ing in England (a term used here in its literal sense) by studying its development during the century in which history gradually came to its own as a separate discipline, an academic occupation, and a repertoire of professional practices.

Her study is organized around four themes: the part played by publishers in the development of historical writing and studies, the thin and repeatedly crossed borderlines between the rapidly professionalizing field and popular writing of history, the materiality of history books, and the life-cycle of history readers (the last a substitute for Robert Darnton’s famous communication cycle). Of these themes the first two are the most convincingly and absorbingly followed.

Howsam’s ample use of the correspondence between publishers and historians, dug mainly from the archives of Macmillan and Company, Oxford University Press (OUP), and Cambridge University Press (CUP), reveals the vital role publishers played in the development of both popular and academic history. They were far more than commissioners and middle men; quite often they conceptualized research and editing. Until about 1880 Alexander Macmillan dominated the publishing scene as Britain’s leading history publisher, as the London publisher of the straggling Oxford University Press, as the nurter of popular authors—like Charlotte M. Yonge—who spawned general narratives, and of an increasing number of historians—notably Edward Freeman and J. R. Green—who allied themselves with scientific standards and the new historical profession and had little patience for Macmillan’s “hacks.” Freeman thought Yonge “never catches the points, never brings out the great landmarks, all oh, oh, oh & such sentences” (p. 33). But the “serious” historians too were accused of hiding argument underneath layers of narrative (p. 39). Macmillan deftly maneuvered between commercial considerations and his astute assessment of the changes which history underwent.

Like Macmillan and Company, the university presses, apparently the hallmarks of the new discipline, were commercial publishing houses that catered to schools and non-specialized readers. Each press cultivated one form of publishing and research. CUP specialized in mammoth series, starting in the Cambridge Modern History and expanding to the medieval, ancient and India history series, and OUP in monographs’ series. The Cambridge format set the ground for historical research as a collaborative venture and embodied in print the assumptions underlying scientific history, such as uniformity in writing, collectivity, and an effacement of authorial presence. Disparaged by the Oxford delegates as “sausages” produced by the competitor’s sausage machines, some of these summae of knowledge became superannuated even as they were published. OUP, slowly emerging from cautiousness and conservatism, retorted with its own formula: a series of discrete histories with distinct authorial voices that took long to materialize. Throughout the period of their professionalization both the syndics and the delegates courted popular stars, from G. M. Trevelyan to Churchill, familiarly referred to in the correspondence as “Winston,” proving again how tenacious the thralldom of narrative was.

Howsam’s main working assumption is that during the century her volume covers, print was history’s dominant medium and books and periodicals were the “only media available outside the classroom” (p. 121). This assumption certainly needs modifying. Scholarship by Peter Mandler, Stephen Bann, and a number of others has amply shown how prominent visual histories were precisely during this century. Historical spectacles, paintings, the theater, monuments and buildings, and—from the 1920s—historical film made the past accessible to mass audiences. The democratic potential of these media was greater than that of the printed histories and formulae which Howsam expertly and most usefully chronicles in the last three chapters of the book: the collaborative series and the professional journal. A greater degree of democratization than Howsam would allow also manifested itself in the role played by women historians. She, correctly, notes their marginalization and relegation to the lesser branches of the historian’s métier: domestic histories, school books, and children’s histories. This status is apparent in the “little books” spawned by Elizabeth Penrose (the first Mrs. Markham and author of A History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the End of the Reign of George III in 1823) and in Eileen and Rhoda Power, Boys and Girls of History (1926). But at the same time that the Markham histories replicated themselves, Agnes and Elisabeth Strickland wrote monster serial biographies of royal women, some of which were based on archival research. Eileen Power orchestrated two state-of-the-art forms of collaborative history: The Cambridge Economic History and the Economic History Review. Moreover, until the outbreak of World War II women historians were visible outside the precincts of the delegates and syndics, precisely in the new and experimental fields of social and economic history.

Notwithstanding these slants and lacunae, this lucid, engaging, and timely history of a barely covered topic should pave the way for further research on the intersections of book culture and the culture of history.

