

William H. McNeill, *The Pursuit of Truth: A Historian's Memoir*. Lexington KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2005. Pp. viii + 189. \$27.50.

**Reviewed by Paul E. Michelson, Huntington University**

William H. McNeill is one of the most prominent and successful American historians of our times: Milikan Distinguished Service Professor and chair of the Department of History at the University of Chicago, President of the American Historical Association, editor of *The Journal of Modern History*, founding father of the world history approach to the history of civilization, multiple times a Guggenheim fellow, visiting professor at Oxford and other major universities, and author of not just one or two, but a whole shelf full of significant books. Paradoxically, a principal emphasis of this somewhat depressing autobiography is McNeill's depiction of himself as an unappreciated outsider (107, 112, 117, 122, 123, 127 in Chapter four alone); dismayed at being unable to get his Chicago colleagues "to cherish or care for the historical enterprise of the department as a whole" (78); unsuccessful in his "personal effort to propagate my version of world history" (92-3); unhappy and isolated on other campuses: he found students at Williams College "capable but uninterested" (136) and reported little or no "intellectual stimulus from my time at Oxford" (116); finally, disappointed in retirement by the failure of his publisher to advertise and reviewers to review what he considered the climax to his "effort at understanding human history as a whole," his 2003 work, *The Human Web: A Bird's-Eye View of World History* (155).

Contrast this with the upbeat finish to the book, in which McNeill compares himself to "John the Baptist, prefiguring a greater revelation" to come as "part of a new, evolutionary worldview, uniting physical, biological, and human reality into a single, ever-changing whole" and concludes: "As this memoir attests, I did in fact strive to grasp 'keys to the old mystery' more pertinaciously than most, and attained more than my share of 'hard-won joy' as well" (157-9).

McNeill's outsider/dissident self-image went back to his youth. One does not have to be a devotee of psychohistory to see that part of this owed to an attempt to emancipate himself from the Calvinist religious and Rankean historiographical stance of his father, the noted church historian, J. T. McNeill (who, curiously, is never mentioned by name in the book). It "took me a long while to live down youthful differences with him, in matters intellectual as well as personal," but eventually McNeill came to see a parallel between his father's efforts to present a transdenominational, unified "vision of the Christian past" and his own effort "to look across civilizational, just as he had looked across sectarian, boundaries" (2).

On the other hand, McNeill speaks warmly of his mother and her influence: "I...remained a Mother's Boy far longer than usual, and reciprocated her affection. I still suppose that I inherited a reckless, roving cast of mind largely from her. My father's...style of scholarship was more careful, minute, and above all, far more text-

bound than my hasty and speculative bent. My mother's mind was also bold and imaginative" (3-4).

In high school, the young McNeill was struck by the absurdity of Anselm's ontological argument and suddenly came to the conclusion that he did not believe in God, "committing me to secret, personal rejection of the Christian piety my parents held dear...But in the pride of my youth, and throughout my adult years, being privileged to lead an easy, comfortable life, I did not need religious faith, threat or comfort, so I never altered my youthful skepticism" (8-9). At about the same time, he was exposed to Carl Becker's "rigorously secular vision of modern European history" and Ferdinand Schevill's "secular, rationalistic version of the European past across ancient and medieval history," both of which "opened spacious new horizons before me" (11). This would be of some importance for McNeill's later research agenda.

As an undergraduate, McNeill pursued a growing interest in cyclical patterns in history, though he was frustrated by his history professor's lack of interest in looking for large-scale patterns. He found inspiration for a theory of social change in the work of anthropologist Robert Redfield, and then was awakened "from my dogmatic slumbers" by Arnold Toynbee's 1957 *A Study of History* (38-9).

McNeill's experiences during World War II brought him additional insights, notably experiences in Greece which fed his interest in East European history, and a wife. He landed at the University of Chicago in 1947, where, ironically, he was hired to help create their renowned History of Western Civilization course and wrote the handbook that tied the course together.

However, McNeill became best known for his preoccupation with what he calls the "macrohistorical enterprise" (117), or "Big History", which he characterizes as the "ambition of studying the whole human adventure" (120). This was the focus of his work from the mid-1950s onward. Apart from Toynbee, he was influenced by his shift to modern history, by the conclusion that "dynamic equilibrium was the proper model for the largely unconscious human social processes," and by discrepancies between West European and East European history (36).

Eventually, McNeill "broke" with Toynbee's approach in his *The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community* (1963), abandoning cyclical patterns and "emphasizing instead the continual innovative effect of contacts and exchanges between civilizations and peoples round about, with special attention to technological transfers..." all in the context of world history (68). Interestingly, McNeill characterizes his disagreement with Toynbee as "like breaking with a father figure for a second time." He goes on to say, "I found flaws in him as I had earlier found flaws in my own father," flaws which increased and were magnified when McNeill later wrote a biography, *Arnold J. Toynbee: A Life* (1989), at the request of the Toynbee family (69).

McNeill's memoir summarizes his aims thusly: "I aimed at rebutting the prejudice that makes world history unacceptable to most historians because no one can assure accuracy by writing about the whole world using primary sources in all the original languages. I remain unrepentant, claiming that inferences and large doses of imagination actually have allowed the construction of a far more adequate understanding of the

cosmic and human past than earlier generations achieved. I even believe that this is the central intellectual accomplishment of the twentieth century...a few swashbuckling intellects led the way, and the outlines of an evolutionary worldview, uniting natural and human history, has begun to emerge. It may be convincing for generations to come—or again may not” (vii-viii). Apart from the fact that this last assertion is true about nearly everything and that the first two assertions are indeed highly problematic for historians qua historians, it is a little embarrassing to find someone describing himself as a “swashbuckling intellect”. In addition, it is far from pedantic to notice that McNeill’s dismissal of the importance of languages is in contrast to a criticism he makes of the use of translations in Chicago’s Great Books program: “Neither Adler nor Hutchins knew Greek, and I have since wondered how drastically their discourse and my own struggles with philosophical questions were governed by the translations we used” (15).

Modesty is obviously not McNeill’s strong suit in regard to his “big book.” “I agree that my book was a more nearly adequate world history than any before.” On the other hand, he did recognize some of its shortcomings, and characterizes his “subsequent books...as efforts to correct a few of those defects...[which] can be described as extended footnotes to *The Rise of the West*” (70). Even here one finds revealing statements such as “grand new vistas of historical understanding dawned upon me,” and “My cast of mind always preferred large views, and, I suppose, that is why...[my] books about European history were so generally disregarded” (100-2). However, readers will find McNeill’s identification of influences and sources for this work in these middle chapters both edifying and useful. We also get some insight into his working methods, which rely heavily on his gift for synthesis and his ability to recall written materials for significant periods of time (63).

*Rise of the West* and, indeed, McNeill’s ambitions were much wider than producing a corrective to Spengler and Toynbee or providing a *magnum opus* of the world history approach. McNeill is quite candid in describing his agenda as the creation of “no less than a secular substitute for the Christian worldview,” though he congratulates himself (inexplicably) that reviewers failed to notice this, despite literary clues intentionally dropped into the text, concluding that “no one seems to have...recognized the overweening character of my intellectual ambitions” (74-5). He further developed his attack on Christian-influenced and Western Civilization oriented-approaches in a scathing attack on Lord Acton in a 1967 edition of Acton’s essays; and in his 1974 *The Shape of European History*, which he describes as “an essay [written] to point out the defects of the historiographical tradition to which I had been apprenticed as a student.” (99). In addition to further emancipation from his father, at least part of this attack was motivated by what McNeill elsewhere calls his “naughty impulse to upset prevailing pieties” (123). A further exploration of McNeill’s effort to “dis-integrate” faith and history in the context of delegitimizing “Western” history would be useful.

Lastly, there is the quaintness of the title of McNeill’s memoir: “The Pursuit of Truth.” As an undergraduate he rejected Marxism, despite being “much impressed by the schematic version of the past and future of humanity that Marx sketched,” because of its dogmatism and requisite party line, clinging “to my own presumptuous quest for a

personal version of truth and righteousness” (15). Later, responding to the obtuseness of reviewers of his work, he wrote: “Historical writing, I concluded, is a very inexact way of transmitting information, much less truth” (52).

It turns out that “truth” for McNeill is a process, a process of mythmaking. In his 1985 AHA presidential address on “Mythistory” (which he ruefully says “provoked no response—literally. None of my friends or colleagues ever said a word about my presidential address to me afterward”), he proclaimed:

“Unalterable and eternal Truth remains like the Kingdom of Heaven, an eschatological hope. Mythistory is what we actually have” (112). And in his memoir he concluded that “my ruling idea was that processes, of which contemporaries were often quite unaware, mattered more than purposes. That view of reality gave me license to imagine, to infer, and to make connections that ran far beyond any contemporary written evidence. Cautious, traditional, and ‘scientific’ historians felt otherwise, so generally disregarded what I had to say. Yet, unless I deceive myself, as globalization intensifies and a worldwide processes that no one wants become more evident, the weight of contemporary experience is on my side...Very likely, the whole effort to construct general truth (read *myths!*) is attempting the impossible...The care and repair of public myths, in short, remains an urgent task for every age, not least our own. And that is what I persistently tried to do” (129-30).

There was more than a little “truth” in his own son’s warning that he was “in danger of developing a private language that would guarantee misunderstanding within the profession” (112). One also wonders how “the weight of contemporary experience” can have any validity if contemporaries usually are unaware of process.

All in all, this brief book is illuminating, sometimes unwittingly so, and challenging, while providing reasonably candid insights into the life and work of a major historian of our times whose impact will be with us for some time to come.

.....

Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Paradise Mislaid: How We Lost Heaven and How We Can Regain It*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. x + 210. \$28.00.

**Reviewed by Marc A. Clauson, Cedarville University**

The author of this book, a recognized scholar in the history of religion (especially issues related to the history of ideas of demons, the devil and hell), would lead one to expect a survey of the ideas held throughout the history of Christianity regarding heaven. What I actually got was unexpected but not disappointing. Much of the book does indeed deal with the ideas Christians have held about heaven, from ancient times to today, though

focusing on the early modern period and forward. For one not an expert in this relatively narrow area, the views presented and the shifts of views over time were both fascinating and illuminating. But I also found that a good deal of the book, perhaps more than half, dealt with the historical context for the changing of views about heaven. This context was primarily that of the history of ideas, particularly theological and philosophical “paradigm shifts” since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This too was interesting and helpful, but I “felt” at times as if I were reading a book more in the history of modern philosophy or historical theology. This emphasis on contextualization did not deter me at all from continuing, and in fact, it would constitute necessary material for the uninitiated.

Several aspects of this book are worth elaborating. First, it was evidently written for non-professional readers. The very title seems to market the book to a well-read general audience. In fact I have seen the book in large chain bookstores in recent months. This is not an unwelcome thing. Too many books written by scholars are inaccessible (literally and figuratively) to audiences which we ought to hope would read such works.

Second, Russell, intends at the outset to advocate the importance of the existence of “free will” or free choice in attaining heaven (8). This seems like a minor point and really is, given that it makes no difference to the history of the idea whether one attains to the reality (which Russell certainly believes there is no good reason to deny) by one’s own choice or God’s grace or some combination. This has, however, as we know, been a major debate in the history of soteriology.

Third, in the first chapter, Russell has very nicely defined the concept of heaven as the church’s theology has understood it, and briefly summarized the tensions inherent in the concept, thus providing some basis for following the later story of the development and change of the idea. He has avoided to some extent one of the problems in doing intellectual history, that is, attempting to trace ideas through time without telling the reader something about what is at the core of the idea, even as its meaning shifts.

Fourth, the author begins his history with a very important assumption, which he introduces following a discussion of the essential and inessential characteristics of heaven (10-2). This assumption has to do with how people have thought about the location, quality and existence in heaven for human beings. Images such as “up,” “down,” “in,” and “out” tended to be used following the seventeenth century in increasingly metaphorical ways, mainly due to the domination of science and the rise of new philosophical ideas. The thrust of Russell’s book is to trace the shifting use of these images and the “secularization” of heaven along with its sentimentalization among evangelical Christians. For Russell, not all use of the metaphorical to represent heaven has been bad. In fact, he rightly argues that the Bible itself speaks of heaven intentionally in such a way at times. On the other hand, not all the changes the author documents have proven to be favorable to the preservation of the idea of heaven.

With these preliminary issues dealt with, Russell moves to his historical survey, giving each chapter a title paralleling an image of heaven. For example, Chapter two is entitled “Up.” In that chapter, the author examines changes in the idea of heaven in light of the Scientific Revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Specifically, he traces the view of heaven from the prevailing idea of its physical location (“Up”) to new

locational ideas. But in the process Russell also outlines the various philosophical shifts which would lead to some skepticism regarding related theological issues—the nature and ultimate destiny of the soul, etc. (38-9). The universe not only was redefined physically but many other philosophical ideas were defined in a more “physicalist” manner (41). Russell asserts that for this period, what could not be measured began to be either rejected or redefined. In addition, this era laid a foundation for major changes in the idea of heaven in the future.

Russell continues his essentially chronological treatment in successive chapters, attaching to each a label fitting for its particular historical period. For example, Chapter 4 is entitled “Ahead,” and Chapter five “Back.” In each, the title reflects the metaphor that is subjected to change in its respective period.

In each chapter the reader will find fascinating and little-known beliefs about heaven held by orthodox Christians and the challenges to those beliefs put forward by novel philosophies and theologies. In addition, as mentioned, each chapter is heavily contextualized historically to provide a background adequate to understand the rationale for the various shifts in ideas about heaven. All in all, the end to which heaven comes in Russell’s book is either non-existence (for example, in the thought of radical physicalism or science, notably in Logical Positivism and Darwinian evolution) or a crass sentimentalization by many on the evangelical side (but also among the more theologically liberal). Nor does Russell omit the influence of the rise of the historical-critical approach to Bible as one significant culprit in the demise of heaven.

While one may criticize this book for spending too much time on context and too little on the historical nature of and actual changes in ideas about heaven, the book nevertheless manages to take the reader on a most useful journey in historical theology. One almost gets the feeling that Russell is using the idea of heaven as a sort of “test case” for a broader agenda (still legitimate) of showing how Christianity itself as a whole has been intellectually challenged over the past four-hundred years and how the challenge to its very existence has taken shape and resisted. One must also take into account that the book was written not only for scholars but also, and even especially, for a more popular audience. But this book is not just a historical work. In it the author subjects the viewpoints which have sought to undermine the idea of heaven to a stinging philosophical and theological critique (the reader will note he appeals to Alvin Plantinga on several occasions). The critique of all forms of physicalism, or “scientism,” as well as any sentimentalizations and deconstruction, is historically conditioned but nonetheless unrelenting. This too may put off some historians. Russell does offer a well-articulated philosophical and theological criticism of these modern ideas of heaven (and ultimately about God), frequently appealing to evangelical philosophers. But I found it refreshing, especially from one who has come out of an atheistic past and who appears to have overcome it without sacrificing his intellectual prowess. All in all, the book is predominantly historical, but where it diverges from “straight” history, it presents a sophisticated analysis rooted in a sound historical background. Finally, it is important to note that this book is not written from the viewpoint of a literalist understanding of heaven, which Russell frequently associates with sentimentalism or crass

anthropocentrism. Though Russell discusses such historical (and contemporary) views, as well as the related individualist ideas of heaven, he makes it clear that the metaphorical approach has been much richer in the history of the idea.

