

Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the editors of *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*

Review

Author(s): Dale K. Van Kley

Review by: Dale K. Van Kley

Source: *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Winter, 1986), pp. 520-523

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/204513>

Accessed: 17-03-2016 20:22 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the editors of *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* and *The MIT Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

unforced impact—nineteenth-century Germany—was also the one where its millennialist leanings were most questioned.¹

Marx may have thought that he was a Lutheran for a time, but can an identity sloughed off so easily have ever been very deep? Besides, Mazlish gives so much emphasis to the facile and well-worn theme of Jewish self-hatred as an explanation for Marx's development (in the process joining those who exaggerate and distort Marx's comments on the Jews) that he ends up casting doubt on his own Lutheran thesis. That there is much continuity between the young and the old Marx is true enough, but that unity is imperfectly understood unless it is seen to include both Marx's own attempts to break it and the effect of his experiences—especially the disappointments of 1848—on his successive positions.

Marx's thinking is not always well served in this book. It is simply not true, for instance, that the agent expected to educate the educator in the famous third thesis on Feuerbach is not identified—the educator is revolutionary practice. The discussion of *Capital* suffers from a failure to grasp the relationship between the first, published volume and the rest, leading to an attempt to present the work's "leading ideas" without any reference to the crucial third volume.

Mazlish concludes that Marx's example should make us wrestle as mightily for understanding as he did. Alas, brevity and the willingness to simplify do not always contribute to that struggle for enlightenment.

Jerrold Seigel
Princeton University

Church and Community in the Diocese of Lyon, 1500–1789. By Philip T. Hoffman (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1984) 239 pp. \$20.00

Connoisseurs of the recent scholarly attention given to the social and cultural impact of the sixteenth-century religious reformations will welcome Hoffman's fine study of the Counter Reformation in the diocese of Lyons, even though much of his story will come as no surprise to readers of Bossy, Delumeau, Perouas and others. The rise of the seminary and the doctrinal "reeducation" of the Catholic clergy; the substitution of the priest as a moral and spiritual *être à part* in relation to the parish for the priest who had been an essential but barely distinguishable part of the village community; the coming of the new clerically controlled and devotional confraternities at the expense of the purely lay and somewhat festive confraternities that had been nearly congruous with the village; the crabbed campaign against quasi-sacral charivaris,

1 Marx, *Capital* (Moscow, 1957).

sportive pilgrimages, and irreverent saints' days—the whole promiscuous intermingling of the sacred and the secular—all of these general features of the Catholic Counter Reformation find their particular variants in Hoffman's diocese of Lyons. More committed than his predecessors, however, to the Braudelian *longue durée*, Hoffman takes nearly the entire Old Regime as his province and carries his story to the onset of dechristianization on the eve of the French Revolution.¹

Hoffman's account of the Counter Reformation's progress in Lyons is both more chronologically precocious and less clerical and hierarchical than that of his predecessors. Gaining a foothold in Lyons proper as early as the 1560s, the Counter Reformation enjoyed the zealous support of the city's lay mercantile and official elites who were attracted to the movement's emphasis on order, rationality, and self-discipline. The conspicuous absence from the Lyonnais scene of any counter-reformational prelate of the first stature only highlights the importance of the elite lay initiative which, together with the support of the local clergy in the famous Company of the Holy Sacrament, saw to the movement's propagation into the countryside. Hence, the Counter Reformation bore the visage of an urban lay elite's cultural assault upon the mores of the village, although even there the movement was supported by lay contingents of the lettered and the women. Indeed, the prominent place of women in the new counter-reformational confraternities of the Rosary and the Blessed Sacrament, which the reformed clergy now favored to the detriment of the older and more independent penitents' confraternities that had been virtually synonymous with masculine piety, may go a long way toward explaining the feminization of Catholicism in the eighteenth century. It constitutes, to this reviewer's mind at least, the book's most interesting thesis.

Hoffman's book relies heavily on serial sources which lend themselves readily to quantification, especially the records of archepiscopal visitations and the notarial and judicial archives. On the one hand, Hoffman's use of tobit and probit analyses of wills as indices of lay piety represents a methodological advance over the technique pioneered by Vovelle, enabling Hoffman more surely to gauge the independent impact on pious bequests of such variables as wealth, age, sex, literacy, and chronological period. The results convincingly demonstrate a rise in the indices of both lay piety and clerical theological literacy throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century. On the other hand, his analysis of the *bailliage* and *sénéchaussée* judicial archives enables him to chart the increase in lay-initiated litigation involving clergymen after

1 John Bossy, "The Counter Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe," *Past & Present*, 47 (1970), 51–70; Jean Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris, 1971); Louis Perouas, *Le Diocèse de la Rochelle de 1648 à 1724: Sociologie et pastorale* (Paris, 1964).

