Jesuit support of princes in the seventeenth century also contributed to the advance of princely absolutism vis-a-vis the Church” (274). In 1640 a papal nuncio acknowledged the heartfelt religiosity of the Jesuits but opined that the order more promoted the interests of Catholic princes than was a champion of the papacy. Considering the oft-recited allegation that the Jesuits strove to bring temporal powers under the authority of the Holy See, Bireley’s point is notable (particularly considering the constitutional dimensions of the Thirty Years War in the Empire and elsewhere).

It was in the Empire, where the chaos of the Reformation had so damaged the older religious orders, that Jesuits occupied with some intimacy the imperial and princely courts. In France the Huguenots had made significant advances against Catholicism. Gallican sentiments inclined French institutions to be suspicious of Jesuit influence. So members of the Society of Jesus aligned themselves closely to the French monarchy. At Madrid (as was the case in many Italian cities) the older orders maintained their pre-eminence and thus the Jesuits did not insinuate themselves as easily in the corridors of power as they did in Munich and Vienna.

Bireley’s research reveals a great deal about the rise of absolutism, the emergence of modern European states, and the origins of nationalism (Vitelleschi’s “national spirit”). Rarely does an academic work reach so many audiences: specialists can glean all sorts of evidence hitherto inaccessible, graduate students may emulate a master historian’s methodology and exposition, and undergraduates will find the synoptic overview that makes a complex period more comprehensible. In short, *The Jesuits and the Thirty Years War* confirms Robert Bireley’s reputation as one of the most skilled early modernists in North America.

As its title makes plain, this is an ambitious book. Attempting to encompass the whole of Western Europe over the 
longue durée in a relatively short volume is setting the bar high. While Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe, 1200–1800 has the limitations of its virtues, Katherine Lynch has succeeded in her goal, which is “to show how family forms and organizational or ‘community’ forms developed together as interdependent parts of the same society” (1–2). Her focus is on continuity, not change, and she justly stresses the fact that many aspects of urban communal life remained basically unaltered from the high Middle Ages until the Industrial Revolution. She also makes a forceful and convincing case for “integrating family history more fully into the history of the public world” (18). To do this, she adopts the concept of “civil society,” which she delineates as a “sphere of public life lying outside the narrow confines of household or family life, but that is distinguishable from formal political life” (19). Among other things, this approach allows her to highlight the contributions of women in urban society, as well as to discuss larger kinship networks beyond the confines of the household.

Chapter 1, “Fundamental features of European urban settings,” provides an overview of urban life in western Europe in the high and late Middle Ages. By setting low population thresholds for towns and cities—3,000 and 10,000 respectively—Lynch is able to make the case that western Europe was more urbanized than many historians have allowed. She convincingly argues that even small towns depended on in-migration to meet their labor needs (and to offset the high mortality rates that habitually plagued urban areas). Yet concurrent with this in-migration was a steady stream of out-migration (especially among members of more prosperous and enduring families), which helped to “intermix rural and urban habits and beliefs” (33). Lynch suggestively links marriage to economic conditions and outbreaks of pestilence (better standards of living meant that fewer people married); she notes the relatively small size of the urban household compared to its rural counterpart and considers the “plebeian” and “patrician” forms of kin interaction, distinguishing broad variations between northern and southern
Europe. She also analyzes continuities—and fluctuations—in the types of work done by urban women, the numbers of women who worked for pay, and the extent to which women worked within the context of the family.

Chapter 2, “Church, family, and bonds of spiritual kinship,” explores how the medieval church tried to shape notions of family and kinship by subsuming individual families into a mystical “family” of Christian believers. The institution of godparenthood, for example, was part of a “system of spiritual kinship to rival or at least complement ties of blood” (70). Communities of the regular clergy were ideally supposed to fulfill the same function. Lynch also examines the various models of community—both familial and extra-familial—provided by the Church, arguing that “religiously inspired organizations,” such as confraternities or communities of beguines, “furnished men and women with forms of solidarity that proved quite useful for surviving in the city” (68). Often, confraternal relations supplemented rather than supplanted the ties of kinship; yet they importantly also helped men and women “establish and maintain networks of friendship and mutuality in ways not permitted through family or kinship alone” (100).