Billie Melman
Tel Aviv University


This pioneering book bridges intellectual and religious history to make a substantial contribution to the hitherto underresearched history of English Catholicism in the early twentieth century. The central figure is Hilaire Belloc (1870–1953), who, according to James R. Lothian, in writings between the 1900s and the 1920s “presented a unified and self-consciously Catholic theory of government, political economy and history” (p. xii).
The book is divided into five substantial chapters. The first surveys Belloc’s life and thought, highlights his distinctive cultural and political inheritance as the child of an Anglo-French marriage, recounts his early parliamentary career, and summarizes his seminal publications, notably *The Party System* (1911) and *The Servile State* (1912). Belloc’s own experience as an MP led him to conclude that British parliamentary democracy had become corrupt. He advocated the importance of property for economic freedom and upheld an idealized version of medieval Catholic society as a model for the radical transformation of contemporary England. The next two chapters are concerned with men (but no women) characterized by Lothian as respectively the “greater” and “lesser” “servants” of Belloc, first Vincent McNabb, Eric Gill, and G. K. Chesterton, and then a younger generation consisting of Douglas Jerrold, Douglas Woodruff, Christopher Hollis, Evelyn Waugh, and Arnold Lunn. Significantly, of the eight figures selected for particular attention, six were converts: only McNab and Jerrold, like Belloc himself, were cradle Catholics. The fourth chapter examines an overlapping network of intellectual influences that developed in the interwar period, inspired by the historian Christopher Dawson, who was critical of Belloc’s abuse of history “as a weapon against the modern age” (p. 286) and fostered by the publishers Frank Sheed and Maisie Ward and the editor Tom Burns, who hosted an influential salon at his Chelsea home. The final main chapter explores the “unmaking of the English Catholic intellectual community,” in part as a consequence of tensions between “Bellocian” and “Dawsonite” networks, and in part because World War II and its aftermath starkly exposed the inadequacy of Belloc’s ideas as a realistic economic and political prescription for contemporary England.

There is much to admire here, with extensive research on unpublished correspondence complementing Lothian’s wide-ranging familiarity with the published writings of his subjects. The book provides valuable accounts of hitherto neglected individuals and enhances understanding of more familiar figures, such as Chesterton, Gill, and Belloc himself. Nevertheless, the analysis is questionable insofar as it is founded on a tendentious portrayal of Belloc as a seminal genius and primary influence on all the other intellectuals discussed, with the partial exception of Dawson. There is little discussion of Belloc’s own intellectual debts to earlier Catholic generations beyond the suggestion (p. 8) that he owed little to John Henry Newman and a lot to Henry Edward Manning. Both cardinals were, however, already old men by the time Belloc was born, and it is disappointing that prominent Catholic intellectuals in intermediate generations such as Lord Acton, Cardinal F. A. Gasquet, and Wilfrid Ward—surely a formative influence on his daughter Maisie—are only mentioned in passing or not at all. It may well be that the star of the Catholic modernists, George Tyrrell and Friedrich von Hügel, was in eclipse by the time of Belloc’s prime, but Lothian too readily writes them out of history altogether.

Not only did the “English Catholic intellectual community” of the first half of the twentieth century have a more diverse inheritance than Lothian acknowledges, but some of Belloc’s prominent contemporaries are also neglected. For example, Ronald Knox only appears in the wings of this book and Bede Jarrett hardly features at all. In general, with the significant exception of McNabb, Lothian’s intellectual community is almost exclusively a lay one, with a high proportion of converts, whereas the contribution of the clergy and the religious orders (female as well as male) should not be discounted. Moreover, while some continental influences are quite well explored, minimal attention is given to developments in Ireland that must have had a significant impact on thinking English Catholic observers. One also wonders in vain whether Saunders Lewis, a towering figure in Welsh political and intellectual life in this period, had any contacts with his English Catholic co-religionists.

In view of the book’s expansive title, unexplained omissions of this kind are hard to justify. It is unfortunate that what is essentially an excellent and valuable study of the intellectual influence of Hilaire Belloc is marred by thus appearing to claim too much for itself. In other respects Lothian is insightful and judicious, for example in explaining and critiquing several of his subjects’ disconcerting enthusiasms for the Mussolini and Franco regimes. His work is also an important building block toward a fuller and more rounded appreciation of early twentieth-century English Catholic intellectual life that must await further research.

JEFFREY S. REZNICK. *Healing the Nation: Soldiers and the Culture of Caregiving in Britain during the Great War.* (Cultural History of Modern War.) New York: Manchester University Press. 2004. Pp. xii, 172. $75.00.

Jeffrey S. Reznick provides a detailed study of the recuperative and curative treatment received by “other ranks” in rest huts, general hospitals, and orthopaedic facilities during World War I. Using a range of written and visual sources, both published and unpublished, Reznick highlights the tensions that existed among public perception, official propaganda, and individual experience, and in so doing adds another layer to our understanding of the material and psychological impact of the war.

The focus first falls on the rest huts that provided soldiers moving up and down the lines of communication to the front with a brief respite from the dislocation of trench life. Run on a voluntary basis by the Young Men’s Christian Association, the Church Army, and the Salvation Army, and predicated on the late Victorian model of salvation through social and spiritual reform, these huts carried on the improving mission of the prewar Evangelical movement by doling out small com-