

were signed with local, native, non-European or non-Christian inhabitants.

In her work Martine Julia van Ittersum presents Grotius as a theorist of rights and contract theories as well as a practitioner of those theories who acted as a negotiator and lawyer of Dutch colonialism and the VOC in particular. In an elegant and very well written book Grotius' theory is analysed and linked with contemporary politics, in which the political philosopher was involved personally. Grotius' thought formed the cornerstone of Western imperial theory in the early modern period. At the same time it had very practical aims—to undermine the Spanish and Portuguese domination of the world's oceans resulting from the Treaties of Tordesillas and Saragossa, but also to justify and legitimize the Dutch entry into the East India exchange market.

Profit and Principle is indeed a very important contribution to our understanding of the colonial expansion in the early modern period. The author has convincingly linked the theoretical considerations of Hugo Grotius with the practical actions of the Dutch (VOC in particular) and the contemporary political scene between Philip III as a ruler of both Spain and Portugal and The Netherlands on the one hand, and England and The Netherlands on the other. Thus we have received a very valuable and important book for historians of political thought, of colonial expansion and empires, but also a history of the Dutch and their struggle for independence.

David Hoyle. *Reformation and Religious Identity in Cambridge, 1590-1644*. The History of the University of Cambridge: Texts and Studies, 6. Woodbridge: Boydell Press and Cambridge University Library, 2007. x + 256 pp. \$105.00. Review by BRAD S. GREGORY, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME.

This book is a history of the intellectual, institutional, and political dimensions of theology in the colleges of Cambridge University from the later years of Elizabeth I's reign up to the First Civil War and the Parliamentary Visitation of 1644, which so disrupted university life. Hoyle's study is arranged as a narrative in seven chapters.

It traces a deeply anti-Roman “prevailing consensus” (69) among Reformed Protestant theologians of various stripes from the 1590s through the 1610s, centered around concerns such as predestination, election, assurance, and perseverance. Theologians such as Perkins, Some, Chaderton, Whitaker, Ward, Ames, and Davenant emphasized scripture alone as a source for Christian doctrine, and were hostile to liturgical ceremony and extra-biblical tradition. In the 1620s, especially once Charles became king, this “reformed theological community” (32) began to lose ground to theologians who were less opposed to Roman Catholic doctrines and worship. In the 1630s, under Laud, these more tradition-minded theologians became dominant at Cambridge, their liturgical preferences concretely manifest in the dramatic alterations of numerous college chapels, before a sharp reaction by the House of Commons began in 1641. Hoyle’s guiding argument is that what united all of the theological disagreements and controversies about grace and election, preaching and liturgy, during this half century was an overriding dispute about the nature and identity of the Church of England. Was the church fundamentally part of Reformed Protestantism, or was it continuous with and part of the pre-Reformation Catholic past?

As Hoyle himself suggests (5), much of the material he covers will be familiar to scholars of the period. His treatment of a late Elizabethan church that was fundamentally Reformed Protestant in its theology, with a spectrum stretching from contented conformists to reform-minded precisians, largely echoes the research of Patrick Collinson and Peter Lake; Hoyle draws on yet significantly qualifies some of the findings of Nicholas Tyacke’s influential work on early Stuart anti-Calvinism; and he is indebted to Anthony Milton’s scholarship on changing attitudes towards Catholicism among some influential English Protestant theologians in the 1620s-30s. More noteworthy, however, is his idea that a dispute about the character and identity of the Church of England, rather than dichotomies between “puritans” and “conformists” or “Calvinists” and “Arminians,” unites the subsidiary theological concerns of these decades. He rightly argues that the relationships among university colleagues were often multifaceted and complex, and cannot be simplistically categorized in either-or terms, as for example the relationship between Joseph

Mede and John Cosin shows (189-191). Hoyle suggests that historians have tended uncritically to use the category "Arminian" in ways that reflect its polemical origins; consequently, not only have they seriously overestimated its presence at Cambridge and in England during the 1610s, but they have often mistaken what was more deeply at issue in the 1620s and 30s, namely English Protestant attitudes toward Roman Catholicism. Making use of some hitherto un- or underused university manuscripts, Hoyle is sensitive to the interrelationships among university institutions, politics, and governance, never losing sight of the crown's significance for and power over the English church and thus over theology in the university, as Elizabeth's suspension of the Lambeth Articles in 1595, James I's Canons of 1604, and the repeated involvement of the crown in the election of the heads of Cambridge colleges make clear.

