SPIRITUALITY IN HISTORY: A SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE

By PHILIP SHELDRAKE

WHO IS PERMITTED to have a history and who is not is a vital issue because those who have no memories, no story, have no life. In André Brink's powerful novel *Looking on darkness*, the South African Coloured actor Joseph Malan, awaiting execution, reflects back on his own history and on that of his family. He is proud because they *have* a story—so many Coloureds do not. Joseph remembers his mother's strong views on this matter. 'You must look up, Joseph. Remember you Fa'er and his peoples. I'm nothing, I'm an orphan born and bred. But he's different, he's got a hist'ry jus' like enny white man. Don' forget that.' But Joseph also reflects, 'Strange to think how little of the country's official history appears in my chronicle as if we've always existed apart from it'. During one ancestor's lifetime all kinds of 'significant historical events' took place—for example the Great Trek, the Zulu Wars, the evolution of the Cape from representative to responsible government, the first Boer War . . . yet, 'Of all that there is no mention in my chronicle. It surrounds our story but forms no part of it. For my tale is not history, but, at most, the shadow-side of history'.[1]

This highlights the difference between a universal historical process which is the creation of all who participate in it, and *recorded* history in which only *some* people are permitted the title of 'historical figures'. This is controlled history beyond whose boundaries are silence and darkness. Because the past affects people's present identity and possibilities, this is not merely a scholarly issue but one that intimately relates to the contemporary concern for social justice not least in relation to spirituality. Scholars increasingly recognize that 'recorded history' has an in-built bias towards the viewpoint of the 'winners' and dominant groups and largely ignores the powerless or 'losers'. History in the

making makes certain groups predominant and others subordinate and so the values of elites gain greater exposure in the records, literature or structures of their time. The result has been a major change of perspective concerning the problem of historical interpretation, involving the retrieval of the story of submerged groups and the revision of our perceptions of particular periods.

Consequently the study of spirituality must, first of all, affirm that traditions arise within particular historical contexts and are, to an extent, limited by them in embodying specific commitments and values. For example, the emergence of mendicant spirituality in the thirteenth century represented both an evangelical and a *social* reaction to the wealth and power of a Church that sped the values of 'the world'. Francis of Assisi's choice of radical poverty as *the* virtue was not a-historical but a response to the characteristic sins of his time.[2] Traditions, as they developed, often spiritualized the original values and treated the structures that expressed them as normative. We would, for example, gain an unhistorical picture of St Francis if we accepted naively St Bonaventure's portrayal of his decision concerning radical poverty as *solely* the result of sudden insight while listening to a reading of Matthew, chapter 10 (*Major life*, 3.1). Again, certain individuals are given 'star quality' in developing traditions not merely because of spiritual criteria but also because they support an acceptable understanding of the tradition. Thus, while at first glance our spiritual inheritance offers impressive variety and breadth, there is an 'underside' to history of which we are frequently unaware.

What are the *priorities* which controlled spirituality and how it was viewed or recorded? One priority really summarizes the rest—that of the *institution and authority structures*. However, within this we can distinguish others: *orthodoxy* (priority of majority over minority, 'winners' over 'losers', those who get their ideas across over the less articulate); *conformity to the centre* (priority of uniformity over pluralism, Establishment over new ventures, a universal 'culture' over local experience); finally, *the clerical-monastic* (priority of special 'ways' or elites over normal Christian life). These priorities raise certain questions about history which together focus on one basic problem: the ways in which certain groups become 'insiders' and others 'outsiders' in relationship to institutional spirituality.[3]

Who was holy and what was holy?

From the early centuries of the Church the development of a hierarchy and the differentiation of charisms gradually set apart

those who had whole-heartedly chosen the 'better part'—in practice the clerics and the celibates-ascetics. Such elitism, related to a dualistic distinction between 'spiritual' and 'material' realities, gave rise to a separation between special 'ways' and the everyday. This was partly the legacy of Platonism as well as of aristocratic social principles from Graeco-Roman antiquity which found a later echo in the development of monarchy among the Christianized Germanic tribes once their nomadic days were over.