.....

Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005. Pp. 149. \$18.95.

**Reviewed by Bryan Lamkin, Azusa Pacific University**

Many of us can trace some of our formative thoughts about American history to Bernard Bailyn. I still remember reading, as a young graduate student, his *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (1967), and being challenged and excited by the author's ability to make sense of highly complex ideas in a succinct and readable manner. Though *Atlantic History* may not be as seminal as some of Bailyn's many other contributions to American history, it is nonetheless an important addition to the recently emerging field of the Atlantic world. Dividing his work into two parts the author covers, in a little over one hundred pages, the historiographical formation and key ideas of Atlantic world history.

Part One, "The Idea of Atlantic History," is a fascinating historiographical journey through the twentieth century as the notions of an Atlantic world emerged. He believes that the seeds of this field are not in imperial histories or exploration and discovery works, but in a Walter Lippmann editorial of 1917, which linked America's interests in the European war to "a profound web of interest" that connected the Western world. Lippmann's views finally gave root to the "idea" of an Atlantic history in the decade after WWII through scholarly forums like the *Atlantic Community Quarterly*, the prodding of AHA president Carlton J. H. Hayes, and groundbreaking writings of European scholars, including Jacques Godechot and Charles Verlinden. A defining moment was when Godechot and Princeton's Robert Palmer presented their collaborative efforts at defining an Atlantic history to a cool and even hostile audience at the International History Congress in 1955. Bailyn argues throughout this first section that it was the "internal dynamics" of scholarship as an organic and "independent creative force" that allowed for a gradual focusing of the field of Atlantic history. He writes, "Simply by the force of scholarship itself, what I have elsewhere called large-scale spatial orbits developing through time were becoming visible as they had not been before, and within them patterns of filiation and derivation" (30-1). Though we have all read historiographical essays, the range and scope of this first section is compelling in itself and Bailyn includes a wide range of scholarly forces, including slave-trade and migration studies, the efforts of Latin Americanists, the rise of computers and the availability of increasingly sophisticated quantitative and economic tools, that independently and creatively brought the field to its present form. The author highlights a deeper understanding of politics and

political power relationships as an especially important breakthrough in the maturing of Atlantic history.

In Part Two, "On the Contours of Atlantic History," Bailyn attempts to make sense of these historiographical contributions and to paint the broad thematic brushstrokes of Atlantic history. Undertaking this task in about fifty pages makes the second part both captivating and frustrating. He sets the captivating-frustrating tone when he writes, "The starting point...is to recognize the impossibility of defining any specific set of characteristics that carries through the entire three centuries of the Atlantic world in the early modern period" (61), though he then develops what he sees as the key characteristics of each of the phases of the Atlantic world.

Phase one, characterized often by violence and chaos, was what Bailyn calls the creation of an ill-defined European outer borderland and the resulting tensions that resulted when Europe attempted to impose control and authority over native inhabitants in non-European territories. Though one might challenge the notion that "pervasive social disorder and disorientation" (70) was the norm throughout this first period, he does highlight many examples of the loss of civility in the various connected areas of the Atlantic world. In phase two, Bailyn states, in what seems an over-rosy view of the Atlantic world, that "gradually, by an infinity of adjustments, negotiations, and extemporized institutions, the indigenous peoples of the Iberian lands came to terms with the invaders and conquerors" (80-1). Though he acknowledges the competition-based economic and nationalist difficulties that remained, he nonetheless holds that a stable, albeit polycentric and dynamic, Atlantic economy characterized phase two. The final phase of the Atlantic world system, Bailyn charges, occurred when the multiple Atlantic world relationships—economic, religious, social, and cultural—matured and became the purview of Creole leaders who sought and claimed independence and a separate identity.

Merely because of its length there are limitations to such a work. One could criticize, for example, his relative lack of attention to the African side of the Atlantic world; his discussions of the slave system are much more focused on the impact of slavery on the European and American worlds than on the contributions of and impact on African history and culture itself. Nonetheless, this is an intriguing work by a master historical craftsman—the kind of work that automatically provokes discussion and thoughtful reflection because of the author's analytical skills.

Chandra Mallampalli, *Christians and Public Life in Colonial South India, 1863-1937: Contending With Marginality*. London and New York: Routledge Curzon, 2004. Pp. xiv + 305. £85.00.

**Reviewed by M.M. Norris, Grace College (IN).**

In the article "India Rising: Messy, raucous, democratic India is growing fast, and now may partner up with the world's richest democracy—America" (6 March 2006), Fareed Zakaria highlights the new, growing, young, well-educated, English speaking Indian entrepreneurs. They are at ease with the messiness of Indian democracy and emboldened by their relationship with the US and their nation's status as the world's second fastest growing economy. However, in the same India there is also unease about this relationship: "Why is the United States being nice to us?" (32-42). Many who remember past experiences with western empires and militant Hindus suggest that to be Indian is to be Hindu. It is often argued, after all, that it was the British Raj which privileged Christianity to the detriment of Hinduism. Chandra Mallampalli, in his ground breaking work *Christians and Public Life in Colonial South India*, helps us to understand how British policy actually worked to marginalize Christianity. At the same time, he leaves the reader asking new and important questions about the relationship of Hinduism and Christianity and about the nature of empire.

Drawing from a wide range of impressive sources including law, politics, and print media, Mallampalli's work shows how diverse Christian groups developed into a single Christian community within the Madras Presidency. It is the story of how Christians became marginalized as concepts of what it meant to be both Indian and Hindu developed. Roman Catholic and protestant professionals and clergy living in the Tamil and Telugu districts are his primary focus. They actively propagated their faith and were from various caste backgrounds. Though these elites claimed to represent their constituencies, Mallampalli does present other voices, including the low-caste Dalits who thrived within both the Catholic and Protestant communities.

Mallampalli presents a central dilemma involving Christianity and empire: "The absence of fixed cultural criteria, which define a Christian, has greatly enhanced the potential for Christians to adapt to any variety of cultural, linguistic or societal contexts. The process of adaptation, however, has been undermined whenever imperial structures, whether colonial or nationalistic, have institutionalized false assumptions about the cultural fit of a given class of people" (202). He gives enlightening examples.

The British Raj maintained hegemony by playing two roles: ensuring Indian progress by maintaining liberal values, and protecting Indian civilization. Christian converts fell between these two roles. On the one hand, though Christian missionaries worked to bring Christian converts under the protection of nineteenth century liberal rights, the Raj saw them as a threat to the Hindu culture and as such worked to protect Hinduism. As an example, Mallampalli explains the reception of the Cast Disabilities Removal Act of 1850, known as the *Lex Loci* Act, into the states of Mysore and Travancore. Its purpose was to ensure the natural rights of converts to Christianity under Hindu law. However, *Lex Loci* became a dead letter and was superceded by the Succession Act of 1865. Mallampalli states that the effect of this act was to remove the "Christian community" from the domain of Hindu law." For example, in regard to inheritance, Hindu laws initially recognized the "highly indigenous cultural practices of 'Native Christians.'" However, they were later grouped together with Europeans under a single law of inheritance. Enforcement of the Succession Act had the effect of isolating

Christian families from caste and community and of granting them a foreign status. The legal definition of Indian Christians became increasingly narrow at a time when Hinduism was becoming more diverse. Christians were denied unity in diversity (51).

Christians, like other Indian groups, had intricate and diverse social customs and this spilled over into marriage. It was normal for Christians in a village to marry members from their own caste who were not Christian. However, the Madras High Court began to deal with these “mixed marriages” by constructing a single body of civil law that dealt with Christian marriages. Thereafter, Hindu and Christian identities were separated (59). Mallampalli shows how this could have disastrous effects especially in regard to inheritance laws.

Mallampalli’s fear that this study may lack focus and, in fact, may “be similar to a stitched doll, whose limbs all too easily break apart” (xi) is not realized. He has many important foci and his work is relevant to scholars from a broad range of fields. In addition, in an era when British legal and Constitutional history are themselves contending with marginality, Mallampalli brings them to the center stage and in so doing provides us with a valuable new social view of the process of marginalization of a minority group. And, in doing this, we are much the better, for he leaves us with important questions. Central to these is the issue of how Christians of the twenty-first century should live in and embrace cultures dominated by foreign philosophies or religions? The answer to this could well help people of all faiths learn to live within different worlds; or, stated better yet, learn to live in an increasingly global one. At the same time, this study can help India and the US to forge for themselves a new and mutually beneficial relationship. But to be successful, we will all have to learn to be at ease with messiness.

Todd Hartch, *Missionaries of the State: The Summer Institute of Linguistics, State Formation, and Indigenous Mexico, 1935-1985*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006. Pp. 272. \$39.95.

**Reviewed by Paul S. Vickery, Oral Roberts University**

Professor Hartch has produced a very interesting and well-written study chronicling the interaction between the normally anti-clerical Mexican government and the

fundamentalist missionary outreach of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), also known in the United States as the Wycliffe Bible Translators. After years of work translating native languages in Central America, Cameron Townsend founded the SIL and began working among the indigenous language groups in Mexico. The purpose of the SIL was to transcribe previously unwritten languages and then translate the Bible into these languages. This had the added benefit of introducing literacy into the communities because Spanish was also taught. Townsend purposely chose the name Summer Institute of Linguistics because it had “the advantages of sounding unpretentious and avoiding reference to the group’s nation of origin” (10). This also served to obscure its true missionary intent and to secure the support of governmental and academic authorities, as well as then president President Lazaro Cardenas (1934-40), known for his nationalism. What followed is the subject of this work—how a fundamentalist protestant missionary organization, funded by middle class American christians, received the support and financial backing of a nominally anti-church government seeking its own way apart from the influences of its northern superpower, and in a country predominately Roman Catholic in tradition and history.

The author seeks to find a middle ground in the ongoing debate between those who criticize the SIL for bringing what they claim to be political and religious imperialism to the native societies and supporters who emphasize the benefits that literacy and modernization brought. The Mexican government used the SIL and its translation of the Bible into the native tongue to help develop a sense of Mexican nationality by teaching and promoting use of the Spanish language. In turn, protestant fundamentalists used the Mexican government’s program to spread their message. Central to this discussion is how the political and cultural traditions were affected by this process. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the example of these influences in the town of San Juan Chamula (168-75). In this case, the influence of protestantism challenged the traditional political elites and brought overt persecution to the converts.

Hartch has brought new insight into the interpretation of the role of religion in Mexican history. Using many primary sources and giving the main arguments of the secondary, he makes his points clearly and articulately. This book would be an excellent resource for anyone seeking a deeper understanding of the ongoing and often chaotic love/hate relationship between church and state in Mexico. Certainly anyone seeking to understand how protestantism has influenced rural Mexico and perhaps find a model for similar missionary outreach in other parts of the world would find this invaluable. For students of missiology, Townsend’s idea of “submission” to the local governmental authorities *vis a vis* the desire to “preach the Word” would provide a source of rich debate. Also discussed is the concept of how to maintain Christian integrity while working for an ostensibly non-Christian government in a secular field. Indeed, Hartch’s conclusion is that the SIL worked “simultaneously in the realms of religion, science, and politics” (165). The organization influenced each of these areas, yet allowed local indigenous peoples some real self-determination in choosing how to respond to and use its program. This was not a case of coercive cultural imperialism in which the SIL forced changes in the religion, culture, and political traditions of its student-clients. Thus the SIL

was successful in improving the material life of the indigenous peoples and at the same time provided the opportunity of reading the Bible. At least initially, most of the translators lived and worked among the people, they were able also to model the Christian life. Isn't this what true Christian missionary activity is all about?

.....

Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. 400. \$29.99.

**Reviewed by Eric Brook, California Baptist University**

*The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* is reflective of the renewed interest in the work of Herodotus over the last few decades. As is typical of other texts in this series, the editors Carolyn Dewald and John Marincola have assembled essays from leading scholars, almost all of whom are professors in classical studies, and have given what is characteristic of this series: a sophisticated orientation without being a pedestrian introduction. Hence, readers are given a sufficient amount of depth without the risk of drowning. In light of the fact that this is an edited work with several contributing authors, I will delimit my comments mostly in reference to the editors.

The stated approach of the editors is "primarily literary," even though Herodotus is "manifestly the first historian of the Western tradition" (xiii). With this designation, Herodotus is placed within the scope of a hotly-debated discussion in historiography circles related to the status of history as literature. The editors note that there are at least four intellectual trends of late that have focused on Herodotus, with the first listed as "postmodernist thinkers and historiographers such as Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Hayden White" (4-5). For these theorists, a historian "was rather viewed to be almost in the position of a novelist, selecting and arranging material from the past that would produce a story" (5). Though such an approach is here labeled as "postmodern," in some sense it can be said that this has essentially been the debate surrounding the reception of Herodotus in history, where "throughout antiquity we can detect two schools of thought about him, one seeing him as the 'father of history'" and the other "persistent strain of criticism that took Herodotus to task for his stories of the fabulous" (1). It is interesting to see in this historic evaluation of Herodotus that his merit as a historian was suspect to the extent that he was viewed in literary terms.

The editors have sought to understand Herodotus in his own historical context by giving upfront a handful of articles that associate his work in the literary trajectory of the broader Greek world (chapters one-four). From there the actual textual contribution of Herodotus is examined in terms of the literature that it is, largely with reference to considerations of genre, rhetoric, and grammar (chapters five-ten). The rest of the chapters (eleven-nineteen) can roughly fit into the category of the social/political

“geography” of Herodotus’s age, with a final essay dealing with his legacy (20). In the process, the editors have sought to be self-conscious of their own context and their work as a product of its time and place, while commenting on the life and writing of Herodotus.

Unlike other companions in the series treating classical texts and authors, the editors could have made better use of the available scholarship by assigning essays into specific general categories, subdividing the chapters into sections for ease of reference and clarity of discussion (cf. the *Cambridge Companion* to Virgil and Greek Tragedy). As it stands, the chapters read mostly as a random sampling of Herodotean scholarship (which may have been the intent of the editors).

The obvious strength of this companion has already been stated: the presentation of Herodotus in context, primarily with the emphasis on his historical work as it was understood in his times as a work of literature. Even in chapters where the subject under discussion would seem to detract from literary considerations, the central focus of the editors stays clear. Two chapters in particular can be cited in support of this. Lawrence Tritle’s contribution “Warfare in Herodotus” would seem on the surface to deal with a typical locus of historical writing (war) that may not easily conform to literary interests. Yet, Tritle has taken note of the “Homeric flavour that infuses his *Histories*, particularly in its battle accounts—he writes in the shadow of Achilles and Hector, Greeks and Trojans” (210). When it came to the actual battles in question, “Herodotus’ personal acquaintance with war allowed him to appreciate the stories that were told him” (210), and these formed the thrust of his historical narrative on war. Sara Forsdyke’s article, “Political History and Political Thought,” brings a literary focus to bear upon the political history writing of Herodotus. She asserts that “the arguments made by Hayden White regarding literary aspects of historical prose have renewed interest in ways that Herodotus uses literary techniques,” and it is “in part through the study of Herodotus’ narrative techniques that new insights have been gained regarding the ways that Herodotus gives meaning to his text” (227).

