

The shift on which Demaray focuses indicates that renaissance vacillations over the competing urges to see history as meaningfully deterministic and also as empirical and irregular represents one era's manifestations of a more general conjunction of contrary appeals or drives in western thought between global goal-directed and predictive histories and specific detailed data-driven histories, often within the same historian. So Demaray often draws from both earlier visions—Plato's utopian versus Herodotus' specifically detailed accounts—and recent historical enterprises. The Renaissance provides a persuasive case for the ambivalent response and, to our ears, incongruous accommodations between the drives of faith and experience in historical explanations. And Demaray's picture reminds us how demanding historical understanding is. Consequently, I would propose that his contribution is the demonstration in one particular western era of problems generally repeated by those seeking "global historical explanations" that make appeals and try to meet demands that may be incompatible. And I would suggest that in order to understand history and historiography more fully we need more such analyses of the irresolutions of historical studies across time and space. For they could help us understand the problems involved with pursuing history and indicate whether or not the contrary impulses of visionary predictive histories and empirical data driven histories can be reconciled.

John Coffey. *John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution: Religion and Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006. 352 pp. + 4 illus. \$105. Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, UNIVERSITY OF HULL.

This is John Coffey's second detailed study of a major figure in the religious culture of seventeenth-century Britain. The first, published in 1997, focussed on Samuel Rutherford, the chief theorist behind the cause of the Scottish Covenanters; that book was widely praised for its grasp of a substantial array of sources and complex currents of thought on the intersection of politics and religion. This was followed by a survey of debates on persecution and toleration from the age of Elizabeth to the revolution of 1688. Coffey has thus established himself as the leading student of the political, doctrinal, and ecclesiological positions of those who quarrelled with the es-

established Church and its clerical defenders. The present book will certainly bolster this reputation, as it is the first comprehensive intellectual biography of one of the more complex minds of a complex century. John Goodwin (c. 1595-1665) was preacher, polemicist, and political theorist in a period where a divide between religion and political life was wholly absent.

But was he a 'puritan'? We have come to expect this group to exhibit a number of characteristics. For them, the scripture contained all that was necessary in religion, and their idea of the church took the form of gathered congregations, meeting in spaces uncluttered by the ceremonial and architectural blandishments of Roman Catholicism. They were staunchly anti-clerical, and strikingly anti-episcopal: they had reason to detest the likes of William Laud and Matthew Wren for their harrying of non-conforming clergy; their promotion of ceremonies and Canons that seemed to smack of 'popery'; and for their brutal treatment of those, like Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne, who would criticise them. According to some historians, it was 'Arminianism'—an assault on the binding Calvinist theology of grace—that drove 'puritan' resistance to the established Church; hence all 'puritans' were Calvinists. Finally, the puritans' position on Charles I was harder to assess. Some regarded him as having been led astray by evil counsel, while others adopted their politics from the scriptures and argued that God would strike down those who defiled his church. In the hands of scholars such as William Haller and Michael Walzer, the events of the 1640s were a revolution of the 'saints', a providential struggle to defeat the forces of anti-Christ in order to establish the Godly kingdom. Cromwell certainly tailored his rhetoric to people of this stripe, but his 'Godly republic' was founded on the genocide of Drogheda and the fanatical asceticism of a regime that banned Christmas, music, and dancing.

Coffey retains the idea of Puritanism and even of the Puritan 'revolution', but his portrait of Goodwin's intellectual life offers a number of challenges to the conventional view of 'puritanism'. This is done at great length and in painstaking detail. The reader laying this book aside will, in addition to having been presented with surgical exegeses of Goodwin's printed works, know which of his children he baptised and how long they survived; which circles he moved in while at Cambridge, not to mention what he paid for his beer; who lived nearby to him in the 'militant hotbed' of London's Coleman Street, and who attended his sermons there; and much else besides. Yet Goodwin himself shatters the Puritan mould. Rather than a pious voice in

the wilderness, he was at the centre of a succession of politically astute and influential networks; as the edifice of the confessional state toppled, they moved, as it were, from opposition into government. Yet Goodwin can be seen to have been tortured by the events he witnessed at close hand: unlike many of his fellows, he assailed Presbyterianism, and espoused ideas of 'liberty' that were rooted in sacred rather than classical sources. Most astonishing is his decision to embrace Arminianism. Coffey argues that Goodwin was 'keen to make his theology match his politics', and so he rejected Calvinist predestination on the grounds that it suggested that God had 'favourites' and that he did not hold all of his 'subjects' in the same esteem (207-11).

