

Comptes rendus / Book Reviews 257

transformed” (p. 53). Even more intriguing is the treatment of Ambrose by Thomas Aquinas, who takes up the question of whether Christ progressed in knowledge. It is a rivetting section to read (pp. 23–38), revealing not only Thomas’s shifting position but also the way the intellectual climate of his era led him to take a stand that departed from his patristic predecessor. With his perceptive treatment of such tense episodes in the history of Christology, Madigan opens up a world of religious thought that is truly “unstable, multiple and precarious.”

Apparently, researchers have long been reluctant to acknowledge such theological ruptures. One thinks especially of the work of Newman, who appears here as a figure still guarding the gate of Queen Theology’s castle: though Newman might not be fashionable among contemporary historians of Christianity, his vision of doctrinal continuity, which Madigan opposes, seems to linger (pp. 7, 91–92). And there is more than an old Cardinal’s ghost. The author’s conclusion — that medieval thinkers offer a “quite radical distortion of patristic opinion” — has been beyond reach of modern scholars due to an alleged intellectual presupposition perhaps rooted in their religious affiliation. His assertion deserves to be quoted: “The intellectual (and religious?) assumptions underlying virtually all of this century’s work on high-medieval scholasticism, particularly that undertaken by French and German Catholics, have not only precluded such a conclusion. They have forestalled interpreters from taking seriously, or even perceiving, the data on which it is based” (n. 5, p. 96). These are strong words and perhaps justified, though not easy to reconcile with all those defunct churches in Europe. It is possible, too, that the work of other scholars might temper Madigan’s assessment. Trained at the Catholic University of Louvain, Philipp Rosemann offers a book that in many ways is complemented by Madigan’s; its title speaks for itself: *Understanding Scholastic Thought with Foucault* (New York, 1999).

If we accept Madigan’s assessment of the scholarship, the “fissures” and “discontinuities” his book so superbly uncovers might not have been as problematic to medieval thinkers as they are to some of us. After all, a twelfth-century theologian could write of his malleable tradition in a way we must surely admire: “authority (*auctoritas*) has a waxen nose,” says Alan of Lille; “it can be bent in whatever direction you like.” Given the author’s high level of engagement, Madigan’s reply to Alan would be gratifying to hear.

J. K. Kitchen
University of Alberta

MARSHALL, Peter — *Mother Leakey and the Bishop: A Ghost Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. 323.

Peter Marshall prefaces this study with an unusually frank account of how this work happened, capturing, on the one hand, the pleasure of stumbling across

an interesting case study, initially offered as a conference paper but with greater connections that expanded to a larger piece, and, on the other, a recognition of the strong and far too frequently masked relation between story and history. What emerges is an analysis of the appearance of a ghost in 1636 to a West Country family, an appearance that raised greater interest than might be expected and is eventually connected to the sensational downfall of the ghost's son-in-law, John Atherton, the bishop of Waterford and Lismore, in 1640.

This is an engaging and ambitious work, moving from the particular to the general without losing touch with the former. An effort is made to contextualize the appearance of the recently deceased Mother Leakey in terms of its meanings for contemporaries and in terms of the socio-economic conditions of the family and their environs. As the possibilities of Mother Leakey's purposes emerge, this entails a contextualization of gender relations, marriage, infanticide, and sodomy as well as the religious and political tensions of seventeenth-century England and Ireland. In addition, there is also an effort to unearth something like "the truth" of the ghost in the secrets of the pasts of the Leakeys and the Athertons. As Marshall recognizes, this effort is unsuccessful beyond what he admits are plausible speculations. However, there is still more, in that dual interests take this tale beyond the micro-historical. Marshall traces the recurrence of accounts of Mother Leakey and the bishop both together and separately, from their appearance in the sensational and providential press of Grub Street in the early eighteenth century, through rebirth of Atherton's downfall when Percy Jocelyn, the bishop of Clogher, was arrested for committing sexual offences with a soldier in 1822, on to the interest of Walter Scott in ghost stories, and into the historical politics of Ireland and the tourist promotion of Minehead in the twentieth century. This brings a fascinating examination of how the story changes and how this reveals the appetites and constraints of differing periods, differing people, and the porous boundaries between oral folklore and the more high-brow print. Finally, he is an explicit narrator in his own right in that, as new leads emerge, the reader is invited to share the pleasure and surprise of new lines as they were found. As an aesthetic reflection of the intimate intertwining of story and history, the work is presented with the accoutrements of a more popular press, with "interludes," a cast of characters, and a set of illustrations that for the most part helpfully guide the reader in appreciation of the successive texts.

Perhaps the greatest task is to produce a work that will appeal to the divergent fields of academic history and broader reading without either boring the academic or patronizing the general reader. In this he is entirely successful, something this reader appreciated particularly when the context moved away from my early modern home soil. What is assumed is intelligence rather than familiarity, and for the contexts of the nineteenth century the accounts are elucidative and informative without invoking any sense of inadequacy. Marshall's tone throughout is that of a carefully enlightening guide more than an elderly uncle boring his less enlightened family.

For the first third of the text, the ghost story serves to illustrate very well the opportunities offered by such "curiosities" as the more famous cat massacre as

a way into the world views of early modern people. The middle section, dominated by the career of Atherton and particularly the legal battles fought to renew the finances of his diocese, focuses less closely upon the ghost story *per se*, although the denouement, with the accusations of sodomy, bring the possible visit of one of Atherton's family back to the centre. However, the ghost appropriately hovers in the background throughout, and the assessment of Nicholas Bernard's account of Atherton's penitential death is fascinating. Additions to and omissions from the story are revealing, with Edmund Curll feeling the need to add bestiality to "spice up" his title and advertisement and others choosing to step around the sodomy as if it were an embarrassing dead body in the library. Mother Leakey returns with the providential interests of John Quick, and, while she is less pertinent in the accounts of the downfall of Percy Jocelyn, she is central to the concerns of Scott as well as to the issues of folklore and efforts to make it an acceptable "respectable" topic.

One suspects that Marshall is aware that readers may feel he is drifting from the central concern, evinced by his willingness to bring the reader back into the fold periodically. This should not be seen as a criticism, but more as evidence of the challenge of keeping multiple strands within a text cohesive as a whole. In a positive sense, what it shows is the value of a holistic approach, of the profit of treating the boundaries of religion, politics, society, culture, and economics as matters of emphasis rather than as fences. For Marshall to have done this and to have also provided stimulating material on folklore and narrative, as well as insight into the ways in which historians work (or at least how this particular historian works), is a remarkable achievement that offers a thought-provoking and enjoyable read.

Tom Webster
University of Edinburgh, UK

PIQUERAS, José A., and Vicent SANZ ROZALÉN (eds.) — *A Social History of Spanish Labour: New Perspectives on Class, Politics and Gender*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007. Pp. 330.

Until recently, it has been difficult to recognize how normal Spain is in comparison with the rest of Europe. Its clichéd image, nineteenth-century Romanticism, and Franco's long dictatorship gave rise to almost insurmountable obstacles in the process of examining the history of Spain using European guidelines. Much the same is true of its social history and particularly of its labour history, which, in fact, as the editors of this collective volume underline, did not appear as such until the last gasps of the dictatorship in the early 1970s. Even then, as the introduction to the historiographical review states, the weight of ideologization in reaction to the dearth of freedom hindered historiography, and only in the early 1980s did it begin to shake off its ideological dead weight. In fact, the articles that make up this volume bring together academic writings starting in the 1990s, a fact