BOOK REVIEWS


On the occasion of the eightieth birthday of Gilles Quispel, the nestor of hermetic gnosis, on 30 May 1996, a symposium was held in his honour at the University of Amsterdam. The lectures presented at the symposium by Roelof van den Broek, Peter Kingsley, Jean-Pierre Mahé, Carlos Gilly, and Quispel himself are inserted in this volume, together with eight other articles written by the same authors, for the most part already published elsewhere but for the occasion translated from Dutch into English. The lion’s share (almost 200 pages in total) is made up by six essays written by Quispel, preceded by three scholarly contributions by editor and introducer Van den Broek. The title of this book is somewhat misleading, since diverse articles — especially Quispel’s essays — cover a period protracted until Goethe and Novalis. Nevertheless the volume can be typified as a compendium of scholarly insights in the Egyptian and Hellenistic roots of the gnostic and hermetic tradition in the western culture. In the 1990s new light has been thrown upon the thirteen codices, discovered in Nag Hammadi (Upper Egypt) in 1945, fragments of an early Christian library, which have furnished a treasury of data — among others the Gospel of Thomas — for study on esotericism. Even for outsiders the texts presented in this volume are easy to understand.

Apparently, the hermetic writings — in particular the Asclepius and the Corpus Hermeticum — supply rather contradictory information. That is why, throughout the centuries, many researchers shrugged the quality of such writings. Kingsley, however, makes clear that hermetic texts are deliberately presented in the form of riddles and enigmas. Contradiction could be used more specifically to confuse, provoke, force people back on themselves and — as a preliminary to launching them into a totally new dimension of knowing — make them realize how little they really knew before. The struggle of confronting the riddle was, itself, the initiation. The role of the hermetic teacher was essentially to help the disciple speed up. But until this has been done, the disciple is not able to understand what the teacher is. That is why — for instance, in the dialogue on rebirth — the teacher drives the pupil almost crazy so that he can begin to show him what he really is, the first step to obtain real wisdom. In a second essay Kingsley explains the etymology of the name ‘Poimandros’. True, the name has
come down to us in Hellenistic Greek — in Latin ‘Pimander’ — but no doubt the origin is Egyptian: ‘understanding of Re’ or ‘intelligence of Re’. It referred to Thoth in his role as the creative intelligence of the supreme god.

According to Van den Broek, some texts discovered in the Nag Hammadi Library give clues that in early Christian communities could have existed hermetic groups in which the ‘way of Hermes’ was taught and celebrated in a more or less structured way. For instance, around 300 AD a hermetic hymn from the Poimandres was incorporated into a Christian prayer book, which shows that its content was not offensive to Christian ears. And several elements, as the holy kiss or the kiss of peace and the sacred meal, suggest parallels between early Christian liturgy and hermetic initiation. In his second essay in this volume, Van den Broek comments the hermetic Apocalypse and other Greek predictions of the end of religion. The Greek original of the hermetic Apocalypse, the Logos Teleios, probably has been written in the third century, when the people of Egypt experienced hard times and the traditional religions fell in a general decline, whereas Christianity rapidly increased its number of adherents. In the fourth and early fifth centuries the hermetic Apocalypse was used as a prediction of the end of the pagan religions, not only by Christians like Augustine, but also by adherents of the old religions. The pagan interpretation of Hermes’ prophecy is, that the worship of the living gods of Egypt in their temples would be replaced by that of dead men on their graves, that is to say, by the cult of the Christian martyrs in their memorials. Augustine did not like this interpretation and tried to refute it: not the Christians but the pagans themselves worship dead men as their gods. His pagan opponents apparently admitted that Hermes’ prophecy was being fulfilled by the victory of the Christian church, but they found some comfort in the conviction that their own worship of the gods was by far superior to the Christian cult of the martyrs. It was this cult in particular which was offensive and repulsive to the minds of educated and philosophically trained pagans. A further elaboration of this theme presents Van den Broek in his third essay, titled ‘Hermes and Christ: “Pagan” witnesses to the truth of Christianity’. At the beginning of the past century a restoration project took place in the Walburgis Church in Zutphen (The Netherlands). Vault frescoes representing pre-Christian figures were discovered in the choir, among others Mercurius Hermes, Virgil, and five Sibyls. The maxims belonging to these figures contain statements on Christ as the Son of God, his incarnation and resurrection. These frescoes, painted around 1500, are late offshoots of an age-old tradition going back to the first centuries of the Christian church. According to Van den Broek, these ‘pagan’ prophecies and oracles are only allegedly pagan: in reality they were invented by Christians, or even earlier, by Jews. For instance, the maxim of Hermes Trismegistas in the vault painting in
Zutphen does not originate in Antiquity, but is a pseudo-hermetic creation of the twelfth century. At that time theologians began quoting the *Asclepius* independently to underpin their thesis that the human mind is able to find the truth of even the most essential Christian doctrines without the help of the biblical revelation. For the relation between the Father and the Son, however, a passage from the *Asclepius* was adduced which was not based on an autonomous reading, but for which one depended on the early Christian author Lactantius (ca. 300 AD). In the first centuries the ‘raison d’être’ of the theory of the pre-Christian, pagan witnesses to the truth of Christianity lay in the practice of apologetics. It is questionably whether many pagans were thus won for the cause. Such a theory, however, could only develop and continue to exist if at any rate its apologists saw real correspondences with pagan conceptions. The introduction of the Greek idea of the Logos in Christian theology was effected by men whose thinking was shaped by Middle Platonist patterns of thought. In the second and third centuries Platonizing pagans, Jews and Christians shared much common ground as far as their idea of God was concerned. Lactantius, therefore, could believe sincerely, and also with some justification, that there is no difference between the hermetic and Christian idea of God.

The six contributions written by Quispel cover almost the whole history of Gnosticism, from Hermes Trismegistos until the magic idealism of Novalis, until Marc Chagall and Harry Mulish indeed. The essays are quite personally coloured and permit us therefore to follow Quispel in his continuing quest of insight and truth, in the trials and errors of his research and in his critical self-analysis. It stimulates reflection, to read (p. 231) that the *Asclepius* is a palimpsest, veiling Egyptian magic, and even so titillating is Quispel’s statement that “Novalis was the only one of all German Idealists to synthesize mathematics, music, language, arts, and philosophy as analogous systems, parts of a whole. That whole is magical. Instead of magic one could also say imagination, or creative thinking. And then it becomes clear that Novalis is one of the inaugurators of modernity. But at the same time he is a *magus*. In him the Old Egyptian magic of hermetism emerges again with power. It is a curious paradox that modernity originated in Egyptian magic. But one sees that only if one uncovers the magic lurking behind the Greek surface of the *Asclepius*. And elsewhere (p. 216): “How was it possible that I needed eighty years before I discovered that the basic tenet of Gnosticism, Encratism, and esoteric Judaism originated in Egyptian magic? Which subliminal inhibitions prevented me from seeing this simple truth? And how was it possible that, as far as I know, nobody ever discovered this? No, it is more probable that an inner censor prevented me from noticing what others must have seen long ago”. The Nag Hammadi texts — especially the Gospel of Thomas — inspired him to see Jesus as well as Paulus in a gnostic context.
The bibliographical essays by Mahé and Gilly, last but not least, complete this survey with a reconstruction of the follow up of Gnosticism in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance and under the disciples of Jacob Böhme. It is, no doubt, a useful and surprising book.

Anton van de Sande, Radboud University Nijmegen/Leiden University


Instead of using the standard orthodox formula of “three Persons one essence (or one nature)”, in his treatise On the Holy Trinity Gregory of Nyssa summarizes his trinitarian faith by saying that he believes in “three Persons . . . one Goodness, one Power, one Godhead . . . .” The focus of this book is the exploration of how the language of “one power” or δύναμις can express Gregory’s support of the Nicene faith. In particular, this book looks at Gregory’s employment of the term in his trinitarian theology as the key term to show the unity of the Godhead. The use of the term in the formulation of the doctrine was widely accepted during the early years of the 380s, because “power” is a scripturally based term, and it captures well the specific Nicene doctrine of one nature or essence.

Barnes argues that a study of Gregory’s use of δύναμις in his trinitarian theology must be done in the historical context and not just in the domain of systematic theology or comprehensive studies of the doctrine of the Trinity as it has largely been done nowadays. In order to do so, Barnes traces the use of the term back to the fifth century B.C., to its “technical” use by medical authors before Plato. He maintains that Gregory’s trinitarian theology undoubtedly makes use of philosophy that goes back to Parmenides and Hippocrates. In the Hippocratic writings one can find a sense that a δύναμις is the “distinctive affective capacity (or capacities) of any specific existence”, or “causal capacities that belong to an object because it is specifically what it is . . . .” (p. 29). For Hippocrates the effect of δύναμις is identical with the δύναμις itself, or in other words, a δύναμις acts by manifesting itself, replacing or dominating the previously manifested δύναμις. Furthermore, individual power (or δύναμις) is one of other opposite powers.

In the Platonic philosophy, the idea of δύναμις and Hippocratic causality is transformed into a “theological” term of causality (p. 55). Plato uses the same terminology to explain both psychological and material causality. In the Republic Plato explains different kinds of powers and mentions the Good among them, indicating that Good may be beyond essence, but not beyond δύναμις. This is consistent with Plato’s view of the Cosmic Mind as a δύναμις. According to Barnes, the Republic gives Gregory an insight of
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what kind of cause God is, that he is "a Power in the ontological sense
the medical philosophers gave to power, namely that power belongs to some-
thing insofar as it exists and not simply insofar as it has office" (p. 93).

During the Arian Controversy defenders of the orthodox faith main-
tained that the title δυναμις is rightly attributed to the Second Person of
the Trinity. Athanasius, for instance, insists that δυναμις shows a single
characteristic of God and a title exclusively given to the Son. Following
1 Cor. 1,24, Athanasius explains that God only has one power, and that
power is the Son alone. For the pro-Nicene fathers, "power" in technical
sense is understood in its relation to nature as "the degree and kind of
unity that obtains in an existent between what an existent is and the exis-
tent as it is capable of affecting and being affected, that is, insofar as it is
real or exists" (p. 151).

In order to present a clear view of how Gregory of Nyssa uses δυναμις
in his trinitarian theology, Barnes discusses Gregory side by side with
Eunomius' theology of the Trinity. This is very helpful, considering the fact
that Gregory develops his trinitarian theology partly as a refutation against
Eunomius. Eunomius understands the Son as the product of the Father,
who in turn produces the cosmos. In his Apology Eunomius asserts that it
is ridiculous to attribute the same essence, activity and authority to both
the Father and the Son. Furthermore, for Eunomius, the transcendence of
God means that God cannot generate a product that is of the same exis-
tence as he is. Gregory, in rejecting Eunomius' theology, uses "power" as
expressed in the phrase "transcendent power" as a title of divine nature
and not as a title of the Son. For him, the transcendence of God includes
the capacity to produce. Because this capacity is the δυναμις of the divine
nature, God's kind of existence is actually the kind that he reproduces.

In Against Eunomius Gregory argues that common capacities indicate com-
mon nature. One of the most important common powers of the Father
and the Son is the capacity to create. Whoever has the power to create
has a divine nature. Because the divine Persons share a common power,
they also share a common nature. Thus, according to Gregory, the Trinity
is a simple power, which shares all goods equally and to the same degree.

This book, a revised version of Barnes' doctoral dissertation he wrote at
the University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, gives us an insightful look
at the use of δυναμις not only in Gregory of Nyssa's trinitarian theology,
but also in the history of the use of the term. Barnes convincingly proves
that a study of Gregory's use of δυναμις must be done historically. In so
doing, Barnes has given a significant contribution to the patristic scholar-
ship in general, and the study of the Cappadocian fathers' role in the anti-
arian theology in particular. One disturbing small problem I found in this
book is the exact repetition of a few sentences, including the quotation and
the footnote, of Joseph Moingt's explanation of Tertullian's understanding
of the Trinity as unius potestatis, found on pp. 104 and 150. A more careful editorial work could have avoided such problem.

Yudha Thianto, Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, IL


The Roman Emperor Julian (361-63) earned himself the epithet ‘Apostate’ in Christian literature on account of his efforts to reverse his uncle Constantine’s religious policy. Gregory of Nazianze characterized Julian as an unbalanced man with a restless look, a hysterical laugh, a faltering tongue, an unsteady gait, and a disorderly way of thinking (Orationes 5,23). Others praised him as a sensible, brave and tolerant ruler who wanted to put a stop to the decline of the old values. Rein Ferwerda (an expert on Plotinus and well-known in the Netherlands as a translator of philosophers from antiquity) explains Julian’s religious policy from his personal attraction to mysticism and the supernatural: he did not find harmony and inner devotion in the Christian church, which was torn by conflict, but in the pagan mysteries and in the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus, Porphyry and especially the latter’s pupil and theurgist Iamblichus. Here, Julian saw himself as an autocratic ruler in the sense of Plato’s philosopher as the ideal leader of the just state (Republic, 540b), or as the representative of the sun god Mithras, whose rays shine on all people indiscriminately. Central notions of his new regime were tolerance, freedom of religion, and religious and educational reforms. His decision to rebuild the Jewish temple in Jerusalem was also based on the conviction that every state should obey the divine command to maintain its own identity. Himself an ascete and moralist, in pastoral letters he laid down the moral law to pagan priests.

Ferwerda translated the two hymns Julian wrote in 362 as personal statements of faith and ‘encycicals’ for the pagan clergy. Unlike his lost Kata Galilaiou (362-63) — as he called the Christians in order to emphasize the fact that they had a local creed — Julian did not use these hymns for overt polemics with Christianity.

The Hymn to the Mother of the Gods provides an allegorical explanation of the cruel myth about Cybele’s infatuation with Attis and the latter’s self-castration. In his hymn, Julian demonstrates that man receives the light from above by commending himself to the gods through the mystery rites.

In the exuberant Hymn to King Helios Julian himself figures as Mithras’ chosen disciple and the image of the Roman sun god. Influenced by Iamblichus,
Julian modified the Platonic distinction between the intelligible world and the visible or empirical world by introducing a third, intermediary world: that of the thinking gods, whose sovereign is King Helios. It is he who is represented by the visible sun; Helios is identical to the intellect that enables us to know the truth. There are striking parallels with Christianity and the Mithras cult: Helios has originated from the highest god in the same way as the Word originates from God in the Gospel of St. John; Helios is a mediator in the same way as Christ and Mithras; Helios is one with the gods yet does not fuse with them, in the same way as the Father and the Son form a unity and yet are distinct. Julian's fascination with the sun and the popularity of the Mithras cult could explain why for Julian Helios/Mithras had to take over the role his uncle Constantine had given to Christ.

Both hymns were never really popular. Pico della Mirandola (1463-93) read the Hymn to King Helios with interest. Because of their esoteric, non-Christian nature, the general public continued to regard them as no more than "ephemeral excesses of an unworldly mind" (p. 37).

Concerning the Gods and the Universe (362), with a more sober rhetoric and a more logical argumentation, is ascribed to Julian's Gaulish confidant and statesman Sallust (d. c. 379), who served several emperors as a counselor of integrity. Ferwerda convincingly opposes the view of Di Giuseppe, who published an Italian edition of the work in 2000, and argues that this text is not solely an introduction into Neo-Platonic philosophy but a catechism of or philosophical apologia for the principles of the new religion, a synopsis for the general public, written in the spirit of Julian and Iamblichus shortly after Hymn to the Mother of the Gods, which Sallust used as a source. Similarities with Boethius (d. 524) may indicate that the booklet circulated in Rome, but it certainly was not well-known; if it had been, Christians would surely have destroyed it together with other pagan works.

Especially Ferwerda's translation of Sallust makes interesting reading, constantly presenting remarkable parallels with Jewish and Early Christian ideas, such as for instance: "It is [...] not unlikely that unbelief is a kind of punishment: it is reasonable that those who have known the gods and despised them should in another life be deprived of this knowledge" (XVIII): cf. Rom. 1,21.24.26.28; Eph. 4,17-18. If punishment does not follow "directly on the offence, we must not be surprised, [...] because, since souls survive through eternity, they ought not in a short time to bear all their chastisement, and because there must be human virtue; for if punishments followed directly on offences, men would do right from fear and would not have virtue" (XIX): cf. Luke 16,19-31 and 1 John 4,18. "Souls that have lived in accordance with virtue [...] are in union with the gods and share with them the government of the whole universe" (XXI): cf. Daniel 7,18.27; 2 Tim. 2,12; Rev. 5,10; 20,4,6; 22,5.

Ferwerda's translations are fluent, his introduction is exemplary, the
portrait he sketches of Julian is well-balanced, his annotation and bibliography are sober and clear. An index completes this excellent edition.

Wim Janse, Leiden University/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam


Claudia Tiersch weist jedoch in ihrem Buch auch darauf hin, dass es noch andere Aspekte gibt, die bisher in der Forschung zu wenig beachtet wurden. Jeder Forscher hat immer das störende Faktum einräumen müssen, dass unter den erbittertesten Feinden des Chrysostomus einige der herausragendsten Bischöfe ihrer Zeit zu finden waren. Wie war das möglich? Die Arbeit von Claudia Tiersch knüpft allerdings an frühere Untersuchungen von Kelly, Liebeschütz und Dagron an — in denen Überlegungen zu finden sind, in bezug auf mögliche Gründe der Entmachtung des Johannes Chrysostomus — möchte aber in zwei Punkten das bisherige Forschungsfeld...


H.J. Franzen, Wateringen
This two-volume work presents the proceedings of the eighteenth "settimana europea" organized by the Fondazione Ambrosiana Paolo VI in September 1996, under the direction of R. Aubert and P. van Kessel. The conference had for its theme the religious history of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

In the preface, P. Macchi reminds the reader that the histories of these three countries were often quite divergent, especially in the centuries following the Reformation. Nonetheless, their common social and cultural pasts justify a common treatment of their religious history. The editors do not claim that these volumes are exhaustive: rather, they aim at sketching the "parallel histories" of the three countries. After an introduction by J.A. de Kock, R. Aubert provides the reader with a useful survey clarifying the complex, sometimes divergent, sometimes united, history of the region. Aubert's survey is followed by another twenty contributions, which include both synthetic surveys and detailed analyses.

Following D. Misonne's study, which rehearses the 600-year-long Christianization of the Low Countries, two studies address the medieval history of the region's ecclesiastical life. That of Belgium is covered by J. Pycke, and that of the Netherlands by J. Kuys. The salient details of the region's religious life in the Middle Ages, which became famous through the mystical works of authors such as Hadewijch and Jan Ruusbroec and through spiritual movements such as the devotio moderna, are discussed by G. de Baere. This essay is followed by a detailed study of the devotional character of the late-medieval painting of the Low Countries by B. Ridderbos, focusing on the work of Hugo van der Goes.

The various religious developments during the pivotal period of the Reformation required that the northern and southern Low Countries be handled separately. The evolution in the southern region is summarized in a study on Catholic and Protestant reform from the end of the fourteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth centuries (M.-F. Henneau and J.-P. Massaut). In W. Bergsma's contribution on the northern provinces, emphasis is given to the political and religious motives, which often encouraged reform and revolt, particularly among Anabaptists and Calvinists.

Several studies in this collection focus on particular, if mostly Catholic, issues: the phenomenon of female semi-religious life (virgins and spiritual daughters) (E. Schulte); the crisis of Jansenism in the seventeenth century (M. Lamberigts); religious life in the Catholic church in Holland between 1650-1750, with special attention given to the 1723 schism of the so-called 'Old Catholic' Church (Th. Clemens). The political position of Catholicism below the rivers in the eighteenth century is studied by J. Roegiers in an
article on the “Belgian Church”, the Catholic Enlightenment, and Josephinism, whereas F.R.J. Knetsch surveys the pietistic tendencies in the Reformed Church of the Dutch Republic up to 1795. An additional article deals with the connections between architecture and religious art in the north, especially as these connections are exemplified in the two cathedrals of the city of Haarlem (S. de Blauw).

The history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is addressed almost exclusively via the vicissitudes of the Catholic Church. The dramatic transition from the Ancien régime to modern times which was inaugurated by the French revolution initially produced vastly different contexts for Catholics in the Dutch Republic (P. van Kessel) than it did for those living in what was soon to become Belgium (A. Tihon). The early decades of the nineteenth century saw a brief period of increased unity, beginning in the Napoleonic period and climaxing in the short-lived United Kingdom of the Netherlands (1815-30). G. Hellinghausen’s contribution is the only article on Catholicism in Luxembourg. The evolution of Catholicism from the 19th up through the first half of the twentieth century, with special emphasis on political and social developments, is exhaustively surveyed by R. Aubert (for Belgium) and H. de Valk (for the Netherlands). The collection concludes with detailed accounts of the wide-ranging missionary activities of both Belgian and Dutch missionary societies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (D. Vanysacker) and the contribution of Belgian and Dutch bishops and theologians to the Second Vatican Council (J. Grootaers).

Our most significant criticism of these volumes stems from what the editors have omitted rather than from what they have included: No attention is paid to the development of Protestantism in the Netherlands after 1650. Less glaring are some inconsistencies in detail that apparently escaped the editor’s eye. For example, the reader often encounters different names (French vs. Dutch) being assigned to the same person or geographical location. Thus, “s Hertogenbosch” is used next to “Bois-le-Duc”, and “Rogier van der Weyden” is used along with “Rogier de la Pasture”. Also problematic are some inconsistencies in historical detail. Thus, one author claims that the Reformation period’s first martyrs for the “new faith” were executed in Brussels, while another says that the first martyrs were made in Antwerp.

The collection, although not striving toward comprehensiveness, has achieved its goal of presenting the reader with an informative and coherent collection of articles written by specialists from various disciplines. They all provide a clear and authoritative survey of historical developments, and are quite well informed regarding the present state of research for their various areas. This latter point is confirmed by a perusal of the various bibliographies: All are uniformly excellent.

All in all, we can strongly recommend this collection as one of the best general introductions to the religious history of a region which, while perhaps
not of central import for the development of Christianity in Western Europe, has been, by any account, one of Christendom’s most dynamic and multifaceted areas.

Leo Kenis, Catholic University of Louvain


Father Kieling’s monograph participates simultaneously in at least three recent scholarly developments: an “augmentation exponentielle” of studies of Qohelet; a renewal of interest in Carolingian exegesis; a reassessment of Alkuin’s contribution to Biblical exegesis in the middle ages.

Although Alkuin’s importance as a central intellectual figure in the Carolingian Renaissance has never been seriously questioned, his exegetical work, until recently, has often been dismissed as derivative and unoriginal. In addition, his separate exegetical works are relatively few for a man of his station and century; trained in the rich exegetical tradition of Bede, he had the mission of transmitting that tradition to the continent, yet he left only five derivative and relatively slight works on Genesis, some of the Psalms, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and some of the Pauline letters, along with one far more substantial work on the Gospel of John. A work on Proverbs mentioned in the *Vita Alkuini* is now lost, and several other works sometimes associated with his name are probably not his. Some of his letters also contain exegesis (e.g., 136 to Charlemagne on Luke 22,36 and Matt. 26,52). Although his commentary on Genesis was used by Remigius of Auxerre and translated by Aelfric of Eynsham, the influence of his exegetical work was slight, perhaps because his transparent agenda was insistently reductive: his theological works, dogmatic, liturgical, and moral, all tend to support the vision of Charlemagne as a source of political unity, a Christian monarch whose realms might come to embody the ideal of Christian unity and peace, giving an ecclesiastical coherence that corresponded with the political.

Lately, however, assessments of Alkuin’s exegesis have become more generous, though not unanimously. Father Kieling argues that Alkuin is a central figure for an understanding of Carolingian exegesis, particularly for having conveyed the exegetical legacy associated with Jerome and Gregory the Great. While Kieling abundantly demonstrates Alkuin’s indebtedness to Jerome’s commentary on Ecclesiastes (“An den meisten Stellen ist seine Interpretation mit der Vorlage identisch”), he also insists that the results are sufficiently emancipated from Jerome to be an “eigenständige Leistung”. In the course of his attempt to make a case for this argument, he offers some very useful distinctions about different kinds of anagogical and tropological levels of allegory, but many readers will find that Alkuin’s additions and
subtractions to and from the text of Jerome (*princeps exegetorum*), while more than ornamental, are not substantial enough to earn the abbot of Tours (his contemporary and rival Theodulf conceded only that he was *nostorum gloria vatun*) the right to be considered a rigorously original theologian.¹

Kieling, however, does succeed in accomplishing a number of very useful tasks: he establishes the importance of the library of Tours in Alkuin’s intellectual development; he sets Alkuin’s Commentary on *Ecclesiastes* both in the context of Carolingian exegesis and in the context of earlier medieval commentaries; he examines several manuscripts of Alkuin’s work and of the Bible to determine which version of the Vulgate Alkuin used, and concludes with a three-part section devoted to Alkuin’s theology. In this final section Kieling focuses upon the Christological aspect of Alkuin’s reading of *Kohelet* (*Ecclesiastes noster Christus est*), on Alkuin’s insistence on the superiority of celestial to terrestrial matters, and on his use of the tradition of *contemptus mundi* as a literary and theological topos. At this point Kieling does not take the opportunity to consider the historical, political conditions that must have contributed to creating the abbot’s personal perspective; certainly the tumult of life at court, and the daily chaos and danger against which even monastic life offered only discontinuous protection (see Alkuin’s *De clade Lindisfarneii monasterii*, a poem on the destruction of the monastery at Lindisfarne in 793, for a relentless use of commonplaces associated with *contemptus mundi*) would have provoked some thoughts about the vanity of earthly life in the mind of an early ninth-century cleric.

In addition, although he points out that no other book of the bible has been more variously interpreted, and that both Alkuin and Gregory the Great were uncomfortable with what they recognized as the hedonistic-Epicurean elements in the text, Kieling does not offer more than cursory attention to answering the question why a late eighth-century English aristocrat, who was acquisitive, egotistic, imitative, encyclopedic, sensual, a worldly collector of information, wealth, and friends, who turned towards inwardness late in life, would have selected a text that is so difficult, filled with apparent contradictions, and which continues to generate controversy in the twenty-first century.² Perhaps the aging Alkuin leaves us a clue in his eloquent comments on *Ecclesiastes* 12.5, where his poetic and exegetical powers operate simultaneously on the topic of mortality:

*Floreti amygdaLum, impinguabitur locusta, et dissipabitur capparis, quoniam ibit homo in domum aeternitatis suae, et circuibunt in platea plangentes.* Per metaphoram etiam nunc de membris nostri Ecclesiastis sermo est, quod cum senectus adventaret, capillus incanuerit, intumuerint pedes, libido refiguerit, et homo fuerit dissolutus, tunc revertatur in terram suam aeternitatis suae, ad sepulcrum, exsequiis rite celebratis atque finitis, plangentium in platea circa sepulcrum turba praecedente.

Robert Levine, Boston University
Marie Maussion, Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qoheleth [Orbis biblicus et orientalis 190] (Fribourg/Göttingen, 2003), pp. 5-6, attributes the phrase to Martin Rose, Rien de nouveau: Nouvelles approches de livre de Qoheleth [Orbis biblicus et orientalis 168] (Fribourg/Göttingen, 1999), but does not give the page number.


In addition, although he had been ordained a deacon, no incontrovertible evidence exists that he was ordained to the priesthood or ever took monastic vows.

Eberhard Bons presents the problematic nature of the text succinctly: “Wie kann eine christliche Auslegung dann heute mit einem Buch umgehen, das wegen seiner inhaltlichen Besonderheiten wie ein Fremdkörper im jüdischen wie auch im christlichen Kanon wirkt?’, ‘Das Buch Kohelet in jüdischer und christlicher Interpretation’, in Das Buch Kohelet: Studien zur Struktur, Geschichte, Rezeption und Theologie [Beilage zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 254], ed. Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger (Berlin, 1997), pp. 327-28. On the other hand, Michael V. Fox finds a “reasonably clear message” and argues that the contradictions readers have found “... are real and striking, but they do not submerge the message that rises to the surface over all the philosophical inconsistencies and structural disarray”, in Michael V. Fox, Qohelet and his Contradictions [Bible and Literature Series 18] (Sheffield, 1989), p. 9.