Another factor was just as ancient. The first language of Christian perfection was that of martyrdom. The detachment from the world that made Christians different was especially manifest in confrontations with the power of the pagan state and with public history. The martyr witnessed to the transformation of the self by losing life in order to gain it by victory over death. With the conversion of the Roman Empire to Christianity, this language of perfection was necessarily translated into something else. The emergence of monasticism from the fourth century onwards did two things. It continued the martyr model of holiness and developed it from victory over physical death to victory over the world as death-dealing. Secondly, monasticism, not inherently but effectively, abandoned the idea of perfection for the ordinary Christian. Thus a division was created within the Church between the perfect and the imperfect, symbolized by physical withdrawal.

Because sanctity is not an autonomous category but reflects a wider context of values it is reasonable to ask *what* is being canonized as well as who. There has, for example, always been a danger of linking spiritual values with much broader social attitudes. This may reinforce prejudices against certain kinds of people. Thus the popular cult of Little Hugh of Lincoln (never officially sanctioned, but nevertheless long-standing) as a martyr to Jewish avarice as well as to the supposed magical and satanic practices of that community, underlined a powerful and unpleasant strand of anti-semitism in England throughout the Middle Ages. Again, the kind of violent death that we interpret as 'martyrdom' is partly a *political and social* decision. We are much less likely, today, to be inspired by the martyrdom of a medieval inquisitor who was killed by the relatives of his victims (for example, the ex-Cathar St Peter of Verona, who turned from poacher to gamekeeper as a Dominican).

Social elitism has also been present in perceptions of holiness. It is interesting to note that between about 1000–1700 saints appear

in a ratio of approximately three to one in favour of elite classes. There has been a disposition to equate moral with social nobility. Because holiness involved a dimension of sacrifice and the reversal of worldly status, the 'surrender' by an upper-class saint of social position and riches appeared more impressive than the poverty and nothingness of the already poor. This tendency to prefer a 'riches to rags and thus back to spiritual riches' journey to holiness appears in religious traditions other than the Christian one—we only have to reflect on the legendary life of the Buddha. It is true that there was a tradition of 'servant saints' in the Middle Ages but this model was hardly subversive. In several ways it reinforced the status quo. It seems clear that the origins of the genre of servant-saints was associated with the patronage of powerful families and supported a desire to maintain the allegiance of a marginal class. The model, with its emphasis on a strict curb on natural sensuality, also embodied the Church's ambivalent attitude to womankind whose natural tendency to be 'temptress' was further compounded by the corrupted morals of the servile state.[4]

An underlying assumption behind spiritual elitism was that the flesh and material things were associated with original sin. It was difficult to conceive of the possibility of saintliness *through* marriage or labour in the fields! In the Middle Ages idealized representations of heaven in art tend to reproduce the hierarchies of society and Church. Peasants do not sit with kings or monks. On the west front of Chartres Cathedral,

> Elongated figures of 'saints' thinned out of the world to reach a God above, and stout, stocky figures of this-worldly artisans and peasants supporting with the sweat of their brows that other 'leisure class' who have all the time and energy for liturgies and mystical contemplation, point to a conception of spirituality indelibly sculptured in the cathedrals of our collective unconscious.[5]

Who creates or controls spirituality?

Because of these models of holiness, the institution and its representatives often took priority as the creators and controllers of spiritual traditions. For example, the spirituality of the medieval West frequently appears to be confined, with few exceptions, to religious orders, the theologically literate and to mystics. There was a bias in favour of clerical-monastic or mystical elites. Superficially this is understandable because in a period when literacy

was not widespread the spirituality of ordinary people, in contrast to that of elites, is less likely to have travelled beyond its original context, to have developed the articulation needed for permanence or to have captured the centre stage.

Equally, there was a theological and social tendency towards 'excessive refinement' conceived in hierarchical terms: the 'spiritual' was above the material, withdrawal was superior to engagement, contemplation a better way than activity. In practice only a minority had access to those contexts where the 'higher way' was possible. Classical spiritual texts such as the fourteenth-century English mystical work, *The cloud of unknowing*, reflect this 'refinement'.

In recent years it has been suggested that the High Middle Ages saw a gradual diffusion outwards from the cloister of religious practices as well as a new willingness to view roles 'in the world' as possessing religious significance. This needs considerable qualification. In the short term, the period was one of increased prominence for the clergy. Supernatural power was increasingly centred in a clerically controlled Eucharist and the roles of clergy and laity were more and more clearly distinguished. While there was a great spiritual revival built upon a desire for the *vita apostolica* of poverty, mendicancy and preaching which attracted large numbers of lay adherents it was, at least in part, a reaction against increasing clerical domination of 'official' Church life and piety. Also the lay share in this spiritual revival was soon challenged and by the early fourteenth century was effectively condemned.[6] There were no new models of holiness to support a greater exaltation of marriage or work. Lay saints simply imbibed the spirituality of the cloister: harsh asceticism, absorption in prayer and alienation from the world around. An elitist monastic spirituality had for so long defined what a saint was that such conceptions were not easily superseded.[7]

What directions were not taken?