Building on these notions, Chapter 3, “Charity, poor relief, and the family in religious and civic communities,” considers the less fortunate members of urban society. Lynch focuses not on “strangers,” the vagrant poor, but on the “familiar poor”; she is thus able to draw a somewhat happier picture than that of the familiar repress-or-expel measures that were increasingly adopted by sixteenth-century municipal authorities in the wake of negative economic pressures. As she contends, “face-to-face relations and reciprocity were key to establishing and maintaining relationships based on charity” (109). In the late Middle Ages, both lay organizations and civic governments were actively involved in poor relief efforts; in the sixteenth century, poor relief became entwined with confessionalization, frequently transforming notions of the “deserving poor” as a general construct into specific, church membership-driven categories.
Lynch expands her argument still further in Chapter 4, “Individuals, families, and communities in urban Europe of the Protestant and Catholic Reformations,” which looks at how the continued religious divisions affected the creation of both civic and confessional communities. Ultimately, she maintains that the manifold expressions of confessionalization—such as the Calvinist consistory or church courts—“had important effects on domestic life and were . . . shaped by the needs that individuals felt to express both individual and family identities” (169). Although the sixteenth century was in some ways a period of declining economic power and status for women, for example, Lynch argues that many women, especially elite and/or married women, gained new opportunities to establish their own spheres of communal action, primarily through charitable work. In short, both Protestants and Catholics “used their domestic identities as fathers and mothers—whether real or fictive—in organized community-building activities that shaped and enlarged the sphere of civil society” (170).

While Lynch ably and imaginatively draws together various skeins of historiography—urban, gender, religious, demographic, familial—to show how urban families and communities coped with incrementally changing pressures and conditions, the first four chapters of *Individuals, Families, and Communities in Europe* are largely a synthesis of recent research within the context of her interpretative framework. In contrast, Chapter 5, “Constructing an ‘imagined community’: poor relief and the family during the French Revolution,” is largely based on archival research. Perhaps because of this, it is the most interesting. Restricting her focus to poor relief, Lynch situates the nation-building efforts of the revolutionaries against a backdrop of earlier models of community formation. She provides a stimulating discussion of how poor relief was seen as a national responsibility, even as efforts to help the poor focused on individuals and the creation of “virtuous republican families centered on the household” (197).

The leap from Chapter 4 to Chapter 5—from the Reformation era to that of the French Revolution—is somewhat curious; how did the Enlightenment or early industrial growth, for example,
affect family and community development? But this quibble should not detract from the fact that Katherine Lynch has produced a valuable, well-argued, and thought-provoking contribution to the fields of family history, urban history, and community formation, among others. In her conclusion, she writes, “If this study encourages research on the sorts of factors and interrelationships explored here, I will count my work a success” (221). It will, and she should.


William R. Shea, holder of the Galileo Chair of the History of Science at the University of Padua, and Mariano Artigas, professor of Philosophy of Science at the University of Navarra, reconstruct Galileo’s personal life by highlighting his six trips to Rome. This is surely an original point of view, allowing the authors to lay stress on the famous case between Galileo and the Church, which “remains as fascinating as ever, and it has much to teach us that is relevant to our own day” (xi).

In the first chapter, “Job Hunting and the Path to Rome” (1-18), Shea and Artigas deal with early moments in Galileo’s career. The meeting with Ostilio Ricci during this time, which brought about Galileo’s conversion to mathematics, can be deemed the beginning of his scientific path. Galileo’s first trip to Rome is set within the cultural milieu of the Counter Reformation. He arrived in Rome in 1587 under the pontificate of Sixtus V, namely the pope who “was more active than any pope within living memory” (11), because of his own tireless action for architectural modernization, public works, the advancement of learning, and against criminality. The most important scientific figure in Rome was “the leading Jesuit mathematician” (5) Cristopher Clavius, the main protagonist of the “Calendar Reform” (6), whom Galileo met in the autumn of that same year. It is uncertain whether at this time he