One value of keeping the literary perspective central in a scholarly survey of Herodotus is that it represents his work as it truly is without artificial and anachronistic impositions placed upon it. If it can truly be said that Herodotus was the “father of history,” it may be entirely meaningless to ask whether we should have regard for his work as history. As the editors have shown, understanding the work of Herodotus from a literary standpoint does not take away from our appreciation of it as history. The work of historiography is not complete and the discipline of history is not monolithic in scope. As this treatment of Herodotus shows us, we can learn something about the nature of history by a closer look at literature.

.....

R. Malcolm Errington, *Roman Imperial Policy from Julian to Theodosius*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Pp. 352. \$45.00.

**Reviewed by Mark W. Chavalas, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse**

It is somewhat of a surprise that there have been few books since A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), concerning the very crucial period (A.D. 361-395) in late Roman history when Christianity became the dominant cultural force within the empire. Thus, R. Malcolm Errington's new work is a very important contribution to understanding the dynamics of change in that period. Moreover, his subject matter is much more compact than that of Jones, but wider in scope than Noel Lenski's recent work on Valens (*Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002]).

Errington organizes the book by concentrating on the aims and deeds of the emperors, foreign and administrative policy in the Empire, and the role of the state in the affairs of religion. Errington concludes that the emperors in this period did not have a set plan or policy, but were reactive in their decision-making, thus affirming the arguments of F. Millar nearly thirty years ago (*The Emperor in the Roman World* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977]). In other words, the old Roman tradition of "challenge and response" continued on in this period. Moreover, the two halves of the empire tended to govern themselves without consultation from the other, as there was no regular systematic attempt to exchange information, thus fostering a high level of independent legislation. Errington argues that the most important event in this period was the Gothic war and subsequent intrusion of Goths into the empire.

Errington sees the city of Rome as a "political backwater" in the late-fourth century A.D. and does not hesitate to state such in a stark manner: "Rome was the parasitic, name-giving center, feeding on the efforts and products of the heavily taxed periphery...incorporating long-vanished values and morbid lifestyles, a gigantic costly irrelevance" (111). Further, it had a sizable Christian proletariat and an overwhelmingly pagan infrastructure.

Perhaps the most important portion of the book is Errington's treatment of the interface of the Roman state and the institutionalization of Christianity. For him, Constantine's decision to favor Christianity was "impetuous," as he did not fully comprehend the complexity of its theological politics or the intensity of its internal squabbles (172). Most emperors interfered with religious affairs only when it affected stability and law, rather than set out a dogmatic program.

Some examples of Errington's method of inquiry will suffice. He sees many of the orthodox Christian leaders in later periods as revisionist mythmakers when it came to describing the Christian emperors of the late-fourth century A.D. For example, later Christian writers preferred to forget that Jovian's attitudes towards pagans were tolerant. The Nicene orthodoxy created myths to enhance some reputations and to blacken the name of emperors who had not sided with them (181). Errington's opinion of Ambrose, the great Christian bishop of Milan in this period, is somewhat low. He sees him as an

aggressively assertive, self-serving person who sought to control the emperors and manipulate public opinion through extortionist methods, exploiting his secular service to promote his religious policy. It was later revisionists, according to Errington, who made heroes out of Ambrose and Theodosius.

Of course, the centerpiece of orthodox Christianity in the late-fourth century was Theodosius, who Errington describes (along with others) as such: "Theodosius and large parts of his entourage were Westerners and men of action, who in general seem to have little sympathy for the undisciplined but much-loved theological speculations of Eastern intellectuals in the church that made the church in the East as an institution currently so unsuitable as a supporting partner for the imperial government" (213). In fact, Errington argues that Theodosius did not make significant decisions based upon dogmatic convictions, as the "mythmakers" contend, but "rather from a cool analysis of military and social matters." Although one may argue that Theodosius' theological convictions are evidenced in his Code, Errington claims that the Code contains rhetorical verbiage that was not to be taken seriously, since competent judges did not regard it either (233). Moreover, Theodosius did not spend a great effort in censoring the pagans, as is commonly assumed, and was thus not the emperor who dealt the "deathblow" to paganism. In fact, the pagans continued to enjoy themselves, in contrast to the "humorless hermits, whose lifestyle was directed to eternal salvation through the mortification of the flesh" and who "disapproved of joy in this world in principle" (235). Errington believes that Theodosius even had a better relationship with the pagan aristocracy than with Ambrose, who Errington calls the "ecclesiastical baron in Milan" (242). Whatever pagan temples were destroyed during his reign was not the result of Theodosius's private initiative, although later writers made him personally responsible for everything that occurred during his reign. Errington contends that Theodosius simply created a climate in which the aristocratic Christians could act virtually uncontrolled. The orthodox tradition made sure to avoid mentioning the contributions of pagans and "heretics" to Theodosius's success. Much of this was altered by the fifth century bishop and historian, Theodoret, who Errington believes should no longer be taken as a serious historical source. For example, the civil war between Theodosius and Eugenius was dressed up as a battle between Christianity and paganism, which Errington takes as mythical in its interpretation. He sums up Theodosius as a ruler by describing his main aim as law and order and the preservation of the social order, not aggressive Christianizing.

This is an important book that confronts significant issues for a Christian audience. Errington is a stalwart historian who has successfully attempted to review this important period by "skimming the fat" off of the historical record (i.e., by critically evaluating the propaganda of the later Christian writers). Though he is somewhat harsh in his assessment of the aristocratic Christians, the Christian historian can see the progress of Christianity in Western civilization in spite of the follies of its leaders and later propagandistic writers.

-----

Jennifer L. Hevelone-Harper, *Disciples of the Desert: Monks, Laity, and Spiritual Authority in Sixth-Century Gaza*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. Pp. xii + 211. \$39.95.

**Reviewed by Dennis D. Martin, Loyola University Chicago**

Building upon the fact that the correspondence of two leading hermits of the monastery and hermitage at Tawatha near Gaza was recently published in a critical edition in *Sources Chrétiennes* (1997-2002), Jennifer L. Hevelone-Harper has undertaken a careful study of the correspondence of Barsanuphius (the “Great Old Man”) and his colleague, John (the “Other Old Man”), focusing on the thoroughgoing integration of ascetic holy men and women with late antique Byzantine Christian society, both lay and ecclesial. “Society” here includes interaction between spiritual masters and their disciples both inside and outside the monastery, in most cases by written correspondence rather than direct contact, even within the monastery. “Frequent challenges to authority, a strong commitment to cooperative leadership, and ready interchange between lay and monastic Christians characterized the daily affairs of the Christian community in Gaza. The network of authority at Tawatha is a local expression of the system that undergirded spiritual authority in Christianity throughout eastern Mediterranean” (5).

Following an initial chapter introducing the ecclesial, theological, and spiritual setting presented by early-sixth century Gaza and its environs (based more than subsequent chapters on previous work by other scholars), Hevelone-Harper then describes (chapter two) from the correspondence how spiritual direction functioned within the monastery, which was composed of a *coenobium* under the administration of an abbot, surrounded by cells of a number of hermits. Maintaining their own eremitical seclusion, Barsanuphius and John dealt with their disciples, whether those within the monastery or lay people or clerics in Gaza and environs entirely by letters. The main go-between, functioning both as courier and in many instances as amanuensis, was a disciple of Barsanuphius who became abbot of the coenobium for several decades, Seridos.

Chapter three then describes the development, to fully formed spiritual director, of Dorotheos of Gaza, who today represents the best known disciple of Barsanuphius and John. Hevelone-Harper mines the correspondence of John and Barsanuphius to describe in chapter four just how these hermits remained fully active in the lives of lay people, acting as spiritual directors and mentors to lay people via correspondence. Chapter five takes up similar interaction with ecclesial officials (bishops) and lay officials or civic leaders as these leaders navigated their way through conflicts and controversies. The final chapter (six) examines from the corpus of letters the abrupt leadership transition that came with the deaths of Abbot Seridos and John, as well as Barsanuphius’s withdrawal from all human contact around the year 543. The new abbot, Aelianos, a wealthy layman, had been formed by correspondence with the two Old Men and others over an extended

time prior to their death/withdrawal and his assumption of leadership, and this chapter thus offers a valuable twist on the monastic interaction with lay people—completing a sort of monastic-lay-monastic circle.

Although life in a bustling late-antique city offered little room to avoid interaction between clergy, laity, monks, and public officials, still, Hevelone-Harper's point (eg., 5) is that lay people and officials deliberately sought out spiritual direction, mentoring, leadership formation, from Old Men. Such spiritual direction required cooperation. The disciples were not passive recipients but active participants (6). Not infrequently, the monks who ended up in leadership positions initially appeared as troublemakers who caused dissension—competent spiritual direction could see past initial appearances and discern leadership potential (6).

The author has interacted with the best literature on late antique culture and early monasticism, making her bibliography and notes extremely valuable. Often we bemoan the fragmentary surviving evidence from the early centuries of Christian history. Here we have a full dossier of correspondence, which Hevelone-Harper competently makes accessible to the general community of historians rather than those who can read ancient Greek and Syriac (7). The reader is grateful for a lucid map on page 2.

Without taking anything away from the book's author, perhaps we are not wrong to glimpse at least a reflection of the touch of the author's *Doktorvater*, Peter Brown, both in the theme of the social role of holy men and women in ancient Christianity and in its attention to well-crafted, limpid prose. Occasionally one notes a lapse: the author uses the term "schema" on page 98 but does not explain it until note 8, referring to page 123 (the monastic habit).

Because Hevelone-Harper simply uses "laity" as the alternative to "monastic," the porousness of the boundaries between those inside and those outside the monastery surprises her in chapter four more than it might have if she had conceived both monastics and non-monastics as "laity" living the same Christian life but in different intensities. In this reviewer's judgment, the opposite of "laity" should be "clergy" (priests, bishops, deacons). Monks ordained as priests obviously are no longer "laity," but non-ordained monastics remain laity, remain lay people who live in vowed commitment to a higher degree of poverty, chastity, and obedience and in wearing a monastic habit. The difference between lay monastics and lay non-monastics is one of degree, not kind. Christian lay people outside the monastery have always been expected to live a degree of poverty (detachment from one's own property, not being avaricious) and to live chastely within marriage rather than in total continence celibately. In the ancient world, most people "in the world" were under some form of obedience to superiors (though not the complete obedience vowed by a monastic).

The widespread conventional view that monks and ascetics contemptuously withdrew from the world into isolation from the world is false and has been false throughout the entire scope of monastic history, in the opinion of this reviewer. Hevelone-Harper's fine study offers vivid and persuasive evidence from the early centuries of monasticism of just how central to Christian life the monastic impulse was.

For this reason, the book should be part of the field of vision not just for specialists in monastic history but for all who wish to understand Christianity in its historic context.

-----

Randall C. Zachman, *John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006. Pp. 277. \$24.99.

**Reviewed by: Martin I. Klauber, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School**

Professor Randall Zachman's most recent work on Calvin is a compilation of essays, most of which he has published over the last several years. The author divides these articles into two sections: 1) Calvin as teacher and pastor; and, 2) Calvin as theologian. These two categories reflect Calvin's sense of his own calling to the ministry. Calvin as pastor spoke to a church at large, in which many of its members are limited in their literacy levels. As a theologian, he instructed a much more limited and much more literate audience and included those in training for the pastorate.

A couple of these essays are of interest. First is the author's treatment of the relationship between Calvin and Melancthon. Calvin saw Melancthon as the greatest teacher of biblical and classical literature in the Reformation. Calvin also argued that the *Loci Communes* was a magnificent work because of its simplicity and clarity, with the goal of leading the church to true piety. As a rhetorician, Calvin, in his *Institutes*, emulated Melancthon style and appreciated the emphasis on the catholicity of the faith. This is reflected in the 1543 edition of the *Institutes*, where Calvin placed a greater degree of emphasis on the patristic and medieval roots of Protestant doctrine. The idea was that the Reformation was not an innovation but was in accord with the historic beliefs of the church.

One interesting divergence between Melancthon and Calvin's was the former's disagreement from Luther on the issue of free will. Melancthon emphasized free will to counter the charge that the bondage of the will makes God the author of sin. In the 1535 edition of the *Loci communes*, Melancthon stated that the three causes of our conversion are "the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the will resisting its own weakness." Obviously, Calvin did agree with Melancthon that the will could resist. So, Zachman investigates why Calvin would be so supportive of Melancthon when the two disagreed on such a central theological issue. The problem with Melancthon was that he was the master of theological nuance, so it was hard to pin him down. Calvin, according to Zachman, interpreted Melancthon's view of free will in light of the Augsburg Confession of 1530. Here Melancthon argued for civil freedom in external matters and felt that the differences between the two reformers were really matters of style rather than substance.

Melanchthon wanted to avoid theological speculation and felt that an extensive discussion of the topic would be unprofitable.

The accord between the two men, therefore, was by no means complete. In Melanchthon's later career, when he signed the Leipzig Interim, he agreed to some Roman doctrine that the Protestants had previously rejected by calling such differences "indifferent matters." Calvin, obviously, did not agree, calling agreement on such issues as "repugnant" to God. In spite of Calvin's desire to forge an accord with the Lutherans on the issue of the Lord's Supper, Calvin was very disappointed with Melanchthon over the failure to reach an agreement at the conference at Worms in 1558. Here, Calvin called Melanchthon "pliant and weak." So, the relationship between the two men was one of general admiration but also one of discord at times. Their relationship reflected the spirit of humanism and of the times when accord was in the best interest of the Protestant movement, but was very difficult to achieve.

Another interesting essay is on the intended audience for the *Institutes*. One key aspect of rhetoric is tailoring one's message for a particular audience. Although this work was dedicated to the French King, Francis I, its real audience was for candidates preparing for the ministry. Its goal was to lead these potential reformed pastors to true Christian piety. Calvin assumed that his readers had achieved a rather sophisticated degree of education, including a working knowledge of Latin, and familiarity with Greek and Latin classical works, as well as Scripture.

Other chapters of interest in Zachman's work cover topics such as Calvin's exegetical method, his use of catechisms, and his development of analogy in theological discourse. Overall, the book is exceedingly useful, covers a wide range of material, and is quite readable for the undergraduate student. I would highly recommend this work for college or seminary students, and for the scholarly community.

Paul Vickery, *Bartolomé de las Casas: Great Prophet of the Americas*. New York and Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006. Pp. 205. \$22.95.

**Reviewed by: Ronald J. Morgan, Abilene Christian University in Oxford**

The history of the Christian West often has been marred by a yawning gap between high ideals and social reality. Such hypocrisy has been most difficult to challenge whenever the shortcomings of governmental policy makers have been reinforced by the quiet complicity of self-interested individuals and social groups. In the aftermath of Spain's early New World conquests, Bartolomé de las Casas, OP, himself once a participant in the exploitative colonial system, spent over a half-century urging Spanish rulers and lawmakers, as well as members of the clergy and civil society, to treat indigenous Americans according to high-minded Hispano-Christian principles. In this most recent

study of the famed Dominican's career, Paul Vickery is "building on the historical interpretations of Las Casas as prophet in the biblical mode" (154).

