The second chapter examines some of the material and textual evidence the remaining ten chapters will examine, although it is largely through the work of other scholars that this is accomplished. For a student, however, this is likely to be a useful chapter.

The rationale for the remaining three parts of the book is somewhat elusive. Part two, "Beginnings: Identities and Communities," contains four relatively short (nineteen pages or so) chapters on kingship, community, and identity. It is not clear to what "Beginnings" refers because the chapters cover, though unevenly, the entire period in question. The first chapter demonstrates that "where kings were strong their power was underpinned by the Church and its ideological and economic resources" (78), which is not, it has to be said, a very provocative thesis. Here Redgate mines the work of Catherine Karkov in particular. The next chapter extends the discussion of royal control by considering the conversion of the Vikings and the manipulation of saints' cults, while chapters 5 and 6 examine diocesan and parish boundaries, the mechanisms of episcopal control, and the various ways in which religious rituals contributed to social cohesion.

Part three also has an enigmatic title—"Ends: The structuring of society." The three short chapters in this part explore everything from political theory and misogyny to slavery and episcopal endowments. Chapter 7, "The Church in Society," rehashes political theory in the works of Alfred and Wulfstan and begins a discussion on the church and gender that is continued in the subsequent chapter, "Women's Agency," which is particularly dependent on the work of Barbara Yorke and Sarah Foot. The final chapter in this part, "The Church in the Landscape," begins with a consideration of the role of minster churches (although it sidesteps any of the interesting debates on the topic) and concludes by mining recent scholarship on episcopal and monastic endowments.

The last part, "Means: Order and Individuals," combines a number of topics, including government, law and administration, pastoral care and the Christian life. At twenty-seven pages, the last of the three chapters is the most substantial, but like all of the others, it contains many subheadings separating topics that are, in some cases, treated in only a page or two. Here, too, the limited notes at the end of each chapter simply reference the author's last name and work, but only if more than one work is listed in the bibliography. It would have been more useful to indicate specific pages, but it is clear early on that Redgate draws quite a lot from each of the works she used, perhaps making it difficult to be more specific. It is also unclear why Redgate chose to cite only a handful of sources from the first volume of *English Historical Documents* rather than more recent editions, many of which are listed in the bibliography.

The subheadings are indicative of a work that sacrifices depth for breadth, which would not be such a problem if the organization were clearer. From the perspective of students and non-specialists, the coverage could, in fact, be a good reason to read this book. Having said that, I would recommend Nicholas Higham and Martin Ryan's 2013 survey, *The Anglo-Saxon World*, over this book as a more readable (not to mention nicely illustrated) overview or the studies listed in the bibliography for more specific topics. The premise that the church played a prominent role in Anglo-Saxon England is standard in any recent work on the subject.

Mary Frances Giandrea, American University

KIMBERLY SCHUTTE. *Women, Rank, and Marriage in the British Aristocracy, 1485–2000*. Studies in Modern History. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Pp. 304. $95.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2015.216

In *Women, Rank, and Marriage in the British Aristocracy, 1485–2000*, Kimberly Schutte uses quantitative and qualitative evidence to examine how the aristocracy ensured its

continuation—and therefore "power and prestige" (1) through its daughters' marriages. In part one, "The Statistical Side of the Story," she provides multiple graphs and diagrams about marriage rates (married/unmarried) and types (endogamous/exogamous) across 750 British aristocratic families. Schutte has compiled an impressive database of 6,413 women using peerage and baronetcy genealogies, although she admits the limitations of her methodology: such genealogies are notoriously error ridden. In part two, "The Less Statistical Aspects of the Story," she uses the diaries and correspondence of around 200 women. This qualitative evidence leads to chapters on the marriage market, family alliances, and elopements. Schutte also includes a useful biographical appendix of all the women who get a mention.

There are some problems: despite excellent use of printed collections of women's papers, all the manuscript sources are from the British Library and a major gap in the secondary literature is James Daybell's work on early modern women's letters. The book also started life as a doctoral thesis and this does still show a bit in over-repetition of the central argument, referencing problems, and chronological elisions that decontextualize evidence (for example, the cultural contours of "the London Season" over time). However, Schutte's book adds much more value to the historiography and scholarship than the shortcomings of its research methodologies and stylistic problems would suggest.

Schutte finds that approximately 50 percent of female members of the aristocracy practiced endogamy over five hundred years, from 1485 to the end of the nineteenth century, and that there was a marked preference shown for marrying into old titled families. A woman's marriage was intended to increase the power and social prestige of the natal family, and when someone like Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, "a new man," married his daughter into an older titled family he discovered that even £10,000 could not buy her social respect.

