under Oliver Cromwell and the divisions and drift found thereafter. To some extent this was caused by Oliver’s legacy, he suggests, for ‘his policy of making such personal, in some cases idiosyncratic, appointments left the army badly exposed in terms of leadership when he was no longer there’ (p. 46). However, Reece argues persuasively that the cause lay primarily in two other factors. He repeatedly highlights the breakdown of stability, unity and cohesion caused by the rapid expansion of the army during 1659 and by the extensive purges of its officer corps during late summer 1659 and early 1660, which destroyed the ‘long-standing association between officers and private soldiers [which] was the cornerstone of army discipline and esprit de corps’ (p. 202). Secondly, Reece disparages the leadership of the army grandees, especially Charles Fleetwood, but also John Disbrowe and John Lambert, after the army seized power in autumn 1659. Their uncertainty, poor communication, and failure quickly to lay clear plans for the future grounded in a new parliament, led to uncertainty in much of the army in England, so that officers and men failed to oppose and eventually—though late in the day, Reece finds—decided to acquiesce in Monck’s intervention. ‘The scattered, leaderless regiments proved unable rather than unwilling to preserve the Commonwealth’ (p. 224), he concludes, while also stressing that the army of 1659–60, which allowed itself to be rolled over so easily, was not the army of 1647 or 1649 or even much of the 1650s.

This fine and compelling study is certainly not the last word on the Cromwellian army—we still need more detailed analysis of army politics and the political role of the English army in 1649–58, as well as of those parts of the army stationed in Scotland and Ireland during the 1650s. However, it makes a thoughtful, well-researched and strongly argued contribution to our understanding of the role and position of the army in England, particularly valuable and generally convincing in casting further light on the military’s role in local administration, on Oliver Cromwell’s handling of the army and its officers and—its freshest and biggest contribution—on the army’s conspicuously limited opposition to Monck and the path to the Restoration.

PETER GAUNT
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Under the direction of Cecilia Palombelli, in a little over twenty years, Viella has turned itself from a being a distinguished distributor of other publishers’ (principally medieval) academic titles to publishing what must now be considered the most interesting and imaginative list of pre-modern history titles in Italy today. The two books under review are excellent examples of this publisher’s long-term commitment to scholarship, since they form the latest addition to a book series—La corte dei papi, founded in 1997—entirely
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dedicated to the history of papal Rome from the middle ages to the French Revolution, whose volumes have been all issued straight into paperback at reasonable prices. The series editor, Agostino Paravicini Bagliani, is in fact author of the companion, medieval volume to Maria Antonietta Visceglia’s study of early modern papal ritual relating to the pope’s death, his successor’s election, coronation and subsequent presentation to the people (Morte e elezione del papa: Norme, riti e conflitti. Il Medioevo, 2013). Together they constitute what is surely destined to become the standard point of reference for the study of the history of papal ritual. However, as the full title of both volumes suggests, they do much more than that, since they also address head-on the question of the politics that these rituals mediated and were themselves shaped by. To this end, Visceglia begins, not with the election of the new pope, but with his death and the challenges this posed to an elective monarchy. One ritual innovation that emerged in the early modern period was the practice of removing the dead pope’s principal organs and the embalming of his body. Julius II was the first to undergo this treatment, and although not all his sixteenth-century successors followed suit, from Sixtus V onwards (1590) it was the usual practice until the death of Pius X in 1914. With the shift of the pope’s principal residence to the Quirinal palace under Paul V, there thus arose the need not only to find a nearby resting place for the papal heart and intestines (which was fulfilled by the parish church of the Quirinal, SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio) but also to transport the dead pope’s body across the city to what remained the liturgical lodestar of the papacy: S. Pietro in Vaticano. ‘The significance of this innovation should not be underestimated. The itinerary of the pope’s dead body made sacred another route [through the city] and multiplied the occasions on which he was made visible to the people’ (p. 110).

Historians have long been familiar with the disorder that often accompanied the interregnum (sede vacante) before the election of a new pope. But thanks to Visceglia’s meticulously documented diachronic study, we are now able to appreciate not only the degree to which the notionally sealed environment within which the elections took place (the so-called conclave) was in fact porous and open to extensive two-way communication, despite increasingly stringent regulations to the contrary—of which Gregory XV’s introduction of the secret ballot in a measure of 1622 was the most significant—but also how the progressively greater length of the sede vacante, (from a little over three weeks on average during the period 1500–50 to more than three months during the period 1700–50) reflected not only the intensified factionalism of the College of Cardinals but also the increased level of international political interference. This fact alone gainsays those who argue that the papacy post-1648 was of ever-decreasing international relevance. Regular use of the veto by the leading Catholic powers dates only from the election of Paul V in 1605, when the candidacy of the Oratorian historian Cesare Baronio was blocked by Spain, partly on the grounds of the cardinal’s temerity in challenging the historical basis of the Spanish monarch’s jurisdiction over the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. This had been preceded, in the conclave following the death of Sixtus V in 1590, by the introduction of the practice of drawing up a list of those candidates, made public by the Spanish ambassador, who were considered acceptable to His Most Catholic Majesty. Visceglia also draws attention to the fact not widely known (but exhaustively treated in the
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excellent recent study by Gunther Wassilowsky: *Die Konklavereform Gregors XV (1621/22): Wertekonflikte, symbolische Inzenierung und Verfahrenswandel im posttridentinischen Papsttum* ([2010]) that during the sixteenth century it was more usual practice for popes not to be elected but rather acclaimed in a ritual of 'adorazione' orchestrated by leaders of the factions who had managed to secure a majority consensus for their candidate in the College of Cardinals. Perhaps counter-intuitively for the modern reader, this method was considered, in the words of a contemporary to be: 'more secure ... [since] the counting [of votes] is more difficult and contentious for being more considered' (p. 164).

