

the 'Reformed' theologians of the period defended Calvinism in three key debates on justification, Trinitarianism (especially in the response to Socinianism) and Thomist ideas of the nature of God.

Hampton concludes his book with the appointment of the Calvinist William Delaune as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1715. What made this appointment significant is that it was in the hands of electors made up of Oxford bachelors and doctors of divinity. Thus a popular – if relatively exclusive – poll of theologians effected the appointment of a Calvinist. Moreover, Hampton points out that Delaune was a high flying Altitudinarian. So the 'Reformed' tradition could accommodate extreme High Churchmen as well as a standard-bearer for Latitudinarianism like Gilbert Burnet. Equally, opponents of Calvinism could cross the same spectrum, uniting the High Churchman William Sherlock and the Low Churchman John Tillotson. Hampton accordingly shows both the complex diversity of the 'Reformed' and Arminian traditions in the Church of England. This is as important a feature of this book as the technical details of the theological debates in which they engaged. Oxford remained the powerhouse of Calvinism; nevertheless Hampton concedes the predominance of Arminianism in the universities and the Church as a whole.

Hampton's book is impressive. He handles the theological debates well and summarizes the position of each theologian clearly. He also connects the Church of England to continental theology, and this is an important feature of the study – and one often absent from studies of the period. Finally Hampton is aware of the consequences of his argument. If, for example, 'Reformed' theology survived in a far stronger form than hitherto conceded, it establishes a connection between the Calvinist High Churchmen of the seventeenth century and the Calvinist strands in the Evangelical Revival of the mid-eighteenth century. Moreover Hampton's study endorses this period as one in which Anglican identity was still in flux and far from settling into the sedimentary layers of the Church in the nineteenth century. If there is one criticism to be made of Hampton it is that he neglects some of the opportunities to pursue connections between 'Reformed' theology and the religious politics of the period. If, as he convincingly argues, Calvinism was alive and well, did it influence the politics of Church and State in a particular direction? Despite this reservation, Hampton has written an important book which demands attention from historical theologians and church historians alike.

William Gibson
Oxford Brookes University

Luke Bretherton, *Christianity and Contemporary Politics: The Conditions and Possibilities of Faithful Witness* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. xv + 251. ISBN 9781405199698 (pbk).
doi:10.1017/S1740355310000227

With this book, Luke Bretherton responds to a vexing question: How should a Christian living in an urban context of "overlapping multiple modernities" faithfully respond to the totalizing realities of the state, the market, and civil society? Bretherton's answer, which is particularly germane to the UK, challenges

all Christians of the West to find ways to cooperate with those unlike themselves in the pursuit of common goods (he eschews the notion of “the common good”), for in seeking the welfare of others, one’s own welfare is found (Jeremiah 29:7). Using case-study analysis, Bretherton maps a course of Christian witness that rests upon “the constitutive political act” of the church: listening (p. 100).

At the outset Bretherton considers the nature of the church’s relationship to the state by reviewing how the state has funded faith-based organizations. He argues that the church “should be extremely wary about partnership given the current terms and conditions of cooperation on offer” (p. 32). For Bretherton, the state’s terms are nothing short of a Rawlsian political liberalism, which fails to aid in the detection of common goods because it excludes religious discourse from political life, it constrains the basic reasons for people’s actions, and it denies non-rational and non-verbal engagement in public considerations. Bretherton wants to move beyond political liberalism, to a post-liberal, post-secularist theological politics that “presumes a liberal constitutional order, the rule of law and a self-limiting state” (p. 48). In this paradigm, a means of cautious cooperation with the state can be discerned, in order to avoid co-option.