Born in Seville in 1484, young Bartolomé accompanied governor Nicolás de Ovando to Hispaniola in 1502. Sometime after his ordination to the priesthood in 1507 he began to reap the economic fruit of the *encomienda*, a system by which individual Spaniards (*encomenderos*) benefited from indigenous labor. With time, however, Las Casas came to question the legality of conquest and the morality of the *encomienda* system. From his dramatic about-face in 1514 until his death in 1566 he advocated indigenous rights as "the very conscience of Catholic Spain" (1).

At the center of Vickery's analysis is religious conversion—of the New World natives, of Las Casas himself, and of Spanish elites and colonists. Even before Columbus unwittingly landed in the Antilles in 1492, the conversion of non-believers to Roman Catholicism was an ostensible motivation for Iberian expansion. In the quarter century after 1492, that spiritual goal was increasingly expressed in papal bulls and royal decrees, thus providing a legal and moral foundation for Spain's right to rule in the Indies. Indeed, Queen Isabel had highlighted the centrality of the evangelistic project in her decree of 1503 establishing the *encomienda*; individual Spaniards were "entrusted" with the spiritual care of a specific indigenous community (or communities) in exchange for the economic benefits of their labor services. As Las Casas came to perceive, however, the gap between theory and practice often was obscene. During his long career, Las Casas consistently advocated policies that would complement rather than undermine pastoral efforts to save native souls.

The "conversion of the Christian believer," in this case of Las Casas himself, also features prominently in Vickery's analysis. The major turning point in his life occurred as he prepared to preach a sermon on Pentecost Sunday, 1514. This "first conversion" from blind participant in institutionalized violence to enlightened prophet of peaceful conversion, was the fruit of his firsthand experience of injustice, the moral influence of local Dominicans who had begun to preach against it, and his own biblical reflection. A "second conversion," marked by his entry into the Dominican Order in 1524, submitted Las Casas to the corporate discipline and intellectual study that would inform the next phase of his prophetic career. Here, Vickery offers insights from the psychology of religion, as well as from liberation theologians like Gustavo Gutiérrez and Anton Peter, to explain the nature of conversion, which in the case of Las Casas was the product of both a longer process of "incubation or preparation" and "a definite moment of conversion" (58).

Following his own conversion, Las Casas spent over five decades trying to "convert" his fellow Christians and compatriots from hypocrisy to righteousness. He certainly had victorious moments: the relative success of his peaceful conversion project in the Central American region of Tuzulutlán ("Land of War"), the royal promulgation of the New Laws of 1542, and his successful prevention of the publication of Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda's *Democrates alter* following their famous debate in Valladolid in 1550-51. Yet these were pyrrhic victories, undermined by the resistance of Spanish laymen and clerics with vested interests in the status quo, as well as by a monarchy unwilling or

unable to enforce its own laws. In relation to the crown, Las Casas played the prophet, calling his own monarch to comply with God's will and, increasingly, warning that failure to do so would result in divine punishment.

In terms of Las Casas historiography, Vickery offers little that is new. For decades now, Anglophone and Hispanophone historians have built on foundations laid by Lewis Hanke in the mid-twentieth century, while liberation theologians have recognized the significance of Las Casas for struggles on behalf of Latin America's poor and indigenous peoples. This abundance of scholarship forces Vickery's readers to wonder about his purposes: for which audience is he writing, and why? The absence of new historiographic insights, alongside the reiteration of such familiar topics as the *Patronato Real*, the Laws of Burgos, and the scholarship of Francisco de Vitoria, would seem to make this work appropriate for a general, even undergraduate, readership. If this is the author's intention, however, Las Casas's life story could have been told more clearly, perhaps with a chronological overview of his life earlier in the work. The author's method of interweaving events as they happened with Las Casas's later reflections on those same events will probably confuse students not already familiar with his career. Furthermore, if one primary value of the book for Christian scholars and students is its invitation to explore the ethical life in historical context, then surely the story of Las Casas should have been more explicitly linked to ethical concerns in our own day, particularly for Latin America. Vickery's references to Gustavo Gutiérrez and Anton Peter are too cursory, used almost exclusively to explain the notion of the "second conversion" of the individual; Vickery stops a bit short of inviting readers to explore implications for their own life and times.

Even so, in his consistent attention to the prophetic potential of the converted life, Paul Vickery offers something of importance here. As he observes in the work's final paragraph: "[Las Casas] challenged *all* to a life of consistency, persistently seeking justice for the oppressed and dedicated to the achievement of God's will. In this he was without equal and served as an example for all who seek to reconcile humanity with God" (157). Christian scholar-teachers from a diversity of academic disciplines will find in this monograph a useful text for exploring the integration of faith and learning, both in their individual scholarship and in the classroom.

.....

Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. xii + 468. \$135.00.

**Reviewed by Diane J. Guido, Azusa Pacific University**

The result of a comprehensive multi-year study, this book offers the reader a window into the development of Protestant theology in Germany and the concurrent changes in the theology faculty at German universities. Thomas Albert Howard presents the thesis that the significant changes in Protestant theology during the nineteenth century are integrally tied to the creation of the modern German university at that same time. The University of Berlin, founded in 1810, serves as a focal point of the study, not only as a prime example of significant changes based upon the ideals of scholarly inquiry, character education, and academic freedom, but also as a model university that came to be esteemed and emulated by other institutions within and outside of Germany.

While the book traces both the history of theology and the history of the German university over the course of the nineteenth century, it also addresses the relationships between and among the university, the state, and the church. In addition, Howard provides a nuanced context within which the reader can interpret this chronicle of events by documenting their medieval and early modern precursors. In the conclusion, he also discusses the consequences and implications of these nineteenth century developments for the early-twentieth century and beyond, particularly as lived out through Karl Barth. In essence, Howard takes the German theology from the Middle Ages, when theology was “queen of the sciences,” to its embrace of modern science (*Wissenschaft*) and its consequent change in methodology, its identity struggle within the university, including its near ban from the institution, its challenges with the boundaries of academic freedom, and its resultant status as a minor field in the present day university.

Throughout the text, Howard challenges the reader to understand the deeper subtext of historical events. He asks, for example, how the theology faculty at German universities diminished in both size and stature over the course of the nineteenth century, while at the same time leading the world in research and theological thought with such great minds as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Adolf von Harnack, Johann Fichte, and many others. Indeed, what one mid-nineteenth century German professor called “the golden age of our theology” (208) is contrasted sharply throughout the book with the simultaneous internal struggles those theologians had with one another in scholarly debate, with the church as they wrestled with issues such as how students are best prepared for practical theology and where clergy are best trained, and with the strong Prussian state as they recognized the implications of state-sponsored funding and hiring practices. Howard also challenges the reader to view the state not always as a bureaucracy distinct from the church and from the theology faculty, but as a power that sought to incorporate religion in culture beyond the church, as it pursued the ideal of a *Kulturstaat* and an *Erziehungsstaat*, an effort that was at times led by state employees who were themselves trained clergy or academicians.

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the subject, this monograph is suitable for scholars in the fields of German history, theology, European intellectual history, and related disciplines. The work necessarily includes German words peppered throughout the text, for example, when the author cites translations of difficult phrases, or when he refers to original book titles. This relatively minimal use of German makes the author’s extensive research in German primary sources accessible to those not fluent in German.

Yet, the text would be quite challenging to those who are not somewhat familiar with the German language.

In his extensive notes, indexes, and bibliographies, the author documents a wealth of sources. The bibliography cites nearly 300 primary sources and well over 500 secondary sources. Howard has called upon university histories, theological journals and textbooks, government materials, correspondence, and various other documents to present this thorough picture of Protestant theological thought and German university development. The author also uses lengthy quotations to make his points, allowing the reader to get a keen sense of the tenor of past discussions as, for example, when he characterizes the time of the founding of Berlin by quoting the philosopher and eye-witness Heinrich Steffens (150-1), or when he cites Schleiermacher on the role of philosophy in the study of theology (168-9). Similarly, these quotes and other references to nuances of university life add richness to the history and even a bit of humor to the book as when he tells of irrelevant lecturing by professors in late-medieval Germany (59) and of the view that German theologians were dangerous when arguing in their native tongue rather than in Latin (357).

A handful of typographical errors notwithstanding, the author has met his goal of interpreting the development of the German university from the viewpoint of theology, and of interpreting the development of Protestant theology from the viewpoint of the university. Throughout the text, Howard narrates the development of academic freedom at German universities, the arduous struggle between faith and reason, and the related issue of the integration of faith into academic life. Readers may find interesting the multiple historical discussions of whether there are boundaries on faith and inquiry; does one pursue research at the expense of religion? Clearly because these and related questions are still at issue today, and because of the significant impact of both the German university and German Protestant theology on American institutions, this book provides keen insight into our heritage and would make a valuable addition to scholarly collections.

.....

Bradley F. Abrams, *The Struggle for the Soul of the Nation. Czech Culture and the Rise of Communism*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004. Pp. 363. \$87.00/\$29.95.

**Reviewed by A. Paul Kubricht, LeTourneau University**

Some years ago, while studying the Prague Spring (1968), I read various autobiographical accounts of Czech and Slovak politicians and intellectuals caught up in those hopeful, yet stormy events. Many Czech and Slovak communists, who were instrumental in the nation turning to communism in 1948, by 1968 were disillusioned

with the communist ideals they had so enthusiastically accepted. They saw 1968 as a time to build a new socialism, the so-called “socialism with a human face.” One disillusioned Czech intellectual, Pavel Kohout, reflected on why he and other intellectuals in 1948 could not see the inconsistencies in communism as a system or ideology, and so unquestionably accepted communist promises for a better future. Intellectuals are supposed to be those who normally ask the tough questions, yet they vacuously accepted communism as the best way to build a new Czechoslovakia. By the 1950s, especially following the Slánský Trials, it was clear that communism professed what it did not follow or practice—the vision was failing. More recently, in her autobiography, *Under a Cruel Star. A Life in Prague 1941-1968* (1986), Heda Margolius Kovály raises the same issue, particularly as she struggled through the arrest and death of her husband, a leading figure in the post-1948 communist government, in the Slánský Trials. They also had accepted the communist vision too idealistically.

Czechoslovakia, noted as one of the most economically-advanced and democratically-oriented countries in Eastern and Central Europe after its founding in 1918, freely gave forty percent of its vote to the communist party in the 1946 election. Obviously, a significant percentage of the electorate felt that communism would be a good solution to the challenges facing Czechoslovakia. When the February 1948 coup took place, the protests were small and muted. Many intellectuals accepted the promised new socialist order as enthusiastically as the typical industrial worker. At the same time, democratic forces reacted with ideological passivity and political weakness to the challenge of communism. In the battle of political ideas, democratic intellectuals seemed to lack energy and vision for building a new post-war Czechoslovakia. After the February 1948 communist coup, many of these democratic intellectuals fled to the West and actively defended their positions and beliefs and justified their failures. Yet what was really happening in the thought life and political activity of the post-war Czech intelligentsia? Both democrats and disillusioned communists each have their share of self-reflection or penance in which to engage as they reflect on decisions made and the consequences which followed.

Bradley F. Abrams’s book attempts to answer two major questions: “What attracted this mass of people to communism” (5), and what were the intellectuals doing or not doing in this battle of political values and national power? Intellectuals are critical in the life of a nation because they can create or promote a political vision and a national agenda. Abrams “aims to recreate and critically analyze the actions and ideas of non-communist intellectuals in their active, living debates with their communist counterparts” (5). But, at the same time, he also gives us some answers to how communist intellectuals were promoting the socialist agenda in their pursuit of the ideal society for postwar Czechoslovakia. It should be noted that Abrams’ focus is on the Czech intellectuals in Prague; he does not focus on their Slovak counterparts. In Part I, Abrams discusses the impact World War II and the Nazi occupation had on Czechoslovakia, and how wartime conditions shaped and influenced the attitudes and thinking of the country; he summarizes the role and contributions of Czech intellectuals from the nineteenth century until the post-1945 world; and, then he briefly examines the role of communist

intellectuals, democratic socialist intellectuals, Roman Catholic intellectuals, and Protestant intellectuals in the years following World War II. In Part II, he explores the national historical debates beginning with the communist vision for post-war Czechoslovakia. He also discusses the impact of Munich and World War II, the nature of the interwar republic, and the difficult geographic position Czechoslovakia found itself in as the cold war began. In Part III, Abrams discusses the meaning of socialism as viewed by communist intellectuals, democratic socialist intellectuals, Roman Catholic intellectuals, and Protestant intellectuals.

What may be of most interest to the members of the Conference on Faith and History is Abram's examination of Roman Catholic and Protestant intellectuals in this battle for the future vision of Czechoslovakia. "Of all the major cultural groupings in postwar Czechoslovakia, Roman Catholics showed the most consistently oppositional stance toward communism" (234). Their position was also helped because Roman Catholic views could be voiced publicly, within certain limits, by the Catholic People's Party. "Roman Catholic political intellectual leaders" saw socialism as a "threat" (237). They also were willing to challenge communist beliefs, such as the concept of class warfare and its materialist world view, as unchristian. Roman Catholic intellectuals were thoughtfully trying to assess responses to both the conditions in postwar Czechoslovakia and communist proposals to solve them from their distinctive Christian worldview. The two major Protestant sects, the Evangelical Church of the Czech Brethren and the Czechoslovak Church, were much more willing to accept socialist principles, although there were differences between the churches in how their Christian values were integrated or conformed to those of the communists. These Protestant churches were noted "in their praise of and pledges of active support for socialism" (267). And, in the case of Protestant theologian Josef Hromádka, one can argue that his theology was compromised or dictated by his willingness to support socialism intellectually. Protestant intellectuals were much more willing to integrate their theological principles with socialism. Later, this would lead to accusations that Protestant theologians compromised too much with socialist ideology. Abrams gives the reader much to reflect on beyond the Czechoslovak experience, as he delves into the relationship of politics, culture, and theology, and how historical experiences may shape the responses of intellectuals. For Christian intellectuals, the challenge is to preserve theological integrity while working within political environments where movements have agendas and goals that may conflict with theological worldviews.

.....

Timothy Larsen, *Contested Christianity. The Political and Social Contexts of Victorian Theology*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2004. Pp. 242. \$39.95.

**Reviewed by Grayson Carter, Fuller Theological Seminary**

Timothy Larsen's collection of highly readable and often perceptive essays aims to illustrate the often-contested nature of Victorian Christianity, and to introduce new conversation partners into its historical investigation. As such, it makes a welcome contribution to the examination of this rather complex period, especially given recent neglect of the study of Victorian Nonconformity.

At the middle of the nineteenth century, things could not have seemed more different from the situation three or four generations earlier. After almost two hundred years of persevering as a minority and often suspect religious body, overshadowed by the larger, more socially respectable, and more politically and economically powerful Church of England, protestant Nonconformity or Dissent (Baptists, Congregationalists, newcomers like the Methodists, and a phalanx of smaller denominations) had arrived. To the surprise of many, the 1851 religious census revealed that Nonconformity was now on a par, numerically, with the Established Church. The implications of this dramatic shift in religious affiliation were not lost on the Dissenting leaders, who lobbied with increased vigor for the abolition of all religious disabilities, even launching an extensive public campaign to bring about the disestablishment of the Church of England. While these efforts contributed to a prolonged season of political and social agitation, aggravating the already strained relations between Nonconformists and Anglicans, they also led to a greater activism and sense of purpose among protestant Dissenters. Moreover, many of the remaining disabilities under which Nonconformists had labored since the crisis of 1662, when some two thousand of their ministers were removed from office for refusing to subscribe to the Anglican Prayer Book, were now swept away. In light of these developments, and given that many recent historical studies of the Victorian period have focused largely on the Church of England, it is time (so the author contends) for a reconsideration of the interpretative landscape, highlighting in the process the important ways in which the teeming and vibrant world of protestant Nonconformity helped shape the political and cultural life of England during the nineteenth century.