Perhaps the most valuable chapter of this exceptionally well-documented study is that (ch. 6) which provides a detailed political history of successive papal elections over three centuries (1500–1800). The increased size of the College of Cardinals from the pontificate of Sixtus V onwards—by the early seventeenth century there were more than twice as many electors as a century earlier—merely served to make it difficult for any one faction to dominate (with one contemporary counting no fewer than eleven factions in the conclave which elected Gregory XV in 1621). In addition to such major players as the kings of Spain and France, together with the Holy Roman Emperor, the significant role played over almost two centuries by the Medici dukes of Florence should not be forgotten. Also striking is the enduring influence of the papal nephew. One of the reasons why the conclave which eventually elected Prospero Lambertini as Benedict XIV in 1740 lasted six months was that there was a deadlock between the nephews of two previous pontiffs. At almost 130 pages this chapter practically constitutes a book in itself, and draws not only upon the usual newsletters (*avvisi*), together with copious contemporary printed literature, but also on manuscript treatises that clearly commanded an avid international readership—reflected in the fact that they still exist in multiple copies distributed between various European libraries. However, the 367 endnotes placed at the end of this chapter unfortunately mean that the book is not user-friendly in its (significantly cheaper) electronic format. Such a drawback should not detract from the fact that this is probably the most important book to be written about the early modern papacy since Paolo Prodi’s *The Papal Prince* (1982; rev. ante, c [1985], 173–5), whose distorting emphasis of the pope’s role as prince (over that as pastor) Visceglia’s study significantly corrects, although she is too polite to say so.

The second book under review, by Mario Rosa, consists of ten essays, first published between 1979 and 2007, prefaced by a helpful introduction co-authored by Visceglia and Marcello Verga, to mark the eightieth birthday of a scholar whose work deserves to be far more widely known in the Anglophone world. Like Visceglia, Rosa is by origin from the south of Italy and, similarly, he brings to his work on the early modern papacy not only a sophisticated appreciation of the role of ‘soft power’ in making possible Rome’s continued cultural and religious importance in the face of its weakening international political power, but also a profound understanding of the resourcefulness shown by southern aristocratic elites in their continued use of the Church for family (and financial) advantage. Accordingly, the collection is divided into three sections: two of four essays each on the Roman Curia and on ‘Culture and Devotion’, with a concluding section of two essays on ecclesiastical career-making in Rome. Rosa’s essays in the two main sections demonstrate how, for all of its undoubted problems (particularly those of a political and economic
nature), the papacy maintained both cultural vigour and the momentum of ecclesiastical reform over the period 1680–1750. This period began with the pontificate of the austere Blessed Innocent XI (1676–89) who inspired his next-but-one successor, Innocent XII (1691–1700) formally to abolish papal nepotism in 1692. Later, Benedict XIV (1740–58)—elected after the longest conclave of the period 1500–1800 and perhaps the greatest canonist to sit on the throne of St Peter since Gregory IX (1227–41)—made creative and surprisingly effective use of those two pre-eminent instruments of papal governance, the curial congregation and the concordat. Over the whole of the early modern period, Rome’s capacity to exploit ecclesiastical revenues (mainly in the form of pensions) from the Kingdom of Naples, and spiritual revenues via the Datary, both increased notably during the period and complemented the papacy’s assertion of its power of direct taxation over clerics within the Italian peninsula. All of this had an impact on the pope’s increasing dominance over the college of cardinals, which ceased to be a senate and whose membership became less princely and more bourgeois. Contemporaneously, the establishment of a comprehensive network of nuncios throughout Europe provided the papacy not only with a diplomatic service of unrivalled reach and experience but also training for a number of senior clerics who subsequently became popes—beginning with Fabio Chigi, later Pope Alexander VII (1655–67).

Taken together, these two volumes provide a nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the papacy that manages to avoid the besetting problem of so much historical literature on this topic, which construes the evidence from the Renaissance period onwards firmly as a Whig narrative of decadence and decline.

SIMON DITCHFIELD
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Historians have long been interested in the nature of nonconformity and its relationship to the established Church in the Restoration period. While older histories tended to emphasise the persecution and conflict experienced by dissenters in the decades after ‘Black Bartholomew’, and the ways in which nonconformist groups maintained the purity of their faith by separating from the unregenerate world around them, more recent approaches have preferred to explore the fluidity of the relationships between conformists and nonconformists, the day-to-day de facto toleration experienced by dissenters, and their integration into wider society. To complicate matters, official policy, veering between the Act of Uniformity on the one hand and the declarations of Indulgence on the other, and the more hard-line anti-dissenting policies of the 1680s followed by the 1689 Toleration Act, made it difficult for people at the time to know how nonconformists should be treated, and, in a period where real religious choice emerged (perhaps for the first time), older mechanisms of forming and maintaining religious communities could be seen to be breaking down or challenged.
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