1750, providing evidence of growing anticlericalism and resistance to further tridentine reformation, if not of full-scale dechristianization.²

Methodological progress in one area ought not, in the best of all historiographical worlds, be accompanied by regress in others. This one is, however. Hoffman's relative inattention to such traditional sources as memoirs, journals, and periodicals (for the eighteenth century, the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* assiduously covers the Lyonnais scene) not only limits his ability to put some narrative flesh on his subject's analytical bones, but also leaves him potentially unaware of the possible long-term impact of legislative and political events simply because these cannot show up as variables in the serial sources that he has relied upon almost exclusively.

Hoffman has no qualms about supposing that a political event in the form of the brief and violent Protestant seizure of Lyons in 1562/63 permanently healed a long-standing rift between the city's clergy and its mercantile-official elites and dramatically reversed indices of declining piety among the latter. Yet, thereafter, Hoffman's political attention lapses, and the consequences of the initial counter-reformational impulse are left to spin themselves out over two centuries or so as though no subsequent political factors intervened. One wonders, for example, whether the Parisian curés Fronde so ably studied by Golden had any counterparts in Lyons. And what of Louis XIV's Edict of 1695 which dramatically extended the clerical First Order's control over the curés? Might it have been a factor in the curés' increasingly zealous implementation of tridentine spirituality in the eighteenth century? And even if no instances of the refusal of sacraments to either ecclesiastics or laymen suspected of Jansenism can be uncovered in the diocese of Lyons during the 1740s and 1750s—which I am far from supposing to be the case—the Gallican clergy's resounding defeat in this infamous controversy at the hands of the parlements in 1757 was indirectly responsible for bringing the *jansénisant* Malvin de Montazet to the Lyons archepiscopal see in 1758, and was bound to encourage lay litigational challenges to perceived clerical high-handedness everywhere in France. Might not this factor have counted for something, then, in the increase in lay litigiousness vis-à-vis the clergy that Hoffman detects in Lyons' judicial archives after 1750? This reviewer, moreover, would be curious to know whether Jansenist curés, whose numbers in the diocese must have increased after Montazet's coming to Lyons, were noticeably harder on devotional confraternities, including those of the Rosary and the Blessed Sacrament, than the others.³

These reservations, however, are meant only as a call for a fuller integration of recent advances in quantification in history with more

2 Michel Vovelle, *Piété baroque et déchristianisation en Provence au dix-huitième siècle: Les Attitudes devant la mort d'après les clauses des testaments* (Paris, 1973).

3 Richard M. Golden, *The Godly Rebellion: Parisian Curés and the Religious Fronde, 1652–1662* (Chapel Hill, 1981).

traditional political and intellectual approaches. They do not detract from the praise due to a superb study which contributes importantly to our knowledge of the cultural impact of the Catholic Counter Reformation in France.

Dale K. Van Kley
Calvin College

Science and Medicine in France: The Emergence of Experimental Physiology, 1750–1855. By John E. Lesch (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1984) 276 pp. \$25.00

This book is concerned with two questions: why did experimental physiology appear in France, and why around 1800? Lesch sees as the key figures Xavier Bichat, François Magendie, and Claude Bernard, and although the latter has been well studied (as by Frederic L. Holmes, *Claude Bernard and Animal Chemistry* [Cambridge, Mass., 1974]), the former have often been dealt with as predecessors to Bernard. Lesch emphasizes them, dealing with Bernard only in the last chapter and concentrating largely on his early work.

Emphasis is placed on surgery as a background. Bichat had two physiologies: one “a taxonomy of vital properties,” as a basis for pathological anatomy and therapeutics; the other an active surgical intervention in bodily processes, after the manner of William Harvey, to analyze functional dependencies (76). This “active surgical intervention” continued in the work of Magendie, who established “a continuous research tradition” in physiology (100). The establishment of a chair for general physiology at the Sorbonne in 1854 represented “the first unambiguous step” in the institutionalization of experimental physiology in France (121). The chair was for Bernard.

Lesch denies attempting “a comprehensive history of physiology in this period in France,” or even a comprehensive treatment of his three principal scientists (4). He “focuses on the interaction between the scientist and his immediately experienced environment” (4). The text is remarkably well organized, with stimulating chapters on pharmaceutical research in the alkaloids and Magendie’s invention of pathological physiology. Through all runs the theme of experimentation which, according to Lesch, was not only unpopular among the medical contemporaries of his trio of innovators, but has also been underestimated by earlier writers on the origins of modern physiology.

This is a noteworthy book. It fills no mere niche in the history of physiology, but a gap which has led us to exaggerate the innovative character of the work of Bernard. It reports in detail on the work of Bichat and Magendie from manuscript sources and clarifies the historical relationship of physiology to medicine, chemistry, pharmacology, pa-