Larsen's study is divided into three sections. Part One, "The Social Context of a Private Faith," examines the issue of gender equality in Victorian religion and society through the curious case of the Mill Yard Seventh Day Baptist Chapel in London. It probes the boundaries of religious respectability during the nineteenth century as revealed in the little-known divorce case of Newman Hall, one of the most celebrated Nonconformist ministers of his generation and author of the best-selling devotional work, *Come to Jesus*. Finally, it documents the religious and social effects of Thomas Cook's (himself a Dissenter and founder of the famous company that bears his name) opening of the Holy Land to mass tourism, which quickly attracted a large number of Nonconformist ministers.

Part Two, "The Social Context of a Contested Faith," focuses principally on the advent of biblical criticism and its impact on Nonconformists. The first two chapters cover the response to Strauss' *Life of Jesus* (1835) and Colenso's *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (1862)—two of the most controversial religious works of the entire nineteenth century. The following chapters concentrate on the work of three important and highly interesting, but now largely overlooked, figures of the

Victorian age: Joseph Barker, Charles Bradlaugh, and Thomas Cooper. Barker, once a prominent freethinker, reconverted to orthodox Christianity—a decision which appears to have excluded him from serious consideration in the historiography of the freethinking movement. Bradlaugh, one of the most famous atheists of the Victorian period and an outspoken critic of the Bible, failed in his attempt to forge a unified secularist movement based on materialist assumptions. The Chartist Thomas Cooper spent two years in prison for sedition (the portion of his life previously examined by historians), after which he abandoned his former convictions, embraced orthodox Christianity, and toured the country giving public lectures on Christian apologetics.

Part Three, “The Politics of Free Church Polity,” examines several of the important social and political campaigns in which Victorian Nonconformists played a leading role. These include the contentious issue of lay representation and the formulation of the Methodist New Connection, the promotion of religious pluralism within Victorian Nonconformity, the Dissenting campaign for the disestablishment of the Church of England, and the Baptist campaign in England waged against the colonial governor of Jamaica following the popular uprising of 1865.

There is much in this collection of essays to savor. Larsen has a knack for discerning significance in people, events, ideas and movements that others have overlooked. Equally rewarding is his witty and subtle style. It is difficult to resist Larsen’s enthusiasm as he skillfully and patiently fills in sections of the historical canvas. Larsen’s call for a reconsideration of the significance of Victorian Nonconformity should stimulate fresh initiatives, especially among those looking for new areas of research.

Though these essays are individually admirable, the collection (as commonly the case in such compilations) tends to lack coherence. A majority of the chapters have been published previously, either in journals or as portions of larger works, and when combined in a single volume, show rather less overall consistency than one might expect. Another concern is Larsen’s characterization of recent scholarship on the Victorian church, which is sometimes questionable. He is no doubt correct in pointing out that modern historiography has concentrated, perhaps inordinately, on the Anglican tradition. While there has been continuing interest in topics such as the Claphamite Evangelicalism, the Oxford Movement, F. D. Maurice, or the ongoing structural reform of the Church of England, the study of Protestant Nonconformity during the same period has become less fashionable, despite valuable studies of Protestant Dissent by scholars such as Larsen himself, David Bebbington, and David Hempton. But it would be misleading to assume that sectarian motives have been the prime cause of this change in historical priorities. Denominational tensions no longer appear to be a potent force in the historiography of Victorian religion. The landscape has been transformed as the result of a number of changes in English religious life, such as the rapid advance of secularization, driving religious bodies towards each other, and promoting the progress of ecumenical relations. In short, the historical divide in England between Protestant Nonconformity and Anglicanism has become much less important. Another factor, easily overlooked, is the precipitous decline of Nonconformity itself, and its present weakness in comparison to Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism. Given that smaller religious denominations tend to

produce fewer denominational historians, this shift in historical relativities is unsurprising. One can only hope that Larsen's stimulating essays will help arouse greater scholarly interest in what was once hugely powerful sector of English religious life.

-----

Sergei I. Zhuk, *Russia's Lost Reformation: Peasants, Millennialism, and Radical Sects in Southern Russia and Ukraine, 1830-1917*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. Pp. xx + 457. \$60.00.

**Reviewed by Paul D. Steeves, Stetson University**

One reason Russia's history differs from that of western Europe is that Russia did not experience the protestant reformation. That hypothesis seems to have entered western historiography in at least a generalized sense. Sergei Zhuk purports to refute this consensus about Russian exceptionalism with the claim that Russia's real experience of the reformation was long overlooked by scholarship in Russia and the Soviet Union, and in the West.

Zhuk says that Russia's "lost" reformation happened three centuries later than the European "radical reformation." In the second half of the nineteenth century Russian peasants acted in ways that continued or echoed the behaviors of sixteenth century German Anabaptists and their offshoots in England and North American (e.g., Quakers, Baptists, Shakers). Zhuk claims that the people of the "lost" Russian reformation were Ukrainian peasants who were identified primarily as Shalaputs and Stundists, and by other names such as "spiritual Christians," "Maliovanty," and "Baptists." In support of his thesis, he dredges up interesting details from archives describing Ukrainian sectarian activity. In the course of his eclectic exposition, Zhuk proposes to explain Ukrainian sectarianism in terms of such diverse hypotheses as those of Max Weber and Frederick Turner as well as postmodernism, with variable persuasiveness.

According to Zhuk, the overlooked Russian reformation should be credited with preparing the base for both the proletarian revolution that removed the tsarist autocracy in 1917 and peasant resistance to Stalinist totalitarianism in the 1930s. This interesting thesis, that probably cannot be made plausible, is asserted several times but not substantiated. In the conclusion Zhuk suggests that the reformation that is his subject was obliterated by soviet totalitarianism.

Contrary to Zhuk's complaint, the Stundists of the Russian reformation have appeared in many published materials, as Zhuk acknowledges in footnotes. In dealing with the Stundists, he compiles a good review of what has been known, while contributing little new information. He draws into the spotlight alongside the Stundists some people that he calls Shalaputs. He says that Shalaputs constituted the largest

number of representatives of Russia's radical reformation. Here is the core of Zhuk's thesis that is unconvincing.

Shalaputs were not entirely absent from earlier Russian historiography. Entries regarding them appear in both prerevolutionary and soviet encyclopedias. What Zhuk objects to is their consignment of Shalaputs to a small element of sectarianism within the category of Russian Khlysts, lacking historical significance. This reviewer thinks, pace Zhuk, that the earlier scholars were correct.

Zhuk claims that Shalaputs constituted a mass phenomenon that represented "evangelical" Christianity. But he gives no clear way to determine which sectarians should be identified as "Shalaputs," and no specific data by which to judge the size of what he calls a "Shalaput movement." How he decided who was a Shalaput remains a mystery. It cannot be a matter of self-identification, since he declares "all participants in the Shalaput movement...denied the name of Shalaputs" (137). The pejorative label ("shalaput" means "wayward") was imposed upon sectarians by opponents in the Orthodox church and imperial police; but, these are notoriously unreliable sources on matters of sectarianism. Zhuk gives no convincing proof that there was a "Shalaput movement."

One could wish for a definitive belief that would distinguish Shalaputs. At one point Zhuk states: "All Shalaputs worshiped [retired Ukrainian soldier Gregorii] Shevchenko as Jesus Christ" (132). But this cannot serve to define Shalaputs, since he provides sufficient information to rebut this exaggeration. But this report does reflect the most common feature of the sectarians that Zhuk labels as Shalaputs: the belief that leaders could become reincarnations of Christ or the Virgin Mary. This characteristic, however, places these sectarians well within the native Russian sectarian tradition and disqualifies them from the "evangelical" designation.

As to the size of the alleged "Shalaput movement," Zhuk asserts that they constituted the largest portion of the lost radical reformation, but he provides no credible evidence. He gives one figure of more than 615,000 in 1897, or thirty percent of all sectarians, which seems intended to make an impression of quantifying the Shalaputs. But this is done in an equivocal manner, and the footnote for these figures does not document them at all (8). At another point Zhuk attempts to give an impression of the mass reach of the movement by saying that "almost a fifth of the rural population in the provinces of Tavrida and Stavropol belonged to the Shalaput sect during the 1860s." But the numbers he provides in his appendix show only 225 Shalaputs in Tavrida in 1865 (432 in 1866) and no Shalaputs in Stavropol in 1866, with 439 counted in 1870, constituting only a fraction of a percent of the population (408-11).

Zhuk cites an enormous quantity of archival sources in apparent support of his account. But the reliability of his reports is difficult to assess. One begins to doubt when one compares contradictory information at various places in his study. Zhuk introduces the substance of his thesis by saying that in 1890 "in the province of Kherson, more than three fourths of the entire rural population belonged to the Stundist sects" (7); later, citing the same source, he says that eighty-four percent of the Kherson population were Russian Orthodox Christians, not sectarians (39); still later he quotes his source as saying that

“the Stundist sect controlled the rural population ‘on three-fourths of the entire territory of the province’” (177). In his appendix, Zhuk gives precise figures for 1890 showing there were 4,648 Stundists out of a total population of 1,868,448, or less than one percent (418-9).

In sum, this monograph makes no noteworthy contribution to Russian historiography. Even if it shows that a small fraction of Russia’s peasants dabbled in reformation-like behavior in the nineteenth century, it does not depict any substantial effect of this activity upon Russia’s development. This is an unfortunate omission because the Stundist activity that Zhuk describes did contribute to a small evangelical presence in Russia, one that continues to the present day in a variety of growing protestant denominations throughout the republics of the former Soviet Union.

Alon Confino, *Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Pp. 306. \$59.95/\$24.95.

**Reviewed by David J. Diephouse, Calvin College**

For anyone in search of clues to recent trends in cultural history, Alon Confino’s work offers a useful starting point. Confino is probably best known for his 1997 monograph *The Nation as a Local Metaphor*, an illuminating revisionist study of nationalism in Imperial Germany that locates the wellsprings of national identity in the essentially local symbolic universes evoked by the resonant German term *Heimat*. The ten essays collected in this new book circle out from the earlier study both chronologically and conceptually, across topics ranging from Freud’s *Moses and Monotheism* and the 1984 television serial *Heimat* to the cultural meaning of postwar German tourism.

While the book’s title and subtitle may seem at first glance to point in separate directions, they in fact frame an argument that runs throughout the entire collection. What Confino calls a “culture of remembrance” is by no means peculiar to Germany; every national community, he insists, is in some sense “the sum of its memories and forgetting” (168). Germany’s problematic history (including, *a fortiori*, the Holocaust) therefore demands to be seen not as somehow unique but rather as an “extreme historical and historiographical case” (xv, 6) of more general issues concerning the nature of national identity and collective memory—and for that matter of the historian’s craft itself, which likewise constitutes an exercise in memory and representation. If cultural historians’ recent emphasis on the role of memory helps illuminate key aspects of German political culture, German history helps bring into focus questions of method and meaning inherent

in the practice of cultural history. Both, in turn, reflect the complex interaction of past and present that is intrinsic to all historical study.

Confino underscores these interconnections in a prefatory reflection on historical thinking that I suspect will quickly find its way onto many undergraduate reading lists. As he construes it, the historian's representations of the past reflect a dialectical interplay of personal experience, shared public consciousness, and professional norms of analysis. This stance obviously leaves little room for naïve modernist notions of objectivity, but it also leaves little room for a radical postmodern relativism. To be sure, the past is far from univocal; it exists in a host of forms, both experienced and imagined. Moreover, historians are manifestly constrained to pursue their inquiries from within the very cultures they seek to interpret. But the multivalence of the past and the historian's lack of a cultural Archimedean point do not preclude the possibility of authentic knowledge. As Confino writes: "When historians write the histories of the past they simultaneously write the histories of their present, but this does not make either of them untrue, though it does make both permanently incomplete" (16).

The book is divided into two parts. The first five essays recapitulate and extend Confino's work on the role of the Heimat tradition in Germany's "culture of remembrance," carrying his analysis forward from the Wilhelmian era into the 1990s. Building on Benedict Anderson's now-famous model of nations as "imagined communities," Confino argues that the Heimat idea—German nationhood imagined as locality and region writ large—was a protean phenomenon whose genius lay in its ability to provide a malleable vocabulary of community that transcended ideology and governmental systems and that was capable of sustaining a sense of shared identity while absorbing and refracting conflicting political impulses across both space and time. As the title of one essay suggests, Heimat could therefore function as "A National Lexicon for All Seasons," providing a way for Germans to "feel German regardless of who was in power" (114). A fascinating case in point is the strange career of Heimat discourse in the former German Democratic Republic, where the regime sought to exploit the emotional potential of Heimat images while simultaneously attempting to re-cast their symbolic referents in the mold of socialist internationalism—an enterprise that, as Confino deftly shows, was inherently self-contradictory and ultimately self-defeating. (Reading his account, I could not help but be reminded of a chance encounter in a small-town pub in rural Thuringia, not long after reunification, with an out-of-work former East German indoctrination officer who was struggling to re-invent himself—as a local history expert.)

The second half of the book offers essays dealing with the more general, but closely related, theme of memory and nationhood. One essay seeks to unravel Freud's narrative of Jewish national character in *Moses and Monotheism*. Others use memory as a focus for examining issues of method and interpretation in cultural history, arguing for the virtues of "open" narratives that acknowledge ambiguity, negotiation, and individual agency, as opposed to "fixed" narratives that posit the causative significance of some a priori factor such as democracy or class. The final two essays merge empirical and theoretical concerns, using tourism as a test case to explore linkages between social practice and cultural representation. Echoing themes hinted at in earlier essays on the Heimat

tradition, Confino suggests that an exegesis of tourist attitudes and habits after 1945 reveals the extent to which ordinary Germans contrived to construct multiple images of their experience in the Third Reich, making tourism a “metaphor that both claimed aspects of the Nazi past and insulated the present from it” (254).

It is hard to do justice to analysis of this sort in a brief review. Confino’s arguments are elegant and subtle, his conclusions often tentative, qualified, and multilayered. Although this set of essays deals with religion only in passing—beyond, of course, the vast implicit challenges posed by the Holocaust—his earlier book drew explicit parallels between nationalism and religion as cultural phenomena, and the implications of his approach to memory and representation should be of interest to anyone concerned with the role of faith in history and historical interpretation. To what extent and in what ways do religious communities constitute “cultures of remembrance”? What interpretive possibilities and challenges might this entail? Such questions lend significance to Confino’s work beyond the specific insights it provides on the dynamics of German nationalism and the theory and practice of cultural history.

Timothy L. Wood, *Agents of Wrath, Sowers of Discord: Authority and Dissent in Puritan Massachusetts, 1630-1655*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006. Pp. x + 160. \$70.00.