Für jede dieser Handschriften gibt die Autorin eine sehr kurze kodikologische und inhaltliche Zusammenfassung, im Anschluss folgt jeweils die Edition des Kalendariums. In der Synopse werden diese Codices einander gegenübergestellt, die Ergebnisse abschließend in Worte gefasst. In jüngster Zeit sind ähnliche Zusammenstellungen von Kalendarium vor allem von der in Wien beheimateten Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters, die zur Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften gehört, vorgenommen wurden, die sowohl in deren gedruckten Katalogen im Anhang aufge-
führten wurden als auch im Internet (bspw. für die Diözese Passau) zugänglich sind. Dem in Wien gewählten Darstellungsmodus sollte gegenüber der vorliegenden Variante der Vorzug gegeben werden, doch dazu später.


Der Aufbau der vorliegenden Publikation ist geteilt in die Überlieferung der Mainzer und Fuldaer Textzeugen mit der jeweils direkt im Anschluss folgenden Edition des Kalendariums. Der zweite Hauptteil ist die Synopse, gefolgt vom dritten Teil, der Auswertung der einzelnen Kalendarien. 2

Auch im dritten Teil wäre eine optisch bessere Umsetzung der Unterkapitel denkbar gewesen, da der gleichgroße Schriftgrad aller Überschriften ohne zusätzliche numerische oder alphabetische Unterteilung eine Orientierung...


Anette Löffler, Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig

1 www.ocaw.ac.at/ksbm/stb/texte.
2 Dazu gehört natürlich auch noch ein umfangreicher Anhang, der Handschriftenverzeichnis, gedruckte Quellen, Literatur, Handschriftenregister, Heiligenregister und Abbildungen umfasst.


Bei der vorliegenden Monographie handelt es sich um eine an der Universität Genf entstandene Dissertation. Das Buch ist in drei große Komplexe gegliedert. In Teil I umreißt Graf Abbildungen von denjenigen Frauen, die mit


dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig findet sich gleichfalls eine solche Darstellung zu Beginn der Libri decem Almansorzs des Rasis.


Interessant ist auch eine weitere Feststellung, nämlich die, dass Frauen zu Beginn der Niederschrift abgebildet werden, und nicht bei der Fertigstellung. Es stellt sich die Frage, ob hier ganz gezielt ein bestimmtes “Frauenbild” geschaffen werden soll, das diesen passiven Status zum Ausdruck bringen soll.


Dem Betrachter und Leser sollte deshalb auch sein besonderes Augenmerk auf den reichhaltigen Abbildungsteil ganz am Ende dieser Publikation richten.

Anette Löffler, Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig

1 Den Abschluss bilden eine umfangreiche Bibliographie, ein Verzeichnis der Handschriften, ein Bildnachweis sowie ein üppiger, überwiegend farbiger Abbildungsteil.
3 S. 147 und Abb. 61b.
5 Beat Mathias von Scarpatetti (Bearb.), Die Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen, Bd. 1, Abt. IV: Codices 547-669 (Wiesbaden, 2003), bes. S. XVII-XIX.

The articles in this book are largely based on papers delivered at the third Egmond symposium held in 1993. They all address aspects of the great Benedictine abbey in North Holland. The principal theme is the manuscript collection donated by Archbishop Egbert, its consequences for education at the abbey, and later learned activity and manuscript collecting at the same institution.

Egmond's sixteen manuscripts are discussed by J.P. Gumbert. They make up a varied collection, probably presented by the archbishop (together with other gifts such as vestments and a golden cross) between 977 and 993 in gratitude for the education he himself had received at the abbey. The manuscripts include liturgical works, Biblical texts, a collection of sermons by John Chrysostom, a volume of five texts by Augustine, Smaragdus' *Diadema monachorum*, four works on grammar, a volume with two works by Boethius on mathematics and music, and Martianus Capella's compilation on the seven Artes Liberales. The educational books given by Egbert to the abbey allow R.H.F. Hofman to reach some conclusion about the form of teaching that went on there, the traditional trivium and quadrivium, with provisions for children and beginners.

One of the most important works to be produced at the abbey was the Annals of Egmond, a section of which, J.W.J. Burgers argues, was written shortly after 1202 by Allinus, a member of the noble house of Van Haarlem, who acted as chaplain to Count Floris III of Holland. After reconstructing his life, his background and his activity as a historian, Burgers publishes the relevant section of the annals together with a Dutch translation. Finally Gumbert edits, with extensive annotations, the list of books drawn up by the librarian Baldwin between 1526 and 1530, thereby providing an invaluable survey of the abbey's holdings, while H.G.E. Rose studies a further manuscript once in the possession of Egmond, a twelfth-century codex containing the Pauline Epistles now at the Utrecht University Library.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University
The author of this dissertation (Catholic Theological University, Utrecht) is a member of the Congregation of the Passion. It is therefore clear that his investigation into the manner in which Thomas Aquinas relates the passion of Christ to God’s almightiness does not only serve a historical purpose but relates to systematic-theological questions and matters of spiritual life as well. Hoogland combined his research activities as a Ph.D.-student at the Catholic Theological University with pastoral work as a hospital chaplain and in several parishes. One may therefore presume that he approaches his subject-matter with a double set of questions. In the first place, questions about the mode and the structure of Aquinas’s theology. In the second place, questions about the plausibility of Christian faith in the face of human suffering, and about the credibility of the answers that have been given in the Christian tradition. Whereas the second set of questions enlivens the otherwise somewhat dry survey of Aquinas’s theology, it sometimes hinders Hoogland’s argumentation when he engages in polemical discussions with contemporary philosophers and theologians.

The book is divided in four chapters. In the first chapter, Hoogland considers Aquinas’s theological approach to the passio of Christ as a question about God, since he begins his treatment of the passion of Christ in Summa theologiae III, 46–49, by questioning the way in which God was involved in this event. Hoogland is aware that his questions do not coincide with Aquinas’s questions, and therefore he does not give a lectio continua of Aquinas’s argumentation, but deals with selected topics, such as the relation between Christ and God at the cross, the liberating character of his suffering, and the real nature of the passion of Christ. The question as to whether one can talk about Christ as the suffering God forms the link to the second chapter, about the passio of God.

This chapter begins with a contemporary interlocutor, the theologian Eberhard Jungel and his interpretation of Aquinas’s refusal to ascribe passio (suffering, but also passiveness and emotional passion) to God. How does Aquinas’s negative approach fall in line with the Biblical language that characterizes God as a caring, loving person? Hoogland is aware, of course, that most contemporary theologians would support Jungel when he says that the ‘passionless’ God of Aquinas does not do justice to the testimony of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. His strategy for defending Aquinas on this point is twofold. First, in the line of interpretations given by David Burrell and Herwi Rikhof, he shows how Aquinas is a ‘negative theologian’ in that he draws attention to the radical distinction between Creator
and creatures and therefore to the radical limits of human language about God. Words such as ‘perfection’ or ‘simplicity’ do not attribute qualities to God, but show how our language falls short because it always involves complexity and therefore distinction of what in God is one. Second, in the line of some other publications in the series of the Thomas Instituut te Utrecht, he shows how Aquinas is a ‘Scriptural theologian’ in that he takes Scripture as his point of departure and frame of reference. Combining both features, Hoogland sketches how Aquinas talks about the love of God without implying corporeality and imperfection. These are beautiful pages, but they are somehow marred by not entirely convincing arguments with contemporary theologians (Jüngel, but also Sarot).

The third chapter gives an interpretation of what Aquinas means when he talks about the almightiness of God. Hoogland discovers that Aquinas must have had the passion of Christ in mind when writing on the might of God in Summa theologicae I, 25 by tracing some quotations of Scripture that connect the two (notably Luke 1,37): nexus mysteriorum. Again, this shows how Aquinas is both a negative and a Scriptural theologian in his theological synthesis. After some new debates with contemporary theologians (Hartshorne, Van de Beek) and their interpretation of omnipotentia, Hoogland characterizes this word as a word of faith that is connected with the mercy of God and His will to liberate humankind.

The fourth chapter deals with a theme that seems rather odd indeed: the almightiness of Christ. It is, however, a blank spot that has to be filled in after the other fields in this double dyptich: passio of Christ — passio of God // omnipotentia of God — omnipotentia of Christ. There is even a famous pictural tradition for this very idea of Christ almighty: the picture of the Pantokrator. Hoogland goes into some detail in order to show how the idea of Christ almighty can go together with his human suffering, and he comes to the conclusion that Aquinas’s answer to this question is not entirely clear: on the one hand, Christ as a human being has a will of his own, but on the other hand this will cannot but follow the will of God because of the hypostatic union. He summarizes his results in the title of his concluding paragraph: “Christ, the Loving Beloved: Two Wills, One Power”. This is quite nicely put together, but it does not seem to give a real answer to the second set of questions about plausibility and credibility.

Maybe this is the reason why Hoogland does not only sum up his findings in the general conclusion of the book, but also announces some further inquiry in a new context, into the nexus mysteriorum between the mystery of God and Christ and a Christian life that is characterized by faith, hope, prayer and the sacraments. One needs a lifetime indeed to answer questions as laden as these.

Pim Valkenberg, Radboud University of Nijmegen

Anyone who wishes to get acquainted with John Duns Scotus' thought on a more advanced, but not too detailed level, is well served by the publication of this book in the Cambridge Companions to Philosophy series. The cover of the volume informs us that the series is directed to students and non-specialists. As with the other volumes published so far, cover and layout are very attractive.

The contributions in the present volume are preceded by an overview of English translations of texts by Scotus (most of these translations are by A.B. Wolter). The book contains various helpful indices: one on places in Scotus' works, one on persons, and one on topics (unfortunately, 'evidence' — quite important in Scotus — is absent). In many contributions we find a comparison between Scotus' views and modern ones.

The volume consists of an introductory chapter followed by twelve contributions. They cover the principal subjects of Scotus' works. Perhaps an extra chapter could have been devoted to Scotus' notion of science as such, with its emphasis on occurrences in nature. The introductory contribution, written by the editor, presents Scotus' life and works. As often with medieval thinkers, it is not easy to build a reliable picture of their career. Williams presents Scotus' life and chronology in a clear and lively way. A good understanding of Scotus' life helps us to appreciate the chronology and nature of his works. Williams reacts to a traditional view, initiated by C.K. Brampton (in an article from 1964), asserting that Scotus must have followed a typical university course leading to his professorship (p. 3). Apart from his early commentaries of logical works of Aristotle, the situation of his works is very complex. The Ordinatio commentary on the Sentences is usually taken as the main source of information on Scotus' thought, but opinions differ on the exact date of its composition. Nor is his Commentary (questions) on the Metaphysics composed within a single period.

The authenticity of Scotus' works poses a special problem. Many of the works attributed to him (notably in the edition Wadding-Vives of 1639), have been proved to be composed by pupils. But problems still remain. For instance, the Octo questiones is not mentioned in the introduction, but in his paper, Calvin Normore considers it as probably authentic (p. 156, n. 2).

In the first contribution, 'Scotus on Metaphysics', Peter King discusses Scotus' metaphysics under six headings, in which fundamental issues emerge such as identity and distinction, as well as Scotus' handling of Aristotelian notions of form and matter. King refers to other contributions in the volume for the discussion of other metaphysical problems (for instance, Scotus' proof of God's existence, examined in chapter 6). In section 3, King dis-
cusses Scotus' view on the concept of being as univocal and analogous. His univocal concept of being leads to the unwelcome consequence that Scotus could be accused of pantheism (p. 21). On p. 19, King refers to Scotus' notion of *differentia ultimata*, of which Scotus seems to have two sets in mind, but of which he does not give clear examples.

Chapter II, written by Neil Lewis, is called 'Space and Time'. Scotus himself does not write much about these concepts. In consequence, some Scotists wrote systematic treatises on special issues. William of Alnwick, for example, wrote on the existence, ontological status and unity of time (edited by Guido Alliney, Firenze 2002). Lewis confronts Scotus' ideas with modern day views such as Richard Dedekind's (c. 1900). One of the most important conclusions is that Scotus conceives of time as separate from things, in contrast to the Aristotelian tradition before him. Scotus was in discussion with Aquinas and defined potential being as not necessarily present to God.

In chapter III, Noone discusses Scotus' notions of the universal and the individual. He notes that Scotus' influence in the history of philosophy is important and well known. No one prefers to discuss these notions in a more systematical context, comparing them with contemporary interpretations like those of Aquinas, Godfrey of Fontaines, Henry of Ghent, Roger Marston and others.

Calvin Normore takes up a cluster of problems around Scotus' modal theory (chapter 4). He emphasizes that sketching the development of Scotus on modal theory is not yet possible, given the present state of research. The notion of the contingency of the present is among Scotus' most important contributions (p. 130). Interesting is Normore's discussion with Knuuttila (p. 157, n. 3) about the synchronic picture of modality. Scotus separates time from modality (p. 156).

In chapter V, Dominik Perler presents Scotus theory of language. Scotus considered linguistic theory important, though he never he never seems to have written a handbook on language and logic (p. 161). This is a prerequisite for the understanding of theology; for instance, when it is said that God is God, one should be able to understand what a term is. The reverse is also true: a thorough understanding of theological problems is necessary to understand semantics.

Perler makes it clear that in Scotus, philosophy of language and linguistic analysis go hand in hand. Scotus' early work, a commentary (questions) on Aristotle's *Perihermeneias*, is an important source of information. Scotus' followers such as Antonius Andreas, were well aware of this (p. 188, n. 2). Scotus has written two versions of this commentary. One wonders if we are seeing a development of his thought here, for instance concerning the *res verbi* belonging to 'est'; this is elaborated in version II, where Scotus says that the primary meaning of 'est' is to denote the act of predication. Quite interestingly, Perler compares Scotus' views with those of Locke, Rorty and Putnam.
In Chapter VI, James Ross and Todd Bates discuss Scotus' natural theology. Somewhat surprising is the way they compare Scotus' proof of God's existence to that of Anselm of Canterbury. The latter is not really apriori, they maintain, whereas others would say that Scotus has refreshed Anselm's proof and uses the same approach. The authors' criticism on Scotus from a modern point of view is interesting.

William Mann discusses Scotus' view on Natural and Supernatural knowledge of God (in chapter VII). According to our natural knowledge, we can know that God exists, which does not imply that we comprehend all of God (p. 252); supernatural knowledge is also necessary. Scotus explains that supernatural knowledge is imperfect at first, so that a human being can gradually become disposed to it. Two short notes: in the translation on p. 149, last line, after 'but', the word 'intention' is missing. In the notes 5, 4, 11, etc., pars and d. (= distinctio) are reversed.

In chapter VIII, Richard Cross presents a penetrating discussion of Scotus' philosophy of mind. The contribution is systematic, contains a discussion with other scholars, and explains Scotus' criticism of Aquinas and Henry of Ghent. One of the conclusions is that Scotus denies the identification of simplicity and unity (p. 273).

Robert Pasnau discusses a related subject, viz. Scotus' theory of cognition (chapter IX). According to Pasnau, Scotus is not so much an innovator of theory of knowledge, but presents a more detailed analysis (p. 285). Like Cross, he discusses Scotus' opposition to Aquinas and Henry of Ghent — it would be a good idea to devote another Cambridge Companion to Henry, an important and influential thinker, many of whose works are now available in a modern edition. The distinction between intuitive and abstractive knowledge is pivotal. This is the distinction between knowledge of something existent, and knowledge of something in as much as it abstracts from existence. Pasnau critically analyses Scotus' conceptions on this point, and points out to what extent Scotus is unoriginal. The distinction between the two kinds of knowledge nevertheless dominates in the fourteenth century. In Scotus' view, an analysis of the knowledge of angels is very important for our understanding of human knowledge.

Chapters X-XII are about ethics. In the first chapter, Möhle explains that Scotus' novelty in ethics is not that he is a voluntarist in any strict sense, but that he assigns a greater role to the judgment of reason than to the natural goal-directedness of a purposeful action. Scotus does not refer to a teleologically-interpreted nature of some agent (p. 323). Scotus' position differs here from that of his predecessors. In chapter XI, Scotus' ethics is discussed against the background of the transcendental terms being and good. Traditionally, Williams explains, being is related to good by participation (a Platonist device), or in nature. Aquinas combines the two, but Scotus dismantles them. He separates appetite from the good (cf. Möhle's paper). A note on Williams' interpretation of Scotus'
text on p. 336 (Ordinatio, Prologus, pars 1, qu. un. N. 14): Scotus gives two alternatives (marked by either ... or). The first is about cognition of the separated substances; the second is about the erring capacity of natural reason. Scotus criticizes the second, and points out that supernatural knowledge is necessary, but he cannot object to the first, I think. Another note: in William's paper, I missed the essential part played by theology as a practical science, as a criterion for our actions, for its first object, God, is virtually (as Scotus says in Ordinatio, prologus, pars 5, q. 1-2, § 314) in conformity to a right will.

In the final chapter (XII), with the title 'Rethinking Moral Dispositions: Scotus on the Virtues', Bonnie Kent investigates the subtle doctor's view of the virtues, a subject of which she rightly notes that it has not yet been investigated in much detail. Scotus' main point is the disentanglement of the unity of the virtues.

In sum, this Companion is a well-balanced introduction to Scotus for a reader wishing to penetrate more deeply into Scotus' thought than elementary handbooks allow. The authors do not intend to exhaustively discuss all existing literature about any one subject. The main divergences of the various interpretations come forward and invite further study of this critical and constructive genius of medieval thought.

E.P. Bos, Leiden University


Everyone knows there was a papal schism from 1378 to 1417, with pope in Rome, another in Avignon, and from 1409 a third made in Pisa — until the council of Constance swept them all away and put a new single one back in Rome. What no one knows is how the Church survived. 1378 marked the peak of long process of centralization: appointments, justice, finance, all the sinews of church power had been gathered into the Roman curia as it called itself, although it had resided since 1316 at Avignon, a European crossroads chosen partly for this very reason. Then the centre split. When the same happened in contemporary royal and civic governments (for some of the same reasons) it brought bloodshed and civil war; in the Church, not. For those who cared, it brought scandal and inconvenience, for those who did not, opportunities for mischief, which scattered a few flecks of bloodshed round the Church's political edges. But away from these, what the Schism years produced was, with much else in the same spirit, The Imitation of Christ.
An explanation of this survival invites massive research, beyond even the monumental contributions made to it over the last century. The present book gives the measure of the task. It is itself monumental, yet addresses just one diocese, in seven isolated years picked as samples from the thirty-seven of the Schism; and within these limits it deals only with those aspects of church life mentioned in official documents, that is, mainly, correspondence to and from the curias of the various popes, or (in a few cases) of lower prelates and secular authorities.

Having begun, in Part I, with a description of the political and ecclesiastical geography of her diocese, the author goes on in Part II to make a thorough survey of these sources. Any of her three chapters on the subject could be recommended as an introduction, in respect of Cambrai or anywhere else. (The second, in particular, gives a valuable account of the survivals and losses of papal registers.) Part III then turns to the content of the registers and related collections, as they touch Cambrai in the sample years. The documents in question total more than ten thousand. Seven chapters wring out all they will reveal of persons and corporations in the diocese who dealt with one or other papacy: their numbers (more than 2,600 individuals, and forty-nine groups), ages, statuses, levels of wealth and education, functions and inter-relationships (familial or otherwise).

It is no slight to this meticulous prosopography to say it yields few surprises. Three-quarters of its subjects are clergy. Nearly eighteen per cent of these (though almost none — this is a surprise — among papal chaplains) have a university qualification. Top jobs in the service of papal, episcopal, or princely courts go almost exclusively to graduates in law, not theologians or mere ‘BA’s’ (the commonest class for all that). As for the law itself, dispensations are forever bending it opportunely to circumstance: to let a noble teenager be a bishop, or a scholar hold pastoral benefices in absentia. And so on. This massive analysis, with its tables and percentages, give us a comforting reassurance that we need not tear up all we knew about the system — comforting, not least, because the system was very complicated and would take a lot of re-learning.

Surprises, however, begin in another area, dealt with mainly but not exclusively in Part III: the stresses brought into the system by the fact of papal schism. The diocese of Cambrai is their ideal testing-ground. Its elongated geography — a sort of 200-kilometre-long Britain, melting and falling castwards — plonked it across most other frontiers (not the Scheldt, northern boundary of the diocese). The bishop of Cambrai, also count of the surrounding Cambrésis, was a vassal of the German Emperor. Ecclesiastically, he was under the archbishop of Rheims. His diocese included substantial parts of Flanders, theoretically under the French crown, and also of Hainault and Brabant, theoretically under the German. In practice, precisely in these years, all three provinces were becoming jigsaw pieces in the quasi-independent Valois duchy of Burgundy. Finally, as if indifferent to all other
boundaries — natural, political, or ecclesiastical — the linguistic one ran straight across the diocese.

Churchmen of all ranks, confronted by the Schism, therefore had plenty of earthly loyalties to tug on them, in addition to any heavenly loyalties the canonical issues of the Schism might propose. Downward gravity is a leitmotiv of the sources, prudence normally more conspicuous than heroism (except, perhaps, in the one or two papal legates sent out on both sides, with orders all but impossible to obey). Far from being a blemish, this prudence in the here-and-now was a factor for stability, and half answers our original question. Over much of the period, for instance, Cambrai had two functionaries claiming to run the bishopric. But they did not fight it out. The Urbanist one cowered in the north, among sympathetic towns like Antwerp and Malines, while the Clementine bishop had Cambrai to himself, together with most of the big southern bulk of the diocese. In this Avignon majority the documents reveal very few crises of conscience, except briefly in 1398 and in 1403, when orders came from Paris to withdraw, then restore, allegiance to Benedict XIII: how could they say one day that he was pope, the next, that he was not — and vice versa?

If many more of these documents relate to Avignon than to Rome, that partly reflects the loyalty of that southern bulk of the diocese. But it reflects something else too, not peculiar to Cambrai. Guillemain's study of Avignon finances during the Schism showed that one reason Avignon held its own against Rome after 1378 was financial inertia. Sixty years had taught papal collectors where to bring their money. The documents in this book draw attention to a second element of inertia: staff. Over the same sixty years, job-seekers from the Middle Kingdom had learned the roads to Avignon, which found it easier to recruit. So hard was it turn the swollen machine back on to its old track.

Within the northern diocese, meanwhile, what we see is something like two embryonic two national churches, though without the hard edges a mature nation state would have given them, and a papally-based system still theoretically in place (to the disappointment of some local collators, who had mistakenly hoped a weakening of papal authority would give them back their rights of appointment). The soft edges of the two obediences rubbed against each other along a broad no-man's-land, running over Brussels — a town itself not untypical in having townsmen and clergy leaning in different directions. A Roman tax-collector might try shaking his bowl south of the boundary, and have to negotiate his way out of difficulties (the intrepid Jacques Dardani was imprisoned); and vice versa. Each side flung rude words like 'schismatic' over the frontier. Urban VI characteristically (his character was half the problem) began his campaign by telling his legate in Flanders to have recalcitrants burned. He was out of touch. Nothing like this happened. The worst violence as we come across is an overspill from an irrelevant dispute in neighbouring Liège, while, within
the diocese, we find occasional violence at a disputed election, as at Malines, but no more than was common in northern Europe in this autumn of the Middle Ages, with or without a papal schism. The impression these documents leave is one less of violence than of pragmatism, a pragmatism encouraged, it goes without saying, by the dictates of lay princes, to the point of warning any churchmen who trumpeted the big issues — notably friars — to keep quiet or suffer for it.

Pragmatism, then, but with conscience only in hiding, not dead. When the count of Flanders finally forced the Antwerp canons to obey Avignon’s bishop of Cambrai, the canons said they would, but would maintain neutralitas on whether Avignon had the true pope. That kind of contradiction was not uncommon. The enduring unease of the diocese’s conscience before 1409 is best witnessed by the alacrity with which almost everyone in it accepted the council of Pisa, dropping their previous allegiances and rushing to take appeals, new cases, and confirmation of offices long held on imperfect title, to Alexander V and John XXIII. That their own bishop, Pierre d’Ailly (bishop of Cambrai from 1397 to 1411), had been an architect of the council may explain some of the alacrity. But he was not leading the unwilling. The mind of the diocese, with its towns and religious houses, took naturally to conciliarism, when it came, and the Pisan popes found no more supportive constituency.

For one reviewer at least, these are some of the important themes to be read between the lines of this awe-inspiring, monumental survey.

Alexander Murray, University College, Oxford


Irena Backus’s investigation of the relationship between historical method and confessional identity represents the culmination of nearly two decades of research on the place of the writings and writers of the early Christian church in the late medieval and early modern West. This line of inquiry has already yielded a number of significant studies, including a groundbreaking anthology of secondary studies on the reception of the Fathers, edited by Backus in 1997 (The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists, 2 vols., E.J. Brill, Leiden/New York/Köln). The present work builds on these earlier findings and argues for a revision — indeed, a reversal — of the dominant trend in understanding the attitudes toward history and the role of the past among sixteenth- and seventeenth-century confessional writers. Specifically, Backus challenges the basic thesis concerning the use of history in the sixteenth-century religious controversies advanced in 1932 by Pontien Polman in his L’élément historique
dans la controverse religieuse de 16e siècle (J. Duculot, Gembloux 1932). According to Backus, the as yet unquestioned assumption of Polman’s study is that “during the Reformation, history was put at the service of religious controversy” (p. 2). In other words, the religious writers of all confessions had no interest in the past for its own sake. Instead, according to this view, polemical considerations drove them to take recourse in historical argument, even when this required Protestants to mitigate their claim to the sole authority of Scripture and forced Roman Catholics to focus on defending the rootedness of their doctrines and practices in the past, removing them from the “living Church” (p. 3).

While not denying the significance of religious controversy, Backus proposes to reassess the role of history in it, arguing that an abiding interest in history was already manifest in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and that this existing interest presented itself as the natural means by which theologians of all confessions could affirm and advance their beliefs. She pursues this argument over the course of six chapters, examining the issue of historical reception in different figures and writings from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. The chapters represent a series of quasi-independent investigations, some of which build upon the author’s previous research. Like the sides of a prism, each chapter approaches the general topic of the use of history from a distinct angle, focusing on a particular question or issue: the reception of Augustine (chapter 1); the balance of pagan and Christian tradition (chapter 2); the character of editions of patristic writings (chapter 3); guides for reading the Fathers (chapter 4); use of New Testament Apocrypha (chapter 5); and histories of the early church (chapter 6). The chapters are linked by a common method, namely, close analysis of select primary texts, chosen to represent different confessional approaches and functioning as case studies illustrating the topic and testing the thesis.

The use of an extremely broad array of primary writings and the cross-confessional comparison constitute two of the major strengths of Backus’s study. When one is confronted with the details and the diversity of approaches as they are painstakingly presented, one cannot help but be convinced of the difficulty of formulating generalizations about Protestant or Roman Catholic attitudes toward the past or about the influences shaping these attitudes. Backus clearly succeeds in demonstrating that all of the writers she examines engaged the past and that they did so in such diverse and sometimes startlingly creative fashion. However, the task of disengaging the recourse to history from polemical interests and demonstrating that religious controversy was not the dominant reason for interest in the Christian past is a little more difficult to finesse. Backus concedes that both Protestant reformers and their adversaries constructed and expressed their confessional identity through historical argument (p. 61) and that religious controversy acted as a spur to produce learned editions of the Fathers (p. 130). Yet
she insists that the recourse to the past was too varied and too positive to be driven more by polemical concerns than by a conviction that the past writings provided "a genuine source of inspiration" for present confessional stances (p. 194) or that "the past could provide the answer to many theological problems of [the] era" (p. 338). Since, however, the need to define and defend one's confessional stance was at least an implicitly polemical task, and likewise many of the era's theological problems had their roots in religious controversy, it was hard for me to be completely won over by this aspect of the argument. I was convinced that theologians' use of the past cannot be explained simply as a fight over the Fathers, and that in some instances this concern was not as prominent as in others. Yet I do not see why the creativity and positive nature of the uses of the past uncovered by Backus would necessarily be diminished if it were the case that the dominant factor driving these tasks, at least in some instances, was apologetic. The central point, it seems to me, is that it is misleading to reduce these varied uses of the past simply to apologetic or polemical factors and, moreover, to view the recourse to the past as inconsistent with the principle of sola Scriptura. That may be, in fact, all that Backus is arguing, as she successfully articulates more precisely the complex role of religious controversy in shaping study of the past and expressing confessional identity.