The book also has a number of shortcomings. Beginning with the least substantive, it has more typographical and editorial errors than are acceptable in a scholarly monograph. To give just a few examples: a sentence about early seventeenth-century English religious life is footnoted only with a reference to Calvin's *Institutes* (26 n. 66); Collinson rather than Lake is identified as the author of *Moderate Puritans [and the Elizabethan Church]* (66 n. 95) even though Lake is given as the author on the same page three notes later; p. 129 incorrectly has "these" rather than "theses"; and just fourteen lines later, "blooded" rather than "bloodied." More seriously, although Hoyle stresses the extent to which there was a "religious consensus" (74) among Cambridge theologians with "some powerful shared assumptions and a common account of Christian experience" (128), his own exposition contravenes his claim. In the 1590s, Andrewes, Baro, Harsnett, Overall, Barrett, and Digby (the last two of whom eventually became Catholics) all stood outside this alleged consensus on one end of the spectrum of English divines at Cambridge, while ardent Protestants such as Bainbrigg and Johnson stood outside it on the other. The story Hoyle actually tells is not one of a movement from a Reformed Protestant *consensus* to a divided university (and nation) in the 1630s, but a shift from the *predominance* of Reformed Protestant theologians and their political influence to a greater contestation of their claims and their temporary political eclipse.

The book's deepest analytical weakness, however, is related to Hoyle's essentializing of terms such as "protestant," "protestants," "the reformers," and the "protestant faith": he fails to see how the "theological sand" (40) on which the Church of England was built was itself rooted in the foundational principle of the Reformation, namely the rejection of the Roman church coupled with the principle of "scripture alone," the weakness of which was empirically manifest in the indefinitely open-ended number of ways in which the Bible was understood. It is not simply that "the rival claims of scripture and tradition" were unresolved in the 1620s despite having been "familiar to English divines since the 1530s" (160), that "The identity of the Church of England in the early seventeenth century was less certain than anyone cared to admit" (128-9), or that by 1644 "The attempt to define the nature of the Church of England had not issued into any agreement" (230). The deeper point is that from no later than 1520, when Karlstadt disagreed fundamentally with Luther over issues as central as the relationship between the Old and New Testaments, there never was any "fragile doctrinal agreement" (86) among Christians who rejected Rome and proclaimed scripture as their sole authority for Christian faith and life, whether on the Continent or in England. Reformed Protestantism was hardly the whole of Protestantism, as Hoyle seems to recognize by his mention of Lutherans (86), separatists (108-109), and Arminius (a "good enough protestant"; 129). But most radical Protestants in the Reformation era, both in England and on the Continent, derived their doctrinal assertions from the same method as Lutherans and Reformed Protestants: "All theological enquiry had to be scriptural, and they ["theologians"] assumed that there were 'places' in scripture that show us the true nature of Christianity" (30). That radical Protestants were politically proscribed and persecuted kept their numbers small and their influence restricted, but it affected neither the theological method that they shared with Lutherans and Reformed Protestants, nor the extent to which their findings issued in a host of mutually incompatible doctrinal claims at odds with Lutherans and Reformed Protestants, who were in turn at odds with one another. What Hoyle correctly sees as an inherent ambiguity, weakness, and source of perpetual contestation about the nature of the Church of England was in fact simply one of many

manifestations of the inherent ambiguity, weakness, and perpetual contestation characteristic of all anti-Roman Christians in the Reformation era that began even before the formal condemnations of Luther in 1521.

Nancy Cox and Karin Dannehl. *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007. xv+214 pp. \$99.95. Review by GENE HAYWORTH, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER.

Evidence of the historical relationship between the retailer and the consumer in Great Britain has provided ample material for scholarly investigation. Recent historians have considered retail space, the production and consumption of goods, and the economic and geographical influences of the marketplace on global expansion as aspects worthy of discussion. The authors of early works, such as *Middlemen in English Business Particularly between 1660 and 1760* by Ray Bert Westerfield (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1915) were content to focus on the economic aspects of trade that led to the industrial revolution. It wasn't until the early 1970s, with titles such as *Oxford Shops and Shopping: a Pictorial Survey from Victorian & Edwardian Times* by Michael Turner and David Vaisey (Oxford Illustrated Press, 1972) and *Urban Markets and Retail Distribution, 1730-1815, with Particular Reference to Macclesfield, Stockport and Chester* by S. Ian Mitchell, that historians took a broader view of the factors that contributed to the expansion of retail trade. More recent works, like *English Shops and Shopping: an Architectural History* by Kathryn A Morrison (Yale Univ. Press, 2003) have taken a more narrow view. Because there is a dearth of substantial data prior to 1830, much of this research has focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

A new study by Nancy Cox and Karin Dannehl, *Perceptions of Retailing in Early Modern England*, takes a more radical approach. Rather than focus on the evidence of sale and trade and the chronological development of early modern retail practices, the authors of this work, faculty at the University of Wolverhampton, structure their research around specific themes of perception, space, and distance.