

ways in which everyday people, such as road builders, taxpayers, and conscripts, also participated in the developing state. While much more could have been said about how war and competition affected the common people over time, the authors do at least implicitly acknowledge the importance of people in both war and the creation of the state. The volume includes a useful bibliography for all of the essays that includes much of the most important research on military history from throughout Europe. Ultimately, this volume will have great appeal to historians of the military and of the state.

Steve Hindle. *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1640*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. x + 338 pp. \$60.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

In this provocative and well-argued study Steve Hindle calls for a fundamental change in the way historians conceptualize the formation of the early modern English state. Political historians tend to view the "increase in government" in Tudor and Stuart England primarily as the product of institutional development and the growth of central authority which gradually spread outward to the provinces and "trickled down" through society. On the other hand, social historians commonly view early modern government as an essentially local affair and consequently pay scant attention to developments at the center. Finally, the growth of criminal and civil litigation in the later sixteenth century is still not widely accepted as an integral part of the process of government and is rarely incorporated into studies of state formation. Hindle advances a "comprehensive" model for the study of early modern English politics and society, one which takes account of the "sedimentary" and "discontinuous" (ix) process of state development and stresses the "participatory nature" (114) of government. Hindle concludes that "the early modern state did not become more active at the expense of society; rather, it did so as a consequence of social need" (16).

As Hindle demonstrates, the center and localities, or the “state” and “society,” were interdependent in late Tudor and Stuart England and the processes of negotiation between the two spheres were conducted to a great extent through the arena of the law. Moreover, Hindle is concerned to uncover the “vertical” relationships between power and socio-economic status throughout society; thus, the extension of state authority required negotiation and legitimization not only between the centre and localities but also within individual parishes. The role of the “middling sort” in the formation of the early modern state is at the heart of this analysis. By acting as overseers of welfare policies, as litigants in prerogative courts, as enforcers of the regulation of moral conduct, and as members of parish vestries, the “middling orders” legitimated the extension of state authority while simultaneously adapting national laws and policy directives to suit local circumstances. Chapter 3, for example, details the role of the court Star Chamber in state formation. Until the 1630s the majority of Star Chamber activity was initiated by private litigants rather than by state agents. As such this prerogative court was a resource for the “middling sort” to resolve private conflicts, which in turn contributed to the “gradual embedding of the state deeper into the social order” (89). The use of recognizances or bindings to “keep the peace” is explored in detail in Chapter 4. Recognizances were both an “instrument of authority” enabling magistrates to suppress “anti-social” conduct as well as a means by which private individuals could obtain a measure of protection from violence.

Hindle also devotes a great deal of attention to the difficulties of enforcing national policies at the local level. Chapter 6 outlines the insufficient resources of the state to effectively implement welfare legislation and Chapter 7 details local resistance to the “reformation of manners.” In response to central directives the “parameters of enforcement were set by the community itself,” and as a result communities developed methods of implementation as well as “strategies of resistance” (201). The desires for justice, peace, order, and welfare were shared by the state and localities

alike, but the forms these ideals would assume were open to various interpretations “by those with conflicting sensibilities, opposing visions, and differing interests” (235).

For this deeply researched examination, Hindle draws on a wide range of material. His command of secondary scholarship produced in last half-century in the areas of political, social, economic, and legal history, as well as the history of popular culture, is impressive and thorough, and he also includes the occasional interdisciplinary foray into the fields of sociology and philosophy. Primary material encompasses both central institutions and their directives, in particular prerogative justice and national welfare policies, as well as local implementation; for the latter, Cheshire records constitute the core of his sources. A good deal of Hindle’s evidence is anecdotal, though this may be attributed to the nature of the material consulted; as he concedes, Cheshire records are ill-suited to “systematic quantification” (109). The author eschews the customary chronological method of discussing state formation and the development of the “political nation” and has instead employed a thematic organization. This approach functions to highlight individual trends and factors in the growth of the state and permits a nuanced analysis of regional and local variations and evolution over time. Introductions and conclusions are provided for each chapter and are related to the central arguments of the monograph as a whole, a process which helps to alleviate much of the discontinuity that often results from such thematic approaches.

There are, however, a couple of issues which would have benefited from further discussion. In particular, the role of religion *per se* as a component of social policy and the involvement of the clergy in state-building receive little sustained treatment in the monograph. Notably, there is insufficient engagement with recent scholarly investigations of the influence of the church hierarchy on the formation of social and political policies throughout the period under consideration and especially during the Caroline regime. Hindle consistently conflates religious and secular spheres. He argues, for example, that for the “reformation of the people” and regulation of moral conduct to succeed, there could be no distinc-

tion between religious and secular issues (179), and in his examination of the parish vestries the secular functions of these bodies is foregrounded. Consequently, it is unclear whether in Hindle's view religious concerns or clerical involvement were incidental to the development of the state or were important instruments in the formation of central or local policies and regulations. Similarly, the extent to which female participation in the culture of "popular legalism" impacted upon the formation of the state is uncertain. Hindle repeatedly notes the concern of local and state officials to regulate female conduct. Moreover, women regularly appear—at least anecdotally—throughout the monograph alongside their male counterparts seeking recognizances, initiating lawsuits, acting as defendants, and defying or negotiating laws and regulations on both national and local levels. Nevertheless, there is no direct assessment of women's impact upon the growth of governance and the participatory nature of state formation.

On the whole, however, Hindle's study—which is intended for an expert audience and assumes considerable familiarity with Tudor and Stuart political history—successfully integrates institutional, localist, and legal approaches to state formation. He also presents extensive analysis of both the exercise and the experience of authority in early modern England. Finally, Hindle offers valuable theoretical suggestions for further research. Not only is the conventional opposition between "center" and "locality" problematic, but also the historiographical dichotomy between "conflict" and "consensus" is to a great extent an artificial one, borne of modern concerns and interpretations. Contemporaries, he demonstrates, not only were accustomed to a world in which both coexisted in a dynamic relationship, but it was this very tension which contributed to the growth of the state and the formation of a popular political culture.