The attention I have given thus far to the over-arching thesis of this book should not overshadow the significance of contributions to more specialized fields made by the individual chapters. First, chapter one's analysis of the use of Augustine in medieval and sixteenth-century treatises on the church challenges some recent and widely-accepted notions about the nature of late medieval Augustinianism. Second, chapter two's discussion of Calvin's anthropology provokes new ways of thinking about his relationship to classical philosophy. Third, the treatments of patristic writings examined in chapters three, four, and six contribute to the rising interest in the reception of the Fathers and the origin of patristic studies, areas in which Backus has already laid much of the current scholarly foundation. Finally, more broadly, the study is also suggestive for the topic of confessionalization.

This is a worthy and welcome addition to Brill's series on late medieval and reformation thought, though the book is not without its minor problems. In my view, the benefits of the "case-study" approach far outweigh its drawbacks, namely, the fact that the overall presentation is at times disjointed and that the close scrutiny of details — however significant — often causes one to lose sight of the larger picture. More seriously, one wishes that the publisher had been more careful in copy-editing and proofreading, especially in the case of such a pricey volume. There are many missing possessive apostrophes, a number of curiously placed commas, some inconsistencies in capitalization (especially for the terms "protestant" and "medieval") and spelling (mediaeval and medieval), and other stylistic incon-
sistencies (e.g., format of dates, and citing of Calvin’s *Institutes* sometimes with Arabic and sometimes with Roman numerals).

Barbara Pitkin, Stanford University


In ‘Bob Scribner: A Personal Reflection’, her evocative and touching portrait of the late Professor Scribner at the beginning of this book, Lyndal Roper summarizes the conversations in which Scribner explained to her his new interpretation of the Reformation. Essential to it was ‘popular piety’, difficult to define but nevertheless characterized on the one hand by the countless Catholic beliefs and customs which continued to appear among the humbler German Protestants for centuries after Luther’s break with Rome, and on the other by certain new modifications of old habits which can only be accounted for by the Reformation.

Despite the dates in the title of this book, the fourteen articles (one of which is published for the first time) are about the German Reformation, and therefore the sixteenth century, with no more than an occasional glance at future developments but with more than a look into the past. They touch on most of the themes familiar to readers of Scribner’s other works — the importance of visual images, the use of magic, the very definition of ‘popular culture’ — and they bring out admirably the cautious but at the same time questioning approach which led Scribner to reject many of the more hackneyed theories about the Reformation and its results.

One of these is the idea of the Reformation as the trigger of a revolutionary and irreversible change in the social lives of those it affected. It is with this approach in mind that Scribner shows so convincingly the continuity of earlier beliefs. In some cases they were undoubtedly modified. Scribner refers to the “scripturally based” spells and charms” that “had come to constitute what was, in effect, a Protestant form of magic”. Yet Luther, and his later followers, believed as strongly as their forefathers in the Devil and in miracles. Even if the traditional cult of the saints and the worship of relics were abolished, new saints emerged, such as Thomas Müntzer, whose remains were “revered as holy for some years after his execution”.

Scribner is highly sceptical about the attribution of the Reformation to a widely shared anticlericalism. The prevalent attitude to the clergy in the 1520s was, he argues, deferential. Luther owed much of his success to the fact that he was seen “as a friar bringing the Bible to the people”, one of
the virtuous representatives of the clergy. The Reformation, writes Scribner, "was not precipitated by laymen from outside the ecclesiastical and social establishment, but from within, by the clergy". What anticlericalism there was was often no more than a mood whipped up by secular authorities eager to obtain clerical property and to press through the reforms which would enable them to do so.

Students of the radical Reformation will be particularly pleased by 'Practical Utopia: Pre-modern communism and the Reformation', a survey of the various forms of communism attributed to the different Anabaptist movements. The charge that most horrified contemporaries was community of women. Scribner shows, however, that, with a very few exceptions of which the Anabaptist kingdom of Münster is the most striking, there was little substance to this increasingly common accusation. Community of property, on the other hand, was indeed experimented by various groups of Anabaptists in various contexts. A firm belief in the imminent end of the world undoubtedly prompted some of the Anabaptists to surrender their property to common use. Yet the case of the Hutterites, the longest and most successful Anabaptist attempt to implement communism, was the result of far more complex causes. It was influenced, says Scribner, by a gamut of emotions such as anxiety, despair, an optimistic belief in a better future, or simply a deep sense of dedication to the community. But it was also dependent on historical circumstances. It was, in Scribner's words, "a practical experiment which simply could not outlast the specific historical conditions that allowed it temporarily to flourish for three generations as a real social alternative while inspiring thousands of Germans to trek over many, many miles to see, to experience, and to decide for themselves".

In 'Witchcraft and judgement in Reformation Germany' Scribner challenges the standard vision of the witch trials as the outcome of deep fears and anxieties in the community which brought about the apparent discovery of a vast conspiracy of evil inevitably ending in the burning of an all but defenseless victim. Scribner concludes that the reality of the trials was infinitely more complex. There were personal tensions inside the villages where the trials took place. There was a power struggle between the laity and the clergy for the control of sacred power, and there was a struggle between the citizens and the officials about the use, or abuse, of bureaucratic power. He rightly observes that charges could not be made with impunity, and that the accused could, and frequently did, respond with appeals which might end in the incrimination of the accuser or the magistrate — a feature common to so many of the trials of the Spanish Inquisition.

The last piece in this book, 'The Reformation, popular magic, and the "disenchantment of the world"', ends, appropriately enough, with a persuasive and perceptive dismissal of Max Weber, "a prime example of the ways in which nineteenth-century concerns were projected onto historical
understanding of religion in the Reformation”. Weber’s ‘Protestant ethic’ “was an insight arrived at less from historical research and more from observations of nineteenth-century Protestant behaviour, which he then projected backwards in time in a classic example of the ‘regressive method’”. Even if historians of the Reformation may not agree with everything that Scribner says, they would be well advised to read the articles contained in this book.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University


“Art and serene patience could no further go. Yet this was the manner and method of the artist in all his work. He built with the patience and success of the coral insect” (J.E.G. de Montmorency, Thomas à Kempis: His Age and Book, 1906, facsimile 1970). This quotation at the start of Dr. Becker’s doctoral dissertation for the University of Wales, Lampeter, applies not only to the author of De imitatio Christi, but also to Dr. Becker himself. The core of his study is the juxtaposition of the full Latin text of The Imitation and of corresponding fragments from the Vulgate version of the Bible, with the intention to show the interface between them (pp. 257-726), supplemented with an exhaustive ‘Index of Scriptural Sources’ on The Imitation (pp. 727-63). Words or phrases in the Imitation text “that are identical with, or closely similar to” (p. 257) words in the Vulgate text are printed in large font and are indicated by signs in the corresponding Vulgate text, which is quoted at great length. Imitation text not associated with biblical sources is given in small type.

Skimming through the nearly 500 pp. ‘Juxtaposed Texts’ section, one is at first impressed by the fact that very little Imitation text in small print is left. Consequently, the author of The Imitation shows a familiarity with biblical language that is in inverse proportion to this small corpus of non-associated text. This of course is common knowledge. At second sight, however, one cannot escape the impression that Dr. Becker has seen many “quotations”, “sources”, “references”, and “echoes” where the interface is open to question. The author, to be sure, is aware of his subjectivity: “Towards the limits [...] are ‘probable’, ‘possible’, ‘plausible’ and ‘just plausible’ cases, the acceptance or rejection of the latter perforce being subject to an element of personal opinion” (p. 156). Even so, he presents no fewer than 3,815 Vulgate ‘source texts’, whereas for instance M.J. Pohl in his 1904 edition
lists only 1,132 Biblical citations. Becker, however, has collated some 2,600 other sources from seventy editions of *The Imitation*, and in addition has identified some 1,200 new sources by using concordances and free scanning of the *Imitation* text. To that end he has developed an intricate but because of its ingenuousness also labyrinthine ‘Classification Scheme’ (pp. 136-38), partly borrowing the classification terminology from recent works on Celtic religiosity, partly coining new terms for certain forms of usage himself. This classification causes confusion. Contrary to the current categorization in four types (quotation, paraphrase, allusion, and reminiscence), Becker distinguishes some 50 (!) forms of usage, but without defining them: “The nature of most of these forms of usage will be self-explanatory”, p. 135; cf. p. 167: “Detailed analysis of the use of individual forms of usage awaits further research”. At the same time, he reduces these nearly 50 classes to two: “Of the total of 3815 sources [...] about one half can be classed as quotations of various degrees of modification [...] and one half as echoes of varying intensities of ‘resonance’” (p. 167). Slightly further down, all references are again called ‘quotations’ or ‘sources’ (p. 173f.). Consistency is a long way off here.

The application of this classification scheme produces surprising, but frequently far-fetched references. As regards the latter a few examples suffice:

- *Ex frequenti auditu evangelii* at 1.1.5 (“Sed contingit quod multi ex frequenti auditu evangelii parvum desiderium sentiunt: quia spiritum Christi non habent”) is presented as a reference to Lob 16:2 (“audiui frequenter talia, consolatores onerosi omnes vos estis”) and to Act 15:7 (“per os meum audire gentes verbum evangelii et credere”).
- *Lc 2:50* (“et ipsi non intellexerunt verbum quod locutus est ad illos”) is listed as source for 1.1.6 (“Qui autem vult plene et sapide Christi verba intellegere”).
- 1.1.8 (“Vere alta verba non faciunt sanctum et iustum: sed virtuosa vita efficit Deo carum”) is interpreted as a reference to Act 10:35 (“sed in omni gente qui timet eum et operatur iustitiam acceptus est illi”), whereas an echo, as regards content, to Iac 1:26s. seems more plausible: “si quis autem putat se religiosum esse, non refrenans linguam suam sed seducens cor suum, huius vana est religio; religio munda et immaculata apud Deum et Patrem haec est visitare pupillos et viduas in tribulatione eorum, immaculatum se custodire ab hoc saeculo”.
- The source of 1.2.19 (“Omnes fragiles sumus”) is said to be Gn 8:21 (“sensus enim et cogitatio humani cordis in malum prona sunt ab adolescentia sua”).
- The phrase *in principio* at 1.11.18 (“Si modicam violentiam faceremus in principio: tunc postea cuncta possemus facere cum levitate et gaudio”) (also at 1.11.21, 1.13.23, 1.13.25, 1.18.18, 1.20.27, and 4.15.4) is listed as a “quotation” (cf. pp. 136 and 141) from Gn 1:1 (“In principio creavit
Deus caelum et terram”) and Io 1,1 ("In principio erat Verbum"). In 1.11.18 and 1.20.27, however, “in principio” is just the opposite of “postea” and has nothing to do with ‘the beginning’ of the first chapters of Genesis and John; likewise, in 1.13.25 and 4.15.4 “in principio” is opposed to “in fine”.

Tu scis at 1.21.10 ("Si tu scis homines dimittere: ipsi bene te dimittent tua facta facere") is classified as a “quotation” (p. 180) from Io 21:7 ("Domine tu omnia scis tu scis quia amo te"), and as a “reference” (pp. 729 and 763) to III Rg 5:2 (“misit autem et Salomon ad Hiram dicens tu scis voluntatem David patris mei") as well as to Apc 7:14a ("et dixi illi domine mi tu scis").

The imperative veni veni at 3.21.15 (“Veni veni: quia sine te nulla erit laeta dies aut hora") is presented as a “quotation” from Apc 22:20 ("etiam venio cito amen").

The phrase tu solus in “Laetatur in te servus tuus; non in se nec in aliquo alio: quia tu solus lactitia vera” (3.50.2; cf. 4.13.1) is listed as a reference to Lc 24:18: “tu solus peregrinus es in Hierusalem”!

Becker selects the exclamation “O Deus meus” at 4.17.2 — an alleged quotation from Ps 30:15: “dixi Deus meus es tu” — for what he calls Thomas’ ‘Working Bible’: a set of “key or evidently ‘favourite’ Biblical texts that appear to have been particularly important in informing the author’s thinking” (pp. 173f.). Becker’s selection procedure for this ‘Working Bible’, however, is not clear: from all “sources cited more than once” (ca. 400), cases sourced “with at least one quotation” were given preference for selection, which left a remainder of ca. 300 “strongly attested sources” (p. 174). Moreover, that “o my God” — an exclamation not uncommon in devotional literature — should be classified as a “strongly attested source” contributing to the assembling of a Working Bible, seems questionable to me, to put it mildly.

Some references are not identified: 1.24.18-23 is intrinsically related to the Beatitudes in Mt 5:1-12 (I owe this reference to Dr. Charles M.A. Caspers, Nijmegen). “Vox dilecti” at the opening of 4.18 echoes Ct 2:8 (“vox dilecti mei”).

Dr. Becker reaches the conclusion that the author of The Imitation was steeped in the Scriptures (p. 219). Of course he was, but so were Hildegard of Bingen, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Müntzer, John Calvin, or Valentin Weigel and so many others . . . In presenting background information on the role of Scripture and lectio divina in the Modern Devotion, on à Kempis’ life and works, and on De Imitatione in the first 250 pages, the author has done his readers a great service. In hunting for textual interfaces, however, he has not kept within reasonable limits. Moreover, he has merely counted his references instead of weighing them, so that the question arises: how revealing are the statistics and breakdown on pp. 130-32, 194, and 209?
It seems that here Becker pays the price for having done his cliometric research rather in isolation, basing himself only on E. Arcns, 'Zitate und Anspielungen in der *Imitatio Christi* des Thomas von Kempen', in *ThQ* 112 (1931), 135-207 (p. 134 n. 80). For recent discussions, see Berlioz; De Reu on medieval sermons; Deploigne on Hildegard; and Lane on Calvin. Currently, team research into *De imitatione*, including its intertextual relations with the Vulgate is done by members of the Titus Brandsma Instituut in Nijmegen (Charles Caspers, Rudolf van Dijk, Rijcklô Hofman), the Thomas-Archiv in Kempen (Uwe Neddermeyer), and the University of Münster (under the direction of Nikolaus Staubach).

Dr. Becker's work indubitably fills a void. It commands respect, but also raises doubts. The author might have taken Bernard Spaapen's observation to heart, in *DSp* 7 (2) (1971) cols. 2355-68, cited on p. 125 (italics WJ): "The Imitation has woven into it more than a thousand quotations from the Bible. [...] Many expressions might correspond to texts quoted more or less freely; but here we have conjecture rather than certitude. However this may be, it seems more desirable to possess some day a good complete study on the influences exerted upon the author of the Imitation than to succeed merely in establishing an exhaustive list of textual quotations and free quotations".

Wim Janse, Leiden University/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam


*Kempener Thomas-Vorträge* contains five articles presented at the Thomas Archive in 2000. Devoted to the Windesheimer Thomas Hermeken (ca. 1379-1471), a native of Kempen, the Archive contains more than 1,800 Thomas editions and other titles, and more than 300 microfilms of late medieval manuscripts of à Kempis' nearly 35 minor works.

After a sketch by Josef Reuter (Kempen) of the previous history of the Archive against the background of the nineteenth-century Thomas renaissance, Rijcklô Hofman (Nijmegen) elaborates on a theme introduced by Hubert Jedin: Thomas as biographer. He bases his case on Thomas' *Dialogus novitiorum* (1436-50), which consists of *De contemptu mundi* and eleven *vitae* of
devotees of the first generation. Hofman shows that the hagiographical *Dialogus* cannot be used as a historical source. Thomas' "sudden obsessive accuracy" (p. 24) with respect to the date and, possibly, the hour of a devotee's decease is only meant to familiarize the novice with the life to come. The *exempla* presented in the *vitae* aim at an attitude to life characterized by *humilitas, oboedientia, and paupertas*.

Monika Costard (Berlin) gives an account of her — exemplary — research into the late medieval reception history of Thomas' *Orationes et meditationes de vita Christi*. In Thomas' Latin original version the *Orationes* attracted little attention, but in Middle Dutch and German translations they were avidly read, particularly in nunneries. As regards structure and content, they have interfaces with monastic skills relating to inner attitude and outward posture. By that, the text "führt (...) tendenziell zum Klosterleben und weist damit einen Weg, den die meisten Frauenkonvente, die als Besitzerinnen der Handschriften bekannt sind, beschritten hatten" (pp. 51-52).

In "Verfasser, Verbreitung und Wirkung der *Imitatio Christi* in Handschriften und Drucken vom 15. bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts," Uwe Neddermeyer (Cologne) examines the common opinion that the *Imitatio Christi* was the most popular book of the Modern devotion and, after the Bible, of world literature. In line with his previous cliometric research done for his *Habilitationsschrift* he analyses the proportion of the number of manuscripts and (nearly 2,400) printed versions of the *Imitation* on the one hand, to the numbers of manuscripts of comparable best sellers on the other hand (in Europe, until 1800). Before the invention of typography the *Imitation* was seventh in the top ten of best sellers; between 1450 and 1530 it occupied the ninth place, between 1530 and 1599 (after the Protestant reformation) it came third. Only in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the *Imitation* actually achieved its "absolute unique position" (p. 79) as the most widely printed book (ca. 210,000 copies in 1720) after the Bible.

In "Von der Nachfolge Christi und ihren Folgen, oder: Warum wurde Thomas von Kempen so berühmt?" Nikolaus Staubach (Münster) gives a sketch of the kaleidoscopic reception history of the *Imitation*. It is the combination of "Sprachklang und Spruchweisheit" that has given the *Imitation* its magic. "Sprachklang" is understood to mean the "rhythmisch-klangliches Kontinuum" of the "Variations- und Repetionsstruktur des Textes, die sich der Exzerptions- und Meditationstechnik der Devoten verdankt (...): die sorgfältige, ja manierierte sprachlich-stilistische Gestaltung, vornehmlich mit dem Kunstmittel des durch Homoioteleuton oder Endreim noch betonten Satzparallelismus". "Spruchweisheit" is the "Sequenz allgemeiner, aber stark affektivischer Betrachtungen und Motive, die sich auf einer Gefühlsskala zwischen Zerknirschung, Gelassenheit und Überschwang bewegen" (p. 103f.). For Staubach this almost entrancing "recurrence of the same with variations" is not only the structural principle of the *Imitation*, but also the motto of its reception history.
The expert contributions are well documented and the volume has been nicely edited and illustrated. Future Thomas à Kempis research will not be able to get around the *Thomas-Archiv* in Kempen.

Wim Janse, Leiden University/Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam


Das zweite Kapitel widmet sich den musikalischen Notationen — bekannt-


Wie sich Liedaufzeichnungen vom liturgischen zum meditativen Gebrauch verschoben, zeigt Hascher-Burger im vierten Kapitel, in dem sie anhand der formalen Elemente der Lieder eine fortschreitende „Entliturgisierung der
Texte und Formen” (S. 168) im Verlauf des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts nachzeichnet.

Das fünfte Kapitel schließlich dient der Widerlegung des Forschungsmythos einer Ablehnung der Mehrstimmigkeit außerhalb der weihnachtlichen Gesänge in der Devotio moderna. Hiergegen spricht nicht allein die Tatsache, dass allein 28 der 121 Gesänge in der untersuchten Handschrift zwei- oder dreistimmig sind, sondern auch eine gründliche Untersuchung der gemeinhin für ein solches Verbot herangezogenen normativen Elemente, die Hascher-Burger als bloße Bindung der Mehrstimmigkeit an bestimmte Regeln zu deuten vermag. Und diese Regeln wurden, wie sie gründlich belegt, in der Utrechter Handschrift tatsächlich befolgt.

Insgesamt ist eine profunde, uberaus umsichtig argumentierende Studie entstanden, die unser Bild von der spätmittelalterlichen Frömmigkeit ganz erheblich bereichert.

Volker Leppin, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena


Am deutlichsten wird das Verdienst der Herausgeber an ihrem Druck der Pragmatischen Sanktion von Bourges von 1438, durch die Karl VII.


Für Forschung und akademischen Unterricht liegt mit diesem Band eine zuverlässige Quellensammlung vor, die innerhalb wie außerhalb des deutschen Sprachgebiets gebührende Beachtung finden sollte. Der einzige Wermutstropfen

This volume collects papers presented at the International Congress on Medieval Studies held at Western Michigan University in 2001. The papers are organized in three parts: ‘Cusanus in Context’, ‘Cusanus: Preacher, Bishop, Theologian’, and ‘Cusanus’ Legacy’. In an appendix, Thomas Izbicki, one of the editors, lists literature on Cusanus in English published between 1994 and 2001. There are indexes on persons, places and subjects — these, however, do not include all occurrences (the index of persons omits for instance Koch, p. 148, and Van de Vyver, p. 233; that of places: for instance Gubbio, p. 224).

In the opening paper of the first part Wilhelm Dupré analyses the notion of spirituality. He pays special attention to Nicholas’ sermons. Dupré notes (p. 16) that one can learn from Cusanus to find Christ in each of us. This is important for interreligious dialogue. No-one has to give up his or her faith: the hidden Christ, as a hidden unity, is already present in everyone.

In the second contribution Louis Dupré analyses Cusanus’ theory of religious symbols. Cusanus holds literalist readings of religious texts responsible for religious division (p. 28). Dupré confronts Cusanus with modern insights about symbols.

The next two papers, by Dennis D. Martin and Thomas E. Morissay, are more historical than the others. Martin gives detailed references to sources dealing with the Carthusian Presence in late medieval spirituality. Though there is no explicit relation with Cusanus, this contribution certainly is instructive as background. In ‘Canonists in Crises ca. 1400-1450: Pisa, Constance, Basel’, Morissay discusses the effects of the Great Schism and elucidates the views of papalists and canonists. In the end Nicholas is also a papalist, not least because Nicholas sees in this position an opportunity to re-unite the Greek and Latin churches.

In part II of the volume, Lawrence Hundersmack and Thomas Izbicki discuss Nicholas’ early sermons on the incarnation. This subject has scarcely been investigated, the authors say. According to Nicholas, when God enters into human nature, nature itself is changed. To what extent were Nicholas’ views particular to him and to what extent were they widely shared? The authors refer on this interesting point to a book by J.F. Biechler, Religious Spirituality and the Human Nature.
Language of Nicholas of Cusa (Missoula, 1975), who seems to defend the claim that Nicholas’ views were highly personal.

Walter Andreas Euler also emphasizes the importance of the sermons. Nicholas takes the person of Christ as kernel of his proclamation. Christ is, Cusanus says, the pax pacificans et uniœn. The author notes that the sermons are in no respect superficial by comparison with his tracts.

Clyde Lee Miller investigates the part played by Meister Eckhart in Nicholas’ sermon of 1456 (one of the sermons edited by J. Koch in 1937). In addition Miller presents a translation. One of the conclusions of his article is that this sermon, and indeed each of the four edited by J. Koch, should not be compared with Eckhart’s German works, but with his Latin sermons and, indeed, with Cusanus’ own writings. The 1456 sermon helps us to understand how Meister Eckhart was undeservedly misunderstood and condemned.

Elizabeth Brient’s contribution, with the title ‘Meister Eckhart and Nicholas of Cusa on the “where” of God’, is in line with Miller’s paper, and reacts to it on the question to what extent the 1456 sermon is conceived in the spirit of Meister Eckhart (p. 127). Brient concludes that the doctrine of the incarnation is important for Cusa, but that he emphasizes God as the infinite way of journeying wayfarers. He takes Christ as central, and therefore God as the enfolding and unfolding reality, to express his Christology in a more metaphysical way.

Bernard McGinn discusses Nicholas’ view on the motive for the incarnation. He notes that divergent viewpoints on this issue have often been presented as a clash between Aquinas and Anselm. His conclusion about Nicholas is that, because the Word takes on common human nature and not a human person, all humans are one in Christ. Nicholas’ notion of creation is principally more christological than that of Aquinas. Man can tentatively assume the maximum humanity of Christ through the docta ignorance.

H. Lawrence Bond discusses the ‘icon’ and ‘iconic’ text in Nicholas’ De visione Dei. He mentions the views of other scholars, such as Beierwaltes, but does not enter into discussion with them. The author conceives the book itself as an icon, which is a rather remarkable thesis (p. 183). On p. 184 we read that Cusanus’ most used method, the via experimentalis, is neither a philosophical nor a theological tool, but rather a pathway of the direct experience of spiritual perception. I felt the need of more extensive discussion and references to the sources to defend the thesis. Bond’s paper ends with a rather remarkable poem of his, titled ‘Guided meditation on “the face”, based on chapter VI, §§ 17-21 from the De visione Dei’.

Brian A. Pavlac tells us that Nicholas often pronounced excommunications while trying to reform the ecclesiastical and political systems in his diocese. However, Pavlac concludes, Nicholas was not very successful as a bishop.
Finally part III. Morimichi Watanabe’s paper can be compared with that of Pavlac’s in that he too retraces Nicholas’ life. On p. 219 he explains the goals of the hospital founded by Nicholas. It was to shelter 33 poor males, who met certain requirements imposed by Nicholas. This number represents the life span of Christ.

Matuschevich’s contribution is entitled ‘John Gerson, Nicholas of Cusa, Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples; the continuity of ideas’. Important though the subject is, I found the elaboration a bit too general. A note such as ‘Cusanus’ evolution as a humanist’ needs further explanation. The same holds for the thesis that Nicholas’ work represents the summit of medieval beliefs, like Dante’s *Divina Commedia* does, and that Gerson spoke as a mystic and not as a philosopher.


In conclusion I would say that the book is interesting for giving the diverse contexts of Nicholas’ life and works. The chapters discuss his theology, his functioning as a bishop, and the historical background of his works. The papers are on an advanced level. I was especially happy with the attention paid to Nicholas’ sermons. Some authors note the importance of Cusanus’ works for interreligious dialogue, which is a problem in our times. Some authors compare important notions such as ‘spirituality’ and ‘symbol’ in medieval and modern interpretations.

E. P. Bos, Leiden University

**Rudolf Dekker (Ed.),** *Egodocuments and history: Autobiographical writing in its social context since the Middle Ages.* Verloren, Hilversum 2002. 192 pp. € 17.

Although Rudolf Dekker noted in 1988 that “to read egodocuments is much more interesting, and much more fun, than to read the scholarship about them”, this has not stopped him from publishing extensively on the history of autobiographical writing. He has collaborated actively with other scholars of the genre, both nationally and internationally; it is an indication of his influence that whereas in 1988 no foreign equivalents existed for the Dutch neologism *egodocumenten*, the word is now widely used among scholars in Germany, France and Spain (although it seems more popular in ‘Euro-english’ than among English native-speakers — none of the three
American authors in this volume choose to use it). It comes as no surprise, then, that Dekker has also succeeded in bringing together an interesting, if rather disparate, collection of essays on egodocuments by scholars from the US, Germany, Israel, and the Netherlands.

The historian Jacques Presser, who in the early 1950s coined the word *egodocumenten* as a generic term for diaries, memoirs and journals, was fighting a lone battle to persuade colleagues that even if such texts were not ‘factually’ accurate, their very subjectivity made them of historical importance. That battle has long since been won, but it has taken scholars longer to appreciate that such texts have been written for a great variety of purposes. Until quite recently scholars were mining egodocuments primarily for evidence of an “emergence of the self” that was seen as a crucial precondition for the emergence of the novel, and indeed as an important symptom of ‘modernity’ in European culture. As a consequence, egodocuments were usually read against the benchmark of Rousseau’s *Confessions* — and many were found wanting. Whenever authors ‘failed’ to explore their feelings and their unique selves, their diaries, journals and memoirs were deemed not to be ‘genuinely’ autobiographical. Such was, for instance, the critical verdict on John Wesley’s *Journal* — discussed here by Michael Mascuch.

