

be removed as the signs of an institution fallen into corruption and “popery.” Others (like the Fellows of Peterhouse), whose libraries would have boasted the works of church Fathers and reports of the great synods, argued that images were an indifferent “help” to worship, and sought a pedigree for them in the ancient church. Seen in this light, Dowsing’s mission forms part of a long struggle to define and defend the Church of England, a theme that is emerging as the most dominant in the history of the seventeenth century. It is this fact that makes this edition worthwhile.

Michael Mendle, ed. *The Putney Debates of 1647: The Army, the Levellers, and the English State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xii + 297 pp. + 1 illus. \$64.95. Review by MARK CHARLES FISSEL, AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY.

In late October-early November 1647, with King Charles I defeated (for the moment at least) and Londoners clamoring for Parliament to disband its victorious (and expensive) army, officers and soldiers of that New Model Army gathered in St. Mary’s parish church, beside the Thames, at the bridgehead of Putney Bridge, southwest London. Contemporaries wrote little of the discussions that continued for several days in the sanctuary of Putney church.

Roughly 243 years later, the librarian of Worcester College Oxford mentioned to a historian that minutes of those meetings had lain undiscovered in a cupboard until recently. Would the historian like to have a look? That serendipitous find propagated an entire historiography, so much so that 350 years after the event, these once largely ignored proceedings of the Army Council and rank-and-file soldiers were now commemorated by a score of political groups, religious faiths, social activists, and more than a few historians.

One need only contemplate the diversity of the audiences at the various Putney commemoration events on both sides of the Atlantic, honoring what are now dubbed “the Putney Debates.” One finds socialists, Green Party members, Americans, Quakers,

Libertarians, Labour Party representatives, antiquarians, Civil War re-enactors, and a host of others who saw (somehow) their identity as having (somehow) emanated from those “debates.” These apparently contradictory legacies prompted one contributor, Blair Worden, to find it “fitting that the 350th anniversary was celebrated in two places: in Putney Church, with speeches by Christopher Hill and Tony Benn, representatives of the tradition that has looked east to Moscow; and, in the conference from which this book has emerged, in Washington, the capital of the free world” (280).

What were these “debates” ? The volume editor, Michael Mendle, writes, “The debates at Putney are battles of texts—*physical* texts” (14): the New Model Army’s “book of declarations,” *The case of the armie truly stated*, *The Agreement of the People*, *The Heads of Proposals*, and others. In their quest to formulate a settlement for the realm, a direct result of Parliament’s failure to negotiate the demobilization of the Army to the latter’s satisfaction, a wide variety of what Americans would term “constitutional” (for lack of a better word) proposals provided the grounds for the debates.

Mendle’s editing integrates almost seamlessly a stellar group of contributors, who have read each other’s essays and cross-referenced frequently. The result is a conceptually unified book that reads extraordinarily well. Lesley Le Claire’s detective-like tale of the provenance of the papers of secretary William Clarke dovetails with Frances Henderson’s textual commentary. The venerable Austin Woolrych then weaves a narrative of events surrounding the debates (a good place for the uninitiated to start their reading). Barbara Donagan brings to bear her unrivalled knowledge of 1640s civil-military relations to define the legal underpinnings of the Army’s predicament. John Morrill and Phillip Baker team for a revisionist interpretation of the authorship of *The case of the armie truly stated*. Mendle explores the use of the pronoun “we” in the debates, casting considerable light on the army’s collective self-consciousness and the centrality of the issue of indemnity.

The radical or populist civilian Leveller Party attempted to infiltrate and influence the army’s deliberations in Putney church. Ian Gentles traces the evolution of three incarnations of their most

famous tract, *An Agreement of the People*. Barbara Taft follows the “journey” of Cromwell’s son-in-law, Henry Ireton, the Commissary General of the Army and an indefatigable opponent of the political aspirations of the propertyless. For all the vociferousness in Putney church, there was “a total silence about women’s political rights” (197). Patricia Crawford pursues the profound implications of citizenship and enfranchisement. Women exercised traditions of activism, from participation in food riots to Elizabeth Poole’s appearance before the Army Council (in January 1649) to communicate a religious revelation. The “Puritan” framework and consequent limitations on the individual’s “liberty of conscience” are dissected by William Lamont, and a distinguished trio (Tim Harris, Blair Worden, and John Pocock) assess the legacy of the debates.

Generally speaking, most contributors “stress the centrality of the army-as-institution to the proceedings of 1647” (126). In other words, it is the military experience and soldierly identity of the speakers in Putney church (not, say, London radicalism or Puritanism) that makes the debates understandable, a view that would win approval from the original editor of the debates, Sir Charles Firth, who first presented to the public these remarkable documents in 1891-1894. The military context has most recently been restored and embellished by Mark Kishlansky. Indeed, Kishlansky’s scholarship is cited frequently, and occasionally is resonated by contributors. One cannot help but to wonder what Professor Kishlansky would make of the powerful arguments put forward by this book. The thoughtful reader might also wish to connect the overall thrust of *The Putney Debates of 1647* with the Kishlansky-Adamson controversy of the early 1990s. That heated exchange merits not a solitary comment in the book.

In spite of the historiographical controversies, the documents themselves are more compelling than any commentator. As John Pocock concludes, “It continues to be extraordinary that some of the things said (and attempted to be done) at Putney should have been said at all; as it remains extraordinary that we should have this, and only this, record of them” (284). That such sponta-

neous and revealing dialogue never became part of our civilization's print record until comparatively recently makes its immediacy rather stunning to the modern reader. Rarely do we see so clearly, without "mediation," into the heart of seventeenth-century political and social consciousness.

Philippe Contamine, ed. *War and Competition Between States*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. xi + 347 pp. \$74.00. Review by MICHAEL R. LYNN, AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE.

States in early modern Europe lived under the constant shadow of warfare. Even during those rare times when a war was not being fought somewhere during this period, preparations for future wars were underway. The daily reality for state leaders, members of the military, and the general population always included the possibility of war. As such, the very construction of the modern state came to depend heavily on how people went about participating in or preparing for war. Based on this premise, Philippe Contamine has edited a volume that examines the nature of interactions between states in early modern Europe, looking at war as well as peacetime exchanges. Competition between states, Contamine notes, played a crucial role in the development of the modern state. It affected not just the creation of the army and navy but the very financial system used to pay for military matters as well as such disparate things as European laws, recruitment, bureaucratic structures, the welfare state, and the fine arts. In addition, war itself was not static but underwent significant changes between 1300 and 1800. The practice of warfare altered as armies became both larger and more professional. At the same time, the effect of war on the general population changed as states formulated customs and laws to deal with topics such as non-combatants, looting, and violence.

This volume is the first in a planned series on the development of the modern state. Based on a number of conferences sponsored by the European Science Foundation, these books seek