In the story of directions taken and not taken, officially sanctioned models of holiness and dominant groups were the significant factors.[8] However we receive a false impression if we look at history simply from the angle of the 'winning side'. The 'institutional' version of events needs 'goodies and baddies' and tends to record 'history' in those terms. We now realize that the medieval Beguine movement of lay women was not as inherently

unorthodox as it was later portrayed in official accounts. Rather a discomfort with women who read scripture, were independent of canonical restraints, did not rely on the clergy for appropriate guidance and preferred a more affective piety had something to do with the suppression of the movement. Without doubt some Beguines were heretical but most were not.[9]

The fate of the *vita apostolica* movement is a good illustration of what can happen to new and challenging directions in spirituality. Were its values, in any sense, absorbed into the bloodstream of mainline spirituality in the late Middle Ages? Ultimately the mendicant movement *did* find an accepted place through the formal recognition of the way of life of the friars. However, it may also be argued that *vita apostolica* spirituality was not so much accepted as channelled into acceptable directions. Many wandering preachers such as Norbert of Xanten eventually settled down to a fairly orthodox monastic life. Even the mendicant orders, while retaining a certain mobility, simplicity and emphasis on popular preaching, took on a recognizably conventual life-style.

The monasticization of spirituality, therefore, while challenged, continued to dominate the Church for some time to come. It was not until the sixteenth century, with the creation of such orders as the Jesuits, that a fully non-monastic religious life emerged. However the emergence of significant *lay* movements in the Church was delayed for several more centuries. Ignatius Loyola and his first companions ultimately accepted ordination and religious life although they had begun as an informal group of laypeople. Women suffered even more. For example, the radical vision of the Englishwoman, Mary Ward, in the early seventeenth century, was condemned by the official Church and her Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary was, until modern times, unable to live the mobile and fully uncloistered *religious* life envisaged by the foundress.[10]

Where are the groups that did not fit?

Thus, directions taken by 'official' spirituality inevitably created individuals or groups that did not 'fit'. This is often reflected in the disappearance of certain traditions and individuals from history, or at least their continuation as a marginal embarrassment to the mainline story. Mary Ward, after her condemnation by Church authorities, was made a 'non-person' by ceasing to appear as foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary in official documents until her rehabilitation in the present century. Another

example was the way in which the spirituality of the radical Reformation (e.g. the Anabaptists) was marginalized by the large Protestant 'territorial' Churches.

Another way of seeing the question is to think of spiritualities as cultures and therefore to look for conflicts of culture. The effect of such conflicts emerges in a 'bad fit' between the values of a predominant culture and a subordinate one. In Britain we may see this in the gradual erosion of the Celtic tradition in the face of Latin cultural and religious hegemony during the sixth and seventh centuries, or in the clash between Anglo-Saxon forms of the clerical life and the new 'reformed' continental models after the Norman Conquest. Even before the 'breakpoint' of 1066, we may ask whether the clamour for monastic reform on the Frankish model simply reflects an overall laxity in English religious life or whether peculiarly English developments in communitarian life did not 'fit' the enthusiasm in offical Church and kingly circles for proper organizations and centralization which was interpreted and presented as a vision of more 'fervent' community life.

Traditions which became predominant were gradually assumed to be *inherently* superior and other spiritual cultures more primitive. This may indicate either the degree of exposure obtained by a particular tradition or the ability of one group to control its environment and to subordinate other groups. The history of colonialism provides a striking parallel to this process which may be thought of in some cases, as 'spiritual colonialism'. If this may be an appropriate concept within which to rethink the fate of the Celtic tradition in the more distant past, it is an even more powerful notion when we consider the attitude of European missionaries in recent centuries and their rejection of local religious symbols and practices. From its origins in the pages of the New Testament, the *real* history of Christian spirituality involved cultural pluralism but because Christianity soon became *predominantly* Graeco-Roman in culture other traditions were treated only *in relationship to, and from the point of view* of the dominant culture and not in their own right.