That this has now changed is partly due to the ‘linguistic turn’ in cultural history, but it also owes much to the insistence of historians that egodocuments, whether they are ‘properly’ autobiographical or not, are helpful in answering questions about past societies. Rather than assume that the main aim of private writings is to write for oneself about one’s self, scholars have come to examine the other purposes of ‘life-writing’ or the chronicling of personal histories — and the influences that shaped these. Ariel Bar-Levav suggests that it was somehow typical for Jewish literary culture that the “ethical wills” fathers wrote for their children had a “moral-collective rather than an individual focus”, but other essays in this volume actually show that this is a much more common pattern. As Stephen Carl Arch points out here, Benjamin Franklin’s *History of My Life*, was much more focused on the ‘exemplary’ aspects of his life than on what made him unique. Adrienne Baggerman argues that, even as late as the nineteenth century, many texts were primarily intended for, and shaped by, family use, whilst Mascuch shows in a fascinating piece that the regular publication of instalments of Wesley’s *Journal* was a conscious attempt to make him into a ‘superstar’, to create a bond between the preacher and his supporters.

Several articles in this volume focus on the influences that shaped writing practices. Gadi Algazi, in a rather sprawling but stimulating piece, charts the interplay between new models of scholarly behaviour and the way in which sixteenth-century humanists came to conceive of themselves in their egodocuments. Jeroen Blaak explores what the diary of the seventeenth-century schoolmaster David Beck can tell us about his reading habits and
discovers some ‘intertexts’ that may have shaped Beck’s diary, whilst Baggerman explores the link between the keeping of family archives, the writing of egodocuments, and the managing of family memory in the nineteenth century publishers’ dynasty Blussé. Helga Meise’s analysis of the way Fürstin Karoline von Hessen-Darmstadt kept separate types of notes in separate almanacs would probably have benefited from a more comparative approach. It was, after all, not unusual for early modern diarists to keep parallel diaries, whilst it is not quite clear to me that attention to the self is really the main distinguishing characteristic of the second set of notes the Fürstin kept in 1772.

The most intriguing contribution to this volume comes from Carolyn Chappell Lougee, who compares the autobiographies written by two groups of French refugees: the Huguenots who left after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the emigré aristocrats of the 1790s. Building on Mascuch’s idea that “discourse fashioned personality” rather than the other way round, she is arguing here that “autobiography assumes its modern form as part of a much larger shift in the production of documents generally”. Huguenot exiles devoted much of their texts to “creating documentation”, in order to collect and safeguard evidence of their lineage, their patronage network and their role in the community. The egodocuments of the emigrés of the Revolution do not show such concerns. After the French Revolution it was the state, and the state alone, that generated ‘public’ identity. The returning emigrés were very concerned with this ‘public’ identity — they were doing battle with the bureaucracy to obtain passports and have their names removed of dangerous lists. But as a consequence they also came to distinguish their public from their ‘real’ and personal identity and to express only the latter in their autobiographies. There are problems with this argument, especially her contention that Calvinism involved a “denial of history”, or that it was new for the state to create identity — citizenship of early modern cities was also conferred by the authorities. Still, this is a really stimulating attempt not just to chart but also to explain the emergence of new autobiographical conventions. A short piece by Gerard Schulte Nordholt on internet diaries, that concludes this volume, reminds us that these conventions remain subject to change to this very day.

Judith Pollmann, Somerville College, Oxford

Not all products of the printing press contributed to a revolutionary increase in access to information. The world of humanistic learning, for instance, remained a largely elitist market segment. Some remarkable reflections of this can be found in early printers' devices, the company logos printed on the title-page or at the end of a substantial number of early books. Esoteric symbols, learned references, visual as well as verbal, to Latin and Greek classics and even quotations in Hebrew are used to advertise the name of the publisher and his skills. Nowadays, complexity hardly seems to be the ideal starting point for company branding, but many sixteenth-century publishers thought otherwise. A substantial proportion of the devices from this period use erudition as a means of presenting their books as reliable, high-quality scholarship. This interpretation is not merely a result of the wanting knowledge of the classics on the part of modern scholars, but explicitly confirmed in contemporary accounts as well. In his Encomion Chalcographiae (Mainz, 1540), the German printer Johann Arnold Bergellanus, for instance, remarked that even Apollo would have had serious difficulties in deciphering the complex riddles of these printer's devices.

Anja Wolkenhauer uses Arnold's observation as the title of her study of the humanistic printer's device. In Zu Schwer für Apoll she extensively catalogues and analyses the devices of over thirty publishers, active in the first half of the sixteenth century. In view of the sub-title, the definition of the corpus is somewhat unfortunate. According to Wolkenhauer, the humanistic device, identified by the presence of classical motifs, almost completely disappeared in the second half of the century. Furthermore, the main focus is on German firms, although the catalogue also incorporates the devices of some early North-Italian printing houses, such as that of Aldus Manutius. The study does not include important centres of book production in this period (including the second half of the century), such as Paris, Lyon or Antwerp. The catalogue is preceded by six chapters offering a thorough introduction to the device, its history and various contexts of production and reception, including an assessment of its social contexts. According to the author, knowledge of the potential book buyers and their intellectual mindset is vital to understanding the humanistic device. Together, introduction and catalogue constitute an important contribution to a more systematic and interdisciplinary analysis of devices.

A pioneering feature of the catalogue is its comprehensive analysis of iconographical, philological and book-historical aspects in a single lemma. After a short description of the printer, a reproduction of the device and
some data concerning use and appearance, the analysis of the device is
given in no less than thirty-six entries, divided into the sections Signet, Verlag
and Kommentar. Here, Wolkenhauer not only describes the sources (both pri-
mary and intermediate), the variants and the forms of reception of the
device, but, for instance, also analyses the publisher’s schooling, his milieu
and the profile of his firm (quantity, activity in the field of humanism etc.).
The final commentary at the end of each entry concisely presents an inte-
gral interpretation of the particular device.

The collected material is a goldmine for those studying the development
of classical motifs in text and image. However, a wealth of material in itself
does not solve the knotty issues of influence and intertextuality. For example,
how are we to deal with the fact that the mark of the Basle printer Joannes
Oporinus was probably ‘inspired by’ the device from the less well-known
Georg Rhaw? Both devices portray the legendary musician Arion, who sup-
posedly used his musical skills to escape from pirates and reached Corinth
on the back of a dolphin. For Rhaw Arion was the perfect icon: Rhaw
mainly published musical works. Oporinus’ use of the story of Arion can-
not be related to his printing activities in any specific way. The mottoes
attached to his device point to a more general notion of overcoming hard-
ship through virtue. As such, there is no indication that Oporinus’ device
is influenced by that of Rhaw. The reception of Oporinus’ mark, however,
shows signs of an intertextual awareness. One remark by the commenta-
tor of Alciato’s emblems, Claude Mignault, for example, suggests that he
at least interpreted the example of Arion here in the same way as in
Alciato’s emblem ‘In avaros’. According to Wolkenhauer, however, Alciato
cannot be seen as a direct influence on Oporinus. Rather, the emblem
seems to have shaped the interpretational space for the device. Moreover,
the printer’s motives for choosing a particular device are not necessarily
concerned merely with the symbolical meaning. Visual appeal and exclu-
siveness were just as important. A striking case in point is Francesco Patriani
from Venice. This printer was clever enough to legally protect his right to
use not only the image of Hercules fighting the Nemean lion, but also that
of all other Herculean tasks.

The relation between devices and emblems is complex indeed. From the
perspective of emblem studies, the printer’s device has often been seen as
a form of applied emblematics. This is perhaps reinforced by a remark of
the founder of the genre, Andrea Alciato, that emblems could serve as
models for making shop signs or printer’s marks. In this context, he men-
tions the examples of the famous devices by Aldus Manutius and Johann
Froben. Still, as Wolkenhauer rightly emphasises in the preface, the first
emblem book was only published in 1531. The vogue of the emblem can
only be located in France from about the early 1540s. By this time, many
humanistic devices had already been invented. In many cases, the influence
starts the other way around, as for instance, the use of the watchful crane
on a bishop’s crozier in an emblem by Gabriel Rollenhagen and Crispijn de Passe. In the emblem even the name of Episcopius is included, thereby explicitly pointing to its earlier use as the mark of Nicolaus Bischoff.

Thus, _Zu schwer für Apoll_ is not only a strong contribution to the study of printer’s devices, but also of importance to emblem studies and research into the use of symbols in Renaissance humanism. The rich outcome of Wolkenhauer’s analysis of a relatively modest corpus calls for more. Moreover, a catalogue like this should ideally be connected electronically to catalogues of comparable sources, such as the massive collection of Dutch printers’ devices, published by Hans Brandhorst and Peter van Huisstede (Nieuwkoop, 1999). An additional iconographical classification, for example by means of Iconclass, as Brandhorst and Van Huisstede have done, could help an even wider group of researchers. If such a grand, preferably European research project into the early modern printer’s device could be set up, Wolkenhauer’s broad approach of the subject surely deserves to be seen as exemplary.

Arnoud Visser, University of St Andrews


Lieber, Kreuz als Unterscheidungskriterien. Laban ist in Luthers Sichtweise eine Figur der falschen Kirche. Demgegenüber sind Jakob, Lea und Rachel eine Figur für Christus und seine wahre Kirche. Nach Hiebsch wird es Luther mit Hilfe der Figuraldeutung möglich, die Heiligen der Genesis (und des Alten Testaments) auf Christus und die christliche Kirche zu beziehen. Luthers „ekklesiologisches Grundaxiom“, daß die Kirche von der Schöpfung des Menschen an da sei und bis zum Ende der Welt bestehen bleibe, basiere demnach „auf der figuralen Wahrnehmung der Heilsgeschichte [...]. Die Personen des Alten Testaments einerseits und Christus und seine Kirche andererseits verhalten sich dabei wie Figur und Erfüllung zueinander. Jakob ist eine Figur für Christus, d.h. in Jakob ist Christus vorabgebildet; Lea und Rachel sind zusammen eine Figur für die wahre christliche Kirche, d.h. in ihnen ist die christliche Kirche vorabgebildet“ (S. 248). Im fünften Kapitel faßt Hiebsch die Ergebnisse ihrer Untersuchung zusammen und deutet abschließend einige Aspekte an, bei denen die verhandelten Themen vertieft und weitergeführt werden können.


Jens-Martin Kruse, Universität Hamburg


Diesen Fragen stellte sich Daniel Bolliger in seiner Dissertation, die durch Alfred Schindler begleitet und im Sommersemester 2000 von der Theologi-


Andreas Mühling, Universität Luzern/Universität Trier


This edition of the registers of Geneva’s Conseil or city council will be eagerly read by all those interested in the early phase of the Reformation in Geneva. Appearing over sixty years after the publication of the previous volumes of the Conseil minutes, this volume is noteworthy because it marks the very beginning of the Reformed era in the “Protestant Rome”. Of special interest, for example, is the entry for 21 May 1536, when the General Council, consisting of all citizens, by a unanimous vote (“omnes una voce . . . , manu in celum levata”) chose to embrace the Reformed faith and renounce the Mass and all “papal sacrifices”. Covering May through the end of December 1536, this was really the Geneva of Farel rather than of Calvin. In fact, there is only one reference to Calvin in these minutes. On 5 September Farel appeared before the city council, expressing the need to provide for the sustenance for the Frenchman (“ille Gallus”) who had begun preaching at Saint Pierre, Geneva’s largest church. The Conseil agreed to provide for the young Calvin’s upkeep.

The editor, Paule Hochuli Dubuis, has done a fine job in establishing
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the text of these minutes, which are written in a challenging hand and filled with many abbreviations. The bulk of these minutes was written in Latin, though French became increasingly common toward the end of the year. Most meetings involved only the Small Council, consisting of four syndics (the highest executive office in Geneva) and twenty-one other councilors, which wielded supreme political and judicial power in Geneva ever since the bishop had been pressured to leave the city in 1533. In 1536 the Small Council typically convened several times a week, and for each meeting the scribe recorded which syndic or syndics were presiding and which other members were present (rarely did all twenty-five attend). The General Council met only to consider extraordinary measures, and the intermediate Council of 200 met occasionally. Ultimately the Small Council ran the day-to-day affairs of the Republic and was empowered to impose a wide range of penalties on those guilty of crimes and misdemeanors.

As Hochuli Dubuis aptly observes in the Introduction, this volume demonstrates that Genevans were enforcing Reformed discipline before Calvin was in a position of power. When a prominent citizen by the name of Gérardin de la Rive confessed in June to having had his child baptized Catholic in a neighboring land, the Conseil condemned him to be banished from Geneva within ten days and his goods confiscated. Three days later, the Conseil reversed itself; in response to de la Rive’s promise that his family would henceforth regularly attend sermons and live “according to the word of God”, members of the Small Council withdrew its order of banishment (and presumably also the confiscation of his goods). The Small Council regularly convoqued people who were guilty of other moral indiscretions, such as adultery and fornication. In passing sentences against illicit sexuality, authorities appeared somewhat harsher toward women than men. Thus when Jean Bailliard was convicted of adultery, he was condemned to three days in jail, while his paramour, identified only as “Claudine”, was banished for one year under pain of a whipping. Still more severe was the penalty imposed 12 August against Françoise Buclin, who was banished for life for adultery with no mention of her partner(s) in sin. Other factors could conceivably have been behind this discrepancy. Buclin could possibly have been a prostitute, and no mention is made of either woman’s origins — foreigners were more likely to be banished than someone who enjoyed citizenship in Geneva. But one cannot help suspecting a double standard, which considered a woman’s sexual sins more evil than a man’s.

The records reveal that the city council did not hesitate to enforce laws strictly, even when prominent citizens were involved. Jean-Ami Curtet was serving a term as lieutenant, essentially the chief of police, when the Conseil condemned him in August to three days of jail on bread and water for committing adultery with his servant. More humiliating still, after serving this brief jail sentence, he was brought before the Council of 200 where he was formally removed from the office of lieutenant.
Most of the individual entries in this volume are very brief, typically only a couple sentences each, and many, to be sure, are of limited interest as far as the early Reform is concerned. The most common matter, for example, did not pertain to religion or the enforcement of morals but rather to landholdings. Many of these involved the sale or tenure of vineyards, meadows, and other lands that had formerly belonged to the bishop, monasteries, or other Catholic institutions.

The annotations in this volume are rather meager. Much can be learned about many of the individuals appearing in these registers from standard works on Genevan history, most notably Albert Choisy’s Généalogies genevoises. Familles admises à la Bourgeoisie avant la Réforme and J.-A. Galifé’s seven-volume Notices généalogiques sur les familles genevoises depuis les premiers temps, jusqu’à nos jours. Galifé reveals, for example, that Jean-Ami Curtet served as syndic nine times between 1535 and 1565 and had a second term as lieutenant in 1550; his adultery conviction in the long run did not lessen his political influence in the Republic of Geneva. Similarly, the apothecary Gérardin de la Rive had served as syndic in 1528 and 1535 and as lieutenant in 1534 and, notwithstanding having his child baptized Catholic in 1536, again served terms as syndic in 1543 and 1547 and as lieutenant in 1545. Annotations with information of this nature would have made this good edition even better.

The index is quite useful, allowing one to find the various places an individual’s name appears in the registers. It could have been improved, however, by including more French versions of the Latinized names that appear in the text. Many readers, for example, may not realize that “Girardus de Rippa” is the Latinized form of “Gérardin de la Rive”. The volume also includes an interesting appendix, comprised mainly of correspondence to and from neighboring states and allies such as Bern.

All told, this volume of the registers of the Genevan city council is a very welcome addition to the growing body of published sources concerning the Reformation in Geneva. It complements quite nicely the editions of the Consistory registers at the time of Calvin, the registers of the Company of Pastors, and the correspondence of Beza.

Jeffrey R. Watt, University of Mississippi


Werner Thomas has dared to undertake the huge task of investigating the rise of Protestantism in Spain and the retaliation by the Holy Office. Besides,
he has addressed the prejudices and clichés regarding the Spanish Inquisition. Years of study in Spanish archives have resulted in a database — unpublished — and not one, but two books, to be read separately, on the same subject matter. Chronologically, it is best to start with the book on the emergence and repression of Protestantism.

As a Louvain historian Werner Thomas ‘limited’ his subject matter to 1648, the year of the Peace of Munster. Between 1507 and 1648, the Spanish Inquisition condemned 2,557 foreigners and 560 Spaniards. In the first half of the sixteenth century the spiritual heritage of the Reconquista made the Spaniards relatively immune to the Reformation: religious identity equaled ethnic identity, and a true Spaniard remained a true Catholic. Moriscos or Jews would never be true Spaniards, and purity of blood became synonymous with purity of faith. Therefore, the word ‘heretic’ or herege was the most awful invective one could imagine. The Jewish expression ‘chosen people’ was easily usurped by the Catholics, and Saint James was on their side. Not afraid to take a radical stance, Werner Thomas suggests that even without the institution of the Inquisition the newly arising contempt for the non-Catholic inhabitants of Spain could have resulted in violent disturbances and uprisings. The Inquisition channelled public uneasiness, so to speak, and it was greatly favoured by public opinion. Having dealt with moriscos and Jews, the Inquisition was saved from oblivion by the emergence of Protestantism and this further persecution of its followers met with general approval as well.

Slowly, but with a certain steadiness, Lutheranism spread throughout Spain. Though small in numbers, its followers adhered to their faith with great tenacity. Equally fanatical was the determination of certain inquisitors, like Fernando de Valdeolivas, to deal with the problem. From the 1520s onwards the alumbrados and erasmistas became victims of the Inquisition as well as the luteranos, the collective name for all types of Protestants. The key-moment in the history of Protestantism in Spain was the discovery of Protestant networks in Valladolid and Sevilla in 1558. For several reasons this caused a real panic: both these cities were situated in the heart of Spain, and not near to religiously divided France; the numbers of Protestants were high; they were native Spaniards of Christian stock, and they adhered to all the dogmas of Lutheran faith. The king being in the Netherlands, and unable to return because of the war with France, the Inquisitor-General Francisco de Valdez seized this moment to undertake action. He had previously fallen from grace, because of his refusal of a loan of 150,000 ducats to the king, and therefore this emergency gave him the opportunity to regain the king’s confidence by means of severe and consistent repression of the heretics. Valdez did not refrain from eliminating political adversaries. On one occasion he had the archbishop of Toledo, Bartolomé Carranza, arrested because he wanted this most important see of Spain for himself. Carranza was accused of expressing Lutheran thoughts
in his *Comentarios del Catechismo Cristiano* (Antwerp, 1558). The cynical approach of Valdez becomes clear from his statement that he did not even know the contents of Lutheran theology. The policy of Valdez became that of the Holy Office itself: to get rid of all political enemies, by all possible means. Even the king approved of this. Back in Spain, one of his first acts was to attend the *auto de fe* in Valladolid (8 October 1559), though he was not present at the actual burning of the victims. On that occasion he is supposed to have said that if his own son were to oppose the Roman Catholic Church, he would carry the wood to the stake personally. For years afterwards Philip always favoured the Inquisition. Although Protestants in other countries expected Spain to succumb to the Reformation, the Holy Office succeeded in eliminating Protestantism from Spain in the 1560s. Philip II stimulated the *confesionalización* of his Spanish realms. From the 1570s onwards the Protestant danger came only from foreigners. When the general religious situation was secure, Philip knew how to compromise: under strict regulations Englishmen in Spain were to have their own ceremonies and freedom of conscience. The peace-treaty of 1604 confirmed this. The Dutch received the same treatment in 1609, with the conclusion of the so-called Twelve Years' Truce. Nevertheless, the articles in question remained secret, to safeguard the reputation of the king and not to embarrass the Spanish people. When the war started again, in 1621, Dutchmen who were condemned by the Holy Office were banned from the country. At the same time the Holy Office knew when to lessen the persecution for political reasons, especially when they were ordered to do so by a mighty Minister like Olivares. There was only one exception: the peculiar Hans, or Juan Avondroot, who went to Spain to convert the king to Protestantism, ended his life at the stake (*auto de fe* of Toledo, 1633); Werner Thomas has promised to write his biography. The Avondroot-case aroused much indignation and hatred in the Dutch Republic, and revived the old sentiments against the cruel Spaniards. Werner Thomas distinguishes between facts and feelings, by offering us a lot of individual cases from the archives. Although the abundance of material is at times too exhaustive for the reader, the examples are often breathtaking, and they lead us into the streets of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain. On one occasion a nineteen-year-old Protestant from Haarlem, visiting Spain, admitted that he always spoke and acted with great care. On the other hand a young Englishman of the same age, who wanted to convert to Catholicism, had two ‘heretics’ denounced because he thought doing so was his duty in order to become a Catholic.

The second book deals with the every-day practice functioning of the Inquisition. Who denounced heretics or Protestants to the Inquisition? Who were the denounced and who denounced themselves hoping to be spared? Only 1.4% of the people denounced to the Inquisition were brought in
by inquisitors. If we add priests, the number rises to 10%. In other words, 90% were denounced by the common believer, the next-door neighbour. Werner Thomas rejects Bartolome Bennassar’s concept, the pédagogie de la peur. On the contrary, as the other volume shows, the Inquisition was generally approved of. Being an informer or familiar of the Inquisition was an honour, and everybody knew his identity. Those who informed the Inquisition were totally convinced of the rightness of the institution, which was established to safeguard the purity of the faith and, in this way, the salvation of the community. The information-system should not be overestimated, however: a commissioner lived in just 7.8% of the villages. More over, he would only act when somebody was accused; he did not initiate cases. The parish priests, on the other hand, protected their flocks by warning them against visiting inquisitors. By reading aloud from the pulpit the Edicto General de la Fe, the flock was informed what to believe and what not. From 1498 onwards the priests had to keep up a register, the padrón parroquial. A later means of social-religious control was the cédula de la confesión, a document that stated when en to whom the bearer had confessed. This probably came into existence after 1525, with the rise of the Morisco problem. Another proof of being a good Catholic was to buy the bula de la cruzada, a receipt for having contributed financially to the struggle against the infidel. And if one were condemned for minor mistakes against the faith, there was a punishment typical of Spain: for a certain period one had to wear in public the sambenito, a peace of cloth by which everybody could distinguish a sinner. Once the punishment ended, the sambenito was put on display in the parish church, with the name of the sinner written on it, thus stigmatising him for the rest of his life. In everyday life those who did not have cédula and bula, could easily be traced as foreigners and thus possible heretics. Being a foreigner was enough to be suspect, and the Holy Office shared the suspicion until the opposite was proven. From 1547 onwards, the Inquisition asked if one had ever been in Germany or France. In 1555, England was added as a suspect country; in 1561 Flanders and Italy shared this dubious honour. Protestants were even more dangerous than Jews and Moslems, for these had different clothes, unlike Protestants.

Though the system of denouncing heretics was established as a means of easing one’s conscience, it was abused by those denouncing people for political, economic or psychological reasons. This happened in approximately 15% of the cases. Again, Werner Thomas describes many cases from the archives, for instance denouncements as a result of bad labour conditions, family quarrels, and economic competition. Again, the whole system was troubled by the fact that the denouncer or delator remained incognito, was unknown to the denounced, and did not face trial in case of false testimony. Two false witnesses could cause real damage. The accused came mainly from France (over 70%), also from England because of its trade relations. To people in Flanders, the Spain of Charles V had the
attractiveness of a Promised Land. The accused from Germany were mer-
chants or artisans. Most of the immigrants were male, in their twenties or
thirties, looking for a job as artisan, pastor or sewer. The investigator is
very accurate in that he distinguishes categories like artisanship, agriculture,
transport, and other means of existence. The artisans from Flanders and
Germany had learned their trades in their own country, whereas the French
learned them in Spain, for instance as a shoemaker. The wealth of Spain
attracted them and most of them did not mind the religious climate, though
in general the immigrants did not want to settle in Spain permanently. As
workers they were appreciated, as long as they conformed to the religious
and social rules, refraining from heavy drinking for instance.

Every foreigner was a possible heretic, infecting the country with Protestant
ideas. Seasonal workers from France and sailors from England and Holland
were especially suspected. Many Protestant merchant ships used the flags
of neutral countries to gain access to Spanish ports. Heretics could be rec-
ognized according to a list of twelve supposed characteristics of the Lutherans,
drawn up by the Holy Office and appreciated by Werner Thomas as a
'serene formulation'. This list influenced the image of the Protestant, but prejudice
and cliché remained as important as ever: el protestante was as demonised
as el judío or el mahometano. As late as 1617 monks in Madrid asked a man
from Flanders whether in his country, and in England and Germany, all
men were heretics. The soldiers of Alva, half a century earlier, would cer-
tainly have had the same idea. Luther was supposed to have agreed with
incest, but nobody was interested in the real content of Lutheranism.

Werner Thomas divides the behaviour of heretics in Spain into two
groups: the offensive and the defensive heretic. The offensive heretic only
operated from 1559-65 and after 1604. This was the man who caused scan-
dal in public, i.e. in front of two or more Spaniards. Those who gave pub-
lic offence were punished by the Inquisition, like Nicolaas Cornelisz van
Leiden, who tore some images of saints from a wall, and held them against
his genitals. The Holy Office was not amused and put him in jail. The
most sensitive subject remained of course the Holy Sacrament: a public
insult to God was worse than the denial of the transubstantiation; the impos-
tor put not only his own salvation at risk, but also the salvation of the
entire community. Another man from Holland, Ginaldo Delhoec Reinoud
van de Hock? — had spent time in Danzig learning from the Anabaptists.
Afterwards he visited Spain learning from Catholicism and he said to him-
self: prueba de todo y guarda lo mejor. He thought that everybody would be
saved in his own faith. Is it a coincidence that he was a Dutchman?

A special category consists of those who were torn apart by their reli-
gious feelings and wanted to return to the Holy Church. Thus in the years
after 1609 nineteen persons from the Northern and eleven from the Southern
Netherlands were received by the Holy Office. They were all born in the
1560s, experienced the years of religious turmoil, and took refuge in the only country where everything seemed to be safe and quiet, and where there was only one faith, Spain. Nevertheless, it took some courage to go to the Inquisition, its name being horrible and its reaction unpredictable. Many feared corporal punishment. Asked for their motives, the answers varied. Those who regretted their former choices could answer that they were now convinced because they considered the Catholic interpretation of the Bible better than the Protestant one. Others considered the Catholic Church to be more powerful. Revealing is the case of Antonio Vacmacras from Breda, son of a Protestant mother and a Catholic father. He experienced the vicissitudes of his family life and his native town, to end up voluntarily going to the Inquisition and reverting to Catholicism. A young man from Lausanne was irritated by the quarrels between Calvin and Beza. Because Calvin himself had insisted that a religion should be old, unique and universal, the man chose thus for Catholicism. Peculiar in these cases is the total absence of positive descriptions of Protestantism. The renegades even denounce their former lives as fit only for animals or dogs. An Englishman who visited Spain during Holy Week exclaimed: "Who am I not to kneel like the others for Christ, who is my Saviour?" On the other hand there are 24 cases registered of those who repented from heavier punishments. They will not to be immortalized in the pages of this periodical, though a grandson of Beza was among them.

Werner Thomas concludes that the famous 'sola scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide' was seldom mentioned. The influence of the Council of Trent turned out to be decisive. Church attendance with all its sacraments increased. In 1571 a Spanish weaver complained: "We are doing everything for the clergy alone — being born, working, marrying, and dying". Complaints of this kind were numerous, but only native Spaniards of old Christian stock were forgiven for expressing them. The anti-clericalism of Spanish society remained generally untouched. But as soon as a foreigner showed a different attitude to social and religious life in Spain, the Inquisition was used to safeguard the Catholic character of Spanish society. Werner Thomas has proven this with overwhelming evidence.

Anton van der Lem, Leiden University


The religious book in sixteenth-century France is a wide subject, and the 'Sixteenth-Century French Religious Book Project' described and led by Andrew Pettegree — the plan to draw up a list of all religious books printed in French in the course of the century — is daunting. The very questions
put by Professor Petticree in the first of the eighteen articles in this book give an idea of its scope. "Who are the most popular authors of each church and each generation? What is the relationship between substantial works of exegesis and pamphlets, between verse and prose, royal edicts and the manifestos of the political leaders? Does drama have a role to play—is history-writing an important polemical tool? Can one deduce anything from the ebb and flow of publishing during the forty years of the religious wars? And what of the relationship between different publishing centres?"

