

shoemakers still had their own representations. Sometimes craftsman's pride seems to be a motivation, but there is also an emblematic significance of diligence and honorable industriousness, usually conveyed through depiction of busy workshop interiors. This fusion of virtue with craftsmanship also extends to the one representation of women's work, the unorganized cottage industry of spinning and weaving. This activity became the epitome of female domestic virtue.

This useful and subtle study by de Vries deserves an English edition but only includes a short English translation of its Conclusions. Its imagery is generous and generally well produced. Its basic point holds lasting significance for art historians and social historians alike—for an urban visual culture Dutch imagery featured (“framed”) positive, often idealized depictions (or their opposite, idle caricatures) of various specialized professions in the celebration of diligent work itself.

Robert von Friedeburg. *Self-Defense and Religious Strife in Early Modern Europe. England and Germany 1530-1630*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002. xii + 278 pp. \$99.95. Review by PAUL M. DOVER, KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY.

With the advent of the religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Christians were forced to make tough choices when faced with secular authorities they perceived as acting against theological and doctrinal truth. Given the long-standing consensus surrounding the need for order, strong governmental authority, and a rigid social hierarchy, active resistance raised many dilemmas. It exercised the minds of intellectuals and commoners alike in both Germany and the British Isles in the early modern period. Open resistance to secular authority might easily be regarded as deliberately wrecking social and political stability and thus called for intellectual justification. Robert von Friedeburg demonstrates that such rationalizations for resistance in the early modern period increasingly made use of the language of self-defense. He endeavors to show how in the religio-political quarrels of England and Scotland from the Marian period through the seventeenth century, writers on the topic looked to the historical example of Germany, drawing upon the political and legal justifications for resistance to political authority composed there. He demonstrates that these Anglo-Scottish interpreters did

so with their own particular political and confessional circumstances in mind. The result was a borrowing that was both derivative and distinctive.

In undertaking this project, Friedeburg is exemplifying two prominent strands in the current historiography of the early modern period: the use of comparative history and the emphasis on reconnecting Anglo-Scottish history to events on the continent. His scope here is ambitious. The book is divided into two parts. The first examines the evolution of thought on the justification of resistance to imperial authority, and especially on the changing definition of self-defense. His analysis actually commences outside the chronological boundaries indicated by the title, taking in pre-Reformation precedents. Because resistance and rebellion were deemed seditious by all sides of the religious divides in the Empire, Protestants utilized the vocabulary of self-defense from an early date in the Reformation. Throughout the book, Friedeburg is primarily concerned with casuistry of legitimizing violence. The right of individuals to defend themselves and their families, the right of a community to defend its faith, and the right of magistrates to defend their own citizens - all of these came to be enveloped into such reasoning. Arguing for the right to resist secular authority was clearly a delicate matter, and German theorists did so carefully, wary of giving license to populations to engage in rebellion. Friedeburg shows how this thought was leavened by political events that revealed the vulnerability of the Protestant position within the Empire: the Diets of Speyer, the Smalcaldic Wars, the Peace of Augsburg, and finally the Thirty Years War.

In the second portion of the book, the scene shifts to England and Scotland. Friedeburg convincingly shows how influential German political thought was on the Islands (though perhaps not as influential as that from France). Although English and Scottish Protestants were "solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany" (231), given the differing political, constitutional and religious realities in the Anglo-Scottish context, German precedents could not be applied unmodified. The fragmented and diffused sovereignty of the Holy Roman Emperor clearly offered considerable contrasts with, for example, the monarchies of Mary or Charles I. Marian exiles and Scottish Presbyterians nonetheless sought to apply German examples to Anglo-Scottish circumstances. The writings of David Pareus, Johannes Althusius and Henning Arnisaeus, in particular, were mined by English writers; Friedeburg's discussion of Sir John Eliot's selective translation and application of Arnisaeus'

De Jure Maiestatis is highly interesting. In sum, the sequential and sometimes overlapping layers of authority in Germany made the appeal to self-defense somewhat easier to make on the continent. The argument of self-defense in England was also constrained by the stipulations of common law. By the time of the Civil War on the British Isles, the debate had become highly polarized, with one side asserting the right to resist monarchical “tyranny” and the other denying the right to do so altogether.

This is an intensely scholarly work, drawing on an admirable array of published and unpublished material. Perhaps because the author seeks to cover such a large expanse of time in two separate contexts, there are some notable omissions. This reviewer would have liked to see the rarified discussions of resistance to monarchs and magistrates connected to the question of popular rebellion and revolt in this period. And while Friedeburg does from time to time give examples of how these debates impinged on events on the ground (especially during the Thirty Years War), this history of ideas seems somewhat detached from choices made for and against resistance by actual historical individuals and communities.

It should be noted that this text is a slightly modified English language version of Friedeburg’s 1999 work, *Widerstandrecht und Konfessionkonflikt: Gemeiner Mann und Notwehr im deutsch-britischen Vergleich, 1530-1669*. The translation, or more precisely the author’s rendering into English of this book (no translator is indicated), is uneven, and occasionally clunky. This is especially unfortunate when faced with abstruse discussions of difficult legal technicalities that would already present a tough read. This said, Friedeburg has ably showed how theories of self-defense developed during an era when ideas about the relationship between individuals and confessional communities and the states that ruled over them were fluid, even if order, authority and hierarchy remained the primary concerns of nearly all political thinkers.