Goodwin is therefore depicted as a man of his time, who nevertheless exhibited qualities of mind that would define the 'most powerful trends' in seventeenth century intellectual life. What are these? "[I]he rise of Arminianism; the development of toleration; the growing stress on reasonable religion; the defence of individual judgement; and the optimism about new knowledge" (9). There is good reason to question a number of these: toleration proved an illusive ambition, for despite the conciliatory legislation of the Restoration, it is clear that the defenders of the resurgent Church of England were at least as concerned with the political effects of non-conformity as were their predecessors in the earlier part of the century. Goodwin himself was hunted by Roger L'Estrange, the Torquemada of the late Stuart age, and was saved from a pogrom by the plague. A small vignette, perhaps, but one of many which call into question how 'reasonable' religion was in decades defined by popish plots, and continuing attacks—in the press and in the alleys of London—on those who deviated from official patterns of worship. In this context, individual judgement was heavily circumscribed.

Coffey concludes by arguing that Goodwin "helps us to see how a new style of English Protestantism emerged from the fusion of radical Reformation and Renaissance humanism" (293). This new style was defined by the virtues of intellectual exploration and 'liberation from slavery'; but the source of these good things was not the light of reason and a concomitant rejection of the faith. Rather, they came through the benevolence of God's redemption. Here Coffey seeks to revise older 'Whiggish' interpretations of Goodwin that depicted him as the harbinger of the Lockean age, and suggests instead that he became the progenitor of eighteenth-century ideas about reason and liberty, ideas grounded firmly in religious soil. This is an intriguing point, but

one that lies outside the remit of this study. Nevertheless, Coffey's meticulously researched and audaciously argued book should at the very least compel us to re-examine the tumult of the 1640s and to think again about the complexity of ecclesiastical polity. Those who continue to urge a portrait of the period as the seedbed of secular liberty will, like his contemporaries, find Goodwin a formidable obstacle and paradox.

D. F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell, eds. *A Chronology and Calendar of Documents Related to the London Book Trade 1641-1700*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005. Vol. 1. 1641-1670. xviii + 643 pp. \$160.00. Vol. 2. 1671-1685. 458 pp. \$187.00. Vol. 3. 1686-1700. 468 pp. \$187.00. Review by RANDY ROBERTSON, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

The *Chronology and Calendar* is a staggering achievement. Some years ago, D. F. McKenzie began to collect references to the book trade that he discovered in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (CSPD)*, the *Journals* of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and the *Court Books* of the Stationers' Company during the span 1641-1700. As Maureen Bell notes in her brief introduction, McKenzie had relied on the indexes of many of these official documents; as Bell observes, however, the indexes are far from exhaustive, so she undertook the daunting task of combing through the entirety of the *CSPD*, the House *Journals*, the Stationers' Company's *Court Books*, and the Historical Manuscript Commission *Reports* for the years covered in the *Chronology*. She provides generous excerpts and paraphrases of the relevant entries, along with full citations and a superb index. The result is a magnificent reference set that should change the field of seventeenth-century book history.

The Bell-McKenzie volumes afford an unparalleled view into the relationship between the government and the Stationers' Company, the guild that held a virtual monopoly on British publishing from its incorporation in 1557 to the lapse of the Printing Act in 1695. The *Chronology* sheds light on complex and sometimes murky topics, such as the mechanics of early modern censorship, the ways in which the Stationers enforced their intellectual property regime, and the habits and predilections of early modern readers. The citation of works that do not appear in the sources calendared but are nevertheless relevant to book historians is one of the work's many nice touches.