Some of these questions are broached in the remaining papers. Graham A. Runnalls tackles the printed editions of religious plays, and observes a deep change after 1550 when the previously popular mystery plays, having met with the increasing disapproval of the authorities on account of "the disruption caused to social, religious and moral behaviour", were almost entirely replaced by a different type of drama. Alison M. Saunders discusses the emblem books, which got off to a remarkably early start in France in 1534. These were very largely Catholic, but, in the cases of Georgette de Montenay and Beza, to which Alison Saunders devotes particular attention, they could also contain expressions of evangelicalism or Protestantism.

Virginia Reinburg examines that popular medieval genre, the Book of Hours, and shows that its popularity among publishers sunk after 1520 but recovered briefly in the 1580s. Karin Maag writes about the ever popular works of religious instruction produced throughout the century with the object of "creating a doctrinally solid group of lay people" and of making a clear distinction between Catholic and Protestant teaching. And Jean-François Gilmont deals with the birth of Protestant historiography. He attributes its novelty to a number of factors: the identification of the papacy with Antichrist, the principle of sola Scriptura, the need to record martyrdom, and the desire to establish a continuity with the primitive Church. It owed much to the chairs of lay history founded, under Melanchthon's influence, at Marburg, Tübingen and Wittenberg, to the French translation, produced by Jean Crespin in Geneva in 1555, of Melanchthon's commentary on the Book of Daniel, and to the research into ancient manuscript sources undertaken by John Bale in England and Flacius Illyricus in Germany.

One of the most interesting themes in this rich and fascinating collection of pieces is the effect of propaganda. Of this there was one illustrious victim and one illustrious beneficiary. Keith Cameron studies the 'demonizing' of Henri III, the unhappy king who, by 1589, had managed to antagonize both the Catholics and the Huguenots. In a pamphlet published in that year, La vie et faits notables de Henry de Valois, embellished by woodcuts and attributed to Jean Boucher, an active member of the Catholic Ligue, we find many of the legends that have blackened the king's reputation up to the present day. He is presented as proud, vain and petulant,
sacrilegious and sadistic, and this influential little pamphlet coincided with gossip about his atrocious sexual habits, his delight in raping nuns and, above all, in enjoying the favours of his *mignons*, the young men in his entourage. In fact, as Jacqueline Boucher has already shown in her *La cour de Henri III*, there was no substance whatsoever to such rumours. Far from being recruited to satisfy his lust, the *mignons*, Cameron soberly and convincingly points out, were chosen as part of a policy to counterbalance the power of members of the great families such as Guise and Montmorency “by giving power to a new, younger order drawn from the ranks of the lesser nobility”. The propaganda campaign, however, had a devastating and immediate result: the assassination of the king by the fanatical Dominican Jacques Clément. The great beneficiary of propaganda, on the other hand, was Henri III’s successor, Henry of Navarre. Michael Wolfe shows how a dexterous use of the ‘press’ by the king’s publicists could not prevent his own assassination, but did forge the myth of Henri IV as “a man of the people”. After his murder it would ensure his permanent reputation as the greatest king of France.

The articles on censorship remind us of how, throughout the period, conflicting interests could keep any excessive severity in check. Ingeborg Jostock, in her piece on Geneva, presents a picture resembling the situation in the Catholic world. Despite apparently rigorous injunctions which already insisted in 1539 on a form of pre-censorship of all books by the city council (accompanied, after 1559, by the ministers of the consistory), censorship was more frequently evaded than observed, and Jean Crespin seems to have submitted no more than 13% of his publications for approval. Even if certain works, particularly those which gave offence to powerful local citizens or were considered theologically unsound or superfluous, were effectively prohibited, the imposition of censorship was ultimately hampered by the rivalry between the town council and the consistory. Kevin C. Robbins demonstrates that, in the Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle, the situation was similar. Every effort was made by the religious authorities to prevent the publication of François Voisin de la Popelinière’s *Histoire de France*, containing, as Robbins puts it, “too much opinion and too little doctrine”. Ultimately, however, the town governors and the members of the book-trade prevailed, and the book was indeed published, most successfully.

The last pieces in this book are about French readers and book collectors. Roger Kuin publishes the inventory of the library of Duplessis-Mornay; Francis Higman studies the inventory of the bookseller Vincent Réal; and Paul Nelles examines the ‘audiences’ for religious books in France. These (as in many other parts of Europe) tended to form the larger part of the average private library.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University
In 1997, Thierry Wanegffelen published a condensed version of his doctoral thesis: *Ni Rome, ni Genève. Des fidèles entre deux chaires en France au XVIe siècle*. It turned out to be a truly innovative book. Avoiding the Scylla of writing from an anachronistic confessional standpoint and the Charybdis of misrepresenting a highly dynamic episode in French early modern history from a static point of view, the author set out to tell the story of those faithful to whom Roman Catholic and Protestant confessional polarization were equally repulsive. Entering a largely unexplored “plat pays de la croyance” Wanegffelen presented to his readers the inner religious life of people who had mostly been forgotten by historians — not entirely forgotten, of course, because it was known that by no means everybody had happily accepted the widening of the rift between confessions as an inevitable outcome of Reformation and Counter-reformation. Nevertheless, Wanegffelen unearthed a fascinating mixture of nicodemites who were not driven by fear of persecution but by inner conviction, considerable numbers of pre-Tridentine Catholics accepting the dogma of justification in a form that looked almost Protestant but wasn’t, and, being otherwise filled with profound eucharistic piety, ‘moyenneurs’ who did not wish to make confessional choices and harboured reservations about Tridentine dogmatism together with irenicists looking for common grounds from which starting-point both confessions would be able to work towards a lasting religious peace. The fascinating theme of the ‘old-fashioned’ pre-Tridentine Catholics surviving well into the seventeenth century he later elaborated in his book *Une difficile fidélité. Catholiques malgré le concile en France XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles* (1999).

In his earlier book, Wanegffelen also pinpointed the historical moment when confessional choice in France became inevitable: 1568, the year of the fall from royal grace of Michel de L'Hospital, as chancellor of France co-responsible, with Catherine de Médicis, for the ill-fated royal policy of toleration during the troubled sixties.

Michel de L'Hospital again plays a central role in the volume under scrutiny here, the fruit of a colloquium commemorating the quatercentenary of the Edict of Nantes in 1998, obviously a moment in history dear to the heart of the editor of this volume, who not long ago also published a short history of toleration for a wider public, taking the Edict as his starting-point and ending his narrative in our own days (Thierry Wanegffelen, *L’Édit de Nantes. Une histoire européenne de la tolérance (XVIe-XXe siècle)*). L'Hospital stands for the espousal, by the government, of the ‘politique’ case in favour of religious toleration as an instrument to stop hostilities and safeguard civil peace in France, at the same time creating breathing space during which royal authority and perhaps also religious concord could be rebuilt. This
policy ended in 1568 in a failure, but it was taken up again by Henri of Navarre, who in 1589 inherited the crown as Henri IV and was finally able, after years of bitter struggle, to impose peace in the form of the Edict of Nantes. It this therefore fitting that this volume also pays attention to the span of time between 1568 and 1598 from the point of view of L'Hospital's moral and political heritage. The volume is concluded with an important contribution by Mack P. Holt, highlighting the development of confessional coexistence in Dijon in the four decades before 1598: ‘L'évolution des “Politiques” face aux Églises (1560-1598)’. From this example we can learn that social necessity, more than any purely religious or political consideration, governed the ‘politique’ programmes as soon as they were put into practice. Confessional minorities which could not be subdued or eliminated without the use of excessive force, had to be incorporated, one way or another, into the daily life of the community.

The first chapters of the volume are devoted to the wider European theatre of the struggle for or against toleration, putting the time of the religiously inspired Civil Wars in France against the backdrop of developments elsewhere: Scotland, the Southern Netherlands, the Holy Roman Empire. To this first part Mark Konnert contributed an interesting essay approaching the history of toleration in early modern Europe from a socio-psychological and sociological angle. He finds, not very surprisingly, that in relatively small communities, i.e. under ten thousand inhabitants, persecution has a tendency to be less abrupt and violent because of existing personal bonds between the persecuting confessional majority and the endangered adherents of minority confessions.

The most interesting parts of the volume deal on the one hand with Michel de l'Hospital himself, his thought and actions, his image in his own time and in historiography, and, on the other hand, with the ‘politique’ climate around him. In the former part we find an excellent article by Jacqueline Lalouette: ‘Vie et déclin du souvenir de Michel de L'Hospital en France (XIXe et XXe siècles)’ accompanied by interesting visual material. Denis Crouzet wrote an equally intriguing article about L'Hospital's religiously inspired poetic works (Carmina) which exude, according to the author, a definitely Erasmian evangelical mood. This is followed by a highly original and thorough study of the juridical foundations of L'Hospital’s political thought and practical politics: the force of law, in which one should trust in order to find politically acceptable solutions for the problem of religious diversity (Marie Seong-Hak Kim, “Nager entre deux eaux”. L'idéalisme juridique et la politique religieuse de Michel de L'Hospital). The numerous articles about the ‘politique’ and irenicist milieu surrounding Michel de L'Hospital in sixteenth-century France partly take the form of case-studies about personalities, concentrating either on their active participation in politics (Joachim du Bellay, Arnaud du Ferrier, Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné), their political thought or political discourse in general
(Myriam Yardeni on Étienne Pasquier and Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Ulrich Langer, ‘La rhétorique de la conciliation dans la Congratulation sur la Paix générale, faite au mois de Mars 1598... d'Étienne Pasquier’) or certain problematic developments (Arlette Jouanna, ‘Les ambiguïtés des Politiques face à la Sainte Ligue’, Robert Descimon, ‘La réconciliation des Hotman protestants et catholiques (des années 1580 aux années 1630’). Other contributions focus on the use of the word ‘politique’, the identity of the ‘politiques’ themselves and, consequently, on their impact or lack of impact on the formation of the French modern state.

This volume represents the best of contemporary scholarship on Michel de L'Hospital, some of his contemporaries and the problem of tolerance during the French Civil Wars, and in itself constitutes a worthy monument to the Edict of Nantes and its importance for European history at large.

M.E.H.N. Mout, Leiden University


Research into censorship in sixteenth-century Europe has been greatly facilitated by J.M. De Bujanda’s superb edition of the indexes of prohibited books (the tenth volume of which appeared in 1996) and by the official opening to the general public of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome in 1998. To Bujanda and his colleagues and to the Inquisition archives the two books discussed in this review are duly indebted.

Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy contains eight papers which survey various aspects of the approach to religion and culture that transpires from the indexes. The first, and possibly the most important point, discussed at length in Gigliola Fragnito’s ‘Central and peripheral organization of censorship’, is the degree of disagreement among the censors and the countless difficulties they had not only in imposing the prohibitions but also in actually deciding on what should be censored and how. Their success inevitably varied greatly from one part of Italy to another, as did their criteria.

The indecisiveness of the censors remains a leitmotif throughout the book. One of the best examples is to be found in Fausto Parente’s splendid article on the treatment of the Talmud. There was a general belief that some-
thing should be done about it, but what? Opinions diverged and the mea-
sures taken depended on the whim of the pope. Talmudic texts had been
burned in the Campo de’ Fiori in Rome in 1553. In 1557 the Talmud
and its commentaries were prohibited by Paul IV. In the Tridentine Index
issued by his successor Pius IV, Talmudic texts were tolerated, “provided
they are published without the name of Talmud and without offence and
contumely against the Christian religion”. If Pius V was again in favour of
complete prohibition, Gregory XIII advised expurgation — a measure also
approved initially by his successor Sixtus V, who was notoriously moder-
ate, if not sympathetic, in his treatment of the Jews, but shortly before his
death he decided to prohibit the printing of the Talmud. In 1593 Clement
VII, who expelled the Jews from the Papal States (except for Rome, Ancona
and Avignon), ordered the Talmud to be burned, but in the index of 1596
it was prohibited in the introduction and permitted, “if corrected”, in the
text.

The other pieces in Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy
include an interesting study by Luigi Balsamo on one of the principal cham-
pions of censorship, the Jesuit Antonio Possevino, who made his recom-
mendations in his Bibliotheca Selecta of 1593 and his Apparatus Sacer of 1603.
The discovery in the Biblioteca dell’ Archiginnasio in Bologna of Possevino’s
copy of Conrad Gesner’s Bibliotheca Universalis (Zurich 1545), the work the
Bibliotheca Sacra set out to attack, to imitate and to correct, shows how
Possevino dealt with the great Protestant catalogue intended to provide an
objective survey of all that was in print. Possevino wished to destroy the
heretical, expurgate what was partially erroneous, and replace the works
condemned with orthodox works of a high quality.

In another article Ugo Baldini deals with the official condemnation of
judicial astrology — natural astrology was permitted — and stresses the
innovative aspect of Sixtus V’s bull of 1586, Coeli et terrae creator Deus. Edoardo
Barbieri discusses the fortunes of spiritual literature, ever more affected by
the precept that religious literature in the vernacular should avoid discus-
sions of dogmatic or moral theology. He shows how, by the late sixteenth
century, the spiritual book had been “made into an everyday object for
personal meditation rather than (as in the medieval confraternities) for com-
munitarian devotional practices”. Rodolfo Savelli’s piece on the censoring
of law books brings out the fear of anything that smacked of an attack on
papal power and the defence of princely prerogatives, while Ugo Rozzi
examines both the prohibition and the sinister rewriting involved in the
expurgation of purely literary texts. This would lead, from the 1560s onwards,
to the disappearance of a substantial part of Italian literature which would
only be rediscovered in the mid-eighteenth century.

After the stimulating articles edited by Gigliola Fragnito, Peter Godman’s
The Saint as Censor comes as something of a disappointment. The most satis-
factory part is the collection of documents which occupy over half the book,
even if we might regret that no attempt has been made to annotate them. Robert Bellarmine is the main figure, but his appearance is relatively limited. Much of the text, and a substantial part of the documents, concern the organization and working of censorship in Rome independently of Bellarmine and are based on the holdings of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

The story is familiar: for many years indecisiveness, disagreements, indifference and incompetence prevented any true progress being made in book censorship in Italy. In 1587, however, thanks to the dynamism of Sixtus V, the Congregation of the Index got off to a new start and Bellarmine, described by Godman as “wide-ranging and versatile, rational and sober”, was appointed a consultor.

A good deal has already been written about Bellarmine as an inquisitor and a censor. He is known for his part in the trials of Galilei and Giordano Bruno, for his role in the revision of the Vulgate, and for his arguments with James I. Some of the documents discovered by Godman in the Roman Archive do, however, throw more, and sometimes unexpected, light, on his activities. Godman publishes his statements on Erasmus, Huarte de San Juan, Bodin, Carion and many other writers, and one of the most interesting documents is his advice on which passages to expurgate in the work of Benito Arias Montano. Strikingly enough — and in contrast to many of his colleagues and to what actually happened — Bellarmine proposed the complete suppression of Arias Montano’s commentary on the Book of Revelation. This was one of Arias Montano’s more heterodox works, since it was entirely based on the commentary by Hendrik Niclaes’ former follower Hendrik Jansen van Barrefelt (Hiel). But it was not this that worried Bellarmine or any other contemporary censor. They objected, rather, to the tripartite division of human nature into a part that was divine, a part that was human but integral, and a part that was human but corrupt.

However interesting many of the documents and however valid some of the points which Godman makes, Godman’s own text is by no means above criticism. In his recent dissertation on (and edition of) Justus Lipsius’s Politica, Jan Waszink shows how misleading, “confused and incomplete”, is Godman’s account of the censorship of Lipsius’s work. When it comes to discussing secondary figures Godman is apt to draw on outdated sources and to arrive at questionable conclusions. Few scholars nowadays would agree with his description of Arias Montano as the “founder of a sect of disciples with Erasmian sympathies that flourished, secretly, at the heart of the Escorial”. Godman’s acquaintance with some of the works he discusses, moreover, tends to be superficial. Justus Lipsius’s quotation of Cicero’s phrase ‘urae, seca’ in his advice on how to cope with heretics — the phrase so essential to his argument with Coornhert — is said by Godman to be in Lipsius’s De una religione. In fact it is in the Politica (IV:3), to which Godman devotes a considerable amount of space. Many readers, finally, may well be put off
by an apparent lack of structure in Godman's text and by his self-indulgent flowery style and facetious comments.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University


Admirers of Nicholas Tyacke's important contributions to the history of English Protestantism in the seventeenth century will be delighted with this collection of twelve previously published essays written between 1973 and 1998.

In his introduction Tyacke combines an intellectual autobiography with a survey of the various trends among modern English historians writing about the first century and a half of Protestantism in England. Here, and in the subsequent essays, certain central themes emerge. One of the most recurrent is Tyacke's argument with 'revisionist' historians, either those, like Christopher Haigh, who have pleaded eloquently for a late reformation in England, imposed from above on a population Catholic or indifferent, or those, such as Peter White, who, writing from a strictly Anglican angle and with a belief in a constantly sustained via media which, they maintain, has always characterized the Church of England, have challenged Tyacke's terminology and his theories about the disruptive effects of Arminianism. Although Haigh's approach, stimulating and elegantly presented, seemed convincing, Tyacke rightly points to Haigh's somewhat one-sided use of evidence and his rejection of any possible interpretation of it other than his own. And indeed, the increasing amount of research on the radical manner in which the English Reformation affected the daily lives of the English at a very early stage without arousing any particular antagonism, seems to imply a far greater acceptance on a popular level than Haigh and other revisionists are prepared to admit.

In the case of his own critics Tyacke returns to the defence of the views which were put in his Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640 (Oxford 1987), still the standard study on English Arminianism. There, and in a number of these articles, Tyacke claims that the Arminianism imposed on the English Church by Archbishop Laud had a far more destabilizing and ultimately revolutionary effect than Puritanism, and that it was truly innovative with respect to previous doctrine informing the English Church. He cursorily examines Dutch Arminianism, dwells on the contacts between the Dutch and the English, and stresses the gradual convergence between the two movements in the late seventeenth century, but he also insists on the major differences between them in the early stages. "Arminianism
in England”, he writes, “emerged with an additional, sacramental dimension to that in the United Provinces. Arminius was read with approval by anti-Calvinists in England but adapted to the local situation. English Arminians came to balance their rejection of the arbitrary grace of predestination with a new found source of grace freely available in the sacraments, which Calvinists had belittled. Hence the preoccupation under Archbishop Laud with altars and private confession before receiving communion, as well as a belief in the absolute necessity of baptism”.

In his chapter entitled ‘Arminianism and English culture’ Tyacke goes beyond the theological debates to examine the effect of Arminianism on scientists, artists and writers. The Arminian thinkers and men of letters form an impressive team: the scientist Thomas Harriot, atomists such as Walter Charleton, John Evelyn and William Boswell, the poets Richard Corbett and John Suckling, the playwrights William Cartwright, Thomas Randolph and Shackerley Marmion, all had a decided preference for the more merciful teaching of Arminius to that of Calvin. The readiness of the Arminians to admit speculative attitudes to religion, science and morality opened them to the charge of free thought, and Tyacke acknowledges that “Arminianism became the religious ally of English libertinage because its exponents sought to rehabilitate natural man by denying predestinarian dogma. Cradled in scepticism, Arminians and libertins alike embraced free will”. It thus comes as no surprise to find so many supporters of Laud participating in the Scientific Revolution. “Despite Arminianism”, writes Tyacke about Oxford in the decades preceding the Civil War, “the upward movement of science continued unabated”. In fact one might be tempted to say “because of Arminianism”. In contrast to Cambridge, however, Oxford, Tyacke shows in his most extensive essay, ‘Religious controversy during the seventeenth century: the case of Oxford’, long remained hostile to Arminianism. Even if the movement came into its own under Laud and Charles I, the chairs of divinity were again in the hands of strict Calvinists in the last decades of the seventeenth century.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University


“There is all the difference in the world between usury and interest”, Professor Kerridge points out (p. 5). Yet as he shows in this learned yet accessible and stimulating study, they are very often confused, especially by historians in their efforts to describe the development of Christian teaching about them during the Middle Ages and the Reformation. As great an
economist as Adam Smith could already, in the late eighteenth century, mistakenly assert that lending money at interest had formerly been considered usury and prohibited by law. R.H. Tawney’s *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1938) is however singled out here as the most important source of current misconceptions about the subject. Professor Kerridge takes Tawney to task for his condescending misrepresentation of Luther’s statements about usury and for his perception of non-existent differences between Luther and Calvin with regard to the payment of interest for capital. Luther, contrary to Tawney’s assertions, clearly understood and upheld what the Schoolmen had taught on the subject of usury and interest. Usury was the taking of money over and above the principal solely in return for a secured loan. According to Christian teaching as it developed during the Middle Ages, there were four “titles”, i.e. grounds of entitlement, to interest. The first was the agreed penalty due if repayment was delayed beyond the stipulated date by (for example) three, six, or twelve months. Another title was emergent loss suffered by the lender as a result of his not being able to use his money when he needed it, such loss being subject to impartial assessment. The third title was cessant gain, the loss of opportunity to profit elsewhere because the lender had not been repaid on time. The fourth title arose from the sharing of risk between lender and borrower, for example in a trading voyage.

Professor Kerridge demonstrates by means of long quotations from their works that the Reformers of the sixteenth century were all substantially orthodox in their discussion of interest and usury. Some confusion arose, however, because of the fact that the word “usury” had two different meanings. In normal usage, this word had come to mean “harsh and unconscionable” usury, otherwise known as “oeker” in medieval England, *woekerse* in the Low Countries. Calvin, however, following the usage of the Roman civil law, and the example of his mentor Bucer, distinguished between legitimate *usura*, usury (which included such never-contested practices as the letting of land to farm), and illegitimate *foenus*, fenery. As Kerridge points out, this has led some writers “into the error of supposing that Calvin allowed all usury in the narrow, normal and popular use of the term” (p. 30). Calvin’s chosen terminology also caused him unnecessary difficulties, and he arrived through muddle at the “absurd” suggestion that usury might rightly be taken from the rich (p. 32). Kerridge writes severely of Calvin’s “cloudy circumlocutions”, and his “intellectual weakness” in contradicting Aristotle’s assertion that usury is unnatural because money itself is sterile (p. 44). Calvin nevertheless clearly loathed usury in the common sense.

In England there was a broad consensus concerning usury among divines and lay authors, which is here illustrated by quotations from a large number of works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. English writers generally followed the Schoolmen’s lead on the subject. True, there were some
eccentrics like Robert Filmer who attempted partial justifications of usury (especially loans to the rich), but their paths were dead ends. English Calvinists, Kerridge insists, perhaps rather too emphatically, "were always a small minority" (p. 53), though many people read Calvin and were "intrigued, bemused or confused" by his terminology. Richard Baxter is a good example. Rising prices sharpened concern about usury, and from 1545 onwards statutes were passed to curb it, which (Kerridge believes) they did.

Well over half the book is devoted to a very valuable selection of thirty-eight passages from sermons, commentaries, letters, catechisms and other works of Christian counsel. Texts are given in the original language and in English translation. Luther (nine extracts), Melanchthon (nine), and Calvin (six) are all especially well represented. The seven English sources include a manuscript treatise in the Bodleian Library.

"This book", the dust jacket tells us, "is the first systematic study of the practice of moneylending during the Reformation" (my emphasis). This is a misleading claim. This book is an incisive and useful account of what the Schoolmen, the leading Protestant Reformers, and a number of English writers had to say on the subject. Its analysis of Luther's views is especially respectful and thorough. It is not however a study of the actual practice of moneylending or the incidence of usury. It is true that a short statement about the punishment of usurers by the church courts on pp. 60-61 is supported by the longest footnote in the book, which contains an impressive number of citations of legal treatises, canons, injunctions and anthologies of court proceedings. Yet if this writer's experience is anything to go by, records of prosecutions for usury in sixteenth-century ecclesiastical court books appear to have been rare. Professor Kerridge's book may not be a systematic study of the actual practice of moneylending. Whoever attempts such a study will nevertheless find him an indispensable guide to contemporary thought on the subject.

Ralph Houlbrooke, University of Reading


This book is important primarily because it tackles a subject that is not usually discussed in Reformation Studies, namely that of superstition. However, one should be aware that superstition should not be understood firstly as magic, witchcraft or any other sort of wizardry or sorcery but, as clearly explained in the Introduction, as pure theology. Thus, superstition is nothing else but the way Protestants approached the 'externals' of Catholic
piety, like the increased number of church rituals, the repetition of an established number of masses and, of course, the masses dedicated to the more or less faithful departed. To be sure, for the Protestant mind of the sixteenth century, anything which did not match Evangelical piety — for instance, lighting of candles, the recitation of prayers, the consecration of various objects and their ecclesiastical or non-ecclesiastical use — was instantly dubbed 'superstitious' and treated accordingly.

Considered as a whole, this book is not for beginners. Though its clarity of style, the precision of thought and the careful choice of essays do recommend it to the use of any person who displays at least a slight interest in the Reformation, the book should not be taken lightly by those who have not laid the basis of their theological and historical understanding of the Early Modern Europe. The reason for such an assessment is simple as the book is a compilation of essays which reveal a wide range of theological questions (images of the Virgin Mary, Catholic identity versus Protestant attacks, Catholic missions, approaches to Jesuit theology and history, interpretations of the person and work of Archbishop Ussher, Scripture and prophecy in John Knox, the relationship between astrology and eschatology in the turbulent years of the French Wars of Religion, Protestant demonology and the belief in ghosts in Elizabethan and Jacobean England). The length of this list may develop into a scattered picture for a non-specialist but for the earnest student of the Reformation it is surely an invitation to arrange the seemingly dispersed themes into a unified image of what the authors and editors wanted to convey in relationship to the concept of superstition. Again, superstition is evidently thrust into a context — that of traditional Christianity regardless of its Catholic or Protestant credentials — that would not normally support it, which makes the entire book even more appealing for a careful research.

For an easier understanding, the editors split the book in two main parts: firstly, as they termed it, superstition, tradition and this world, and secondly, superstition, tradition and the other world thus establishing a connection between practical ecclesiology and eschatology. As far as ecclesiology is concerned, Bridget Heal’s article on the Virgin Mary in Protestant Nuremberg is noteworthy for at least a couple of reasons. Firstly, contrary to the shallow image of Mary’s rejection in Protestantism and to the condemnation of the cult of Mary in the theology of the Reformers, we are reminded that Nuremberg’s religious authorities (which were undoubtedly of genuine Protestant stock) adopted a rather moderate position concerning the liturgy and some elements that made direct reference to the Virgin Mary. Secondly, Protestants did not simply dismiss the image of Mary but rather reinterpreted it to fit the main tenets of their theology of grace (see, for instance, the approach of Martin Luther and Lazarus Spengler who saw Mary as an example of the grace of God).
Jason Nye’s essay on Catholic Identity in Rottweil is centered upon the life and work of the city priest Johannes Uhl. His activity in Rottweil would make any Protestant envious, as Uhl was a prolific preacher, who underlined the importance of catechetical instruction for the youth and made repeated attempts to strengthen the practical piety of Catholics by constantly calling them to the Sacraments and the Mass.

The third essay of the first part deserves special attention for two main reasons. Firstly, it is about the history of the Reformation in Transylvania, a subject that is not known in Western thought as it should be. Romanian lands, including Transylvania, are generally associated with Eastern Orthodoxy but it is utterly important to realize that the Reformation did not stop in Hungary. Confusion may arise as during the sixteenth century, Transylvania was part of Hungary but its Romanian population has always been predominant. Secondly, the article is written by a Romanian. Traditionally the interest for the Reformation in Transylvania was shared by Westerners and Hungarian historians. Now, however, we are presented with a fresh perspective of a Romanian scholar. Nevertheless, Maria Crăciun is concerned with Catholic Missionaries in Transylvania and probably the most important aspect of her contribution is the emphasis on the complexity of events that took place in sixteenth-century Transylvania. For a Protestant, cities like Wittenberg, Zurich and Geneva will always be prominent. On her part, Maria Crăciun managed to highlight the prominence of some Transylvanian cities like, among many others, Oradea, Cluj and Sibiu. As far as Catholic missionaries are concerned, Maria Crăciun describes the work of the Jesuits, who were very eager to insist on religious differences as means of converting their subjects.

