality in bed if not at board" may well have been a "liberating one for their women readers" and was — *pace* Todd and Davies — "for its time an immense and radical step forward" (p. 179). Here, then, we have a contribution "to the formulation of a particular kind of Protestant consciousness" (p. 180). "Protestant" in the title, though, may be too broad. Almost all of his writers would seem to be Collinsonian "puritans". There is, for example, an absence of anti-Calvinists; did they offer different ideas?

Susan Hardman Moors reasserts the primacy of religious motivation, and espe-

cially a renewed search for purity in the face of popish threats, in English emigration to New England in the 1630s. Analyzing the 79 ministers who decided to leave (1629–1640), Moore notes that overwhelmingly they were settled parish ministers, not sectaries. Although many had been suspended or deprived, there was great difficulty in deciding whether Providence wished them to leave England. The emigration was thus “reactive, a response to pressure” (p. 273). Moore denies the divine mission concept of Miller’s “errand into the wilderness”. Following Collinson’s (later) view that puritanism was indeed part of the Church’s mainstream, Moore asks why such a uniting tendency so quickly turned to “apparent” sectarianism in New England (p. 260). Leaving proved an “unexpected watershed” (p. 261); amid protestations of loyalty, the emigrants undeniably “made daring innovations in religion” (p. 258). The local, voluntary, and consensual structure of New England churches developed as the “antithesis of all they saw as popish in England” (p. 281); these were ways of demonstrating purity rather than wilful schism. Covenants and conversion narratives became ways of binding people, overcoming disappointment, and stabilizing churches. Nonetheless, by the late 1630s highly respected godly ministers in England became critical of the experiment and opposed further emigration. The criticism spurred a strong providentialist defence by emigrant ministers. The problem after 1640 was to prevent mass remigration to England.

In other essays, Mark Greengrass analyzes Nicolas Pithou’s historical account of the French Reformation. The emphasis on the “magisterial” nature of the changes and on the drive for a reformation of manners as well invites interesting comparisons with Collinson’s appraisal of England. Michael Hattaway argues from some Elizabethan plays that by the end of the sixteenth century the figure of the “soldier” had been replaced by the “suspect” figure of the “martialist”. Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*, for example, subjected “both the code and the cult of valour to a probing scrutiny” (p. 86). Peter Roberts argues that the legislation of 1572 against retainers and vagabonds was crucially intended, after the rebellion of 1569, to “curb disorderly elements ... while at the same time enhancing social distinctions and privileges” (p. 45). Only those employed by aristocrats were exempted from the new regulations, which were thus a blow to the self-esteem of gentlemen. Cities and towns, however, could continue to regulate the travelling companies of players and entertainers. An interest in raising standards of minstrels and players is not evident from the debates. Nor do the arguments or voting patterns allow for any “facile generalisation ... about the predilections of Puritans or courtiers on the question of the freedom of movement to be allowed to the travelling entertainers” (p. 40). Lisa Jardine and William Sherman provide an interesting analysis of “pragmatic readers” — scholars who, usually for a “consideration” rather than a “fee”, provided “a highly specific (though not yet institutionally regularised) form of information service for politically involved public figures” (p. 106). Hassell Smith investigates the different ideas of Sir Nicholas and Sir Francis Bacon about their gardens and offers a minute (and usefully diagrammed) reconstruction, especially of Gorhambury, where Sir Nicholas’s stoic philosophy was heavily influential. A brief passage concerning the application of mathematical texts to garden design further redefines “science” for the sixteenth century.

Conrad Russell, John Morrill, and George Yule all write about Anglo-Scottish relations under the early Stuarts. Russell uses his remarkable powers of organization and argument to contrast the success of the union of Scottish and English crowns with the failure of the Spanish-Portuguese experiment. Yet again, Charles compares unfavourably with his father, this time on use of the Scottish bedchamber to hold Scotland for an absentee king. Neither the Scots nor the English saw the breakup of this union as in their interest, the Scots covenanters indeed pushing for new forms of alliances to guarantee old purposes. Morrill argues that the Scots early on wished for further reformation in England because they more readily anticipated regal union. James's 1604 assurance to the Scottish that union of the two nations' churches was "not on the agenda" (p. 214) was genuine; James was rather striving for "congruity" (p. 216). Yet he did become "increasingly sloppy about protecting the autonomy and equality of the two churches" (p. 218). Laud, on the other hand, while not claiming ecclesiastical jurisdiction over either Scotland or Ireland, "did not just advise the Irish hierarchy: he commanded it" (p. 230). He was "far more circumspect" in his dealings with the Scottish church (p. 231). Even Charles rejected "straightforward anglicization" (p. 225), though he did "insist on uniformity of practice" (p. 233). Yule argues that James in both his kingdoms sought and largely achieved broad churches. English churches were redesigned along the lines of "the theological and liturgical insights of James and almost all of his senior bishops" (p. 189). In Scotland, James insisted on changes, most notably perhaps as enshrined in the Five Articles of Perth, yet he was also "at pains to preserve the integrity of the Scottish church" (p. 207). Laud receives no solace from Yule, either.

