ing to readers who are interested in seventeenth-century English life on a broad scale rather than in Shropshire in particular. For all its workmanlike merits, its wider importance is chiefly that of the "contribution"—the scholarly work whose value is in fitting together with other works to provide a more significant picture of a subject (in this case, the conditions of life of ordinary people in seventeenth-century England) than it contains itself. As a piece of the jigsaw puzzle, it takes its place with such scholarly works as Peter Laslett and John Harrison's "Clayworth and Cogenhoe" in *Historical Essays 1600-1750 Presented to David Ogg* and Alan Macfarlane's lively study, *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin*.

The fact seems to be that Myddle itself has betrayed Dr. Hey. Though Gough made literary gold out of his observations there—his first edition was very aptly given the title by its editor of *Human Nature displayed in the History of Middle*—yet when we are removed from the sort of face-to-face observation that was possible for Gough, Myddle seems rather dull. The Reformation and Civil War passed over it, creating few ripples, and little else of importance happened there in the period Dr. Hey covers; and the absence from the parish of a dominating squire or nobleman left the social structure relatively informal and free of tension. The local vice—much noted by Gough—was that age-old solace of boredom: drink.

There is, however, an interesting problem concerning Myddle which Dr. Hey touches upon but does not discuss in detail, as not being within his defined period. This is the problem of how this stable, quiet, and on the whole not unprosperous community broke up in the eighteenth century when it was "destroyed by engrossing as effectively as the east Midland peasant communities were destroyed by enclosure. The small farmers were driven out, and a new society, more sharply divided between the rich and the poor, arose out of the old. Richard Gough died in 1723 on the eve of these changes, and his unique book describes a traditional way of life that was soon to be destroyed" (pp. 230-31). Perhaps Dr. Hey will write an essay on this transformation. A question that has interested at least the present transatlantic reviewer is whether any of the families described by Gough still live in Myddle. Dr. Hey has worked out the genealogies of many of these families by piecing together details laboriously from Gough, parish registers, manorial documents, and the like, but he never records any of them as living in Myddle later than the nineteenth century.

ROYCE MacGILLIVRAY, *University of Waterloo*

Nugent, Donald. *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation: The Colloquy at Poissy*. Harvard University Press, 1974. Pp. xii, 258. \$14.

This most recent volume in the distinguished Harvard Historical Series reminds the reader of the sad truth that history is usually written by victors. The victor recognized here is the Council of Trent whose influence in ecumenical affairs has been so overwhelming that few but specialist historians know much about the subject of Dr. Nugent's book, the Colloquy at Poissy. It met from July to October, 1561, just prior to the opening of the last session of the Council of Trent on January 18, 1562. We should all be grateful to Donald Nugent for this thoughtful appraisal of Poissy's attempt to provide an ecumenical alternative to

the Counter-Reformation mentality that was being fostered and was given dogmatic form at the Council of Trent.

In our post-Vatican Council II era it is refreshing to be reminded that ecumenist sensibilities were not unknown among the first generation of Reformation era leaders. Like Calvin, who was concerned for the "horrible mutilation of Christ's body" then being carried out, many of them were appalled at the enormity of so much schism in the universal church. Adrian IV, the last non-Italian pope, candidly attributed much of the division to the sin of Catholic prelates and clergy. Pierre Favre, Ignatius Loyola's first disciple, prayed daily for the Reformers, so harshly judged by his fellow Catholics. Though they were a minority, there were irenicists in both camps, ecclesiastical peacemakers who were committed to serving Christendom as well as polemical theology. These men who followed Erasmus, and were generally ill-appreciated by contemporaries, formed the "anti-heroes of the Reformation," a stubborn minority of churchmen who refused to accept schism as normative.

The irenicists had their great chance to express opposition to Catholic and Protestant rigorism at the Colloquy of Poissy, held in France, rather than the Empire, on the very eve of the religious wars. Nugent views the colloquy as a "sixteenth century summit conference" which reflected all the tragedy of the Reformation in miniature as it sought to find religious and ecclesiastical accommodation. Though it was essentially a French synod, the irenicists hoped it might develop into an international ecumenical council. This hope was not as far-fetched as some historical writing would suggest. Pope Pius IV, Gian Angelo de Medici, was a welcome successor to the fanatical Paul IV, willing to be influenced by men like the gentle Cardinal Morone, recently released from the Inquisition dungeons, and the ecumenists believed him to be accessible, tactful and pacific by nature. Catherine de Medici's tactics were almost always a reflection of expediency, but her fear of both the House of Guise and the Huguenots made her a supporter of those who hoped to find a middle way at Poissy, the Cardinal of Lorraine, the King of Navarre, and the theologian George Cassander.