Eric Nelson’s article is a fortunate continuation of that of Maria Crăciun because it is a minute analysis of what has become known as the Jesuit legend. The essay reveals the attempts of both Protestant and Catholic critics to distort the Jesuits’ public image and associate it with elements (like witches, demons, Jews and Gypsies) that were supposed to stop their missionary endeavors. In other words, as Nelson correctly writes, Jesuits were depicted as wolves in sheep’s clothing and true masters of hypocrisy and deception.

The second part of the book begins with an article written by Ute Lotz-Heumann, which focuses on Nicholas Bernard’s most interesting biography of James Ussher. Thus, Bernard pictures Ussher as an eschatological prophet who utters words that are effective in historical reality. For instance, a notorious case is when one of Ussher’s sermons was preached exactly at the time that the battle of Kinsale was fought and won by the English. The explanation is simple: using the text from Revelation 4,1, Ussher allegedly rebuked the Irish (Catholic) Church for being dead in spite of her own claims to spiritual life. The result, at least for Bernard, is evident: the English (which were, of course, Protestants) won the battle with the armies of the
unfaithful Irish Catholics. Bernard’s portrayal of Ussher is even more interesting when he makes a striking parallel between Christ and Ussher, described as a holy man who has the spirit of the Apostles.

An equally interesting essay is that of Dale Johnson and is centered on the works of John Knox. Johnson is occupied with Knox’s view of Scripture, his doctrine of Scripture in practice and his view of prophetic gifts in contrast to that of Calvin. Also of importance is Johnson’s list of views regarding Knox’s prophecies. One of the fundamental insights of the entire article is probably Johnson’s observation that Knox had always been convinced that God was speaking in the sixteenth century by means of prophets as he had done in biblical times. The last but not the least important aspect of Johnson’s article is found in his concluding remarks which describe Knox as being closer to the prophets of the Old Testament. Knox himself seems to have claimed that he had both “forthtelling and foretelling powers”. For Johnson, this is a clear shift in Knox from Scripture alone to Scripture and prophecy, which forced the Scottish reformer out of the most revered party of the Protestant reformers.

Astrology and eschatology are two words that are not put together very often. Luc Racaut, however, managed to do this in order to show that secular interest in astrology was severely confuted (with minor and insignificant differences) by both Catholics and Protestants in France during the sixteenth century. In the end, because astrology was seen as science and divination it proved to be a means of accusation between Catholics and Protestants. Racaut argues that both parties blamed each other for using astrology, which was closely associated with magic and illicit superstition.

P.G. Maxwell-Stuart’s article on rational superstition offers seminal proofs of both Catholic and Protestant writings on demonology. What is important, however, despite various accents in Catholic and Protestant attitudes to the realm of demons should be found in Maxwell-Stuart’s observation of the similarities between the Catholic and Protestant approach to demonology. To conclude, as Maxwell-Stuart rightly notices, authors of both confessions admitted that demons may interfere in and even change the realm of human history only with God’s permission.

The book ends with Peter Marshall’s article on the vivid interest that some Protestant (and Catholic) theologians in Elizabethan and Jacobean England showed for ghosts as spirits of the dead who could not find rest or were disturbed in their rest. Thus, there was a real preoccupation with the possibility that the Devil should have the power to animate the souls of the dead. While Protestants did not have a unified position on this particular matter, they all seem to have drawn their interest for ghosts from the biblical image of Saul’s encounter with the witch of Endor. Regardless whether this biblical incident was interpreted as reality (the which did call the spirit of Samuel) or as a fraud (the which had hired an accomplice who had ventriloquist skills and used to disseminate ‘prophecies’ from the
witch’s closet), the interest for ghosts in England was of concern not only to few Puritan ‘zealots’ but to a wide range of Protestant ideology. These concluding remarks could and probably should be extended to the entire book. As such, this compendium of essays on superstition displays sufficient proof that Protestant theology has not always been in search for godly theological themes but also for matters that, quite often, were not in a close relationship to the Bible or were not biblical at all.

Corneliu C. Simuț, Emanuel University, Oradea


Was dem Gesamtwerk ohne die nun erschienenen Bände gefehlt hätte, bringt eine Durchsicht der nunmehr über 2.000 Lemmata ans Licht, wenn man nach den für die Kirchengeschichte insgesamt bedeutenden Personen sucht. Die wenigsten von ihnen wurden in den ersten drei Bänden bedacht, und so sind erst nun zugänglich: Jan Bakhuizen van den Brink (G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 5: 30-33); Pierre Bayle (J. van Sluis, 5: 41-46); Johannes Coccejus (W.J. van Asselt, 4: 92-98); Lambertus Danaeus (J.G. Schenderling,
Man mag einwenden, daß gerade zu den Genannten auch an anderen Orten Informationen zu finden sind, gerade weil es sich um 'große Gestalten' des Christentums handelt. Allerdings ist es für eine Einordnung dieser Theologen wichtig, wie sie aus der Innensicht des niederländischen Protestantismus und seiner Historiographie verortet werden.


worden. Es spricht für die freien theologischen Institutionen in Kampen und nun auch Apeldoorn, daß sie in der Lage und Willens sind, ein solches Projekt zu tragen, und es spricht gegen die Kulturpolitik eines reichen europäischen Landes, daß eine staatliche Theologische Fakultät hier immer weniger Möglichkeiten hat (eine Aussage, die bekanntlich für andere 'Kulturnationen' noch mehr gilt als für die Niederlande). Die Verdrängung geisteswissenschaftlicher (hier theologisch-kirchenhistorischer) Großleistungen aus dem staatlichen Wissenschaftsbetrieb darf als wachsendes Problem der westeuropäischen Wissenschaft(un)kultur nicht übersehen werden. Dankbar nehmen Theologie und Kirchengeschichte daher das Biografisch Lexicon entgegen, wohl wissend, daß der Dank nicht nur der wissenschaftlichen Qualität der Herausgeber und Mitarbeiter gilt, sondern auch ihrer enormen logistischen Anstrengung, um die Rahmenbedingungen für die Weiterführung zu schaffen, was eigentlich die Aufgabe anderer hätte sein müssen.

Jörg Haustein, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn


The last landmark in Calvin’s attacks on Nicodemism was his Response à un certain Hollandois of 1562 written in response to Coornhert’s Verschooninghe van de roomsche afgodeyere, compiled two years earlier. This was the culmination of a series of works in which Calvin criticized what he regarded as the habit of simulation, the readiness of Protestants to attend Roman Catholic religious services, sometimes for considerations of personal safety or opportunity and sometimes in the name of theological convictions. Although he had opposed such a tendency since the mid-1530s, he had first described his targets as ‘Nicodemites’ in his Excuse à Messieurs les Nicodémites in 1544. Yet, as Mirjam van Veen reminds us, he was not the first theologian to connect the New Testament figure of Nicodemus with simulation. Otto Brunfels and Frederik Hondebeke had done so in the early 1520s, as had Erasmus in his commentary on Seneca in 1529.

In her study, which ends with an edition of Coornhert’s text based on the manuscript dating from 1572 and now in the Leiden University Library, Mirjam van Veen discusses the origin of the term ‘Nicodemism’ and surveys the situation in France where Guillaume Farel, Antoine Marcourt and Paul Viret had first observed, and objected to, those who committed themselves neither to Protestantism nor to Catholicism but preferred a third path between the two. Calvin found such a situation particularly dangerous and deplored it accordingly. Over the years, Van Veen shows, his objec-
tions grew, and were stimulated still further by the eirenic recommenda-
tions of Georg Cassander after the Colloque de Poissy in 1561.

But why did Calvin take such a radical view of individuals who were
often simply trying to avoid the martyrdom entailed by religious non-con-
formity? Van Veen rejects the theory proposed by Eugénie Droz in 1970
according to which Calvin, who always advised exile rather than compro-
mise, was moved to attack the Nicodemites in a broader plan to encour-
age French Protestants to emigrate to Geneva and consequently to strengthen
his own position in the city. Van Veen convincingly attributes Calvin’s atti-
dtude to his own deepest convictions — his true horror of any sort of com-
promise with the Church of Rome, the importance which he himself attached
to religious ceremonies (and his consequent hatred of the wrong ones), and
his belief in the Church as an institution, his ambition to found a new
Church free of the errors of the old.

Van Veen then turns to the situation in the Netherlands where, she
shows, the spiritualists — men such as David Joris and Sebastian Franck —
had a very considerable influence at a time when there may have been a
widespread opposition to the Catholicism associated with Spanish rule but
there was also a marked reluctance to join one of the new Churches. The
third way of Sebastian Franck, the belief in an invisible Church and the
insignificance of outer ceremonies, provided fertile ground for Nicodemite
behaviour. In the Low Countries, too, those who had committed them-
shelves to the Reformation feared and resented this tendency, but it had a
stalwart spokesman in Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert.

Coornhert’s Verschooninghe was directed not only against Calvin but also
against Menno Simons. In her analysis of the text Van Veen demonstrates
that Coornhert was influenced by Erasmus and Sebastian Franck, as well
as by David Joris (whom he himself had attacked on grounds very similar
to those on which he attacked Calvin). Coornhert’s arguments are familiar
to us from many of his other works. He firmly ruled out the need for mar-
yrdom, especially in the name of outer ceremonies which were of little
importance, and he called into doubt the prerogative of either Menno
Simons or Calvin to know the ‘truth’ and consequently to found a Church
of their own.

Mirjam van Veen’s study is, by and large, sensible and reliable, and her
edition of Coornhert’s text will remain of the greatest use. One of the few
criticisms of any substance which might be advanced concerns her treat-
ment of Carlo Ginzburg’s Il nicodemismo. Simulazione e dissimulazione religiosa
nell’Europa del ’500. Despite other studies which have appeared since and
which have either questioned some of Ginzburg’s conclusions or have shifted
the perspective, Ginzburg’s remains the standard book on the subject. While
Mirjam van Veen is prepared to enter into a debate with the authors of
more recent works, such as Labrousse, Higman, Eire and Waneggfelen, she
relegates Ginzburg to a passing reference in a couple of footnotes. This does not do justice to the man who put the sixteenth-century debate about Nicodemism on the map.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University


Gary Waite’s Reformers on Stage is a study of the provocative ideas expressed in Dutch rhetorician drama and of the propagandistic function of this kind of theatre. Although it was produced by amateur literary societies, the impact of this drama was considerable, since the members of these ‘chambers’, a peculiarly Dutch phenomenon, were respected citizens from several classes, for instance artists, artisans, nobles, merchants, bakers, butchers, schoolmasters, and old clothes sellers. Waite has chosen a “historical perspective in order to uncover the role played by the rhetorician playwrights and actors in the propagation of reform ideas within the Low Countries of Charles V” (p. ix). This book contains the first systematic and complete investigation in the English language of the influence of the chambers, their social composition and their role in society. It is divided into three parts: ‘Drama and Society in the Low Countries’, ‘Vernacular Drama and Early Urban Reformation’, and ‘Reform Themes in Rhetorician Drama, 1519-1556’.

The rhetoricians were historically related to religious fraternities that laid emphasis on the development of piety and charity. One of the results was that the main goal of the dramas produced by the rhetoricians was to promote the piety of the people. The authors saw their work as inspired by the Holy Spirit and as an instrument in the work of God. This caused some envy of the clergy, the professionals who looked at these amateur theologians with some suspicion.

The plays of the rhetorician chambers, particularly those of the much-discussed competition of 1539, have been studied thoroughly, especially by literary scholars, and their texts saw modern editions. Waite took another position as a historian and this is one of the reasons why his book may be highly praised. He systematically assesses the religious orientation of many plays and gives the chambers their place in their social context. He does so by contrasting the local social milieu of Antwerp and Amsterdam. In both cities the chambers were a melting pot of “the upper artisanal, professional and merchant elements of urban society” (p. 39) and as such their members were the cities’ opinion leaders.

In cosmopolitan Antwerp the chambers and their members wished to maintain a good relationship with the magistrates. Partly as a result of that
the evangelical reform ideas were only subtly expressed in their plays. In the city of Amsterdam, which was more provincial and less prosperous in those days, the rhetoricians expressed their ideas for reform with more vigour. Their relationship with the magistrates was more problematic and thus they turned to the artisanal guilds and other groups. They were so to say marginalized. Perhaps that is what made them support, for instance, the Anabaptist revolution of 1535.

I see four objections that can be made to this highly inspiring book. The first is that the 'impact' of drama is questionable. It was one of many other media, such as sermons, pamphlets, debates and songs. What then is the role of drama even if it was "serious business"? (p. 202) And drama tends to express accepted views, since the audience have to be able to understand what they see and have to recognize at least part of their own ideas. Does drama, then, lead or follow public opinion?

A second objection is that Waite focuses on vernacular drama. Of course, this is the scope of his book, but in my opinion the book would have gained considerably from taking into account the contemporaneous Latin plays as well. ‘Dutch’ drama in Latin had its impact on pupils of the Latin schools, who later in life would become leading men in society. Plays written in the Netherlands were read and staged all over Europe. For instance Gnapheus’ Acolastus, a play with the story of the prodigal son as its subject, was printed over 50 times and played in Germany, England, and France, to mention only three countries. It expressed reform-like views. The Latin dramas that were played by pupils of the Latin schools, who were to become the political, literary and social leaders of their cities, must have had their impact on the players and perhaps also on the audience. But here, too, it can be questioned whether drama set public morals or followed the developments.

A third objection is that Waite tries to assess the religious position of the plays. In an appendix he classifies them as orthodox Roman Catholic, Erasmian Catholic, Lutheran, Reform-minded, Calvinist, Spiritualist, Anabaptist, other religion, and secular. In those days, however, most people had little idea of the differences between the several denominations and they often did not know to what denomination they themselves belonged. They could be reformed and yet adhere to some elements of the Roman Catholic faith and still attend mass. Who knew the subtle differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism and who expressed those differences exactly in drama? Is it really true what Parente stated (quoted by Waite, p. xv), that audiences, “many of whom had only a superficial familiarity with Christian dogma, were thus informed of the fundamental tenets of their faith”. Were the chambers’ members better informed than the audience? And were the tenets expressed in a dogmatic or far more generally Christian manner, demonstrating the way a Christian should behave, showing desirable moral attitudes? It is significant that Waite does not mention the recent literature
on the history of religion (for instance by Pettegree and by Janse) and that
he uses the term 'Reformation', only incidentally distinguishing between
'Protestant' and 'Catholic Reformation', as is done in recent publications.

In recent historiography the Netherlands are not divided into 'North'
and 'South' but in the economic centre consisting of Holland, Zeeland and
Brabant, and the periphery. Waite does not question or discuss this, but
confronts southern Antwerp with northern Amsterdam, both seaports and
mercantile centres. There are very good reasons to do so, but he could
have discussed this topic and accounted for his choice.

But all these objections do not really affect my deepest respect for Waite's
achievements. He wrote a very inspiring book on an important phenome-
non in the Low Countries.

Jan Bloemendal, Constantijn Huygens Instituut, The Hague

RIENK VERMIJ, The Calvinist Copernicans: The reception of the new astronomy in
the Dutch Republic, 1575-1750 [History of science and scholarship in the
Netherlands 1]. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen,

The first volume in this new series on the history of Dutch science and
scholarship deals with the introduction and dissemination of Copernicus' doctrine in the Republic of the United Provinces. Owing to pioneers like Simon Stevin, Willem Jansz. Blaeu, Philips Lansbergen, Martinus Hortensius and Isaac Beeckman the heliocentric system evolved from an esoteric doc-
trine professed by a few specialists into a serious alternative cosmology. As is generally known, the telescopic discoveries by Galileo strongly confirmed the new cosmology. From the first moment, the University of Leiden also played an important role in this development. It was at Leiden that a strong philological tradition emerged that was represented by humanists who roused the interest of scientifically minded people in astronomy, not only through their chronological studies (Josephus Justus Scaliger) but also their editions of such (post-) classical authors as Martianus Capella (Hugo Grotius). In this way Leiden philologists also contributed to the plausibility of divergent cosmologies like the Capellan compromise system, in which the earth is no longer the centre of all planetary motion. In the beginning, the prepon-
derence of the old Aristotelian worldview remained unchallenged, and the discussion lingered on without really catching fire, but the introduction of mechanistic Cartesianism in about 1645 caused a great shock. Before long, Copernicanism would become an essential element in a broad philosophical-
physical discourse.

In the eyes of Descartes, the cosmos was regulated by laws which only needed a 'first mover' to carry on independently. Cautiously, the French
philosopher tried to separate religion from science, but even so God was put aside in his new physical system. Descartes held that the earth moved in relation to the sun. In general, his followers endorsed heliocentrism, even though they could only come up with vague physical speculations instead of empirically based evidence. Daniel Lipstorp and, more pertinently, Christophorus Wittichius, made the incompatibility of Copernicanism with the literal text of the Bible a hot issue and an essential element in the philosophical debates. A confrontation with the Dutch theologians was inevitable. Professor Gisbertus Voetius of Utrecht became the most prominent opponent of Cartesianism. The struggle, encompassing theological, physical, philosophical and political points of conflict, would dominate public life far into the eighteenth century. Not only the literal meaning of the Bible and the structure of the cosmos, but also the independent position of the Church as opposed to the State, as well as the Stadholderate versus republican ideologies, were subjects of intense debate. While the Cartesian faction demanded autonomy for physical research and philosophical hypotheses, the Voetians argued that it was better "to err (if it is permitted to say so) with Moses, rather than to know with Copernicus" (p. 179). The debate intensified because university professors of divinity and philosophy fought each other through their students, who propagated their views in numerous disputations. After a climax in 1656 with twenty pamphlets and other writings, the introduction, around 1715, of Newtonianism eventually led to a gradual adjustment of controversies. According to Vermij, a complex mix of factors underlies this interesting phenomenon: the struggling parties had become war-weary and the orthodox theologians now realized how dangerous it was to anathematise scientific discoveries. In addition, Newton's empirical physics favoured the rise of a physico-theology which eventually helped to satisfy the orthodox party.

Vermij's detailed survey makes clear that, soon after 1656, all controversies ended in deadlock. From the very start, the orthodox ministers assumed that their opponents' only aim was to discredit the Holy Writ and undermine the fundamentals of faith. They stubbornly adhered to the literal meaning of the Bible and refused to give up the dogma of literal inspiration by the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, the Cartesians noted that the Voetians were not interested in abstruse calculations and astronomical observations. Many progressive scientists and theologians emphasised that biblical passages should often be interpreted in a broad metaphorical sense. In their eyes, the Bible also made use of colloquial language and even accommodated itself to erroneous common notions. One of the most controversial passages was Joshua 10,12-14, which says that God had stopped the course of the sun and the moon in order to enable the Jewish people to destroy the Amorites.

In the confrontation between the old Aristotelian cosmology and the
Cartesian system, Copernicanism played a central role, but one may ask if this new worldview was also a crucial force in the gradual erosion of the sacrosanct status of the Bible. In my opinion, there is some truth in the proposition that autonomous developments in the field of philology were a more decisive factor here. Perhaps this aspect should have received somewhat more attention in *The Calvinist Copernicans*. On p. 159, it is assumed that philology had ceased to provide participants in the great cosmological debate with important ammunition by around 1650. This statement is beyond dispute, but it is also certain that in the same period textual criticism, especially biblical criticism, made a good deal of progress. Research into the world of the Bible reached a high level, not only in Leiden, but also and even more so in France. At the Protestant Academy in Saumur, for example, Louis Cappel developed the idea that the Bible texts were not preserved in one single, undamaged sacred source. Later on, the Oratorian priest Richard Simon provided further insight into the haphazard and complicated transmission of the Old Testament in his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1678). Meanwhile, in many publications, representatives of heterodox movements like Remonstrantism and Socinianism undermined the traditional belief that the Word of God was literally inspired. As Vermij himself points out (pp. 318-19, 375), Copernicanism soon degenerated into a symbol, a banner cry or a shibboleth. Numerous discoveries in the fields of astronomy and physics did not cause the Voetians to abandon their rigorous vindication of Biblical truthfulness. While the orthodox theologians utterly neglected empirical arguments, the scientists refused to disavow their calculations; they only complied with the theologians under sheer social pressure. It was a war with static fronts. Meanwhile, philology made headway — slowly perhaps, but irresistibly — and its influence must have been more important than the study of Vermij would have us believe.

This remark however does not detract from my great admiration for Vermij’s research. A surprisingly long series of astronomers, theologians, land surveyors and downright amateurs are assembled in a well-structured and clearly written narrative which demonstrates that Copernicanism provoked the same vehement discussions within the Protestant community as in the Roman Catholic world. In his description of the fierce polemics within the Dutch Reformed churches, Vermij goes into the political and social context in great detail, and also opens up new perspectives on the basis of archival material. The extensive Bibliography at the end of the book (pp. 376-425) shows yet again that the author has gone through a mass of contemporary pamphlets and many secondary publications, thus unfolding a broad and inspiring panorama of the developments in Dutch intellectual life.

H.J.M. Nellen, Constantijn Huygens Instituut, The Hague

Pim den Boer and Anneke C.G. Fleurkens are to be congratulated and thanked for their edition of Simon Stevin’s Burgherlick leven, complete with a translation of his text into modern Dutch and an introduction.

Stevin’s (1548-1620) work was reprinted ten times between 1590 and 1686 and then sunk into oblivion. It thus shared the fate of the whole genre it was a part of. As such it is of specific interest in terms of the specific shape that genre took in the Netherlands. In providing in the margins the Latin terms that he had in mind when choosing vernacular terms for his own work, ‘Burgherliecheyt’ and issues having to do with ‘Burgherlick’ were given as ‘adiunctis politiae’ or politice. Stevins’ work is indeed one of the very early examples of the development of an own discipline inquiring into the very basis of life in society prompted by the civil and religious strife of the period. It developed mainly from the genre of commentaries on classical authors, but opened up, by its keen interest in understanding current problems, an entirely new approach to understanding state and society.

It thus differed substantially from the three different basic approaches preceding it during the sixteenth century. One was to search scripture for precedents on government. Second, lawyers had been busy to interpret both Roman law and custom and common law in order to gain insight into the nature and extent of government, for instance as a comprehensive analysis of the laws of a given realm. Third, since Aquinas had attempted to integrate Aristotelian empirical sociology on the ways and forms of government into a Christian framework insisting on the prime duty of serving God, comments on Aristotle had become a major genre of its own, mushrooming during the whole of the sixteenth century. These three different approaches were by no means mutually exclusive, but were indeed frequently combined, though the legal approach was primarily dominated by lawyers, while comments on Aristotle combined with scripture remained the demesne of theologians.

The religious civil wars of the sixteenth century in Germany, the Netherlands, England, but primarily in France prompted two important new developments. The allegation that any supreme government worth the name had to have a monopoly on major executive and jurisdictional rights, summarized as maiestas or sovereignty by the French lawyer Bodin (1576), did challenge the late medieval dispersal of such rights and led into an intense debate which institution or person in a given realm was actually the possessor of this new kind of nearly all encompassing power. Second, in the wake of this development the older genre of interpretations of Aristotle gave slowly way to the emergence of a new genre, attempting to provide a comprehensive analysis of government, the nature of society, the duties of
citizens, the grounds of legitimacy, but indeed every possible aspect of what we would now acknowledge to be the disciplines of sociology and politics. In particular, a critical approach to why men act in which situation in what way and how that could be manipulated or controlled was an important part of the considerations of the new genre. A whole number of these works in Germany or England chose to put in their title the term 'Politica' as a comprehensive umbrella-term for this wide range of subjects, but also to emphasize their interest in a more fundamental and deep-reaching approach to the subject then either the disciplines of law or theology had provided. These accounts were based on a broad range of sources, including classical ones — apart from Aristotle, Plato and Cicero also Sallust, Tacitus and Livy —, on Scripture, on medieval commentaries on these sources, on Roman law, on common law and on histories. But rather then using these sources as entirely normative benchmark, they were increasingly used as historical examples of the success or failure of society. Their link with the past was to assume that life in society equalled essentially life under laws — to Stevin, vitam politicam —, as opposed to men in the status naturalis (thus, rendering 'burgherlick regel/Axioma politicum' as 'staats- burgerlick' (p. 83) or 'burgherlick dragen' as 'as goed burger' (p. 95) is not quite adequate, for the establishment of society and state were to be thought one and the same issue and the citizen was a person that by definition lived under laws — otherwise he lost his office as citizen).

Scholarship is yet divided to what extent different schools in this development should be distinguished and to what extent they served specific purposes at their time, for instance in the struggle of princes and estates. But given the disputed nature of the true Christian faith and the current upheaval in Europe, managing crisis and strategies to secure and hold power had to be of particular importance to all possible readers. But it is undisputed that during this time emphasis on the societas civilis and the role of its members was overshadowed by the need to establish a res publica, a hierarchy of order and subjection, to plainly keep the peace, a demand on government that was supplemented in the new genre by historical and sociological evaluations of how to best serve this purpose.

Stevin's work is an early example of this genre, still in its formation. Rather then using Politica as an umbrella term as later works, it uses the derivatives of 'Politic' to address the subject matter of his discourse, that is the 'burgherlick leven — vita politicae' (and of course 'burger' as 'politici', p. 31), but then also uses civilis for staatsgevonden, i.e. Public (p. 63). Within the traditional framework of Aristotelian physics, he defines the life as citizen as the material of the inquiry, being given shape by the gemeensake, the respublica, the institutional aspect of this live, being government and laws (p. 27). Also, his account of human (= civil, 'plaatsgebonden', p. 37) natural and divine law was common to contemporary thinking. So was his insistence on obedience toward these laws, including the human
ones (p. 39). For precisely the living under laws and obeying them defined a 'burgerlicke persoon' (p. 91).

The translation is very helpful. A few exceptions where other renderings could have been suggested (such as 'burgerliche stof' into 'burgerschapp' (p. 25), 'gemeensake' into 'algemeen belang' (p. 27) rather than as 'staat' as at another place (p. 57) — losing the background of Aristotelian physics and the institutional sense of the res publica slightly out of sight — or 'Staatsvorstheid' into 'constitutional monarchy' (pp. 49, 51)) are matters of legitimate dispute.

Where should we put Stevin's work? Some of his points clearly support the states of the Union of Utrecht in their case against Spain and in upholding civic order in the face of religious divisions. Pim den Boer rightly stresses this background in his informative commentary (pp. 171-72). Stevin adds to the three basic forms of government — by one, few and many as monarchy, aristocracy and democracy — the cooperation of prince and estates ('staatsvorstheid') and seems to favour the latter and aristocracy as government by the wisest (p. 53). His illustration of struggles between a prince and the estates by that between the Roman Senate and the infamous tyrant Nero reinforces his pro-aristocratic point of view (p. 61), as does his critique of the practise of monarchy (p. 77) and his condemnation of chilastic revolts such as of the Anabaptists in Munster and Amsterdam. He criticises them for having attempted to exclude the earlier local government-elite (p. 55). Here, his terminology changes from burger and politici to plain 'onderdaan', who has to obey his urban elite. This mirrors exactly the point of view of, for instance, the Magdeburg mayors in their resistance against Charles V in 1549-50 — they understood themselves as magistrates under God just like the Emperor, but expected obedience from their citizen-subjects. His point about the possibility of tolerating dissidents (p. 113) also fits this specific partial point of view. In terms of the development of Political Thought, his plainly non-confessional attitude to the meaning of religion and his functional approach to its use in supporting civic virtue (pp. 99-101) did also inform statements such as Althusius' inaugural oratio at Herborn. This functional approach to religion and law (p. 121), the emancipation from any single main source and the beginning inquiry into a comprehensive sociology of rule and order aimed at solving current problems all put the work within the new genre of the Politica. This genre did fundamentally transform theorizing on politics between the late sixteenth century and the mid-seventeenth century.

