

Professor Tucker shows Crespin going to great lengths to ensure that the documents he offered his readers, sometimes translated from Latin or German, were always as accurate as possible while still suitable for his greater purpose. His fundamental tactics never varied: invent nothing, but omit whatever seemed irrelevant to his purposes—above all, anything contradicting Calvin’s doctrinal positions—and abridge his citations. Crespin was generally skeptical of any miraculous circumstances narrated about martyrs and invariably hostile to references about possible relics of martyrs, but unable to resist juicy tales of swift and ugly punishments afflicting those who executed them.

Crespin had the good fortune to rely upon two careful contemporary martyrologists, the Anglican John Foxe and the Luthlean Ludovicus Rabus. Professor Tucker has the good fortune to say something pertinent while standing upon some sturdy academic shoulders. The two largest belong to Catholics: Crespin’s bibliographer, Jean-Etienne Gilmont, in Europe, and the dean of comparative martyrologists, Brad Gregory, in America. Your reviewer is also cited accurately at appropriate moments.

William Monter, *Northwestern University*

*A Companion to the Huguenots.* Raymond A. Mentzer and Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, eds.

Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 68. Leiden: Brill, 2016. xv + 482 pp. \$297.

---

The Huguenots have never lacked attention; the French Wars of Religion, the Edict of Nantes, and its subsequent Revocation stand out as landmarks in early modern European history. At the same time the study of the Huguenots has long been peripheral in mainstream historiography, occupying a niche field ploughed by a limited number of specialists. Somewhere in between a gap was created, between the well-known contours of Huguenot history and the vast number of specialist studies. It is this gap that *A Companion to the Huguenots* seeks to fill, offering a clear overview of the current state of affairs of Huguenot research. And it does so well.

The *Companion* goes a long way to rid Huguenot historiography of its hagiographic aura, even if the introduction by the editors probably sets in awkwardly by trumpeting a traditional paradigm. Strong language is employed to underscore the dire fate of the Huguenots (“brutal,” “bloodbath,” “horrific”), at the same time reiterating their remarkable achievements in politics, art, etc. But the introduction continues on a surer footing, outlining more dispassionately the state of affairs in Huguenot studies.

The editors are to be commended for having gathered a diverse group of historians primarily from France, the United States, and Germany, so that the companion offers a wide perspective on Huguenot history for a nonspecialist readership. The sixteen chapters are distributed in two parts, focusing on Huguenots in France and in the diaspora.

The eight chapters on France deal with church organization, liturgy, political thought, pacifying France during the Wars of Religion, women, pastoral activities, art, and the Revocation and its consequences. The eight chapters on the diaspora focus on networks, integration, language, memoirs, martyrdom, the Huguenots in New York, their role in imperialism, and memory after the 1770s. As such the volume deals with a great variety of topics, some traditional, some more innovative, but together providing a fairly complete overview of Huguenot history. Having said so, readers interested in military, diplomatic, or economic history will probably be disappointed. Moreover, there is nothing on outside perceptions of Huguenots, which remains a gap in Huguenot studies.

The chapters are, without exception, well researched and solid. Still, there is a wide variety in the ways that authors have tackled their subject. For instance, some chapters are dense and focused on historical detail, whereas others are surveying the historiographic field, others yet exploring new themes. It does not affect the quality of the *Companion*; indeed, some variety is warranted given the diverse nature of the subjects dealt with. But the editors could have been stricter in enforcing a standard format in chapters, given the likely readership of the *Companion*. For instance, whereas most chapters are subdivided in clear paragraphs, ending with a succinct conclusion, some have no subdivision or conclusion at all.

Without downplaying the value of the other chapters, some inevitably stand out. By way of sample, Andrew Spicer's study of Huguenots and the arts is a wonderful piece based on original research. It explores the relatively unknown role of Huguenots in painting, portraiture, and print, accompanied by a series of (color) illustrations. Another innovative chapter is written by Manuela Böhm, in which she explores the social dimension of the language that Huguenots in the diaspora in Germany employed. Böhm charts the variety of ways the exiles used the French language, either to the exclusion of German or rather the sacralization of French. It enables her to analyze the ways in which French was related to the identity of Huguenot exile communities. A strong chapter is written by Amanda Eurich, researching the position of women within the Huguenot community. The chapter gives a very well-structured but widely diverse overview of the role of women in such fields as finance, war, liturgy, care, etc.; moreover, the analysis is continuously interwoven with current historiographic debates. The changing position of women has been hotly debated in Reformation studies, and Eurich, with precision and insight, situates the case of Huguenot women functionally within the wider field of Reformation historiography.

Indeed, this may very well be the most important added value of this volume: the ways in which Huguenot studies are situated within mainstream history. Through the analysis of such topics as women in the Reformation, networks, sociolinguistics, diaspora, and migration, Huguenot studies and therefore this *Companion* have become increasingly relevant for a wide variety of historians working in the field of early modern history.

David Onnekink, *Universiteit Utrecht*