not undertake a concerted effort to use their wealth to wrest power in the lower House out of the hands of the gentry.

Gauci has written a well-balanced, thoroughly researched account of an important aspect of English government during a period that has often been considered one of both commercial and political revolution. The argument is both detailed and subtle, and it should be of interest to scholars actively engaged in research on related topics. It is not the sort of book to which novice students could be referred with confidence, but it may certainly be considered one of the starting points for future work in the field.


This collection of essays is divided roughly between the topics of orthodoxy, conformity, and Catholicism. In their introduction, Peter Lake and Michael Questier note that the recent historiography of early modern England has focused on “debates about what sort of Church the Church of England was” (ix). The book intends to “comment upon and modify” the propensity in the literature to dichotomize the study of the Church between doctrine and discipline, ultimately hoping to find a “third (or middle) way” (xiv). Recent study of the Anglican Church has stressed the conflict with Recusancy. This volume is a refreshing “diversion” from that obsession.

The essays in the volume have all been researched meticulously as evident in the detail with which they treat their subjects. Nicholas Tyacke’s “Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism” begins with the following argument: because Andrewes’ work was published and reprinted before and even after the English Civil War, and because he was “a quintessential exponent” of Anglicanism, he is to be regarded as “an Anglican benchmark” (7). Tyacke is adept at showing how both reception
and publication of Andrewes’ work changed over the course of a hundred years depending upon the publisher, the editor, and even, sometimes, unknown glossers. Overall, this is a textual study that relates publication history to Andrewes’ work and influence. Tyacke notes that Andrewes’ teaching and practice fail to present “a unity”; what unity we see today is the result of redactors and publishers who assimilated the texts to present an overall Andrewes’ philosophy and theology.

Thomas Freeman’s “Demons, Deviance and Defiance: John Darrell and the Politics of Exorcism in late Elizabethan England” examines the little-studied Puritan preacher and exorcist John Darrell. The Cambridge-educated Darrell stressed fasting as an essential component of exorcism, but the fasting was apparently not intended only as an ascetic practice. Instead, fasting led one to prayer and, thus, to hearing the word of God. One can also see fasting as a component of the spiritual exercise as reflected in Ignatius Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises*. Darrell’s exorcizing of Mary Glover in 1602 contributed to the denunciation of exorcism from the pulpit and ultimately gave rise to the Canon 72 which in essence banned the practice of exorcism.

“Puritans, Predestination and the Construction of Orthodox in early Seventeenth-Century England,” by David Como, aims to explore “the rhetorical and polemical strategies that were deployed in building and maintaining [the] consensual Calvinist coalition” regarding doctrines of predestination (65). Judith Maltby’s “From Temple to Synagogue: ‘Old’ Conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey” begins with Harvey’s poem “Church Utensils” which laments the destruction of the prayer Book. The essay goes on to address Harvey’s *Synagogue*, a book of poems modeled after George Herbert’s *Temple*. Between 1640, the first publication of *The Synagogue* and 1840, Harvey’s poem was often published with Herbert’s *Temple*, and although Maltby does admit that some of Harvey’s verse is “at times dreadful,” the work’s literary and historical merit is well noted here. Maltby’s essay is a welcome contribution to the study of a lesser-known poet.
Kenneth Fincham’s “Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud” argues for a better understanding of “contrasting readings of conformity” that arose in the seventeenth century. The essay is a good historical overview of an often-complicated subject. “Archbishop Richard Niele Revisited” is Andrew Foster’s study which takes up Fincham’s claims and examines the career—“a long and complex career”—of Richard Niele. Foster argues that Niele was “subtly changing notions of ‘orthodoxy’ as well as ‘conformity’” (178).

Peter Lake’s “Moving the Goal Posts? Modified Subscription and Construction of Conformity in the Early Stuart Church” looks at John Burgess’ run-ins with conformist authority. Lake has a propensity for cliche and slang: “spill the beans,” “which way the chips would fall” (203). Nevertheless his examination of Burgess concludes with Burgess’ death, before which he was “fulminating in print against the radical puritan arguments for nonconformity of Williams Ames” (204). Alexandra Walsham’s contribution to the volume, “Yielding to the Extremity of the Time: Conformity, Orthodoxy and the Post-Reformation Catholic Community,” is something of a case study of Thomas Bell, who was at one time the most active Catholic priest working in the north of England. Although not a Jesuit, Bell became involved in the Jesuit cause. Curiously, Bell eventually preached the Protestant faith and returned to that faith sometime in 1592. As she does in Church Papists, Walsham’s research here is flawless, and she presents us with the history of a neglected figure.

Michael Questier’s “Conformity, Catholicism and the Law” studies the intersection of the Church with the law—the sacred and the profane. Questier looks at some of the many cases where Church officials were prosecuted after the 1559 Settlement. The volume concludes with Pauline Croft’s “The Catholic Gentry, the Earl of Salisbury and the Baronets of 1611.”

This is a well-executed volume. The selected essays give us a good introduction to the problems of conformity and orthodoxy in the English Church. The case studies included are insightful and meticulously researched. Lake and Questier have compiled a group
of essays that are related to each other in such a way that reading the volume through from the first essay to the last does give an overall impression of the subjects being addressed. In particular, the essays on Catholicism shed new light on how Catholics fit into the debate over conformity and orthodoxy at a time when the Catholic faith was under fire in England. As the second volume in Boydell’s “Studies in Modern British Religious History” series, *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church* succeeds in the series’ goal of “understanding the importance of religion for the history of modern Britain.”


In exasperation Mark asked, “What do you want me to swear on, the counter-top?” My brother-in-law’s question was prompted by the demand to swear an oath at the county offices, coupled with the news that they did not have a Bible. I could not help but think about this story and its implications as I read David Martin Jones’s book about the pivotal period of oaths and oath-taking in the history of England. For here in pluralist, secular America we use oaths to assure truthfulness in almost every official business of the federal government, the states, and all localities, but we have deprived them of the divine sanction that was the original guarantor of assurance and was, indeed, the cause of so much controversy during Jones’s long seventeenth century.

Jones traces the use of oaths from the Henrician Reformation to the Hanoverian settlement, although, as the title suggests, the bulk of his research and writing attends to the seventeenth century. And “bulk” is the appropriate word here. It appears that Jones has found almost every reference to oaths and oath-taking in statutes, legal decisions, speeches, pamphlets, diaries, public and