Finally, when we think about groups that did not fit, one of the unavoidable questions is: where are the women? It is not simply that, with some exceptions (for example, Julian of Norwich), the feminine aspect of God and God's way of relating to the human condition did not appear in what are remembered as the great 'spiritual classics'. Common spiritual stereotypes as well as theories about spiritual development tend to echo the assumptions of a

male, clerical establishment. To what extent and in what circumstances did women contribute to the development of spiritual theory and practice? For example, is Teresa of Avila, as a doctor of the Church, the token female, an honorary male or what? The *public* presentation of women such as Teresa continued to offer to women conventional roles and their lives were recorded selectively for institutional ends in such a way as not to disturb time-honoured patterns of attitude and behaviour.[11]

The numerical significance of women in the history of spirituality is rarely reflected in standard accounts. The problem with recorded history is that it works within established perceptions of 'importance' and so focusses on what can be defined, in these terms, as *necessary* to the progress of a spiritual tradition. The situation is further complicated by the fact that many of the sources are products of cultures where the psychological, moral or social inferiority of women is taken for granted. Thus it is difficult to find sources where women are taken seriously in their own right. Even if women wrote about themselves in history they often spoke in conventional ways. For example, Julian of Norwich seems to suggest that her theological creativity is *in spite of* her gender (*The showings*, Short Text, chap VI).[12] Although, at times in the Middle Ages, women became more visible in spirituality, in the Beguines movement or by making distinctive contributions to devotional trends, and although there was a certain 'feminization of religious language' there was also an increase in prohibitions against spiritual leadership and a decline in women's ability to exercise authority or active ministry.[13]

It is a sobering fact that over the last ten centuries relatively few women have been accorded the status of saints. A high proportion of those who were date from an earlier time when popular cultus was of greater importance in the process of recognition and canonization. Between 1000–1900 about 87% of saints were men and 13% were women. The improvement since 1900 has been only marginal: about 75% men and 25% women.[14] I suspect that this reflects an association between traditional understandings of holiness and a dualist emphasis on liberation from that 'embodiment' of which women were potent symbols. Men, in order to reach spiritual transformation, needed to escape from their bodies while women really had to escape from *themselves* which was a much more difficult matter! So, in summary, we may ask whether traditional spiritual theory made of women as a whole a

group that did not 'fit'—even if individuals were able to transcend the limitations.

Oppression, victims and dissent

Spiritual history has its victims as well as its heroes. 'Victims' is a weak word and without doubt many people in marginalized groups succumbed to the pressures of mainline spiritual culture by accepting a subordinate place and whatever supports they could find within a clerically dominated spiritual ethos—for example, by association with religious communities in Third Orders. Some medieval historians have noticed a kind of 'compensation' among groups that were excluded from the mainstream. Thus women, while unable to consecrate, could at least have a special relationship to the Eucharist in visions and even through miraculous contacts with the Host.[15] Many people channelled their unfulfilled spiritual energies into pilgrimages and unsanctioned devotions to local saints. There were also 'substitutes' for offical spiritual structures. For example, the rosary, meditations on the Passion and Books of Hours were effectively lay imitations of monastic rhythms. The devotionalism of the 'spiritually poor' was a significant development in late-medieval Christianity. The monastic-contemplative approach was marked by an effort to transcend the particularity of time and place. Devotionalism, in contrast, pointed to the popular need for the specific—for sacred places and objects.

Oppression, however, did not merely produce victims, compensation or substitutes. The medieval division between an intellectually sophisticated mainstream and popular fervour also produced a substratum of apocalyptic and 'spiritual poverty' movements among the disadvantaged classes. There were flagellant groups and others concerned with spiritual simplicity in contrast to the 'this-worldliness' of the official Church such as the Humiliati in Italy or Peter Waldo and the 'Poor of Lyons'.[16] Sometimes unorthodoxy preceded and caused suppression. The tendency of the Cathars to view all matter as evil would be a case in point although we may ask why this movement was so attractive to lay-people in twelfth-century southern France. The presence of women among the Cathar elite, the rejection of a sacramental system and the challenge to the wealth of the Church may well reflect a wider lay dissatisfaction with the patriarchal and clerical dominance of Church life. However, the fate of Waldo's followers indicates the way in which marginalization is often the *cause* of eventual dissent. Waldo

condemned the Cathars and had no difficulty in making an orthodox profession of faith. It seems that the role accorded to lay people in preaching (including some women) and the espousal of poverty and spiritual simplicity were the main reasons for the gradual suppression of the movement. The Archdeacon of Oxford, Walter Map, was very revealing in his protest against new lay movements. It was their affrontery in *preaching*, thus usurping a clerical monopoly, that scandalized him.[17] It was only when a formal ban was imposed in 1184 on Cathars, Humiliati and Waldensians in one indiscriminate decree that the Waldensians began to move towards separatism and gradually to develop distinct beliefs.

