examines shifting patterns of corporate prayer. The *Book of Common Prayer* prescribed a set form, which was distasteful to Puritans. When it was proscribed in favor of the *Directory of Public Worship*, extempore prayer became law. This placed a significant new burden on ministers, some of whom took to memorizing the text of the old book and delivering it as new. The *Directory* limped along, a “mixed failure” until 1662, when the *Book of Common Prayer* and its set forms were restored.

One of the most fascinating essays is Trevor Cooper’s study of the semi-private worship of the Ferrar family. The entire Ferrar household, some 40 individuals, was driven from London by debt and took up residence at an old manor house in rural Huntingdonshire where they established a conservative family cult in the abandoned parish church. They practiced a demanding asceticism and fitted out the church as they wished, and all the while scrupulously avoided any association with non-conformity. As church practice changed, so too did Ferrar practice, if only to “keep a low profile” in dangerous times (219).

The debates about the source and pace of the English reformation have consumed much ink and felled many trees. This volume and its companion offer no simple answers to these questions, offering a kaleidoscope where one might want a laser. Even in a state determined to enforce conformity, the English experienced at home and in their parishes a diversity of reformations.


Between 2007 and 2010, a consortium of university researchers led by Jane Ohlmeyer and Micheál Ó Siochrú digitized, transcribed and created a searchable keyword database of around eight-thousand depositions (Trinity College Dublin, MSS 809-841) concerning the rebellion of Catholic Irish in 1641. The deposed were largely Protestants interviewed in the 1640s and 1650s, but the people interviewed came from all walks of life. One finds the voices of lords and servants, men and women. Even though they give a decidedly one-sided view
of this remarkably violent period, they nevertheless offer a rare and profoundly complex view of Ireland in this period. If you have not yet seen them, go explore before reading further. [http://1641.tcd.ie/]
The website is a more general model for digital humanities projects.

_Ireland, 1641: Contexts and Reactions_ compliments the online depositions project. It is also the second book in a series by Manchester University Press on Early Modern Irish History. The volume largely collects the papers from two conferences at Trinity College Dublin in 2009 and 2010 about the rebellion and the larger question of war and atrocity. This produces a good set of lenses through which the events of 1641 can be read. The 1641 depositions open debates about key questions in current early modern historiography—including Irish history as a driver of events in Britain and the Atlantic World more generally, the relationship of Irish history to European history, the significance of religious warfare, and the issue of the more global “general crisis” of the seventeenth century. They also bring up a number of more transhistorical questions about history and memory, the problem of representing traumatic events, the role of the state in managing conflict, the performative nature of violence, and the role of gender in warfare (including the remarkable phenomenon of “stripping” as punishment).

For this reader, the literal and conceptual heart of this highly varied volume is William Smyth’s data-rich analysis of the depositions. It includes four maps—the distribution of events and atrocities in the depositions, the percentage of depositions by barony involving killings, the urban geography of Ireland in 1641, and the location of Irish colleges and Irish writing projects across Europe in 1641. This data speaks volumes, and Smyth is right to point out the importance of urbanization and the Irish intelligentsia in this period, not to mention the administrative ways in which the depositions were gathered that make the conflict fundamentally linked to the question of “early modernity.” In fact, if one wanted to interrogate that concept more generally, Smyth’s maps would be an excellent place to start. In general, they reveal the nested contexts in which the depositions might be read and how complex of an archive they are.

The broader volume reveals, however, more of a garden of forking paths. The first half of the volume focuses on local events and the
memory of 1641 itself. An array of possible methodologies that could be used in approaching the depositions are on display. The first two essays by Ethan Shagan and Aidan Clark interrogate historical memory as a problem and seem inspired indirectly by fields like Holocaust Studies (even though the Holocaust goes unmentioned). They compare well with recent scholarship on the broader question of memory and remembrance in Catholic-Protestant conflicts, such as the Troubles or more benign Guy Fawkes Day celebrations. Other approaches include colonialism (Nicholas Canny), regionalism (David Edwards on provincial unrest as a cause of events in Ireland), performativity (John Walter), William Smith’s aforementioned cultural geography, and Hiram Morgan’s analysis of Iberian news pamphlets, which makes steps towards a critical analysis of print cultures.

The main weakness here is the lack of grander narratives, and, more surprisingly, too little use of the depositions themselves. It may be a function of length, but for pieces where the primary insights are methodological, framing and footnoting the debates more substantially with secondary literature would have been welcome. But perhaps that is too much to ask from an edited volume, and the fine work on display here suggests that much remains to be done in relation to this period. One hopes that the kinds of vaguely post-modern and revisionist skepticism employed might also inspire at some point a reconceptualization of old-fashioned and rather provincial ideas that are still staples of the profession, like the ‘causes of the English Civil War.’ The emphasis on methodology here appears to be an attempt to work through the minefields of historical memory—whether the events of the 1640s and 1650s were indeed a kind of ‘holocaust’ as more polemic authors on both sides of the religious divide have argued. This volume quite rightly avoids such language. As Aidan Clarke writes in a critique of the notion of ‘massacres,’ “In reality, the significant number is not the number who were killed in cold blood, but the number who died, by whatever means. The fact that this number is unknowable is unfortunate, but the truth we must learn to work with” (49). While such conclusions show good academic moderation, there are degrees of unknowability and precise delineation of what can be known is perhaps more productive.
The second half of the book is comparative, giving a much clearer perspective from which to weigh the events of 1641. There are essays on the Thirty Years War (Peter Wilson), the Dutch Revolt (Erika Kuijpers and Judith Pollmann), the French Wars of Religion (Mark Greengrass), the North American colonies (Karen Ordahl Kupperman), the Atlantic World (Igor Pérez Tostado) and refreshingly as an afterforward Southeast Asia (Ben Kiernan). Methodology is on display here too, as in Mark Greengrass’s interrogation of the problem of ‘orality’ in the context of a different set of documentation about the religious riot of Cahors in south-western France in 1561. Pushing the comparisons back in time to the sixteenth-century wars of religion helps moderate the tendency to read the depositions in the very precise context of the mid-seventeenth century. But the over-arching question here remains a careful and productive interrogation of the kind of global claims that Geoffrey Parker has made about the seventeenth-century general crisis, which at least some of the contributors refer to as “so-called.” As in the case with the first half of the volume, one still wishes for more in this regard.

Students and scholars will be able to pick and choose from the wealth on offer here and then dig into the digitized primary sources to build their own interpretations. A few editorial errors made it into the final volume (most annoyingly the comma and colon confusion between the cover and title page), and the price is steep. A small amount of effort could have produced a companion volume highlighting the importance of the depositions themselves and selling at a much lower price point. Perhaps one will emerge. However, considering what the team of scholars has provided for free through the TCD website in an age of vastly more expensive databases, £75.00 seems like a reasonable price for libraries to pay for a landmark of seventeenth-century scholarship.