William Sheils analyzes some West Riding fast sermons delivered on the eve of the Civil War. As discontent increasingly focused on Charles, providence was accounted an ally which might do what the godly of their own accord should not: resist a legitimate (even if ungodly) monarch. While fasts united provinces and parliament, they remained "essentially spiritual exercises to renew the people's covenant with God" (p. 309). Peter Lake continues his Holmesian inferences about the representation and meaning of murder in the seventeenth century, concentrating on the "rather striking amalgam of ... the Puritan conversion narrative and the murder pamphlet" (p. 313). Conversion statements on the scaffold — "suitably coached by their clerical mentors in the distinctive rhetoric and behaviour patterns of the godly" (p. 321) — offered proof of the salvation available to even the most horrible, provided that they were moved to repentance. It would be fascinating to be able to reconstruct execution crowds. Did the ministers involved with the "coaching" put it about that a good lesson was to be had and that the godly especially should attend? Some pamphlets downplayed the crime and placed the murderer's conversion in the context of the broader struggle, pitting God and the godly against the devil and the profane. The pamphlets thus offered an "ongoing dialogue or dialectic" between the perpetually fluid categories of "Puritan" and "popular". William Lamont, finally, examines Collinson's idea of "unitive Protestantism" as it persisted in declarations for a "national" church in 1691 (by Richard Baxter) and in 1829 (by Coleridge). Lamont sees both centripetal and centrifugal

impulses in Baxter. Through his late rediscovery of John Foxe, Baxter came back to the idea of a realizable and acceptable National Church, not wholly pure, and not with a saint on the throne, but still implacably Protestant. He wanted not a diocesan episcopacy but rather a system based on ministerial discipline which would be acceptable even to many Independents. Hypocrites (and of course papists) would still be excluded. Both Baxter and Coleridge saw the pope as the Antichrist but only in the sense of ‘a usurping power of magisterial rights’ (p. 347).

In the preface to *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, Collinson suggested how worn the small ‘p’ of his typewriter must have become after ‘thirteen years of devotion to the Elizabethan puritans’. The rest of us may well reflect, some 30 years later, about the frequency with which we have all typed ‘Collinson’ in our footnotes. David Lodge once facetiously remarked on the influence of T. S. Eliot on our reading of Shakespeare. A tribute to Collinson’s influence on our deconstruction of sources is Lamont’s suggestion that even Richard Baxter must have read his Collinson! Throughout, this collection offers solid research, provocative rethinking, and plentiful good ideas, too: enough both to honour a great scholar and to redefine further the culture of early modern Britain.

John Morgan  
*Ryerson Polytechnic University*

Helen E. Hatton — *The Largest Amount of Good: Quaker Relief in Ireland, 1654–1921*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1993. Pp. xii, 372.

In the 1680s Quakers offered relief to both sides in the Williamite War; and in the 1980s one prominent Quaker family, the Bewleys of Dublin, led a resettlement programme for Irish itinerants and travellers. Between these two terminal decades came the Quakers’ trojan relief efforts in the Irish famine of the 1840s, for which they will be long remembered.

The Quakers were well informed of local conditions in Ireland through observation and reporting by fellow members. They required accurate statistics before committing funds, a precaution that has resulted in the rich archival heritage of documentation used to advantage here by Helen Hatton. A noteworthy finding of this book is the good working relationship between the Irish and English Quakers in relief efforts and fundraising.

The author sets out to chronicle the transition from Quaker persecution in the seventeenth century to an active involvement in the relief of distressed people beyond their own sect, particularly in the 1840s. Surprisingly, most of this relief was unofficial, carried out without formal approval of the ruling body of the Society. Hatton indicates in depth how specific Quaker religious beliefs influenced economic, professional, and business activity.

The central focus of the book is Quaker relief during the Great Famine of the 1840s. Although much of the analysis is predicated on the premise that the famine