**Reviewed by Linford D. Fisher, Harvard University**

In 1631, George Philips, minister at the Watertown church in the Massachusetts Bay colony, ruffled the feathers of Puritan divines by asserting that “the Churches of Rome were true churches.” Unsurprisingly, Philips’s provocative statement earned him an imposing visit from Governor John Winthrop, Deputy Governor Thomas Dudley, and Boston church elder Increase Nowell. As it turned out, Philips was more “orthodox” than he sounded; his seeming endorsement of Catholicism was made while defending infant baptism against the Baptist polemicist Thomas Lamb, who attacked both Puritan baptismal practices and George Philips himself in one fell swoop. Although the controversy did not die easily, by the summer of the next year Philips, lay elder Richard Browne, and elder John Masters had all clarified their positions and largely submitted to Winthrop, Dudley, and Nowell.

Dissenters like Philips, authority figures like Winthrop, and the contestations over Puritan identity, are what Timothy L. Wood seeks to explore in *Agents of Wrath, Sowers of Discord*. Philips, Wood tells us, “threatened several facets of the Puritan self-identity” and “undermined the mission of reform that was so central to Puritanism, as well as the role of scripture as the ‘spiritual constitution’ of the colony” (39). The responses of the Massachusetts Bay spiritual and civil leaders to Philips and other better-known dissenters—Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, and Henry Dunster, for example—allow us to see both the spectrum of dissent as well as the broad and variegated responses to it.

The colony's leadership "did not automatically see dissent as a symptom of an unhealthy society," however, and in the best cases the leaders were able to "defuse principled opposition and reconcile dissenters back to the Puritan way" (13).

*Agents of Wrath, Sowers of Discord* is arranged into five topical chapters, bookended by an introduction, conclusion, and lengthy historiographical essay on authority and dissent in early New England. The first chapter steps back and provides a larger context for Puritanism within the early modern period. World events like the "Islamic expansion into eastern Europe," "Catholic aggression" against England and Protestantism in general, and the "Native American presence on the American frontier" all gave first-generation Puritans the sense that "their most cherished political and religious values seemed to be threatened at every turn" (34).

Chapters two and three explore the role of dissent in forcing early Puritan New Englanders to negotiate an emerging Puritan religious and civil identity. Using what quickly becomes a rather worn-out cast of characters, Wood explores the challenges to Puritan identity presented by George Philips, Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, Henry Vane, and Henry Dunster, each who helped clarify the precise shape of New England Christianity. Points of difference with dissenters—the rejection of infant baptism by Harvard president Henry Dunster, or the radical immediate personal revelations of Hutchinson—provided the context in which this emerging Puritan identity could be formulated clearly. In the wake of these controversies, Wood contends, "the Bay colony embraced a religious vision that might be described as doctrinally contained, Biblically based, anti-schismatic communitarianism" (58).

Chapters three and four look at ways in which dissent was actually expressed—and dealt with—in Puritan New England. Dissenters varied in their levels of critique, and, accordingly, in the level of perceived threat to society. Philips attacked political and theological ideas but supported the overall social structure of society and so was merely guided back into the orthodox fold. Williams, on the other hand, "sought to divorce himself" from Puritan society in all of its facets and was banished. Various kinds of dissent, expressed in local contexts of churches and state houses, elicited varied responses from those in authority and additionally triggered more on-the-ground networks intended to correct the dissenter and restore him or her to the society. In making decisions and prosecuting dissenters, local magistrates and ministers had to navigate a "horizontal authority" that "stressed the need for coordination and cooperation among all the rulers in the Bay colony," and a "vertical solidarity" that "emphasized the unity of a given town or congregation across the entire social spectrum" (88, 98).

Overall, there is much to commend in this book. Wood has helpfully analyzed themes of dissent, authority, and identity in New England Puritanism through a few case studies. In choosing some relatively lesser-known dissenters from the Massachusetts Bay, Wood reinserts people like Philips, Dunster and Vane into the larger conversation and illustrates the spectrum of dissent and the tailored responses by those in authority. In other ways, however, the book is unsatisfying. Throughout the book, Wood employs a fairly narrow definition of "dissent" and "authority" and ends up with familiar standoffs between Williams and Winthrop. More interesting, perhaps, would have been a

discussion of the ways in which competing visions of life in the New World emerged in the everyday rhythms of family and the marketplace, as evidenced in diaries and church and court records. Similarly, forces that shaped this emerging “Puritanism” were broader than religious and political leaders; “authority” trickled down into informal family and communal structures, seeped out of the pages of the Bible, and traveled over the Atlantic in letters and on the pages of books.

Additionally, the cast of characters is lamentably small, which the structure of the book—four central chapters using the roughly the same people to illuminate various themes (religious identity, civil identity, etc.)—does little to help. At times, various ideas, movements, and concepts seem to be unnecessarily monolithized. If English historians, following Patrick Collinson, have long left “puritan” uncapitalized to recognize the fluid nature of the movement, Wood implies we should use a bolded capital “P.” Even as Wood admits that ideas about theology and society were still being formed, he also asserts that there was a something definable called “Puritanism,” there was a particular “Puritan identity,” there was a “Puritan mission,” that there was an “American Congregationalism,” even though scholars have long contested such notions. Finally, Wood’s horizontal/vertical categories, prominent in chapter four, are not entirely convincing and tend to confuse more than clarify.

These quibbles aside, this book is sure to find a warm reception among readers looking to delve more deeply into traditional frameworks of authority and dissent within early New England Puritanism.

.....

Walter D. Kamphoefner and Wolfgang Helbich, eds., *Germans in the Civil War: The Letters They Wrote Home*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Pp. 560. \$59.95.

**Reviewed by Bradley J. Gundlach, Trinity College**

While United States history textbooks usually mention the fact that about one in four Union soldiers was foreign-born, the ethnic component of the Civil War continues to suffer neglect—especially the German element. Such neglect may arise from a number of causes. Military historians and social historians often feel at odds in terms of interests, methodology, and especially the proportion of attention each area receives in textbook chapters on America’s wars. Ethnic history, once at the forefront of efforts for inclusion, has fared poorly in recent decades. In the 1960s and 70s the descendants of working-class ethnics got Ph.D.s and produced study after study of social history exploring such topics as urban life, voting patterns, socioeconomic mobility, and labor experience—but this early effort at diversification and inclusion spent much of its energy on local studies, which after a while seemed redundant. In the 1980s and afterward, the whiteness of

European immigrants disqualified them from attention as the push for diversity focused on nonwhite Americans. Now the term “Anglo” usually denotes any white American (as generations of immigrant dead roll over in their graves). In the case of German immigrants, their rapid assimilation in the early-twentieth century, especially under the stress of World War I, spelled the destruction of important source materials, as new generations lost both pride in their ethnic heritage and the ability to read their forebears’ literary remains. The Irish brigades in the Civil War are much better known than the many German units, in part simply because of their use of English. (Americanists rarely master a second language.) And so, when Ken Burns put together his highly popular PBS documentary on the Civil War, German immigrant soldiers were absent—and barely missed.

Kamphoefner and Helbich’s rich collection of Civil War letters is a significant step in addressing such neglect. It divides neatly into two parts: a thorough and masterful interpretive section by the editors (some seventy pages, all told, of preface and introduction), and a wide selection of Civil War letters by German participants and their family members, translated (coincidentally) by a great-great granddaughter of Robert E. Lee.

Kamphoefner (Texas A&M) and Helbich (Ruhr Universität Bochum) take a characteristically European approach to the study of history: rather than starting from a question and hunting down pertinent sources, they start with a particular source—in this case, the North America Letter Collection (Nordamerika Briefsammlung, or NABS) at the Forschungsbibliothek in Gotha, Germany—and milk it for all it’s worth, supplementing it of course with plenty of other pertinent material. In the United States, most Civil War letters and diaries languish (if they survive at all) in the obscurity of local historical societies and family attics. But German soldiers sent letters to loved ones across the ocean, where German scholars have made an effort to gather them into one place as part of a larger collection of emigrants’ correspondence. Indeed, in 1988 these editors published a selection of letters documenting German-American immigrant experience entitled *Briefe aus Amerika* (translated into English as *News from the Land of Freedom*, 1991). Researchers in this field will be glad to know that the entire NABS was microfilmed by the Library of Congress in 1997, and that efforts continue in Gotha to enlarge the collection—especially to add thousands of letters from the former East Germany.

The present volume focuses directly on the Civil War, selecting and excerpting letters for the light they shed on such matters as ethnic consciousness; immigrant perspectives on the war, politics and slavery, interethnic relations, and more. Of the 956 letters from 1860-65 in the NABS, written by 258 German immigrants, the editors have chosen 343 letters by seventy-eight individuals. They estimate that immigrants sent nearly four million letters to Germany during those years, some half a million of which were written by Civil War soldiers—so that the sample in this volume represents perhaps 1/4000 of them. But the point is not *representation* so much as *illustration*—and after carefully documenting their procedure and qualifying their right to generalize, the editors do venture to make some distinct interpretive claims. First, they find that German

immigrants thought of themselves as Germans, whatever their regional or confessional background. Second, they find in these letters “the broadest imaginable spectrum” of points of view. The particulars of individual background and experience explain this variety, and it is the variety of experiences that interests them most. This leads to the third and most important interpretive claim: the denial of the “Americanization thesis.” The Civil War was not the proverbial melting pot that made its soldiers Americans all. German immigrants retained distinctly German interests and attitudes throughout the war, whether they served in all-German units or not. Too often American historians treat immigrants in relation to their American relations and concerns, whereas these letters reveal the continued German-ness of German-American soldiers, in both their own eyes and the eyes of the “Americans.” It might almost be better, the editors say, to characterize the German regiments in the Civil War as allies under American supreme command, than as American troops speaking a different language (23).

The goal here is not a celebration of “the German contribution” or of sheer German-ness. Repeatedly, the editors scorn “ancestor worshipping” older histories produced by the German American communities. Rather, they wish to explore “the intercultural refraction created as immigrants experienced and interpreted the war” (xii)—in other words, how the particulars of German background and immigrant experience gave the letter-writers a different perspective on the war from that of their American neighbors.

It should come as no surprise, then, that the book is less about the war (military history) than about the soldiers (social, cultural, intellectual history). Civil War buffs will find plenty of references to particular battles, but little in the way of military strategy. These are soldiers’ letters, giving compelling firsthand accounts but from a necessarily limited perspective. One feels throughout how little the soldier on the ground—especially the Confederate soldier—knew what was going on. Those interested in particular battles or locales will have to use the index extensively, and even then many descriptions of battle are excised. This is not a weakness; it is a necessary function of the editor’s purposes and of the unmanageable complexity of this, the best documented war in history.

The heart of the book is of course the letters themselves. They are grouped by theatre of war (Eastern, Western) and within that simply by soldier. In most cases we read a series of letters, sometimes including letters from home. Typically we follow the soldier from origins in Germany (in a brief editorial introduction to each) to arrival in America, enlistment, numerous war experiences, and postwar situation (when available). The editors have done careful background research on each person. They even provide comments on individual writing style to indicate level of education and personal idiosyncrasies. In short, we experience the war years vicariously as the experience of actual people, with their own personalities, relationships, interests, and backgrounds.

This is history at its most elemental—and it makes for a compelling read. We encounter tales from the home front, as a husband, wife, and sister recount the New York City draft riot of July 1863 and its effect on their business (65-6), or a farmer’s wife in Texas deals with her husband’s absence and taxation in kind (459). We read tales from the camps, battlefields, prisons, and hospitals. A German surgeon taken prisoner in the

rout at Chancellorsville describes how “hundreds of our [wounded] men starved on the battlefield, died of thirst—or of madness brought on by the scorching rays of the sun burning straight down on them” (158). An infantry sergeant describes the arrival of a hundred contrabands—escaped slaves who fled to Union lines—one of whom was later ripped to pieces by slavecatcher’s dogs (208). We read social commentary: one soldier from Milwaukee with a drinking problem crabs about this nation of swindlers and reflects on how the Constitution no longer fits the kind of grasping riffraff Americans have become (138); another marvels on social leveling in America, where “a soldier just puts his hand on an officer’s shoulder and lights his pipe on the latter’s cigar, without asking permission” (199). There are accounts of high morale and the crossing of ethnic lines: at a sending-off parade in Buffalo “every soldier in the regiment received something handmade by the daughters of the town aristocracy under the age of ten, and they presented them in person” (198). Yet most German soldiers far prefer the company of other Germans. They cook and eat together in German messes within mixed units; some organize reading clubs and chorale singing in their camp, scorning “Yänkee” vulgarity as they fight for the Union and against slavery (213). But not all Germans fight for the Union. Some of the most intriguing stories come from German Southerners. A graduate of a German mining college finds himself in charge of the Confederacy’s largest copper works, disliking the war and sympathizing with the North all the while, and sending his letters via Mexico to evade the Northern blockade (374-86). Texas Germans in pro-Union counties are forced to fight for the Confederacy or lose all their property, and a band of sixty-eight who try to flee to Mexico are captured, lined up, and used as targets, “their faces and bodies completely riddled with bullets” (433). A recurrent theme is the general German American opposition to slavery, which does figure prominently in a great many letters, especially as motivation to fight despite all the “humbug” of the North—but prejudice and less-than-noble motives abound. A Union officer reports, “I have bought myself a *Nigger*” (158). The final selection is that of a pious Lutheran non-slaveholder from Texas whose letters reveal an odyssey from reluctant military service (“I had to join the army and fight for a cause I never approved of”) to active Republicanism during Reconstruction, opposing segregation laws into the 1880s, but ending in approval of the white-supremacist Democrat government after all (448-76).

Some letter series end with the announcement of the soldier’s death to loved ones in Germany, striking the reader with the abrupt end of a young and vibrant life as if it happened yesterday. This quality makes the book a marvelous source of specific illustrations for lectures, diversifying our telling of the war in a way entirely natural and fitting. Students will find the book accessible and enthralling. A glossary, copious documentation, and comments in footnotes add to the book’s effectiveness, though the close reader will want to keep a Civil War atlas handy. Even at \$59.95 this unique collection of primary source material is well worth the price.

-----

Margaret Lamberts Bendroth, *Fundamentalists in the City: Conflict and Divisions in Boston's Churches, 1885-1950*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. Pp. x + 250. \$55.00.

**Reviewed by P.C. Kemeny, Grove City College**

If all politics is local, as Tip O'Neill is best remembered as saying, so is all religion. In *Fundamentalists in the City: Conflict and Divisions in Boston's Churches, 1885-1950*, Margaret Lamberts Bendroth offers a much needed local history of fundamentalism in a major urban environment. Although historians have been mining the history of fundamentalism for almost a generation, and producing a number of outstanding studies of fundamentalism's origins, beliefs, and institutions, Bendroth explores the history of revivalist Protestantism in one particular geographical locale.

After an introductory chapter that situates the study within the larger historiography of fundamentalism, Bendroth, the Executive Director of the American Congregational Association in Boston, takes the reader on a walking tour around Boston, surveying the religious, ethnic, and class lines that divided the city into very distinct neighborhoods. In the late-nineteenth century Boston was the nation's sixth largest city; geographically, however, Boston was (and is) rather compact. Conservative Protestants not only rubbed elbows daily with Boston's burgeoning Irish population but soon saw Yankee cultural dominance eclipsed by Catholics. The 1885 election of the city's first Irish-born Democratic mayor, Bendroth argues, signaled to Yankee Protestant Republicans that their dominance of Boston's political life had come to an end.