Pim den Boer stresses Stevin's emphasis on the 'de facto' legitimacy of power (p. 188) and the contrast to Lipsius (p. 192). But what was once understood as 'de facto' legitimacy is now seen as a reiteration of Augustinus. Stevin's inquiry into the historical origin of the founding of society for protection was going to become a standard speculation, but does also reflect his matter of fact argument, emphasizing security and necessity of government
rather than purusing virtue, or serving God. Likewise, his emphasis on obeying the government at a given moment in power, no matter what earlier or later governments had ordered, and his attack against the use of religion to undermine civic order (p. 115) clearly reflected the need of the emerging Dutch republic to persuade everyone to obey rather than to cling to allegiance to the king of Spain. His occasional use of examples, such as to put Moses, a major leader of the People of Israel under God, in one line with Tamerlan and other infidel princes also points toward his relative disinterest in confessional Christian issues of legitimacy (p. 49). However, Stevin’s continued insistence on the historical legitimacy of the limited nature of power in the Netherlands (pp. 67-73) demarcate a clear cut difference to what has been understood to be arguments in favour of the commonwealth de-facto dictatorship in England from 1649. Rather, Stevin’s work provides proof that ideas about the rule of law and the cooperation of various agencies serving the law within a regimen politicum et regale approach could and did well survive the religious strife of the period, even when combined with a ‘de-facto-approach’ to politics. A fairly realistic approach to the actual nature of power and its preservation was, however, what plainly distinguished most works of the new genre and precisely distinguished it from its precursors. Normative priorities, such as the rule of law, were not given up, but were put into a framework of discussing how actually to defend them under adverse circumstances. But neither did Stevin’s prime insistence on obedience to given laws or lack of emphasis on civic participation squares easily, as Boer claims (p. 192), with what scholarship now understands to be the Italien-urban-republican ideal of vivere civile. Stevin’s ‘burgerlicke regel’ insists on obedience to ‘rechte overheyt’, not on civic self rule. Stevin is thus neither a latter-day Florentine Republican nor an early Dutch Hobbes. He does not need to be either. The emerging discipline of politics to which he contributed was rich enough in its diversity and methodological breach with the past to be studied in its own right.

Robert von Friedeburg, Erasmus University Rotterdam


With the appearance of Isaac Casaubon’s *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XV* in 1614 the *Corpus Hermeticum*, so long and so widely believed to have been written by Hermes Trismegistus and to date from the remotest Antiquity, was at last exposed as a compilation made in the first centuries
A.D. For Frances Yates this was the end of an era, "a watershed separating the Renaissance world from the modern world". In Das Ende des Hermetismus Martin Mulsow tries to establish just how abrupt this change was and how decisive its effect. He has consequently assembled eight articles by different scholars, to which he has added two pieces of his own besides his introduction and epilogue. The result is a collection documenting the last stages and the 'end' of the Hermetic tradition. The articles assembled are by no means always new, but they illustrate the long debate prompted by Frances Yates's statements. Although most of them have been translated into German, three, two by Frederick Purnell and one by Nancy Siraisi, are in English.

It is to the important research of Frederick Purnell and his two articles, included in this volume and first published in The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in 1976, that we owe the discovery of some of Casaubon's predecessors. In the course of the sixteenth century various scholars, arguing from entirely different positions, came to the conclusion that the Hermetic texts were far later than their admirers believed. In his Chronographia of 1567 the French chronographer Gilbert Génébrard had dated them to 303 B.C. Two years later the Fleming Goropius Becanus denied the historicity of Hermes. In 1575, in Geneva, the Reformed historian Matthieu Béroalde decried the Hermetic writings as forgeries, and in his Exercitationes of 1585 (an attack on one of the most committed Hermeticists of the time, Francesco Patrizi), Teodoro Angelucci, writing in Treviso, rejected the authenticity both of Hermes and of the works attributed to him. In 1588 Angelucci implicitly dated the writings about the third century A.D. and succeeded in converting to this view the philosopher Antonio Persio.

Yet Hermes retained many champions. The fact that the Hermetic texts should have been quoted by so many Fathers of the Church bestowed on them, we are reminded in Cesare Vasoli's fine article on Ficino and his debt to Gemistos Plethon, a profound respectability. Hermes retained his place among the founders of the præsca theologia, and Ficino and others could use his writings as evidence of an eternal piety heralding Christianity. Maria Muccillo demonstrates how Annibale Roscelli contrived to find arguments in favour of the Trinity in the work of Hermes and also how he presented two aspects of the legendary Egyptian deity — on the one hand a prophet divinely inspired and on the other a pious philosopher who had not received a divine message but owed his own semi-divinity to his virtuous life.

Martin Mulsow's epilogue is preceded by a German translation of Anthony Grafton's classic article 'Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus', first published in the Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes in 1983 and since reprinted in Grafton's Defenders of the Text. After a brilliant analysis of Casaubon's critique of the Hermetic texts in his great attack on Baronius — a critique largely prompted by his disapproval of
Baronius’s habit of marshalling pagan authorities — Grafton shows how little opposition Casaubon’s conclusions about Hermes aroused. What was found far less acceptable was his attack on the antiquity of the Sibylline oracles, still considered genuinely prophetic.

The “reactionary Hermetists” (Frances Yates’s term) who continued to sustain the antiquity of the Hermetic writings after Casaubon’s publication, were relatively few, the most notorious being the eccentric Athanasius Kircher. Yet, as Mulsow argues in his epilogue, there remained various groups who continued to venerate the memory of the Egyptian sage. For this there were different reasons at different times. To start with, the only Hermetic texts which had been discredited by Casaubon were those in the Corpus Hermeticum. Others, such as the Tabula Smaragdina, might retain their respectability, and certainly did so in the world of alchemists and Paracelsians which was essentially different from that of the philosophers. Besides, Casaubon’s discoveries may have been circulated among scholars but they were ignored on a humbler level of practitioners of magic and medicine. By the eighteenth century the situation had changed once more. Those thinkers such as Georg Schade who continued to cultivate Hermeticism did so in reaction to the materialism entailed by the philosophy of Spinoza and La Mettrie, while at a later date their spiritual heirs might resort to Hermes in search of alternatives in the face of advancing modernity.

Das Ende der Hermetismus contains a number of appendices. The relevant extracts from Génébrard’s Chronographia, Francesco Patrizi’s edition of the Hermetic texts, Francesco Muti’s answer to Angelucci, and Casaubon’s Exercitationes are given in facsimile, while the epistolary exchange between Angelucci and Persio has been fully transcribed. Even if the quality of the facsimiles is not always ideal, they contribute to the extreme usefulness of this fascinating publication.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University


„Eine Sonne in der Kirche Gottes“. So bezeichnete 1667 die gelehrte und fromme Anna Maria van Schurman Albertine Agnes, die Gattin des friesischen Statthalters Willem Frederik. Ihr Hof würde zum „Diamant göttlicher Tugenden und Segnungen“ werden, meinte van Schurman. Willem Frederik...
erweist sich in seinen Tagebüchern als ein reformierter Pietist: Er geht zum heiligen Abendmahl, liest erbauliche Werke, geht in Schwarz gekleidet in die Kirche, singt Psalmen, bevor er zu Bett geht und hält strenge Disziplin in der persönlichen Religionsausübung ein. Ebenfalls für ihre pietistischen Sympathien bekannt, war die Prinzessin Maria Louise van Hessen-Kassel, die jahrzehntelang das Gesicht des Leeuwerder Hofes prägte und als eine fromme Witwe bekannt war. (Bereits 1711, zwei Jahre nach ihrer Eheschließung, verlor sie ihren Gatten Johan Willem Friso.)


Beide Bücher sind im Rahmen der Veranstaltung des Friesischen Museums und des Leeuwerder Prinzessinnenhofs, wo im Frühling 2003 eine Doppelausstellung über die Vorfahren der Oranjes veranstaltet wurde, veröffentlicht worden.


aufgenommen worden. Im Rahmen dieser Rezension stellt sich die Frage, wie diese Publikation für die (nähere) Erforschung des Hauses Oranien und der Religion fruchtbar sein könnte.


Wir dürfen den Redakteuren der Archive der friesischen Statthalter für dieses gute Hilfsmittel erkenntlich sein. Es wird sich in Zukunft für die Erforschung des Fürstenhauses, der Statthalterschaft, der frühmodernen Politik und der Hofkultur im Allgemeinen als unentbehrlich erweisen.

Jan-Kees Karels, Apeldoorn
This is a book about community identity. In particular, it is about the identity of Scots migrants in Rotterdam in the 1600s. The author argues that there was reciprocity of influence between the Scots migrants and the people, culture, and general life of Rotterdam. The research that underlies this book is aimed at seeing what determined migration for Rotterdam’s Scots, as well as how their migration determined Rotterdam.

In looking at the pattern of migration in early modern Europe, the author suggests that people were not just aware that migration was a strategy, but they also participated, either actively, as those who actually migrated, or passively, as supporters of the networks underlying most migrants. The Scots in Rotterdam exemplified the power of endurance of migratory system and the social networks that served as the infrastructure. The Scots were very active in Rotterdam’s public life. They influenced Rotterdam through various means, and one of the most important means was the way they created solutions to problems. At the same time, they also influenced Rotterdam by way of ties of mutual aid that they formed within their personal networks as they settled in Rotterdam, as each member of the community attempted their identity in a foreign land.

The author is aware that in order to tell the lives of Scots men and women who decided to settle in Rotterdam in the 1500s and 1600s he must start with the migrants’ own stories. He also acknowledges the need to trace what the migrants knew about Rotterdam even before they set sail to the new land. Therefore, in order to gain better sense of the role of social networks in the lives of Scots migrants in Rotterdam, he does not restrict himself to just one facet or one subculture of Scots migration. Instead, he followed the fate of an entire ethnic enclave, and how it settled its place in the new community. The result is remarkable: in this in-depth historical study he is able to reconstruct the life of the entire community, complete with its intricate interweaving of personal relationships among the people as well as their interactions with the government of Rotterdam. He conducts this study through a maximized utilization of countless archival material. He believes that through the use of notarial acts, probate records and personal letters he can hear “echoes of the personal networks and memories that helped Scots to survive and prosper in a culture that was, in important respects, not their own” (p. 2). The actual cases analyzed to build the author’s arguments provide the readers with a clear idea of how migrants’ life in the early modern Europe actually took place. This constitutes the strength of this book.
As foreigners in Rotterdam, Scots migrants developed among themselves social structure with reciprocity and trust as the core values. Scots Rotterdammers often relied on other Scots for help. Most importantly, they almost always turned to family members and relatives for help. It is therefore arguable, according to the author, that there is a need to consider whether the roots of ethnicity lied in such enclaves as Scots Rotterdam or in the formation of nation-states (p. 130).

Because of their religious, political and economic influence, Scots participated in the shaping of public opinion in Rotterdam. There were several areas in the development of the Dutch Republic in which Scots' influence was apparent. The opening of Scotland's coal fields for the support of Dutch industry, the rise of Rotterdam’s maritime economy, and the political form of mediation in Rotterdam are some clear examples. Their influence was also felt in matters concerning religion. As strong Calvinists, Scots ministers contributed in serious religious debates. The way Scots Rotterdammers engaged themselves in religio-political debates indicated that they were still outsiders. However, they found their place in which they combined heterodoxy with strict orthodoxy and also by holding on to a church that was outwardly Calvinist with toleration of Congregationalist practices.

The accession of William of Orange to the throne of the British monarchy impacted Scots migrants in many ways. Those who saw themselves as refugees avoiding religious persecution felt free to return to their country. But most Covenanters stayed, considering that political events in Scotland did not affect Rotterdam. They were the so-called the “apolitical Calvinists” who migrated because of the long history of Scots settlement in the Low Countries, and not because of the religio-political situation in Scotland. By 1690 more integration between the Scots and the Dutch started to appear, which means that the outsider status of the Scots began to disappear. It is for this reason that the author chooses to end his exploration of Scots migration in 1690.

This book is an excellent proof that careful archival study can lead into a reconstruction of a community that lived in the past. It has a significant contribution in the scholarly research of early modern Europe. The author's painstaking and hard labor resulted in an academic work that helps the readers to “experience” the life of migrants who lived in a different era, a life full of religious, political and economic struggles, as well as success.

Yudha Thianto, Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, IL
What actually determines man's behaviour? Is it an authority above him, fickle Fortune, inescapable Fate governing everything, or divine Providence? Or has man free will, which makes it possible for him to assume an independent attitude towards the powers above? In the seventeenth century these questions took pride of place with theologians and other thinkers. According to Konst it was also the central theme of seventeenth-century tragedy: the relation between individual human actions and the absolute power of higher, abstract authorities.

Konst hardly permits himself to go outside his speciality: literary history. Therefore he discusses the philosophical debate only in so far as is necessary to understand the writings of the dramatists. In other words: he restricts himself mainly to the tragedies themselves. I shall come back to this later. A second restriction Konst imposes upon himself is that he deals with plays from the literary canon. In this he takes it for granted that the canon is fixed and that the present canon is identical to that of the period under discussion. The latter is certainly not true, if only because the canon had yet to be formed. Certain 'hits' from the period, such as a play about the siege of Leyden, have now been almost forgotten, whereas certain plays by Hooft and Bredero received hardly any attention at the time. The least Konst could have done is to justify his canon.

Back to Konst's canon. He discusses plays by Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft, Gerbrand Adriaensz. Bredero and Samuel Coster in the first part, in which the central concepts are Fortuna, Providentia Dei and Fatum. The second part is devoted to the plays by Joost van den Vondel, whose central concepts are the of God's providential governance, free will and guilt. According to Konst government by the Fatum of the Stoics is central to the plays by Jan Vos and Lodewijk Meyer; in French-classicistic drama the place of Fate is taken by poetic justice.

Much good can be said of this well-produced book. It is wide-ranging and the subject-matter is presented neatly and clearly. Moreover the subject is an interesting one. Yet I have some objections. In the first place Konst assumes that the concepts of providentia Dei, fatum and fortuna are central themes. That is not impossible, but it is some years ago a heated debate took place in Dutch studies (caused by W.A.P. Smit's important study of Vondel's drama, Van Pascha tot Noah), which resulted in most literary historians agreeing that there is no use in looking for a 'central theme' in a form of drama that aims rather at a variety of subjects, themes and phraseology (varietas rerum and copia verborum). Konst ignores this debate.

In the second place the strength of Konst's wide-ranging approach is also its weakness. In some cases matters are simplified too much. Thus it seems in his presentation as if Hooft was mainly oriented towards stoic fate,
whereas this author was Christian through and through. It is not for nothing that he makes one of his characters say: "om beter alle quaet de grote God laat schieden" (the great God makes everything happen for man's good, *Theseus en Ariadne* 1371-72), in which the undeniably Christian concept of divine providence is conveyed.

How could the two notions — the classical stoic one and the Christian one — exist beside each other? Were the dramatists always conscious of their choices? Konst assumes that they *were*. In so doing he seems to ignore the context-directed research of recent years; neither does he take issue with it. To a great extent, Konst leaves out of consideration the question whether the author's social background, occupation or religious affiliations influenced the choices he made.

Moreover the choices dramatists made for the portrayal of their characters were sometimes determined by the demands of literary theory. Aristotle had laid down that characters were neither very good nor very bad, but something in-between, so as to make it possible for the spectators to identify with them. The influential sixteenth-century theorist Scaliger had defined tragedy as a form of drama in which horrible events with an unfortunate outcome happened to highly placed persons. The choices that were made depended on the theory the authors directly or indirectly (through their creatively imitated examples) adhered to. These choices did not always agree with their ideas of a higher authority. For instance Konst advances the thesis that after 1640 Vondel no longer puts protagonists on the scene who suffer tragic developments with resignation, but characters who determine the course of events by their own actions. According to him this is caused by a change in Vondel's theological ideas. However, the great dramatist also became more and more 'Aristotelian' in outlook with regard to emphasis on action and attention to impact and emotive effectiveness. In this respect the relations between Vondel and the literary theorist Vossius are left out of account, except for a short remark on p. 122 that Vondel secured Vossius' assistance with the study of Aristotle's *Poetica*. He does mention that Vondel was indebted to Heinsius (p. 217, n. 17), but not that he owed much more to Vossius' *Poeticae institutiones* or Vossius' ideas in general, which were laid down in this voluminous work in 1647. However, these ideas did not appear out of the blue: the two friends will certainly have discussed them together. Ironically the section of Smit's work about the connection with Heinsius referred to in n. 17 mainly examines the relationship with Vossius!

There is another objection to Konst's approach: His book has too much the character of a story, in which the quotations from the authors are considered more illustrative than authoritative. Interesting, for instance, is the part dealing with Vondel. In the Amsterdam dramatist Konst distinguishes two themes in particular: the theme of God's providential governance of
the world against man’s free will and his guilt. Konst sees three kinds of
guilt: intentional, unintentional and involuntary. A beautiful system, but it
is not immediately clear whether it applies to other plays by Vondel, too,
nor whether these three are to be found in the same relationship in bibli-
cal plays by other authors. Did they make the same choices, or did they
choose differently? How unique is Vondel in this respect? And how do the
plays he translated or adapted relate to their originals? The choices he
made in this respect make it possible to be more specific about his inten-
tions. Konst does take this aspect into consideration when discussing Vondel’s
translation of Sophocles’ Oedipus Coloneus, but not in his treatment of Vondel’s
Jephta — an adaptation of Buchanan’s tragedy — or Adam in ballingschap.
a translation of Grotius’ play of that name. Evidently Konst regards the
latter two plays as original works and as such they have been entered in
the index, in which Konst makes a distinction between original and trans-
lated tragedies by Vondel. Vondel’s adaptation of Grotius’ Sophompaneas is
not part of Konst’s canon and therefore need not be considered here.

In spite of these objections the appearance of this new and wide-ranging
study of Dutch tragedy and superhuman authorities is certainly to be wel-
comed. It may give an extra stimulus to the study of Dutch drama of the
early modern time.

Jan Bloemendal, Constantijn Huygens Instituut, The Hague

HARTMUT LEHMANN, HEINZ SCHILLING, HANS-JÜRGEN SCHRADER (Eds.),
Jansenismus, Quietismus, Pietismus [Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus 42].

In seiner Unpartheyischen Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie widmete der radikale Pietist
Gottfried Arnold ein ausführliches Kapitel dem Quietismus. Einige Jahre
vorher disputierte man an der theologischen Fakultät von Leipzig über den
Quietismus. August Hermann Francke übersetzte das Hauptwerk des spani-
schen Mystikers Michael de Molinos (1628-1696), und auch Philipp Jakob
Spener hat sich, wenngleich kritisch, mit De Molinos Werk auscinan-
dergesetzt. Der Quietismus entstand innerhalb der römisch-katholischen
Klostermauern in den romanischen Ländern. Diese Strömung fand sowohl
unter kirchlichen als auch radikalen Pietisten im Siebzehnten und Achtzehnten
Jahrhundert Anklang. Die deutschen Pietisten erkannten im Werk der
Quietisten wie De Molinos verschiedene Dinge, die sie gemeinsam hatten,
die stille Gelassenheit hinsichtlich des Willens Gottes, das innerliche
Christentum, das Streben nach geistlicher Vollkommenheit, die Aufhebung
der Selbstgerichtetheit, die asketische Lebensweise und die mystisch gefarbte
Glaubenserfahrung.

Die Beiträge sind das Ergebnis einer Tagung in Beuggen, bei der französische, deutsche und schweizerische Forscher sich miteinander auf eine Debatte einließen. Im Buch geht es vor allem um die Verbindung zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich (und der Schweiz). Selbstverständlich sollten in weiteren Studien auch andere Länder einbezogen werden. Hinsichtlich der Niederlande zum Beispiel ist der Einfluss puritanischer Werke in der Republik bereits eingehend erforscht worden. Die theologische und erbauende Lektüre, die aus dem Deutschen ins Niederländische und andersherum übersetzt wurde, wartet aber noch auf nähere Untersuchungen.


Der dritte Teil behandelt die gegenseitigen Kontakte und Einflüsse. In diesem Teil wird die historische und geistliche Verflechtung der Bewegungen dargestellt. Francois Lacharme verfasste beispielsweise einen interessanten Artikel über die französische und die janssenistische Herme

Die Beiträge sind das Ergebnis einer Tagung in Beuggen, bei der französische, deutsche und schweizerische Forscher sich miteinander auf eine Debatte einließen. Im Buch geht es vor allem um die Verbindung zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich (und der Schweiz). Selbstverständlich sollten in weiteren Studien auch andere Länder einbezogen werden. Hinsichtlich der Niederlande zum Beispiel ist der Einfluss puritanischer Werke in der Republik bereits eingehend erforscht worden. Die theologische und erbauende Lektüre, die aus dem Deutschen ins Niederländische und andersherum übersetzt wurde, wartet aber noch auf nähere Untersuchungen.
zu einer Interpretation, in der Christus der sens mystique jedes Bibeltextes ist. Die jansenistische Hermeneutik aber wird von dem Gedanken des verborgenen Gottes und dem Gegensatz zwischen den Mächtigen der Welt (gemeint sind die kirchlichen Führer) und dem schwachen, aber wahren Volk Gottes bestimmt.

Anne Lagny wagt sich an einen Vergleich der geistlichen Autobiographien von Francke, Madame Guyon und Pascal heran. Über diese Quellen entdeckt sie einen aktiven, der Welt zugewandten Pietismus (Francke) und einen zur Passivität und Weltmeidung neigenden Quietismus (Madame Guyon). Die Strömungen stimmen jedoch in der Auffassung übererein, „dass die Lebensgeschichte des Subjets der Bereich ist, in dem Gott einwirkt“. Hierin stellt Lagny einen Unterschied zu Pascal fest, der in seinem Memorial seine Bekehrung aus der Perspektive der Heilsgeschichte betrachtet, etwas, was bei Francke und Guyon undenkbar wäre.

Weitere Themen, die behandelt werden, auf die ich aber im beschränkten Rahmen dieser Rezension nicht ausführlich eingehen kann, sind die gemeinsame Kritik von Pietisten, Jansenisten und Quietisten am Theater (Hellmut Thomke), deutsche Echos des französischen Streites über die par amour zwischen Bossuet und Fénelon (Jacques Le Brun), die kritische Rezeption von De Molinos bei Arnold, Poiret (Hanspeter Marti) und Spener (Klaus vom Orde), die unterschiedlichen Haltungen von Jansenismus und Pietismus dem Staat gegenüber (Ernst Hinrichs), pietistische Strömungen im Kanton Luzern (Alfred Messerli), der Einfluss Guyons auf die deutsche Literatur (Hans-Jürgen Schrader), die jansenistische Kinderbibel von Nicolas Fontaine (Ruth B. Bottigheimer) und die „pietistische Medizin“ von Johann Samuel Carl, Stifter einer philadelphischen Arztgemeinschaft (Christa Habrich).

Ich möchte die Bemerkungen Ernst Hinrichs in seinem „Versuch eines Strukturvergleichs von Jansenismus und Pietismus“ unterstreichen. Hinrichs stellt in Übereinstimmung mit Hartmut Lehmann fest, dass die Erforschung der verschiedenen Strömungen zu isoliert innerhalb des eigenen Landes stattfindet. „Eine Änderung der Perspektive wäre erst möglich, wenn allgemeine, von nationalen bzw. regionalen Voraussetzungen unabhängige Kriterien für einen Vergleich solcher Bewegungen gefunden würden und von ihnen aus dann allgemeineuropäisch geforscht und argumentiert werden könnte“.

Staaten und Schweden einen Kongress veranstalten. Ausgezeichnete
Möglichkeiten, die nationalen Schranken niederzureißen und die Perspektive
der Vergleiche, gegenseitigen Kontakte und Einflüsse, zu der dieser Band
Ansätze liefert, auszubauen.

Jan-Kees Karels, Apeldoorn

Carlos Gilly and Friedrich Niewöhner (Eds.), Rosenkreuz als europäisches
Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert [Pimander Texts and Studies published by the
Bibliotheca Philosophica Hermetica 7]. In de Pelikaan, Amsterdam 2002,

Most of the seventeen essays collected in this book are elaborated texts of
lectures presented at an international symposium at Wolfenbüttel in 1994.
Central theme is the origin, spreading, and historiography of the Rosicrucian
Manifests in the seventeenth century. Two added contributions, however,
deal with the reception of the Manifests in contemporary movements and
their founders, viz. Rudolf Steiner and Jan van Rijckenborgh, essays respec-
tively written by Gerhard Wehr and Lex van den Brul.

It is astonishing how many writers rushed into print after the appear-
ance of the three Manifests — Fama, Confessio Fraternitatis and Chymische
Hochzeit, first printed between 1614 and 1618 —, in the beginning above
all in German speaking countries, but soon also in France, Italy, England,
Scandinavia, and the Carpathians. Merely in the seventeenth century sev-
eral hundreds of pamphlets, treaties, and satires on the Rosy Cross must
have appeared. For a long time this material slumbered undiscovered in
archives and libraries. Systematically research on it started not before a
twenty years ago. The results are really fascinating, as this book shows.
Very informative are three articles written by Carlos Gilly and also Joost
Ritman's essay on the birth of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood in Tübingen.
Textual critical endeavours have proved for sure that Johannes Valentin
Andreae, born in Württemberg, was the author of the three Manifests.
Probably these writings date back to the years between 1608 and 1614. At
that time Andreae belonged to a select company of students — the 'Brother-
hood'? — near homo universale Tobias Hess, a professor in Tübingen. No
doubt it was Hess who inspired Andreae to write the pamphlets. Manuscripts
mentioning the 'R.C. Brotherhood' circulated already at both sides of the
Alps before Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Kassel, in 1614, committed the text
of the Fama to the press (in a mutilated version, as afterwards has appeared).
This same ruler, indeed, would order an indictment against the 'rosicrucianism'
in 1619. It was the onset of a paper war wherein supporters and
opponents difficultly can be discerned, since scribblers sometimes were oper-
ating under pseudonym on both sides at once. A few decennia ago Francis
Yates has endeavoured to explain the Rosicrucian movement as a sheer political phenomenon, connected with the proceedings of Frederick V of the Palatinate, better known as the Winterkönig whose defeat in Bohemia, in 1618, ushered in the Thirty Years’ War. Carlos Gilly makes clear, however, that the origins of the movement can be located both earlier and elsewhere. Since the Religion Truce of Augsburg had gone forth, the Protestant ranks were broken up by discordances between Calvinists and Lutherans, whereas the Counter-Reformation became an increasing threat. Hence resulted about 1600 that several Lutheran princes turned against the orthodox Calvinists; afterwards they even preferred to join the Catholic League in order to take the wind out of the Evangelic Union’s sails. Let it be true that the pamphlets of Luther’s days may be considered as the first example of early modern mass media, but modern propaganda, on the other hand, only experienced a breakthrough in the Thirty Years’ War. In the then erupted torrent of polemics Jesuits, Lutherans, and ‘Evangelicals’ did not distaste any means to offend their opponents. In that context we have to explain the origins of the Fama Fraternitatis. According to Gilly, the need for a new and ‘complete’ Reformation — wherein the distinction between Catholic and Protestant would fade away — can be seen as a chiliastic ideal, nourished by prophecies allegedly deriving from the Paracelsus heritage, but in reality descending from the select circle near Tobias Hess, and after the death of the latter in 1614, written down by Andreae. In those prophecies figures, over and over again, the image of the ‘Midnight Lion’ which will destruct the ‘Eagle’ (cf. the Eagle vision in the Old Testament book Ezra): Habsburg will be defeated by a Protestant ruler, namely ‘The Lion’. That role could be assigned successively to Frederick of the Palatinate, James I of England and Gustav Adolph of Sweden. Seldom Europe experienced such uncertain times as it did in the period 1610-50. Hence it is obvious that just in that time pastors and scholars assiduously looked for an esoteric escape in order to revert discord in harmony. In the mystified ‘Rosicrucian Brotherhood’ hermeticism, alchemy and cabbalism got a Christian inspired revival which before long could be retraced everywhere in Europe, even in countries dominated by the Catholic Church. In the present book the trails of this ‘European phenomenon’ have been minutely laid open: an impetus for further research in seventeenth-century esoteric Renaissance.