Dissent became endemic in the Middle Ages largely because there was an increasing emphasis on orthodoxy and orthopraxis defined by the institutional Church and socially enforced by the secular powers. Fundamentally popular spirituality ran counter to the concentration by the institutional Church from the eleventh century onwards on development as a corporation independent of secular control. The problem in the end was that the Church as institution could not cope adequately with intense fervour. Its emphasis instead was on a higher pitch of law, finance and government.

Spirituality and the ways we use history

If the flawed nature of Christian history in itself demands careful reinterpretation, the use we subsequently make of it may equally perpetuate the mechanics of oppression. In spirituality, until recently, non-historical assumptions of spiritual theology tended to determine the view of history making it a study of particular instances of *enduring truths* and of the triumph of *the sophisticated over the primitive* and *the orthodox over the deviant.*

An account of the past is essential to the life of any culture. By identifying the central features of our heritage and interpreting their meaning, we possess a historically-based language which grounds our sense of identity. Some years ago, while visiting a museum in India, I was taken aback to see the events of 1857 described not as the 'Indian Mutiny' but as the 'First War of Independence'. Yet this revisionist approach was both as valid and as limited as interpretations in traditional British textbooks and this reinforced some important perceptions about the power of 'history'. Until recently, histories of spirituality concentrated their

attention on dominant groups and ideas and so made a *social* judgement based on elitist assumptions.[18] If certain groups (such as women) are treated as historically insignificant it is doubly difficult for them to escape from traditionally subordinate roles. Histories have also frequently made spirituality a transcultural phenomenon. A historically reinforced mind-set which suggests that 'real' spirituality means the values of a dominant Western culture will devalue any cultural plurality. Universalist models of holiness oppress because they impose alien values on different cultures. Such modern historians as Outram Evenett and John Bossy (in reference to an ahistorical approach to Ignatian spirituality) have strongly criticized the treatment of spiritual experience as 'a region of certainty transcending any historical or psychological conditions'.[19]

All histories of spirituality involve choices. Firstly, *we choose appropriate temporal and geographical limits* to 'enclose' a specific interpretation. For example, viewed from the point of view of religious or political elites, the Reformation began about 1517, peaked in the middle of the sixteenth century and was complete by the early 1600s. However, as a movement affecting the 'person in the pew', it was only just beginning to take effect by 1600 and was hardly complete before 1700. Secondly, *only certain evidence is treated as significant.* This relates to what we think history *is.* Contemporary spirituality is increasingly influenced by the *annales* school of French historians which at best seeks ways of rereading traditional sources and of 'recovering' popular history by attention to a broader range of evidence.[20] Thirdly, the history of spirituality has inherited the *Western ideology of autonomous progress.* There is a kind of spiritual theory of evolution, based on principles of supernatural selection. However, an uncritical 'progress' model of history which arranges events into a pattern of crescendo (while *claiming* to be value-free) tends to present what we have inherited as inevitable and the directions taken as fully appropriate.

The history of spirituality has deviations. An ideological tendency predetermines *what must have been the case* in the light of assumptions about meaning and 'screens out' what does not fit the established 'thesis'. Thus the spirituality of the seventeenth-century Caroline Divines has often been viewed through the preconceptions of the nineteenth-century 'Catholic revival' in the Church of England which passed over the 'inconvenient' Calvinist elements of their thought.[21] A hagiographical tendency is essentially

a form of popular story-telling with the classical structures of folk-tale and myth and framed within a 'plot' with heroes and villains as well as ultimately helpful endings. Such 'history' presents a purposeful framework that reassures us about the ordered nature of the world and the 'rightness of things as they are'. A cautionary and true story illustrates how this may be a *social* issue. An elderly nun had been deeply impressed by a book concerning the short, and undoubtedly beautiful, life of a little French boy called Guy de Fontgallant. He was apparently so good and noble (not only spiritually, but also socially as it happened) that after making his First Communion he died in the odour of sanctity. In conversation with other sisters the nun said that she had afterwards looked in the library for another book with the same admirable sentiments and values and had the good fortune to find one. It was the story of *Little Lord Fauntleroy*!

