

This splendid collection certainly succeeds in its aim of stimulating ‘Calvinian historiography, in the tradition of the Jubilee of 2009’ (p. xvi).

GERMANTOWN,
TENNESSEE

DONALD K. MCKIM

Pragmatic toleration. The politics of religious heterodoxy in early reformation Antwerp, 1515–1555. By Victoria Christman. Pp. xiii + 241. Woodbridge–Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2015. £75. 978 1 58046 516 8
JEH (69) 2018; doi:10.1017/S0022046917001968

Antwerp in the first half of the sixteenth century was awash with heterodox religious sentiments. Its evangelicals organised conventicles, its presses pumped out illicit publications, its chambers of rhetoric performed dramas that openly challenged the Catholic Church, and its communities of foreign merchants included Portuguese ‘New Christians’ suspected of Judaizing. As Victoria Christman shows, all of this had the tacit consent of the city magistrates, who did their utmost to circumvent or at least mitigate the harsh anti-heresy edicts of Charles v. Why the magistrates shielded Antwerp’s heterodox inhabitants is proclaimed by Christman in the title of her book: out of a ‘pragmatic toleration’ whose motivations, she argues, were purely economic and political: to promote the prosperity and defend the autonomy of their city. Their toleration was accordingly selective, extending only to ‘their most (usually economically) valuable inhabitants, while allowing the less valuable to be harshly prosecuted’ (p. 11). The Anabaptists, in her argument, were the exception that proves the rule: of scant economic value, they were proactively prosecuted and promptly executed by the local court – partly as a diversionary tactic to protect others. Through this and other forms of ‘pragmatic toleration’, the magistrates sought constantly ‘to appease their emperor without disturbing the social and mercantile health of their city’ (p. 2). Not that they succeeded always, but it required heavy pressure from Brussels to bring the magistrates to execute several non-Anabaptists in the mid-1540s. Christman shows that Charles v’s regent, Mary of Hungary, was personally responsible for much of this pressure, and that she was more implacable than Charles in her stance against ‘heresy’. Christman’s book concurs with other recent historiography that finds religious toleration being practised earlier and more widely than once was thought; indeed, Christman shows that economic arguments for toleration were being made in Antwerp as early as the 1520s. Her findings are also in line with recent work that sees the practice of toleration as not dependent on any principled commitment to tolerance as an ideal. At times, though, Christman goes to an unwarranted extreme in reducing the magistrates’ motivations to economic and political interest. Her chapter on the chambers of rhetoric suggests that a different kind of value – the honour and prestige of the city – motivated Antwerp’s magistrates to shield the city’s unorthodox rhetoricians, and one might ask whether this was not a consideration too in their shielding of others, for example printers and publishers. It is not clear either whether it was economics that weighed most heavily in the magistrates’ refusal to protect Anabaptists, who were perceived as uniquely violent and seditious. Not everyone whom the magistrates protected was well-to-do; in fact, one gets the impression that the magistrates

tried to protect everyone except the Anabaptists, which suggests that ultimately their toleration may not have been so selective after all. Nevertheless, Christman's concise book offers much new insight into the early history of religious toleration in the Low Countries.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
LONDON

BENJAMIN J. KAPLAN

Grave matters. Death and dying in Dublin, 1500 to the present. Edited by Lisa Marie Griffith and P. Ciarán Wallace. Pp. 252 incl. 26 ills and 17 colour plates. Portland, OR–Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2016. €24.95 (paper). 978 1 84682 601 6

JEH (69) 2018; doi:10.1017/S0022046917001129

This collection of essays on matters related to death and dying represents a wide array of interests. Sponsored by the Glasnevin Trust and published by the Four Courts Press, the collection ranges from medical histories and descriptions of commemorative displays to histories investigating the effects of pandemics on the fabric of Dublin society. The volume itself seems unsure whether its audience is solely academic or whether it wants to cater to the mainstream; nevertheless, its contributors are employed in an impressive array of careers, including established academics, postgraduate researchers, PhD candidates and archivists. Overall, the book covers what its title claims it will, providing interesting and understudied perspectives on Dublin's culture surrounding death and its causes.

The book includes fourteen essays, four appendices, twenty-six illustrations, a bibliography and an index. This leaves some essays wanting space and making the book's 252 pages seem too short. The essays are largely derived from presentations given at a symposium sponsored by the Glasnevin Trust, and thus vary in length. Some chapters seem to be disadvantaged by the shorter page limits, as many of their arguments could use a few extra pages for the construction and illustration of their points. Other contributions seem amateurish in that they require additional research if they are to make a real contribution to Dublin's mortiferous history. John McCafferty's essay, for example, seeks to establish a link between the public funerals of the Irish soldiers killed in Niemba and of Michael Collins to illustrate how the funerals were constructed to increase the reputation of and support for the Republic of Ireland's armed forces – in only eight pages. This is an interesting premise, but the chapter struggles to balance descriptive elements of the Niemba funeral with analysis of why certain details were chosen by the designers of the funeral, or how, exactly, they were influenced by or compare with the funeral of Michael Collins. McCafferty's reasoning is apparent throughout the piece but many thoughts are left only implied, a problem that perhaps would have been easily solved if there had been more illustrations within a longer piece.

On a more positive note, some essays in the book have interesting premises and good historiographical contextualisation: their authors have made good use of the space given to them. In his essay on Crimean War memorials, for example, Paul Huddie contextualises his argument within the broader sphere of the existing types of war memorials in 1850. He demonstrates how these memorials differed and changed war memorial design in general, and he analyses the thought behind