In the third chapter, Bendroth recounts the arrest of three prominent Protestant clergymen for preaching on Boston Common in May 1885. The Boston Common had long been associated with open-air preaching. George Whitefield, for instance, stoked the flames of the First Great Awakening on it in 1740. When the police arrested Adoniram Judson Gordon of Clarendon Baptist Church, Horace L. Hastings, editor of the evangelical periodical, *Christian*, and William H. Davis, superintendent of a mission in the North End, for preaching without a permit, Boston evangelicals smelled a conspiracy and, according to Bendroth, they were right. Earlier that year, the Republican dominated state legislature had passed a bill placing Boston's police force under the direct administration of the governor of Massachusetts. Republicans made such a move because they were certain that the police force as well as the mayor and board of aldermen were corrupt tools of a Democratic political machine owned by liquor interests. So, the reorganization of the metropolitan police force marked a major defeat for saloons and the Irish Catholics who frequented them and also profited from them. Since Boston Protestants had led the fight to reorganize the police, Catholics were out for revenge. The controversy, as Bendroth demonstrates, galvanized evangelical Protestants around old fears of Catholic conspiracy and fueled religious strife well into the next decade.

The fourth chapter explores the battle between Protestants and Catholics over the control of the public school system. When Protestants learned that Catholic women were registering to vote in local elections, several evangelical women's organizations

mobilized to recruit Protestant women voters who would help counter Catholic efforts to control the school board elections. Despite their apolitical reputation, Bendroth shows, conservative Protestants were deeply engaged into local politics. The chapter also reveals the crucial role that women played in generating religious militancy. While women constituted the majority constituency in Protestant churches in the late-nineteenth century, women are usually irrelevant to most historians' accounts of fundamentalism. According to Bendroth, women's leadership in this anti-Catholic controversy was in fact a result of their secondary status in Protestant churches. Since they were barred from ordained ministry and marginal to the city's ecclesiastical structures, Bendroth contends, women actually enjoyed greater latitude to push the boundaries of religious civility.

The sixth chapter examines the institutional legacy of these anti-Catholic crusades. In response to his arrest on the Boston Common, A. J. Gordon helped establish two organizations in the late 1880s, the Evangelistic Association of New England (EANE) and the Gordon School of Missions, devoted to the conversion of Catholics. The history of these two organizations shows that anti-Catholicism was essential to conservative Protestants' identity and not the transient, politically driven passion of a few late-nineteenth century erstwhile preachers. The history of Tremont Temple embodies many of fundamentalism's beliefs and strategies. Its two most influential pastors, George Lorimer and J.C. Massee, were revivalists and outspoken cultural conservatives. Yet in other ways, as Bendroth argues persuasively, Tremont Temple defied conventional wisdom. Lorimer, for instance, was a thirty-third degree Mason and the church paid its mortgage by renting out its theater-like sanctuary to all sorts of secular groups and even showing movies in it.

In the second half of the volume, Bendroth devotes chapters to three major city-wide evangelistic campaigns. The first revival, in 1909, was led by the scholarly Presbyterian J. Wilbur Chapman; the second, in the winter of 1916-17, brought Billy Sunday to the city; the final one, in 1950, saw the neo-evangelical Billy Graham welcomed by Catholic Boston. Although the revivals ultimately brought little growth to Boston's evangelical community, they offer a revealing glimpse into the ways that conservative Protestants were coming to terms with their role in the city. The first two evangelists addressed urban sin and corruption but did so in a more abstract manner than did revivalists in previous decades. By the early-twentieth century, most evangelical churches had relocated to Boston's streetcar suburbs. So, when Sunday tried to rally a no-license vote in 1916, he failed miserably. Although most conservative Protestants were less local than before, there were two notable exceptions—Tremont Temple and Park Street Church.

The history of Park Street Church, the subject of the ninth chapter, illustrates the growing conflict between evangelicals and their urban environment. This congregation had narrowly avoided closing its doors in the years before the Chapman revival. By the 1940s, it had reinvented itself as an urban congregation by forging new ties to a larger world of evangelicals in rural New England. Park Street soon eclipsed Tremont Temple in popular appeal and, more importantly, had taken a leading role in the neoevangelical revival sweeping the United States after World War II. On the one hand, Graham's 1950 crusade demonstrates evangelical detachment from the city—he and his associates were

far more interested in saving the nation and the world than just Boston. On the other hand, Graham's crusade demonstrates the continuing power of local attachments: Graham held his last, most emotionally-charged meeting on Boston Common.

Bendroth's work makes an excellent contribution to American religious history. Her book draws upon a remarkable range of sources, including obscure religious and secular periodicals, sermons, and church membership records. Bendroth is an excellent writer whose wry sense of humor makes the book a true delight to read. More importantly, her work sheds new light upon the history of fundamentalism's emergence from a local conservative Protestant effort to generate greater civic virtue in Boston into a national and even international movement to convert the world for Christ. Yet the study offers more than just a window on the transformation of fundamentalism into neo-evangelicalism. The study challenges conventional interpretations in a number of important ways. Most fundamentalists opposed women's ordination, although A.J. Gordon was an interesting exception on this point. Bendroth's study, however, demonstrates that women played a far more significant role in late-nineteenth century fundamentalism than most historians suggest. While evangelicals today might see themselves as cobelligerents with conservative Roman Catholics in the so-called culture war, Bendroth's study uncovers (or recovers) the deep and abiding contempt that conservative Protestants had for Catholics in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Finally, Bendroth's work challenges American religious historians to take the geographical location of their subjects more seriously. Where people actually live, work, and worship plays a significant role in shaping not only how they view themselves but also how, where, and why they interact with people of different beliefs. As Bendroth puts it, all religion is local.

-----

Jeff Taylor, *Where Did the Party Go?: William Jennings Bryan, Hubert Humphrey, and the Jeffersonian Legacy*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006. Pp. xiii + 373. \$19.95.

**Reviewed by Robert J. Eells, Spring Arbor University**

"To use a biblical analogy," according to the author, "one could say that the Democratic Party exchanged its birthright for a mess of pottage" (271). The birthright was true, principled Jeffersonian liberalism—incarnate in the third president and later embodied in Andrew Jackson, Martin VanBuren, and especially in William Jennings Bryan's evangelical populism. Pottage, on the other hand, was the disastrous direction first taken by Woodrow Wilson, then quickly followed by the Hamiltonian statism of FDR, LBJ, and the author's particular nemesis, Hubert H. Humphrey.

Taylor's book is exhaustively researched, with extensive endnotes and an impressive bibliography—a combined total of seventy-eight pages. Notes and bibliography alone make this book a useful resource for college libraries, regardless of one's ultimate assessment of its other merits or lack thereof.

For Taylor, Jeffersonianism has twelve political "tenets": "democracy rather than aristocracy, political decentralization, strict constructionism, opposition to banking, legislative preeminence vis-à-vis executive, suspicion of the judiciary, protection of civil liberties, ethnic inclusiveness, frugal spending, low taxation, pacifism, and isolationism" (2).

In contrast to the tenets of Jeffersonianism the author argues that the ideology of modern (twentieth century) liberalism involves "eight pairs of contrasting emphases: ideology vs. pragmatism, commitment vs. compromise, populism vs. elitism, morality vs. economics, common good vs. special interests, agrarian vs. urban, left vs. center, and radical vs. respectable" (44). For liberals these dualisms are best seen as a continuum, as a pendulum swinging back and forth between extremes depending on historical circumstances. Though a "good" liberal has elements of both within each dialectic, it is obvious where the author will end up in light of his confession in the preface that he is an ideological "populist," someone strongly committed to democratic majority rule (viii).

Chapters five and six concentrate on the above eight emphases in the political lives of Bryan and Humphrey. Naturally, Bryan emerges not only as the most authentic Jeffersonian (with the partial exception of ethnic inclusiveness) but also trumps Humphrey by stressing the better side of the eight dialectics. Bryan was a "practical ideologue," whose "career was grounded on principle, and he remained faithful to this foundation" (74-5). Humphrey, unfortunately, was "a somewhat weak and self-absorbed man" (82), whose only real ideology was pragmatism itself. Bryan was the "quintessential populist" (93), Humphrey an elitist, a "limousine liberal" who rejected populism both from the political left as well as the right (100-1). Bryan was a religious moralist, Humphrey a moralist whose moralism "was cast in distinctively economic terms" (105). In sum, Humphrey was part of the Establishment, in league with special interests, a man with little real sympathy for the plight of farmers, a politician who gravitated toward the "vital center" in order to be respectable. And Bryan, of course, was the opposite, a proponent of the common good, agrarianism, leftist politics, even radicalism.

Chapter seven examines the supporters of both political figures and Bryan appears, naturally, as a champion of the "people," whereas Humphrey depends on the financial support of millionaires and intellectual encouragement from such establishment institutions as the Council on Foreign Relations. Bryan's presidential campaigns were largely a grassroots effort; Humphrey's many campaigns, on the other hand, were made possible by "bankers, businessmen, corporate lawyers, real estate investors and others belonging to the nation's elite. He received little money directly from the grassroots" (157).

Humphrey fares no better in chapters eight, nine, and ten, where Taylor concentrates on issues relating to the foundations of democratic theory and practice as well as specifics

concerning domestic and foreign policies. Bryan believed in popular sovereignty, Humphrey in “paternalistic statism” (172). Bryan supported and Humphrey opposed political decentralization. Bryan was opposed to the power of banks and monopolies, Humphrey’s wing of the Democratic Party was prisoner to the economic management style of “the Wise Men of Wall Street” (194). Bryan was the liberal isolationist, Humphrey the committed imperialist (217).

The modern Democratic Party has left Taylor, and he doesn’t like it. Readers get the picture. But where to turn? Taylor tackles this question in chapters eleven and twelve. The answer surely is not President Clinton, who represents “the antithesis of Bryan Democracy” (222). Taylor’s answer lies in the “transcendent” politics of modern populism, a movement that is bringing together the radical left and the libertarian right—a fusion of people like Ralph Nadar, Ross Perot, and Pat Buchanan. He labels this fusion a kind of “radical remnant,” the true heirs of Bryan. Additional political figures include Senator Russ Feingold and Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney!

In the final analysis, Taylor is optimistic about the future of his brand of liberalism, because “many, if not most, Americans remain Jeffersonian in orientation” (229), and because Jeffersonian politicians are “spread throughout America in large numbers, perhaps waiting for a genuine political champion” (271). It appears that Taylor is waiting expectantly for the unfolding of the 2008 presidential campaign. Hope remains eternal.

In terms of the principal thesis, this reviewer remains unconvinced. Jeffersonianism and Hamiltonianism are, in fact, the two main pillars of American political history. True transcendence, however, would mean going beyond both pillars, finding a new foundation for politics and new definition of the state. Do we really expect politics to be transformed by vague and superficial tenets like opposition to banking, frugal spending and low taxation, pacifism and isolationism? Even by a new evangelical Bryan? Taylor’s exhaustive study does not get us very far if we are looking for normative, biblical “transcendence.”

Finally, chapter twelve begins with a section entitled “Religion and Politics.” Though it contains a few insights about the limits of politics and the dangers of civil religion, it seems out of place in an academic study like Taylor’s. The book is about the evolution of the Democratic Party, but the author just cannot restrain himself from attacking our present Republican President, George W. Bush. The attacks are inappropriate and cruel. Bush is no Bryan the author proclaims; Bryan understood the proper relationship between religion and politics. Bush, on the other hand, “is not Christian enough,” his faith is immature; he’s a shallow Christian (246). “On the micro level,” says Taylor, “George W. Bush’s faith may have helped him with his substance abuse problem, but on a macro level it does not seem to have changed his view of the world or his acceptance of its basic principles. It has also had the unfortunate effect of infusing Bush’s preexisting arrogance with an almost messianic sense of self-righteousness” (247). Bush suffers from megalomania and leads a life “characterized by love of power, preference for wealth, glorification of war, and practice of deceit” (248). “In truth,” Taylor opines, “from his upbringing to his present position, Bush’s life more closely resembles Caesar’s than it does Christ’s” (249). On and on he goes, for ten pages!

This section is completely unnecessary, disrespectful, and questionable for a university press publication. Taylor needed a courageous editor, one with a red pen. He should have posted this ranting on an Internet blog.

Because of the above criticisms, I would give his book only a qualified recommendation for Christian colleges, and evangelicals in general. Read it cautiously, recognizing the author's various biases and his obvious political agenda.

-----

Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005. Pp. 437. \$35.00.

**Reviewed by Thomas Jones, Taylor University**

Elizabeth Borgwardt's *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* is a timely publication for both American foreign policy scholars and a broader range of readers who have concerns about where American foreign policy is headed. While her clear focus is on providing a descriptive overview and explanation of the Atlantic Charter's principles and their implementation during the Cold War years, she concludes that something more important than buildings collapsed when the World Trade Center towers fell on September 11, 2001. In her view, the Atlantic Charter's bold multilateral approach to peacefully resolving divisive world political, economic, and social issues collapsed as well. She writes that "rather than framing the war on terror as an opportunity to build a robust, multilateral defense of civilization, however, the United States chose to look almost exclusively to its own devices, reasserting the unilateralist preferences of an earlier era" (11).

The author clearly states the book's thesis in the introduction: "The ideology of the Atlantic Charter blueprint represented a new articulation of US national interests in the 1940s, expressed concretely through three sets of contentious international negotiations. That blueprint included the United Nations, IMF and World Bank, and Nuremberg trials. They were all part of the design developed to lead the transition from war to peace and to shape the postwar world" (7-8). The following chapters provide a complete description and explanation of the diplomatic processes and interpersonal dynamics involved in translating FDR's domestic New Deal ideals into specific foreign policy strategies reflecting a multilateral approach that had been absent from American leadership following WWI.

The book begins with the "ghost of Woodrow Wilson" (Chapter one) and closes with "an expanding vision of the national interest" (chapter ten). In the eight middle chapters, Borgwardt probes the ways in which the Atlantic Charter inspired post-war diplomatic ideas, ideals, and programs. The Charter's Four Freedoms, Bretton Woods,

the San Francisco Conference of 1945, and the Nuremberg Trials are all cogently—if not concisely—developed.

Borgwardt does a thorough job of explaining the complicated negotiations that took place during the early years following WWII. For example, when discussing the 1945 conference in San Francisco that met to create an organizational structure for the United Nations, she includes the usual cast of leaders. They range from President Truman to Britain's Anthony Eden and Russia's Vyacheslav Molotov. However, she also includes discussion of the roles played by leaders of NGOs, whose views are seldom part of the analysis such as the Kiwanis, Lions, and Rotary clubs (189).

Among the NGO leaders present were NAACP representatives W.E.B. DuBois and Director Walter White. Both DuBois and White were cynical about the degree of commitment to human rights voiced by American delegates to the conference. They viewed themselves as “window dressing” and wondered whether “what was true of the United States in the past is true of world civilization today—we cannot exist half slave and half free” (190). Borgwardt writes that DuBois “made a point of linking domestic racism with transnational colonialism” (189-90). She summarizes the general perspective of African-American editorialists, whose question was “how far democratic principles shall be stretched to embrace the rights of our brothers in the colonies and to what extent American Negro's own security at home shall be guaranteed” (190).