It is important to distinguish between deviations and a *committed* standpoint which is nonetheless open to new facts as they present themselves. No history is 'value-free' for everyone has an overall sense of what history *means*. Thus a 'religious' view of history will, without avoiding the facts, inevitably see behind them the revelation of God's action. More specifically, a commitment to the belief that the Kingdom of God is intimately linked with issues of human justice will lead us to retrieve the 'underside of history' as we seek to learn the lessons of oppression from our past so that *our* search for identity does not prevent others from having a history.

NOTES

[1] Brink, André: *Looking on darkness* (London, 1982), pp 35 & 48.

[2] See essay on Franciscan spirituality in *Christian spirituality, High Middle Ages and Reformation*, ed Jill Raitt etc., 'World Spirituality' no 17, (London, 1987) espec. pp 31–33; cited as Raitt, *Christian spirituality, II*. Also Jacques le Goff, 'Francis of Assisi between the renewals and restraints of feudal society' in *Concilium*, 149, 1981, *Francis of Assisi today*, pp 3ff, cited as le Goff, 'Francis of Assisi'.

[3] In formulating these priorities and questions I have been greatly helped by Giuseppe Alberigo, 'New frontiers in Church history' in *Concilium* vol 7, no 6, 1970, pp 68–84 and John Staudenmaier, *Technology's storytellers: reweaving the human fabric* (The Society for the History of Technology/MIT, Cambridge, Mass., 1985), Introduction and chapters 1 & 5.

[4] See Michael Goodich, '*Ancilla Dei*: the servant as saint in the late Middle Ages' in *Women of the medieval world*, ed J. Kirshner & S. Wemple (Oxford, 1987), pp 119ff and D. Weinstein & R. Bell, *Saints and society: the two worlds of Western Christendom, 1000–1700* (Chicago, 1982), chapter 7 'Class'.

[5] Pieris, Aloysius: 'Spirituality and liberation' in *The Month*, April 1983, p 120.
[6] See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as mother: studies in the spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, pp 3–4 and 9–21, cited as Bynum, *Jesus as mother*; also Robert Lerner, *The heresy of the Free Spirit in the later Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1972), pp 44–54, cited as Lerner, *Free spirit*.
[7] Richard Kieckhefer, *Unquiet souls: fourteenth-century saints and their religious milieu* (Chicago, 1984), pp 14–15, 87ff, 194ff.
[8] See Pierre Delooz, 'The social function of the canonisation of saints' in *Concilium*, 129, 1979, *Models of holiness*, pp 14–24.
[9] See Lerner, *Free Spirit*, Introduction and Chapter 2.
[10] The story of Mary Ward's condemnation has yet to be told with any exactness. Some reference is made in Lavinia Byrne IBVM, *Mary Ward: a pilgrim finds her way*, Dublin, 1984, pp 22–25 and chapter I.
[11] See Mary Collins OSB, 'Daughters of the Church: the four Theresas' in *Concilium*, 182, 1985, 'Women—invisible in theology and Church', pp 17–26.
[12] See Bynum, *Jesus as mother*, p 136 and n. 86.
[13] See Bynum, *Jesus as mother*, Chapters IV & V.
[14] See Delooz in *Concilium*, 129, 1979.
[15] See Bynum, *Jesus as mother*, pp 256–58.
[16] For a good general survey of twelfth-century developments in spirituality, see George Tavard, 'Apostolic life and Church reform' in Raitt, *Christian spirituality, II*, pp 1–11.
[17] Quoted in le Goff, 'Francis of Assisi', p 8.
[18] While still not perfect, the 'World Spirituality' volumes on Christian spirituality offer a much broader approach to history than another recent volume, *The study of spirituality*, edited by Cheslyn Jones etc., (London, 1986).
[19] Evenett, H. Outram: *The spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (London, 1968), pp 55–56 and John Bossy's Postscript, pp 126–32.
[20] For a balanced critique of this approach see, Bynum, *Jesus as mother*, Introduction, pp 3–8. See also Richard Kieckhefer, 'Major currents in late medieval devotion' in Raitt, *op.cit.*, who pays attention both to devotional literature and to art, relics, liturgical practice, pilgrimages and popular cults.
[21] See Gene Edward Veith, *Reformation spirituality: the religion of George Herbert* (London, 1985), Introduction & chapter 1.