the Society. Consequently, in some stories, the identities of the protagonists appear to be unclear (e.g., 21n55), or the details seemingly inconsistent (e.g., 79n70).

Notwithstanding an excellent English translation of Ribadeneyra's *Life of Ignatius of Loyola* by Claude Pavur (Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2014), the "Autobiography" remains for many Jesuits and laity the privileged source for teaching the connections between Ignatius's experiences and his doctrine, so that the lessons often return to the same unexamined chestnuts. In that sense, Munitiz's translation might contribute to a second watershed moment in English-language studies of Ignatius's life. That, at least, is my own hope for his work.

Barton T. Geger, S.J.

Boston College

bgeger@bc.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00604007-02

Michael Questier

Dynastic Politics and the British Reformations, 1558–1630. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. 528. Hb, \$45.00.

In *Casablanca*, a film with many eminently quotable lines, Rick explains the predicament to Ilse: "But it doesn't take much to see that the problems of three little people don't amount to a hill of beans in this crazy world." Without too much exaggeration, this sentiment also summarized traditional, textbook, Whig historiography's approach to early modern English Catholicism. Catholics, of every hue, were irritants easily dismissed in a paragraph or a page so that the author could concentrate on the glorious, ineluctable rise of Protestantism. Questier, either alone or with backup, has repeatedly challenged the establishment over its myopia: "History, it is often said, is written by the victors and, at one remove, by those who, down the centuries and in our own time, have desperately wanted to identify with those whom they take to have been the victors" (3). Thirty years ago, Christopher Haigh wrote *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) to demonstrate how the then *au courant* aggressively revisionist approach effected the traditional historical narrative of the era. Questier undertakes a similar task: "The contention of this volume, however, is that there are reasonable grounds for reintroducing and reintegrating into the 'mainstream' what one might confidently call Catholic voices

and, indeed, Catholic narratives and analyses of the exercise of royal authority during this period" (4–5). The inclusion of the Catholic voice does not require the exclusion of Protestant, agnostic, or *politique* voices—that would result in an equally one-sided triumphalist account. Nor is this monograph a counterfactual narrative predicated on the accession of Mary, Queen of Scots, or the triumph of the invincible Armada. The inclusion of the Catholic perspective would, on the other hand, greatly aid “answering the larger questions of post-Reformation English and British history, particularly about the relationship between the kingdoms of what in the early seventeenth century became Britain and also, of course, the relationship of England and Britain to the States of continental Europe” (9). Questier expands the current fascination with the Elizabethan succession crisis into a more general concern for dynastic security and international influence. In so doing, he extends the timeline beyond 1603 when the Stuarts ascended the English throne to the personal rule of Charles I in 1630.

The fall of Richard III and the accession of Henry VII after the battle of Bosworth Field in 1485 did not end the dynastic struggle that had plagued England for more than thirty years. It simply retreated from the public stage until the “King’s Great Matter” in the late 1520s. For the rest of the century, it never strayed far from center stage despite royal proclamations and parliamentary legislation. Catholics, although not alone in their advocacy of Mary, Queen of Scots, advanced her claims. Her elimination fractured Catholic support for a claimant? Should their allegiance be automatically transferred to her young son who, although raised a Protestant, surely had the Catholicism of his sainted mother in his DNA? Or was that too risky? Should Catholics rally around a different foreign candidate whose Catholicism was certain even if his/her credentials were less immediate? Disagreement over claimants became increasingly divisive and played a significant role in the well-known vituperative tension between English secular clergy and Jesuits. Even within the Society of Jesus dynastic preferences threatened religious unity as the Englishman Robert Persons and the Scot William Crichton (Questier prefers the Creighton variation of the surname) lined up behind their candidates. Crichton backed the winner, James VI, King of Scotland, who, not surprisingly, disowned whatever promises he might or might not have made. The Stuart dynasty was secure even if its religious orientation remained in doubt as King James, seeking appropriate marriages for his children, courted Catholic and Protestant rulers. Could James adapt the famous saying regarding the Habsburgs to his family: “*Bella gerant alii, tu felix Britannia nube*” (Let others wage war: you, happy Britain, marry). Elizabeth Stuart married the Protestant Frederick V, Elector of Palatinate, but the holy grail, a marital alliance with Spain, eluded James. By 1617,

Britain seemed more committed to continental Protestantism than to some sort of dynastic ecumenism.