For Bretherton, engagement with others in the pursuit of common goods occurs on three planes—the local, the national, and the global. On the local plane, common goods are secured when churches participate in broad-based, local, community organizing. To illustrate, Bretherton turns to the strategy of Saul Alinsky, an influential American community organizer of the mid-twentieth century. Alinsky’s approach required disciplined formation and fostered common life in the midst of injustice to ensure that those excluded from decision-making processes in urban centers had the power to act in defense of common goods. Bretherton argues that Alinsky’s approach has many affinities with Christian theology, particularly Augustine’s understanding of politics in the *saeculum*—that ambiguous time in between Christ’s ascension and return, when both Christians and non-Christians exist in a single reality and negotiate an earthly peace. Accomplishing this demands a community of listeners.

Listening at the local level, however, extends to the national reality of human migration and the treatment of refugees. Here Bretherton develops an account of a Christian cosmopolitanism. The crux of his vision rests on a sense of “bare life”—the refugee’s minimalist existence—which animates the church’s response to all who exist outside the rule of law due to their political status. Through worship Christians move beyond the ties of place and kinship to include all who need God’s help because even bare life is to be hallowed. Bretherton views the Sanctuary Movement in the US as a tangible example of this in action, where churches extend the benefits of law to refugees, even and especially when the state fails to do so.

In the global realm faithful witness takes on the form of political consumerism, by which Bretherton means a consumption that is circumscribed by Christian desire. Such consumerism challenges the structures, organization, and priorities of today’s global market. Through fair trade, for instance, goods are produced in more environmentally sustainable ways, patterns of consumption are recast, and claims are made upon states, corporations and institutions. Political consumerism also cultivates virtue by concretizing neighborly love, the pursuit of justice, and

humanizing capitalism. Bretherton is seeking ultimately a hospitable political witness that can withstand every totalizing force impeding democracy and the securing of common resources.

Though the book is a learned and stimulating work, it is not without its shortcomings. First, Bretherton is overly occupied with an almost too immanent reality. He assumes that the systems and structures of this world constitute the foundational and immovable *loci* of Christian politics. His eschatology is thus insufficiently realized, rendering his ecclesiology penultimate to the greater “space” in which common goods may be discerned, shared, and defended. Second, Bretherton’s attempt to redeem the notion of consumption reveals a profound underestimation of the insidiousness of capitalism. I wonder, then, if he is not unlike those “humanitarians” who, as he puts it, fail to address the structural nature of injustice, “so that while the symptoms may be ameliorated, the causes of the problem are at best ignored and at worse legitimated or colluded with” (p. 141). Third, while the book is clearly concerned with questions of missiology, Bretherton’s argument that the legal-constitutional, liberal-democratic nation-state can be critically aligned with Christian existence undermines the church’s radical witness. In the end, Bretherton’s proposal requires little risk, and without risk, there can be no martyrdom.

These criticisms do not diminish Bretherton’s skills and gifts as a theologian. He confronts his readers not simply with theory and abstraction, but with on-the-ground, practical approaches for living an authentic Christian existence. While I remain unconvinced by his project, I would recommend the book to all theologians, priests and informed laity interested in the contemporary relationship between church and state.

Alison Hari-Singh
Wycliffe College, University of Toronto

Ian Green, *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). Pp. xvii + 373. ISBN 978-0-7546-6368-3. Hb.
doi:10.1017/S1740355310000215

There was a lot of money to be made out of publishing Latin texts and textbooks during the early modern period. As Ian Green reports, the lucky individual who secured the royal patent to print and distribute copies of ‘Lily’s Grammar’ (very much the default primer throughout Tudor and Stuart England) could look forward to an income comparable to that of a small bishopric. Not surprisingly, there was fierce competition to secure the rights to other texts. Some – grammars and dictionaries, for instance – were often within the royal gift but many others were up for grabs. Here, the Stationers’ Company in London led the field, securing monopolies on books that sold in their tens of thousands of copies. There was an avid readership, especially among the unlettered middling sort. Consequently, the era saw something of an explosion of classical works in translation: as Green reveals, Ovid and Cicero routinely outsold Calvin. The staple market for all publishers of classical wares, however, was the schoolroom, most notably, the grammar schools where, for six or seven years, the children (always just the boys)