Schutte is very eager to confirm the argument, à la Lawrence Stone and Jeanne Fawtier Stone's *An Open Elite? England, 1540–1880* (1984), that the elite was closed and self-perpetuating. Schutte's aim was to add gender analysis to this argument, proving that women were "vital to the preservation of noble rank identity" (13a3). The approach works most effectively with the qualitative evidence. The impact is powerful when the reader learns how "prodigious angry" Betty Bentinck's family was in 1720 when she eloped with a physician (146). When Sackville Tufton proposed to Mary Sackville, before even speaking to her, apparently "800£ a year pin money, 3000 jointure, and 50,000£ for younger children … was favourably received by Mother and Daughter" (121). Women were the matchmakers and they policed the boundaries of social propriety. When men married outside rank, women could be vicious about their spouses, calling them vulgar and likening them to donkeys.

Schutte admits that the quantitative evidence is more ambiguous about rank identity. The 50 percent rate of endogamous marriages demonstrates "a strong, *though not overwhelming* [my emphasis], tendency of aristocratic women to marry within rank" (26). After all, the argument could be turned around: if approximately 50 percent of aristocratic women married *outside* rank, then the question about whether or not the aristocracy was an open or closed elite is left rather unanswered.

Schutte's statistical research does, however, complicate the picture intriguingly. Hypogamous marriage (marrying downwards in title) was avoided. In the seventeenth century, closer to 60 percent of women's marriages were endogamous, and this temporary rise in endogamy was accompanied by a decline in hypogamous marriage, from around 25 percent in the sixteenth century to around 18 percent after 1611, when the rise in baronetcy numbers devalued this hereditary title. Even more interestingly, a continuous decline in hypogamous marriage followed, accompanied by an increase in marriages outside of title altogether, rather than even higher levels of endogamy. Exogamy occurred in over one-third of cases in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, up from about a quarter in the centuries before. The money of the mercantile rich, it seems, spoke louder than the landed estate of a baronet. Indeed, Schutte concludes that it increasingly became the case that "it was better to remain unmarried than to make a bad match" (73). Her statistics for unmarried women

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2015.216 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(notwithstanding underrepresentation in the genealogies) reveal an increase from less than 5 percent in the sixteenth century to greater than 15 percent in the nineteenth century, which maps exactly on to the point at which British society began to discuss the "problem of surplus women."

The complexity of Schutte's overall statistical analysis is hard to encapsulate in a short review, and I leave it to the reader to discover the finer details of marriage patterns broken down by decade and the comparison between daughters of the old and new nobility. Some of the most interesting discussion is to be found in Schutte's analysis of the "Britishness" of the British aristocracy. The political context in each century had a considerable impact on whether or not the English were marrying into the Irish aristocracy or the Irish were marrying into the Scottish aristocracy, and so on. Striking, if unsurprising, is Schutte's conclusion that the use of marriage as a means to maintaining rank and status was a system that collapsed in the 1920s. After this, only about 25 percent of aristocratic women married endogamously. This Schutte puts down to liberalization of attitudes, the changing role of women, and the dreadful loss of sons suffered by the British aristocracy during the First World War. However, until this seismic demographic shift, aristocratic rank identity was "personified in the woman" (25) and the culture, at least, of closed ranks depended most heavily on the social (and sexual) restraint of women. Therefore the evidence of this book—both quantitative and qualitative—helps to confirm the conservatism (often manifest in societies through a sexual double standard) of the British aristocracy. It further confirms the remarkable robustness of the cultural fairy tale of a woman marrying well: Schutte mentions the 1981 marriage of Lady Diana Spencer to Charles, Prince of Wales, but the new Duchess of Cambridge also springs to mind.

Amanda L. Capern, University of Hull

GERGELY M. JUHÁSZ. *Translating Resurrection: The Debate between William Tyndale and George Joye in its Historical and Theological Context*. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions. Boston: Brill, 2014. Pp. 542. $199.00 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2015.217

This learned book is the compelling story of the Bible and of a friendship lost, the tragic break between of William Tyndale and George Joye, who were never reconciled following Joye's correction of Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. In *Translating Resurrection*, Gergely Juhász has written a scholarly study that elegantly follows a very human tale of imagined betrayal to explore the heart of Protestant biblical culture in the first generation of the Reformation. Particularly impressive are the layers of meaning Juhász finds in a dispute occasioned by Joye's rendering of "resurreccion" as "lyfe after this." The difference might elude even the keenest eye, but as Juhász demonstrates, the change was fraught with significance beyond a wounded ego. Joye, as Juhász repeatedly tells us, has suffered greatly in posterity, hated by supporters of Tyndale and ignored by most historians of the English Reformation. He remains unforgiven for being the lesser scholar who dared to correct the "Apostle of England." Although later generations would have little regard for Joye, in his own day he was one of the leading Lutherans at Cambridge and regarded by men such as Thomas More as a notorious heretic.

Certainly, Juhász offers a full historiographical account of Joye's alienation and more recent rehabilitation, but that story is not the most interesting part of the book. Juhász truly hits his stride when he turns to the many dimensions of the debate, beginning with the import of the words themselves. The disagreement over the translation takes us to one of the most