Pius IV had to contend with more than French concerns, however, and it was pressure from Spain that ultimately persuaded him to support the Counter-Reformation ideology that the Papacy was to serve for so long. Nugent notes the radical change in the spirit of Spanish Catholicism between the retirement of Charles V and the end of the Council of Trent, and the most convincing part of his study is his account of how Pius accepted the Spanish view that Poissy represented a French turning to Lutheranism rather than a venture in reconciliation. Nugent is particularly incisive when he compares developments at Trent with those at Poissy: "while an international council was allowed to become largely national, a national council showed promise of becoming international."

The weakest part of the work is found in the chapters discussing the confusing theological and political positions assumed at Poissy. It is, of course, no easy task to understand the ambiguous attitudes assumed by the Cardinal of Lorraine as he tried to cope with the Reformers on the one hand, and on the other with the Cardinal of Ferrara and Diego Lainez, who had come to Poissy on behalf of the pope "as it were to administer extreme unction." Nugent, of course, recognizes the difficulty of analyzing the tortuous developments at Poissy, and admits that any study of the intentions and machinations of someone like the Cardinal of Lorraine will reflect "an element of ambiguity."

Apart from his failure to improve significantly on earlier studies of Lorraine's role at Poissy, Dr. Nugent's attempt to appreciate the ecumenical significance of the French synod

is commendable. One understands more readily how Trent developed its rigorism when Dr. Nugent indicates how similar intractable and triumphalist views were spawned at Poissy. It is probable that with the spectre of Philip II's Spanish Catholic power in the background, any accommodation made for the Reformers at Poissy would only have been made at the price of further schism. The "Hispanicization of Roman Catholicism" was clearly recognizable at Poissy, and as the days went by the irenicists lost any hope that the synod might transcend itself and become an exercise in ecumenism. From this time there disappears the anxiety of earlier churchmen over the fate of Christendom and their contribution to the sin of schism. Poissy, as Dr. Nugent so cogently and expertly argues, was a "kind of watershed" in sixteenth-century religious history. From this time the papacy decided to support the ideology of the Counter-Reformation, and the age of religious wars was inevitable.

DESMOND BOWEN, *Carleton University*

A. G. Dickens. *The German Nation and Martin Luther*. London: Edward Arnold, 1974. Pp. vii, 254. £3.75.

Since completing his magisterial study of the English Reformation in 1964, A. G. Dickens has increasingly devoted his attention to the continental Reformation. This shift in focus has already yielded two attractive volumes in the "Library of European Civilization" series as well as a brief biography of Martin Luther—the latter a competent but highly conventional treatment of the subject. In *The German Nation and Martin Luther*, however, Dickens has produced an original and provocative study of the German Reformation that deserves to be taken as seriously as the author's work on England.

This is neither another biography of Luther nor a survey of German history in the early sixteenth century. Instead, the author's purpose is to distil and interpret the fruits of recent work in some of the most active areas of German Reformation research. The first four chapters bring us up to date on the ever-vexed problem of the intellectual and theological "influences" on Luther's thought. Two chapters are devoted to the relationship among Luther, Lutheran pamphleteers and the printing profession in sixteenth-century Germany. And another three chapters deal with the urban Reformation, a field which has been enriched in recent years by the questions and techniques of social history.

The material which Dickens presents is based entirely on secondary sources, a fact which the author confesses with almost zealous candour, but this book is more than a mere survey of current research. In fact the author has chosen his three topics as vehicles for exploring a single theme: the relationship between Martin Luther and the German people. In examining the various "influences" on Luther's thought, for example, the author really wants to know what there was about Luther's ideas that made them so palatable to sixteenth-century Germans. In this context, one can understand why German nationalism looms so large in Dickens's analysis—and why certain theological forerunners, notably Occam and Biel, are so sharply deemphasized. The *via moderna*, Dickens tells us, was "hardly capable of forming a platform for mass-action." Thus, when Luther began to "speak directly to the masses" he tended "to select issues which they could understand and to simplify those issues by literary techniques amounting to an inspired journalism" (p. 83). From this premise the