Anton van de Sande, Radboud University Nijmegen/Leiden University
Treatments of the Enlightenment, like those of most of the great cultural and religious movements of the past, have fluctuated considerably in their choice of perspective. For many years the Enlightenment tended to be treated as a national phenomenon, English, French or even German. Foreign influences were acknowledged, but some sort of national primacy was claimed or implied. One of the more refreshing and stimulating features of this new publication, a choice of a wide variety of texts accompanied by a thematic introduction to each section and a biographical sketch of the authors, is its thoroughly international approach. Certainly the French and the English retain pride of place, but we are also given texts by Catherine the Great, Beccaria, Vico, Linnaeus, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin.

The authors chosen illustrate progress, or anyhow changes, in the approach to the Enlightenment. It is not altogether surprising to find John Toland, but it is a little more so to welcome the Marquis de Sade. There are a high number of women. More obvious names, such as Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Wortley Montagu and Mme de Roland, are accompanied by lesser known representatives of the Enlightenment, Mary Astell, Catharine Macaulay, and the unhappy Olympe de Gouges who died on the guillotine.

The sections also display a new emphasis. Texts in which the various races are scrutinized are prominent in the section on human nature; there is a more than justifiable insistence on science, with extracts from Newton, Stephen Hales, Buffon and Erasmus Darwin; there is a section entitled 'Gender and society' dealing with the rights of women, one on travel (with excerpts from Raynal and James Cook) and one on autobiography. Attention is bestowed, too, on the history of art. Besides reproductions of works by Chardin, Hogarth, Gainsborough and Joseph Wright, there are texts on architecture by William Chambers and Marc-Antoine Laugier.

The collection of sources ends with selections from nine of the more relevant twentieth-century studies of the Enlightenment, thereby illustrating some of the shifts in perspective that have occurred between 1932 and 1989. These include extracts from Ernst Cassirer, Adorno and Horkheimer, Jürgen Habermas, Peter Gay, Robert Darnton, Michel Foucault and two students of feminism, Sylvana Tomaselli and Joan Wallach Scott. Although scholars working on the Enlightenment might miss a couple of texts which seem to them of particular relevance, this splendid selection should more than satisfy most teachers of the subject.

Alastair Hamilton, Leiden University

“Although the Church of England’s history is strewn with dismal predictions that have been proved wrong, it’s hard for an outsider to avoid the conclusion that something has it by its throat”. With these words Paul Ferris, a journalist, opened in 1962 his unsettling The Church of England. Ferris’s timing was significant. Most historians today recognize the early 1960s as a turning point in religious history, the period when a drastic erosion of the Christian influence on European society started to take place. But if in the 1960s the model of secularization was still generally accepted to explain such a decline, modern observers are less sanguine about the overall validity of a theory that sees modernity as leading inevitably to a decline of religion. Secularisation still has its adherents, but many historians have limited its usefulness to description and dismissed much of its explanatory value. Many have objected that Christendom cannot and should not be equated to religion. Some have even argued that Christianity is adapting rather than declining. However, what most historians agree on is the decline of the social and legal compulsions of religion in Western Europe.

The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe consists of thirteen essays that trace the changing faces of Christianity in six Western European countries (England, Sweden, Ireland, The Netherlands, Germany, France) during the last two centuries and a half. The approach is not merely historical. McLeod and Ustorf have brought together a series of essays that alternate social, historical and religious views of decline and bring out the current state of research in the field.

The first essays review the situation of Christendom at the end of the twentieth century. Callum G. Brown posits that “what happened in the late twentieth century has been unique and epoch-forming” (p. 29). What was unique was that during these decades Christian religiosity underwent a drastic change in virtually all western European countries, a change which can be empirically demonstrated. The data Brown uses to prove his point for Britain is impressive. But Brown’s purpose is not to repeat the findings published in his recent The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularization 1800-2000 (London, 2001), but, rather than drawing attention to how change took place, he wants to emphasize that the very change itself has changed our conception of what religion is and was. Such an awareness is essential in understanding religion and secularization, he argues. For Sweden the sociologist Eva M. Hamberg describes a scenario that is similar to that of Britain. Her data too shows a decline in the prevalence and saliency of religious beliefs, although she remains more cautious in her conclusions. In Sweden there might well be, she argues, a latent demand for religious consumption for which the contemporary monopolistic situation of the Swedish
Church simply does not cater. Another sociologist, Yves Lambert, highlights the many contradictions in (ultra-) modern Christianity, and argues that secularization is only one of these contradictions. He too emphasizes that it is above all the modern need for a "religion à la carte" that has led to the erosion of Christendom, and he asks whether we can still speak of Christianity when its basic core is gone in people's quest for personal religion.

The second and third parts of the book investigate how the decline of Christendom has come about in Western Europe. These historical essays, which make up the bulk of The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000, reflect more properly the title of this volume.

David Hempton singles out England as a country for which the secularization theory seems to work at least partially, that centuries of pluralism have indeed led to a steady erosion of the influence of the established church. The pattern in The Netherlands, Peter van Rooden writes, is similar, but, notwithstanding the limited social power of the official churches, religion became for two centuries "a major basis for the distinctive identity of specific communities, classes and factions within a divided society" (p. 126). This pillarised situation disappeared only during the 1960s. Van Rooden rejects an apparent long-term linear and gradual process of secularization in The Netherlands. For Ireland too, Sheridan Gilley maintains, one has to go the 1960s for the first signs of secularization. Irish Roman Catholicism had long been a symbol in the country's struggle for independence, and this remained so long after that independence had been achieved. Until quite recently, religion in Ireland remained closely bound up with national identity. Thus, while the secularization theory might have some value in interpreting English religious history, the cases of The Netherlands and Ireland testify that a long-term correlation between modernization and secularization is dubious. Martin Gretschat, in his study of the Darmstädter Wort, even argues for a continuing tension between the refusal or acceptance of Christendom in post-war German Christianity. These largely narrative approaches are followed by Thomas Kselman's study of death in modern France, Michel Lagrée's pioneering survey of the influence of technological innovations on religion in France, and Lucian Hölscher's analysis of the semantic structures of religious change. These further thematic approaches indicate fascinating new fields of research that show how complex the question of modernization and religion really is.

The book suitably concludes with two essays of more general import. Jeff Cox reviews modern religious history with respect to the secularization theory. Although growing dissent against the theory has manifested itself amongst historians, the problem with this field of study, he argues, is that there is no alternative "master narrative" to make sense of the many exceptions and objections that have been voiced over the last three decades. He
insists, therefore, on the necessity of constructing new narratives, so that scholars may be able to decide on the “best story to tell about the decline of Christendom in modern Europe” (p. 214). Werner Ustorf meditates on the future of Christianity and argues that the task of missiology is to reorder existing elements of change so that “God calls us into the future and to Himself, not necessarily into religion, Christianity or Church” (p. 224).

This excellent collection of essays is prefaced by a comprehensive overview of the state of modern scholarship in the field of religious history. Hugh McLeod highlights here the new developments and the different attitudes to secularization presented in this volume and relates the different contributions to each other. These fascinating and well-written essays will be essential to all those who study the modern history of religion and will offer much food for thought for those who theorize on the future of religion in Western Europe.

Jan Marten Ivo Klaver, Università di Urbino


The tension between diversity and unity in America is one of the major themes in U.S. history. Since this relationship is still troublesome, historical analyses may serve a current agenda. After reading this book, I was not completely certain, whether it emphasized diversity or unity. Its celebration of self-determination seems to aim at the diversity of American culture, stating that mixed marriages had a positive influence on expanding the boundaries of American culture. From a different perspective, the gradual acceptance of interfaith marriages underwrites unity. Whatever option is taken, Beloved Strangers offers a welcome contribution to the debate about the possibilities of integration. The theme of this book connects beautifully with the concept of the triple melting pot of separate subcultures presented by sociologist Will Herberg in his 1960 book, Protestant, Catholic, Jew. This book examines the opportunities to go across the rims of these separate bowls and might even play a part in the debate about multiculturalism, in which historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., hoped and expected that love would overcome the separateness of Americans.

Anne Rose, associate professor of history and religious studies at Pennsylvania State University, produced a book with a positive tone: interfaith families provided opportunities and broke down restrictions. She reached her conclusion by scrutinizing the experiences of twenty-six mixed couples throughout the nineteenth century. This long period helps to distinguish some significant historical trends. In the 1820s the occurrence of interfaith
marriages was hardly noticed thanks to the openness of the liberalizing early Republic. After mid-century, intermarriage became hotly debated, due to the fear of disintegration of the Catholic identity and the discussion about lineage among the Jews. Rose noticed a withdrawal of interfaith couples from institutionalized religion after 1900. The early twentieth-century celebration of exoticism in the press, made these mixed marriages more acceptable.

A positive feature of this book is that it listens to the families themselves, and not only to the religious leaders, who mostly expressed their concern about the phenomenon or were defensive. Yet, the book is less broad than its title suggests. The selected couples all belong to the liberal tradition, which leads the author to the conclusion that tolerance (read: American liberalism) was a condition for interfaith marriages. This link seems plausible, but is not a historical law: seventeenth-century Holland had a liberal tolerant tradition, but no higher rate of interfaith marriages than the surrounding countries.

While the author collected a wealth of information about the family life of her subjects, her conclusions are only valid for the upper-class liberal elite. She too readily assumes that working class mixed marriages behaved like these elites. This is hardly believable, since education and financial independence play such a large role in these marriages. This weakness is caused by the lack of any statistical basis. As the author freely admits, interfaith marriage was not a novelty in nineteenth-century America: people had married partners from other faiths before, for instance in order to join the ruling class. This was the reason why Protestants generally were less troubled about the phenomenon: they saw themselves as the dominant force and valued individual choices.

In fact this book reveals more about the impact of the forces of self-determination in American families than about interfaith marriages. The line of argument suggests that freethinking marriages transcended religious differences, but in fact they replaced them by esoteric experiments. If the selection of couples is made by their attachment to liberalism, it should not surprise us that liberalism is the common denominator. These couples were happy without religion. Rose suggests that differing religious practices were more difficult to combine than competing intellectual concepts. In fact, the family histories reveal remarkably little discussion about theological issues.

The rise of the racial issue in the public debate in the early twentieth century prodded Reform Jews and Roman Catholics to explicitly reject intermarriage, but simultaneously provided instruments to keep those very unions tied to their faith. Their official resistance was much stronger than that of the Protestants, whatever a diverse group this might be.

It is not always fair to criticize a book for what it does not contain. So to be sure that the appreciation is clear: Beloved Strangers possesses the charm of a coherent argument of the workings of two faiths in one bedroom, writ-
ten in a clear and attractive style. It would be intriguing to find out more about the probability of interfaith marriages among various sects. Does the evidence support the thesis that the more American a church is (Methodist, Baptist, Mormons), the less likely it will allow interfaith marriage? Before one can draw more definitive conclusions about the increase of tolerance, another book is needed analyzing Rejected Lovers: Religious Differences as Terminators of Courtship which could explore the opposite movement. Even without statistical underpinnings, this approach would further enlighten the role of religion in the changing horizons in American family life.

Hans Krabbendam, Roosevelt Study Center, Middelburg


This handsomely presented biography of the modernist Protestant churchman and academic L.W.E. Rauwenhoff fills a gap of more than a century. Curiously enough, since Rauwenhoff’s death in 1889 there has been no substantial account of the life and work of this prominent figure until now; anybody interested in the theological debate in the Dutch nineteenth century will therefore welcome Piet Slis’ detailed picture of the life and thought of this ‘Apologist of modernism’.

Rauwenhoff was born in 1828 into a well-to-do Amsterdam family. After his theological studies in Amsterdam and Leiden he worked as a minister in Mijdrecht, Dordrecht and Leiden. He became known for his excellent sermons, and managed to combine a prominent role in local and national church politics, for which he had quite a talent, with academic research. In 1860 he was appointed professor at Leiden University, initially teaching Church History, later Philosophy of Religion. As a churchman, church historian and university professor Rauwenhoff became a prominent figure in Protestant modernism, a movement that originated around 1840 and to a large extent determined the prevailing mood of the theological debate in the second half of the nineteenth century in The Netherlands. Much of the discussion going on today about faith and religion focuses on the same questions that were so hotly debated in Rauwenhoff’s time; these centred on the fundamental issue of the extent to which religion, and specifically Christianity, should adapt to changing times. Within the rational, anti-supernaturalistic modernist movement Rauwenhoff occupied a middle position between the rigorously intellectualist school and the so-called ethical-modernist party rejecting the former’s strict rationalism and the latter’s view that no knowledge of God is possible, but sharing the intellectuals’ monist idea that God is inseparable from the world, and the ethicals’ conviction
that moral consciousness, especially the unconditional sense of duty, is the basis of faith.

The modernists were believers and wanted to remain so. They saw themselves as pioneers, heralding an inevitable Second Reformation. This did not materialise: sadly, the man in the pew wanted little or nothing to do with their ideas. The difficulties modernist ministers encountered in their congregations led them to much soul-searching about the best way to serve the cause of truth: should they remain in the Church and reform it from the inside, or should they accept the consequences of their radical views and leave? The many contemporary pamphlets with titles such as Farewell to my congregation bear witness to often gut-wrenching decisions. Rauwenhoff himself resolved at a fairly late stage in his life that the Dutch Reformed congregation in Leiden was too orthodox for him, and joined the Église Wallonne.

Rauwenhoff is divided into four parts, entitled, respectively, ‘Life’, ‘Rauwenhoff and the modernist school’, ‘Rauwenhoff as a church historian’, ‘Rauwenhoff’s theology and philosophy of religion’. This thematic rather than chronological structure has its disadvantages, but the author handles it well enough, and the resulting text is not as repetitive as is often the case with this approach. The book contains many excellent and informative passages, with the wealth of material presented in a very factual manner. On the one hand, we should be thankful that the author has chosen to show rather than tell, and does not, for instance, venture into a psychological analysis of his subject; on the other hand, there are moments when one feels one is reading an inventory of books written, meetings attended, etc. Only rarely does the author allow himself a critical remark, such as when he has to concede a “certain opportunism” in his hero (pp. 167-68). The writing style reflects this sober approach in short and simple sentences. Due to its factual character and style, the portrait Slis draws of Rauwenhoff is certainly no expressionist painting in vivid colours, but rather resembles one of those clear and detailed 19th-century greyscale etchings of which the title page offers an example.

As the back cover states, this is a study “on a scholarly level, yet aimed at a wide market”. It is this point that constitutes somewhat of an Achilles’ heel of the book. Two different perspectives seem to be constantly at war with each other: if we are to assume that non-theologians are among this broad audience, the author might have been more consistent in providing clear definitions of certain concepts, and less oblique in his labelling of the many personalities that figure in the book. Why write “the so-called Tubinger school” (p.186), without giving any characterisation of this important group of theologians? Why speak of “the so-called ‘medical way’” (p. 127), without further elucidation? Who was J. Caro (p. 276)? More examples of this kind could be given, and in combination with the author’s rather conser-
ervative use of cross-references these lacunae contrast oddly with very explicit definitions of, for instance, ultramontanism (p. 176), and the precise overall structure of the book.

If from this we may conclude that Rauwenhoff does perhaps aim at an audience of theologians rather than a more general academic public, we are justified in also assessing the value of this biography as a research tool for professionals. From this perspective there is much to be grateful for. The 72 pages of notes, index and bibliography (including a wide array of contemporary, partly unprinted sources) testify to thorough research and a meticulous approach to the nuts and bolts of scholarly texts. The bibliography is very well-presented, even providing thumbnail sketches of the contents of all personal letters mentioned. It is then all the more surprising to find on p. 183 the statement that Obbink defended his dissertation in 1929 — this was actually Obbink’s year of birth; in the bibliography and preface the correct date, 1973, is given. The book has an extensive index on proper names, and a very detailed table of contents, so that the lack of a subject index is no great inconvenience.

“Schoon en belangrijk, maar te lang” [“A beautiful and important speech, but too long”] was the verdict on an address Rauwenhoff gave in 1874 for the Dutch Protestant Society. Do any or all of these epithets also apply to Piet Slis’ biography? With just under 300 pages of text, the book is agreeably compact; as the first decent biography of Rauwenhoff it cannot be other than important. Whether one may call the book ‘beautiful’ will depend on how far one allows the slight but persistent itch caused by its sometimes less than flowing style and jarring ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ perspectives to mar one’s enjoyment. As a whole, however, this long overdue biography is an admirable piece of work, and recommended reading for anybody, professional theologian or not, who is interested in this representative corner of Dutch nineteenth-century life and culture.

Inke Smit, Leiden University


Anti-Catholicism has a long tradition in the Netherlands. The Eighty Years’ Independence War (1568-1648), during which the Seven United Provinces liberated themselves from Spanish occupation, has always been considered to be a liberation war from Roman Catholic dominance as well. The Netherlands considered itself to be a protestant nation, in which Roman Catholics were only tolerated as a minority. The Catholics could have their
Sunday services in so-called hidden churches, kept a rather low profile in Dutch society and had a rather negative image. It was only in 1853, after the liberal revolution that swept through Europe, that Rome could reinstate the episcopalian hierarchy in the Netherlands. The new Dutch democratic constitution of 1848 not only instituted the fundamental freedoms of religion, speech and the right of assembly, but also the separation of church and state.

The restoration of the episcopalian hierarchy in 1853 caused uproar among Dutch Protestants. Some press publications even suggested that this would mean restoration of the Inquisition. This so-called April Movement resulted in a petition signed by 200,000 citizens to prevent a violation of what they called the protestant Dutch national character. During the official presentation of the petition in Amsterdam King William III did not react in the way that was suggested by the liberal Prime Minister Thorbecke, but stressed the close relationship between the Dutch people and the House of Orange. The king’s reaction was at odds with the new constitution and the Thorbecke government resigned. A conservative cabinet stepped in, but it could not undo the legitimate rights of the Roman Catholic Church. After a few months the opposition against the restoration of the episcopalian hierarchy died down.

On the occasion of the 150th anniversary of this restoration the Society for Dutch Church History took the initiative to publish a book to put this church-historical event into a new perspective. Fifteen (church) historians contributed to this book. It does not offer the reader a full systematic overview of all relevant historical facts, but can rather be seen as a colourful bouquet of flowers, both large and small. The first six chapters are written from a broad historical perspective, the next seven focus on local situations and specific aspects of the restoration of the clerical hierarchy. The last two chapters deal with the centenary in 1953 and the present situation of the Roman Catholic Church in a secularised society. Inevitably some chapters overlap, others are supplementary to each other. Some chapters are apparently written for insiders, others also take ‘laymen’ into account.

Among others Hans de Valk, senior researcher at the Institute for Dutch History in The Hague, pictures the interesting power struggle within the Roman Catholic Church that preceded the actual reintroduction of the hierarchy. The papal commission De Propaganda Fide, which was responsible for the northern part of the Netherlands as a missionary area, did not want to loose its power and opposed a new hierarchy. The Netherlands could not do without direct interference from Rome for the time being, it stated. The seats of the new bishops, and especially the seat of the archbishop also caused a lot of trouble. Should it be Amsterdam, Den Bosch or Utrecht? Utrecht used to be St Willibrord’s seat, but it was also the main seat of Old-Catholic hierarchy and the city of the orthodox protestant theological academy. A choice for Utrecht might provoke hostile reac-
tions. Den Bosch already had a cathedral very much suited as an archbishop seat. More importantly: bishop-to-be Zwijsen preferred to stay in Den Bosch rather than to move to Utrecht.

Annemarie Houkes, from the University of Groningen, offers a new perspective on the April Movement, which she does not consider to be a conservative reaction to the consequences of the 1848 constitution, but rather the first modern extra-parliamentary mass movement. It was the first time in Dutch history that an effort was made to mobilize public opinion in order to change a political course. Formation of political parties in later years was the logical next phase.

The Old-Catholic priest Dick Schoon describes the position of the Catholics of the old Cleresy, a rather unique group in the western catholic world. Those Catholics maintained their own church within the Republic of the United Provinces with a self-proclaimed episcopalian hierarchy. These so-called Old-Catholics opposed the cult of saints and relics and stressed the rights of the local church. The Old-Catholics felt their position very much endangered by the reinstitution of Roman Catholic hierarchy. Attempts were made to get into contact with the Vatican, but they failed. Rome simply disregarded the Old-Catholic proposals for reconciliation. As the Dutch government had lost its constitutional right to protect or to favour certain churches, the Old-Catholics had to continue as an independent church.

Prof. Sible de Blaauw, from the catholic Nijmegen University, offers an overview of the search for cathedrals for the new bishops. It is striking that the newly appointed bishops evaded all public celebration of their newly acquired position. De Blaauw's article almost invites the reader to visit the episcopalian cathedrals in Roermond, Breda, Utrecht, Haarlem and of course the St John's cathedral in 's-Hertogenbosch, as it describes the architecture and the religious equipment of those churches in detail.

Two case studies give an impression on how the restoration of the episcopalian hierarchy worked out on the local level. Historian Thomas von der Dunk writes in much detail on the situation in the city of Utrecht, and Arie Oliehoek on the developments in the city of Delft, where he is employed as a community worker to the Roman Catholic Church. As maps of Utrecht and Delft are missing, these interesting articles will not easily keep the attention of the reader who is not familiar with these cities.

Prof. Hans Bornewasser, emeritus professor of the history of church and theology at Tilburg University, concludes in a concentrated evaluation on the first centennial of the episcopal restoration that the 1953 festivities were marked by an atmosphere of Roman Catholic triumphalism in order to disguise upcoming sentiments of insecurity. In the final chapter Prof. Peter Nissen (Nijmegen University) points out, quoting observations of the Polish priest Karol Wojtyla, who visited the Netherlands in the late 1940s, that the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands always concentrated on
organization and institutions, and not so much on spirituality. This *polder-catholicism* is now in its final phase. Many catholic organizations have been dissolved or lost their identity; many Catholics left the Church. What will be left of the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands in fifty years time? May be the anti-catholic sentiments still even present among secularised Dutchmen.

Herman Amelink, *NRC Handelsblad*, Rotterdam


In literature and literary discussion writers’ personal histories are getting more and more prominent. Ego-documents and autobiographical literature sell. Even in science and arts there is an increasing interest in the man or woman behind the written word. What makes him or her tick? This trend certainly partly explains the publication of *Getuigenis van Gods genade*. This hand-written autobiographical text, found in the archives of the late Cornelia de Vogel (1905-86), professor of the history of classical and medieval philosophy at Utrecht University (1947-74), has only recently been published. It shows her personal spiritual and intellectual development from early age till her mid-twenties. The text was written in 1941 and based on personal diaries she kept as a young student, from which she quotes extensively. The book is a religious self-portrait, an intellectual biography as well as a character study, as Prof. J. de Bruijn justifies its publication in an informative prologue.

Brought up in a liberal upper middle class family in the Frisian capital Leeuwarden, De Vogel converted to orthodox Protestantism and became a full member of the Dutch Reformed Church in 1927. In this phase, she writes, the most central theme of her life was ‘the road to God’. But in the text of her autobiography, there are already clear omens for her later transition, in 1944, to the Roman Catholic Church, to which she would belong for the rest of her life. She later added a second phrase to the central theme of her life: How can we stay on that road? In theological terms: First came justification, next came purification, a process inspired among others by the life and works of the British theologian, and later cardinal, Newman.

In this autobiography of her youth, running from 1905 up to 1929, De Vogel proves herself to be not only a classical rational, but also a sensitive, sometimes passionate and often mystic woman. Apart from detailed descriptions of what she read and whom she met, the autobiography gives a thorough insight into the development of her thinking at an early age.
In her diary she already commented on literary works. She translated French poems or learnt them by heart. In the meantime her enthusiasm for the antiquity increased.

In her late teens she joined popular idealistic, total abstinence youth organisations, inspired by theosophy and anthroposophy. She attended youth camps and heard, among others, the Indian teacher Krishnamurti speak. A few years later, as a student classical languages and philosophy at the University of Utrecht, she would reject these ideas as godless. In 1923 she had a first personal mystical experience and a second one during Christmas 1926, after which she realised to be “a member of Christ’s church”. A year later, already a teacher Greek and Latin in the city of Harderwijk, she was baptised in the reformed Nicolai Church in Utrecht. From then on both ancient times and Christianity would leave a stamp on her life.

Herman Amelink, *NRC Handelsblad*, Rotterdam


As the European Union constructs its brand new constitution a debate rages about the Judeo-Christian’ character or inspiration of ‘Europe’. It is interesting to note that the principles and traditions of Classical Antiquity, (Radical) Enlightenment, Free Masonry and Freethinking in general, which might just as easily have been brought into the discussion, have exercised no appeal to politicians desperately seeking a ‘deeper’ foundation for ‘Europe’. This one-sidedness should perhaps be traced to that long tradition in European history in which the relations between Church and State assumed a special importance. On the one hand they were competitors for the minds and souls of the simple citizens. From the end of the 18th century onwards there was an intense drive by states to develop and strengthen the allegiance of subjects to the new nation-states, while at the same time churches and chapels were enhancing their efforts to transform traditional belief and rituals into deeply-felt personal convictions, in line with their understanding that internalised beliefs produced better results than formal compliance. In this sense church and state were competing for the ideological commitment of the population. However, at the same time, they could agree that Christian morals and beliefs were the most effective means of binding societies together. Atheism among the intellectuals, bad as it was, could be endured, but normal people walked best in the light of Christ and the
Blessed Virgin. Perhaps, indeed, that was the essence of civilisation.

This insight has led to a shift of focus in the historiography of religion: recent studies are now less concerned with entangling the details of theological disputes than with analysing the triangular relationship between personal belief, the socio-political position of the church, and the political order. The balance of this relationship, termed the ‘religious regime’ by the Dutch historian Peter van Rooden, did, of course, change over time and the French revolution was perhaps the most notable turning point. However we should not see secularisation in the nineteenth century as simply the growth of disbelief, or the separation of State and Church, but rather recognise it as the re-arrangement of a former religious regime. So it is not interesting, perhaps even somewhat misleading, to think of the massive exodus from the Western European churches in the 1960s as simply the natural outcome of a process that started around 1800 (as a consequence of the triumph of Reason) and which gained momentum as states assumed a neutrality in religious matters during the nineteenth century.

It is against this backdrop we have to read this volume on the relation of state and church in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, edited by Jos Raadschelders, who at present is holding a chair in the department of political science at the University of Oklahoma and is a well known author in the history of public administration. The volume opens with a rather abstract article by the editor himself, probing into the deeper influences of ‘Judeo-Christian Heritage’ on the way public life is organised, such as the importance afforded to localities and communities, and on notions of the how decisions should be taken, such as the idea of absolute majority and the secret ballot. After this four introductory articles on France, Italy, the Netherlands and Austria bring the argument into modern times. Although the relation between church and state in these four countries was very different, none of them showed a clear-cut separation so much as a prudent ‘disentanglement’ (as Frits van der Meer and Pieter Wagenaar named the process in the Dutch case). This point recurs in the second part of the book, with three case studies written from the perspective of administrative history dealing with the disentanglement in the city of Paris as a consequence of the law of 1905; the struggle for independence of Protestant consistories in Prussia and Bavaria; and the efforts of the established churches in Britain and Ireland to reform themselves. In a third part of this volume the point is driven home by two articles focussing on animated conflicts: an analysis of the handling by the authorities in France of ‘proselytism’ in catholic hospitals among poor and sick Protestants; and an interesting description of the ‘Braunsberger Konflikt’ (1871-76) in Prussia which revolved around Catholic religious education in secondary education. Following a few more articles with a wider relevance (the financial arrangements within the Catholic church the nineteenth century in Spain, the debate about the
First Freedom in the American Bill of Rights up until the present day) the volume concludes with some contributions on the history of public administration which are perhaps of less interest for the readers of this journal.

This book, then, offers a broad general overview of changing relations between state and churches seen mainly from the perspective of public administration. Although the differences between the different countries and in different periods are of course important, the most remarkable conclusion for this reader was that most of the time and in most places, politicians and administrators handled a very complex matter with diligence and prudence. The secular authorities were too conscious of the social value of Christian beliefs to handle the churches too roughly while the churches had too clear a recognition of their need for the state to be too intractable and intransigent. In the light of this historical compromise it might seem reasonable to suggest that by including the tradition of the Enlightenment in the current debate on the European Constitution we might come close to the best of all possible worlds.

Piet de Rooy, University of Amsterdam