Ethan H. Shagan and Debora Shuger

Religion in Tudor England: An Anthology of Primary Sources. Baylor University Press: Waco, Texas, 2016. Pp. xxxiv + 638. Hb, \$89.95.

Let me start by saying that it is reassuring that, in this internet age, a publisher should still be prepared to produce in print a major corpus of primary materials of the kind edited here by two leading scholars in the field of early modern history and literature. Also, it might just be me but there have been times in recent years when it seemed as if Reformation and Counter-Reformation studies no longer constituted a coherent subject at all. Or, rather, it appeared to have become uncertain what belonged where and there is, perhaps, a sense that traditional approaches have become regarded as being out with the ark and that we should all be seeking to subvert and deconstruct with even more vigour than we did in the past. Furthermore, with the profusion of new approaches and, indeed, the avalanche of print, in whatever format, which at least in Britain seems to be the result of the entirely mad government-imposed modes of measuring research output (which in fact measure very little), it was almost impossible to decide what, with only twenty-four hours in the day, one should be reading.

Of course, some people might regard the title and topic of “religion” of and in this volume as inherently narrow. And, I suppose, there might be those who would say that one should get away from conventional texts of this nature. On the other hand, after the last twenty or so years when so much of the field of Reformation studies has been at least partly de-confessionalized, sometimes even by those with confessional allegiances of one sort or another, the subject is actually a lot more interesting than it was in the days when texts such as these were first reckoned to be quasi-canonical. It is definitely refreshing to have, as one does here, sections dealing with subjects which are not central to what used to be regarded as the high and definitive stages of the Reformation. Here there are texts on late medieval and Counter-Reformation religious culture as well as on, as one would expect, well-known texts from the Henrician Reformation and the high period of Elizabethan puritanism. Significantly there has been a coherent effort to incorporate material which has traditionally been thought to lie at the margins of the field. Here, then, we have some of the texts associated with the English members of the Society of Jesus—Robert Persons’s *Brief Discourse* and the so-called *Jesuit’s Memorial* and Henry Garnet’s *Sum of Christian Doctrine*. The suggestion is that these frankly very controversial Jesuit works fit into the mainstream of contemporary literature about politics and religion. This is nowhere explicitly stated in the introduction or footnotes but, for those interested in the impact of Jesuit interventions in

post-Reformation England, these works raise all sorts of questions about the way that the current historiography deals with issues of religious identity—the currently in-fashion phrase used to refer to the fracturing of religious consensus caused by the assertion of the royal supremacy over the national Church. If these were regarded as having the same status as other texts which are frequently used as primary sources for the purposes of teaching, this might well in time have a serious impact on the field.

Inevitably, there are going to be disagreements about how one selects the appropriate texts. Where one field overlaps with another (where, for instance, the “Reformation” as an exercise in religious reform overlaps with, say, the “history of parliament”), there are going to be arguments about whether one sort of document or record class or printed text should be regarded as more “important” than others. But this volume certainly raises the issue of what it is, in this respect, that we should be looking at. There is a fine general introduction and the editing and scholarly apparatus are not too heavy. There is a useful (and brief) explanatory preface for each document. I can certainly imagine using this volume for undergraduate teaching and, if I were to do so, I would suggest to students that they should acquire and practise research skills by working out, even if they have to do it electronically, how some texts printed here are linked to others which are to be found elsewhere and in what ways the rest of a cited author’s corpus of work might relate to what is printed here out of his *oeuvre*. Even in the days of funded research proposals and projects on, for example, material culture, the history of the emotions and what not, this kind of exercise should still be central to the doing of early modern history. At least, I hope it should.

Michael Questier

Queen Mary University of London

m.c.questier@qmul.ac.uk

DOI 10.1163/22141332-00402008-06