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Now in its fourth edition, Henry Kamen’s *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision* remains the best one-volume survey of this well-studied institution. The new edition has the advantage of pulling back from some of the more controversial positions staked out in the third edition, and its brief bibliography highlights some important recent research in the field. It is lucid, engagingly written, and continues to serve both the general reader and the specialist. But nearly fifty years after its first edition, its conceptualization may strike some specialists as disappointing. New developments in the field have been incorporated, but the underlying structure remains largely unchanged. This is not a wholesale reimagining of the history of the Spanish Inquisition. It continues to fulfill an important function for many readers, and is a definite improvement over the third edition, but for those looking for work at the cutting edge of the field, this volume does a sometimes inconsistent job of pointing the way.

That should not suggest that the fourth edition is unchanged; in fact, it is subtly but significantly revised. Individual chapters are all lightly, moderately, or significantly revised, but those changes bring recent scholarship to bear and alter the argument for the better. In addition, the second two-thirds of the book are reorganized, and a new chapter on gender and the Inquisition has been added. One of the most problematic chapters of the third edition, “How It Operated,” has changed significantly, and under its new title, “The Image and Reality of Power,” it eliminates a schematic overview of procedure in favor of an expanded discussion of lay fear of the tribunal, the rituals of the *auto de fe*, and Kamen’s important point that the Holy Office functioned because of the complicity of laypeople. Also in the fourth edition Kamen addresses recent work such as Stuart Schwartz’s book, although not, unfortunately, Doris Moreno Martínez’s or María Tausiet’s work. Kimberly Lynn’s important volume on inquisitors probably came out too late to be incorporated into this edition.

The third chapter presents a fascinating window into Kamen’s changing attitudes about New and Old Christians in Castile and Aragon. It is clear that he has moderated his tone somewhat since 1997, moving away from Benzion Netanyahu’s analysis. (This is also apparent in the otherwise lightly revised chap. 14, previously titled “Visions of Sefarad” and now called “Twilight of the Holy Office.”) This brings Kamen back to the mainstream of scholarship on *conversos* (i.e., Jews who converted to Christianity and their descendants, also known as New Christians) and the Inquisition. He is now willing, for example, to argue for a range of practices among *conversos*, and he acknowledges a debt to David Gitlitz here. Yet in his notes he continues to make extensive use of Netanyahu (and Norman Roth, who makes a similar argument), rather than citing more widely accepted scholars. That is a legitimate, if minority, scholarly viewpoint, but it is not one that has stood the test of time well. Kamen has made use of recent scholarship in the important and worthwhile contextual broadening of his narrative to reference Spanish Italy, for example. But some of the most interesting work on the *converso* problem has moved away from reified categories, more than Kamen does here, and has entirely reconceptualized the political and cultural landscape of the period. It has emphasized the fundamentally contingent nature of religious identity—and in fact the whole question of identity. It is a missed opportunity that Kamen does not make more use of Stefania Pastore or Jonathan Ray here or respond to the critiques of Netanyahu and Roth offered by John Edwards and others.

A peculiarity of the third edition was its profound skepticism regarding the Inquisition’s power over *conversos* (or even the existence of Judaizing *conversos*) and its
credulity regarding the Inquisition’s power to limit the awareness and spread of Protestantism. That has been addressed in chapter 5, where the Inquisition’s role in smothering interest in Protestantism has been downplayed. Kamen has inserted useful passages on Miguel Servet and Casiodoro de Reina, and Clive Griffin’s work on Protestant printers has been rightfully incorporated into the text. Similarly, the discussion of scientific learning in chapter 6, while still short, is much improved.

Another striking change from the third edition is Kamen’s decision to move the material on sodomy and witchcraft to a new chapter entitled “Gender, Sexuality, and Witchcraft.” This welcome change includes new analysis, in which Kamen reiterates his argument that the Inquisition responded to local community norms and individual denunciations, rather than initiating cultural change through preemptive prosecution. He emphasizes the agency of Spanish women in and out of the Inquisition’s tribunals and makes use of Allyson Poska’s excellent work in this field. But he bluntly states that “there is no basis for attempting to look at [the Inquisition’s] proceedings in terms of gender prejudice” (281). Kamen argues that any gender difference in practice emerged from the culture in which inquisitors operated, rather than a particular misogyny of inquisitors themselves. His analysis for the most part addresses women, rather than gender, and will not please scholars who view gender as a useful category of analysis, beyond the gender prejudice of contemporaries. But his overviews of sodomy and witchcraft prosecutions continue to provide a helpful narrative for newcomers to the field.

This volume carries within it an unusual opportunity to watch the transformation of a field and a scholar over half a century. While specialists may critique elements of Kamen’s work and the selectivity of his (intentionally brief) bibliography, and while a wholesale rewriting in light of new thinking might have made for a more provocative volume, it remains the best starting point in English for understanding the Spanish Inquisition and a decided improvement over the third edition.

**GRETCHEN STARR-LEBAU, University of Kentucky.**


This is a small book on a large, highly vexed topic, and it clearly means to be irenic. David Kastan’s position is slightly self-contradictory: we cannot know what Shakespeare’s religious commitments were, and he did not have any. Kastan acknowledges that he “may have taken what might be thought the easy way out” (11). I think he did. He often backs away from a point that looks established because to affirm it would be to take sides, so to speak. But sometimes he is overly certain.

In the opening chapter, Kastan observes that the many readings that speak of “the emotional spaces left empty by the loss of [Catholic] ritual” do not “consider carefully to what degree ritual in early modern England was in fact lost” (8). But he quickly leaves the point behind. The second chapter gets to the meat: “Shakespeare’s Religion.” Kastan is clear that “there is no evidence for Shakespeare as a recusant” (17), someone who did not attend his parish church. Shakespeare’s father, late in life, was a recusant, but John Shakespeare’s recusancy was caused by his financial rather than his religious situation and was recognized as such (21). But here too, Kastan does not want to eliminate the Catholic possibility or even seriously downplay it (as, I think, he knows he should). He deals well with the other supposed evidence for the Catholicism of Shakespeare senior or junior (the father’s “Spiritual Testament” [22–25] and “Shakeshaft,” the player in a Catholic household [26–27]). Kastan notes that Shakespeare’s will opens with “an unmistakable Protestant marker” (27), but