In addition to the usual Jesuit suspects such as Persons and Crichton, and the customary battles between the Society and the secular clergy over the archpriest and the bishop of Chalcedon (we await *All Hail to the Archpriest: Confessional Conflict, Toleration, and the Politics of Publicity in Post-Reformation England* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019] for Questier's and Peter Lake's analysis of that controversy) less known Jesuits make appearances in Questier's investigation. Some, e.g. John Percy ("Fisher the Jesuit") and the former Jesuit and *pro tem* apostate Archbishop Marc'Antonio de Dominis, merit further study. Equally intriguing is the rare—perhaps first—appearance in Stuart historiography of the Italian Jesuit Tomaso Cerronio. In 1617, a professed Jesuit, Cerronio had sought permission to accompany an unnamed duke to England. The superior general refused, but the Jesuit had already departed. Within the Society it was rumored, for reasons left unexplained, that he had apostasized and fled to England where he spread incredible tales of a Franco-Spanish plot to assassinate James I and his heir Charles presumably to abort England's drift towards the Protestant block. What his examiners learned according to John Chamberlain, the prolific letter-writer, "was not all worth the whistling, being certain strange chimeras and farfetched imaginations of plots and dangers not worth the knowing, much less the relating. Whereupon it was thought good to dispatch him away, the rather for that he grew scandalously debauched with boys and likewise" (*The Chamberlain Letters*, ed. Elizabeth McClure Thompson [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965], 187–88). The Jesuit returned to his province and died in the Society in Genoa in 1627. Given the well-established myth of conniving, plotting, regicidal Jesuits so recently illustrated in the Gunpowder Plot (1605), one wonders why Cerronio's warnings were so easily dismissed. Did the government fear that the encouragement of anti-Jesuit and anti-Catholic sentiment would frustrate or destroy any chance of the Spanish match?

Questier concludes his monograph modestly. He intended simply "to bring a series of more-often-than-not ignored or marginalized contemporary perspectives and assumptions to bear on what, in other respects, remains a relatively orthodox style of political narrative for this period" (462). But the very fact that he did so and did so well has undermined the traditional political narrative. William Faulkner shrewdly observed: "The past is never dead. It's not even past." Catholicism may have been repudiated; Catholics of varying hues may have suffered imprisonment and persecution. But Catholicism did not pass: "The topic of Catholicism (and/or popery) informed mainstream national politics, year after year, long after the Reformation was meant to have been

securely established in the British Isles" (460). Now that Questier has deconstructed the traditional narrative, others may follow his example.

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.
Loyola University Maryland
tmmccoog@gmail.com

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00604007-03

Konrad Eisenbichler, ed.

A Companion to Medieval and Early Modern Confraternities. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 83. Leiden: Brill, 2019. Pp. xvi + 475. Hb, €195.00.

Confraternity studies have grown tremendously in the last thirty years, and *A Companion to Medieval and Early Modern Confraternities* reflects the depth and width of that growth. The complexity of confraternities can easily be reflected in the diversity of the terms used to identify them. Thus, the editor of the volume, Konrad Eisenbichler, spends a significant amount of space to introduce the variety of words used in each of the contributions of the work (3–6). While it is intended to help guide one through the complexities of the broad terrain that is confraternity studies, a more comprehensive study of confraternities on the order of an encyclopedia remains to be developed. It would be a daunting task, but the scholars assembled for this work represent a good starting team for such an enterprise.

The *Companion*, of course, seeks to provide “a comprehensive approach (history, religion, art, music) in a larger geographical area” (8) to confraternity studies. Hence it is divided into five parts focusing on key aspects of any confraternity: 1. Their establishment and growth; 2. Their spiritual and devotional life; 3. Their works of charity; 4. How they negotiate the transcultural world; and finally, 5. Their contributions to the arts and literature. While each chapter addresses specific geographical or denominational areas, the work is unified by the fundamental characteristics of the confraternity. In outlining each of the contributions in the book, Eisenbichler also generalizes the motivations that created the confraternity, “the desire to pray in community was the primary motivation that drew lay people into confraternities” (11). This follows the general theory that lay spirituality in the medieval and early modern church sought to imitate some of the characteristics of religious life (and no doubt grew out of the lay oblates of the Benedictine order as well as the Third Orders of the mendicants).