Borgwardt illustrates the power and culture-specific meaning that words have beyond their immediate context. For example, if American Congressional and foreign policy leaders had trouble understanding the precise meanings of the Atlantic Charter principles, leaders of developing nations had even more difficulty. They tended to view the idealistic language of the Four Freedoms, for example, as representing a fresh American commitment to their own national aspirations. Robert Sherwood wrote that “it was not long before the people of India, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia were beginning to ask if the Atlantic Charter extended also to the Pacific and to Asia in general” (29).

Borgwardt notes that the principles of the Atlantic Charter inspired aspiring young leaders around the world, such as Nelson Mandela. Mandela wrote later that “some of the West saw the [Atlantic] Charter as empty promises, but not those of us in Africa.... We hoped that the government and ordinary South Africans would see that the principles they were fighting for in Europe were the same ones we were advocating at home” (29).

*A New Deal for the World* has a solid research foundation and effectively applies social science theory that the author mastered in her law school studies at Harvard and her Ph.D. studies in history at Stanford. Borgwardt treats her sources fairly and uses them effectively to tell the intriguing story of this largely ignored aspect of America's foreign policy vision of a post-war world in which fundamental human rights were to be recognized and respected by all nations. While her treatment of New Deal sources is generally uncritical, Borgwardt does include the voices of those who argued opposing views.

James B. LaGrand, *Indian Metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago, 1945-1975*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2005. Pp. xii + 284. \$34.95/\$20.00.

**Reviewed by Jacob H. Dorn, Wright State University**

James B. LaGrand of Messiah College skillfully interlaces his own interviews with Indians, wide research in primary sources, and the work of a broad array of social scientists to offer a fresh interpretation of a process of urbanization among Indians that outpaced that of whites and African Americans. The fact that the percentage of Indians who were urban rose from ten per cent in 1940 to fifty-three percent by 1980 shatters the notion that the typical Indian still lived on a reservation in the decades after World War II. LaGrand does not segregate Indian history; rather, he integrates it into broad patterns of American social and political life. His approach is also appropriately comparative: he puts patterns in Chicago alongside those in other cities with significant Indian populations, and he uses the processes of urbanization for earlier European immigrants and for African Americans to illuminate that process among Indians.

From the outset LaGrand presses the theme that Indian migrants were not simply pawns of impersonal forces; nor were they responding only to federal policy. The Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) policies of "termination" (of federal responsibility for some reservations) and "relocation" (of Indians out of reservations), adopted in the early 1950s, accounts for a substantial share of migration, including about five thousand to Chicago by 1959. Yet from half to two-thirds of the decade's migrants to cities did so, LaGrand estimates, on their own. Expropriation of tribal lands, existing patterns of temporary migration, exposure to occasional wage labor, internal tribal conflicts, family stresses, and especially the experiences of military service and defense work in World War II were prior factors behind migration to which some Indians reacted of their own free will.

"Legitimate historical actors in their own right," Indians made choices that were complex and varied (6). Their attitudes toward the BIA and to relocation ranged from hearty approval to rejection. LaGrand believes the most representative posture was a complex one: being "torn between reservations, cherished as ancestral homelands, and the glittering appeals of urban life" (59). He offers a pioneering analysis of BIA statistics to differentiate reasons for moving according to tribe, age group, sex, marital status, proximity, and the period of time.

Likewise, Indian experiences in the city were complex and varied. Many arrived without skills to facilitate easy entry into the labor market; to make matters worse, they came at a time when Chicago's industrial fabric was shrinking. They also faced housing discrimination in this sharply configured ethnic polyglot. Urban life was generally, however, an improvement over reservation living. Remarkably, LaGrand reports, "no other group experienced a more rapid increase in median income during the 1950s than urban Indian men" (103). This improvement reflected the deprivation from which they

started, but it was improvement. Chicago's Indians also gained experience with non-Indians that was unavailable on reservations. Though some tried to follow tribal ways undiluted, and others virtually abandoned tribal customs, most "carefully balanced valued old ways with attractive new ones" (131).

LaGrand considers return to the reservation in the context of this tension between old and new. Rates of return are impossible to gauge precisely, but the numbers who returned, either temporarily (e.g., for visits with kinfolk) or permanently, was probably between thirty-five and forty-five percent. Here again is diversity: in both motives and effects on different reservations.

By the end of the 1950s a new identity—an Indian, rather than tribal identity—emerged out of life in Chicago. It found expression in new Indian organizations, especially the American Indian Center, begun in 1952. The center's activities, including an annual powwow, introduced tribal groups to each other. They also enabled Indians to integrate the evolving Indian culture with elements from the enviroing culture.

Readers of *Fides et Historia* may be interested in the role of religion in urban Indian life. Some Christian organizations lent assistance to Indian groups, in particular the Chicago Church Federation, the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, and the Fourth Presbyterian Church. They encouraged assimilation, a stance that younger Indians who became assertive in the 1960s often sharply criticized. Many Indians were Catholics, but there were also Protestants, followers of the Medicine Lodge, and other traditionalists; by the mid-1960s, the syncretistic Native American Church had appeared. Their religions helped them in some aspects of adjustment, but they were divisive, not unifying, and did not contribute to the pan-Indian identity.

Internal conflicts among Chicago Indians and between urban and reservation Indians dominates LaGrand's final chapters on the 1960s and 1970s. Indian militancy caused controversy at the American Indian Center and with white supporters. LaGrand argues that Indians, rather than African Americans, "led the way" toward a new "identity politics" (184). Only their protests differed from assertions of Black Power: whereas Black activists asserted the rights of individuals and sought integration, Indians demanded self-determination, the right to be allowed to exist "as a people," treaty rights rather than individual rights (191). Indians saw their cause as different than that of Blacks and feared that whites would lump them together.

Urbanization remains central as LaGrand recounts the occupation of Alcatraz, birth of the American Indian Movement, occupation of the BIA building in Washington, D.C., and Wounded Knee. Clearly, the cultural activism engendered in cities was a source of political activism. Paradoxically, by the 1970s Chicago's Indians had acquired a unifying identity that crossed tribal lines and combined diverse tribal elements; but they had also become sharply divided, fractured to such an extent that they "could no longer hold together in any meaningful way" (227).

George Harinck and Hans Krabbendam, eds., *Morsels in the Melting Pot: The Persistence of Dutch Immigrant Communities in North America*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2006. Pp. 243. \$52.00.

**Reviewed by Robert Schoone-Jongen, Calvin College**

At times historians rely on metaphor to summarize their ideas. The title of this collection of conference papers offers one for immigration. “Morsels” takes a place beside melting pots, plants (either transplanted or uprooted), weeds, wallflowers, walls, and bridges in the ongoing search for just the right descriptor. Even bowling has its moment in the spotlight here. These similes, whether novel or gnarled, are all harnessed to one theme—ideas, particularly religious ones, played a major factor in forming ethnic consciousness among Dutch-Americans.

This ensemble of ideas, considered at a 2004 conference in Amsterdam, moves beyond the usual suspects—adherents to the Reformed Church in America and Christian Reformed Church—to consider smaller Dutch Calvinist bodies, as well as Roman Catholics and Pentecostals. Even Dutch socialists make an appearance in an essay on a short-lived North Carolina settlement. The papers are gathered under three headings: “Context and History,” “Piety and Ethnicity,” “Work and Money.” An editors’ introduction and an essay pointing to future endeavors act as the bookends.

The editors include both familiar and less-published names in the field, and equally insightful scholars from a variety of institutions in the Netherlands, Canada, and the United States. Most of the essays carefully consider how various subcultures within the broader Dutch-American world have wrestled with the twin demands of remaining faithful to their tenets while adjusting to life in a strange new world. In many respects sociological models prove the most interesting in this volume. Gerald Dekker employs Roger Finke’s notions on the nature of social durability (229-39) while Peter Ester’s essay, “Still Bowling Together,” (21-31) suggests that social capital theory may help explain the Dutch-American ethnicity’s durability.

The historical overviews presented here examine the tensions that denominations and individuals endured as they sorted through various cultural concerns. Linguistic issues often cloaked deeper theological concerns, especially the definition of Calvinist orthodoxy. Richard Harms’s history of the True Reformed Dutch Church (55-68) ably demonstrated the timelessness of the questions. During the 1820s these churches in New York and New Jersey voiced themes of linguistic and religious purity championed by the Dutch Seceders upon their arrival in the 1840s. The 1822 schism in the Reformed Church eerily presaged the 1857 rupture in Michigan that produced the Christian Reformed Church. Calvinists from the Netherlands arrived in North America equating orthodoxy with Dutchness. The proliferation of denominational offshoots in America (schematically summarized on page 19) mimicked both debates in the Netherlands and varying levels of

comfort with a new American environment. Should orthodoxy be preserved in isolation, or should Calvinist truth be dispensed to the broader society? Should the immigrants' institutions represent built walls or bridges? These questions repeatedly arose in, and sundered, immigrant churches and communities.

Unlike their more numerous Calvinist compatriots, Dutch Pentecostals, Catholics, and socialists did not carry self-sufficient organizations across the Atlantic to mitigate their social reconstruction processes. Pentecostals who immigrated after the Second World War lived in isolation among their English-speaking sponsors (131-45). During the 1840s the Catholics arrived in Wisconsin under the guidance of Dutch priests. Their parishes endured in the face of the American hierarchy's antipathy to many expressions of ethnicity (147-60). Dr. Frederick Van Eeden and his followers came to North Carolina to proselytize for Marxist ideals, but became just another answer to Werner Sombart's famous question about why there was no socialism in America (161-8).

Meanwhile, Calvinist groups like the Netherlands Reformed, Protestant Reformed, Free Reformed, and Canadian Reformed clung to their Dutch ties with a tenacity that belied (or reflected) their modest numbers (69-124). Robert Swierenga suggests they were bodies formed among those least comfortable with the compromises that acculturation exacted from immigrants. Walls tended to be the most apt metaphor for them. Bridge-building metaphors belonged first to the Reformed Church in America, and then to the Christian Reformed Church (33-42). Gerald Dekker offers a third structural metaphor, drawbridges (235), to describe the uneven process of adaptation. Those who equated acceptance in North America with declining orthodoxy raised the bridges, and resealed the ramparts against untoward innovations and unacceptable new definitions of traditional spiritual boundaries.

Such is the gist of the stories in this volume. Aficionados will be happily satisfied with the minute details offered about all the players. Others might want to bring an atlas on the journey, to help keep track of the little towns and congregations they pass along the way. The history is straight-forward, and the observations generally evenhanded, although some of the analyses stray close to apologetics. These are accounts about earnest groups and opinionated individuals whose zeal and vituperation often lustily overshadowed a sense of Christian mercy and comity—an observation diplomatically, or sparingly, broached in some of the essays.

For the non-specialist the essays grouped under the "Work and Money" heading will be the most accessible. After visiting the Dutch socialists in North Carolina, this section offers accounts of one family's journey to southern California (169-85), the rise of Dutch dairy farmers in the Los Angeles area (157-94), and the attempt to form a Kuyperian labor union in Canada (195-211). These micro-level stories help focus the denominational histories into a concentrated beam that spotlights ordinary people simultaneously attempting to remain faithful to their ethnic roots and relevant to their adopted homelands. Swierenga's essay on a financial scandal that rocked the Christian Reformed Church during the 1990s illustrates how new fissures still reflect old themes among Americans with deep Dutch Calvinist roots (213-27).

This new volume offers a reminder that human migration is never a simple, linear process. Acculturation does not produce harmony automatically; accommodation and compromise entail both gains and losses. The pain of losing valuable legacies inspires humans to retreat within cultural walls. Yet, for religiously serious people, as many of the Dutch migrants were, the need to live the “truth” pointed beyond those walls to choices and confrontations. As these essays show, divining an acceptable ratio between retrenchment and advance is a formidable enterprise. This complexity drives these scholars, like poets, to use metaphor (culinary, horticultural, architectural, and athletic) to convey deeper truths. In such a context, even a vision of bowling can be a transcendent experience.

.....

Burt Feintuch and David H. Watters, eds., *The Encyclopedia of New England: The Culture and History of an American Region*. A Project of the Center for the Humanities at the University of New Hampshire. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005. Pp. xxiii + 1564. \$65.00.

**Reviewed by Douglas A. Sweeney, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School**

This weighty tome is the result of more than a decade of scholarship by nearly a thousand experts on New England and its cultures. It is patterned after the acclaimed *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture* (1989), edited by Charles Reagan Wilson and William Ferris. Funded partially by the National Endowment for the Humanities, chaired by Ferris during the period of this latter work’s gestation, *The Encyclopedia of New England* makes an excellent companion to its predecessor.

Though Feintuch and Watters teach English at the University of New Hampshire, they also run centers that contributed to this work. Feintuch is the director of the Center for the Humanities at the University of New Hampshire, the institution that managed most of the details of this project. Watters directs the Center for New England Culture there, which lent some academic muscle to the undertaking.

Their volume is divided into twenty-two sections, cross-referenced to each other, ranging from “Agriculture” to “Literature” to “Tourism.” Each of the sections was laid out by one or more scholarly section editor(s), often with the help of consulting editors. Each opens with a comprehensive, introductory essay, written by its editor(s), which orients the reader to the history of its subject. Dozens of shorter articles follow on major aspects of the subject, some written by senior scholars, containing brief bibliographies of secondary sources.

The section on “History,” for example, starts with an introductory essay written by Charles E. Clark, Professor Emeritus of History at the University of New Hampshire. His essay is followed by seven chronological “overviews” of the subject, starting with

“Precolonial Settlement” and concluding with an entry on “Reorientation and Revival, 1945 to the Present.” Finally, dozens of brief articles appear on subtopics, ranging from “Abolitionism” to “Perry Miller” to “Woman Suffrage,” and written by the likes of Francis Bremer, David Hall, Mason Lowance, and Karen Kupperman. Altogether, the section comprises eighty-seven dense pages, most printed in three columns, covering multiple topics of interest to the readers of this journal.

Feintuch and Watters make it clear that they have taken “today’s New England” as their volume’s “primary subject” (xvii). They have not designed it solely as a reference work in history. Nor is it full of WASP nostalgia for the days of old New England. They have tried not to whitewash the region’s multifarious landscape, depicting it in terms of tall steeples and town greens (a largely antebellum strategy, but one that has persisted). Rather, they honor the region’s diversity, declaring at the outset that “the land of the Pilgrim Fathers is now predominantly Catholic; its inhabitants have not been primarily of English descent since the Civil War” (xvii). They make it clear, furthermore, that “though the book ranges from before European contact to the early 21st century, the first principle has been to present information on the *lived experience* of the region” (xx—emphasis mine). Modern society and culture get more space than big ideas. Religion is only one of the volume’s twenty-two section headings.

Stocked with well over 200 carefully chosen photographs, and organized in an eye-catching, user-friendly format, this reference work should gain a broad readership. Scholars will scour the several thousand entries in the index, employing them to locate topics central to their work. General readers can leaf through the volume’s contents leisurely, expanding their view and checking their knowledge of New England’s history and culture. All will find this work to be a treasure trove of information. Indeed, it will long remain the standard work of reference on the region.