affiliations, were the Cistercian and Milanese nobleman Gioacchino Besozzi (incidentally also concerned in the Congregation with Tommaso Crudeli and freemasonry, and later as a Cardinal proposing reforms of the Roman Breviary), the Minim Francesco Zavarrone, the Dominican Luigi Maria Lucini (Commissionary General 1714–43), and Tommaso Sergio from the Pii Operai. They provided very nitty-gritty commentaries, revealing considerable background knowledge and reading of what had been allowed or just tolerated in previous texts over the centuries. They tracked what they thought was hostile to the papacy and St Peter's succession, contrary to the Council of Trent (as over marriage), where suggestions were implied on the limitations of Salvation, where the Virgin's roles and veneration were downplayed, and so forth. Coffin's hymns, undesirably replacing some of ancient lineage, were scrutinised for Jansenist implications; but Besozzi in particular admitted some phrases could be differently interpreted, might not be harmful, and indicated that likely intentionality of the reformers of the liturgical texts was to be assessed. How many general clergy, let alone laity, were concerned about the new breviaries and missals is an open question.

CHRISTOPHER F. BLACK
University of Glasgow

doi:10.1093/ehr/cev048

Legal Pluralism and Empires, 1500–1850, ed. Lauren Benton and Richard Ross (New York: New York U.P., 2013; pp. 314. £15.10).

Since John Griffiths published his 1986 article, 'What is Legal Pluralism?' (*J. Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, xxiv), the concept of legal pluralism has been influential—and hotly debated—within legal anthropology, legal sociology, and legal studies. Despite historians' once frequent mining of anthropology for methodological insights, legal pluralism has only recently begun to gather momentum among historians. Lauren Benton and Richard Ross have been leading exponents of legal pluralism, and have co-edited this volume of papers from the 2010 Symposium on Comparative Early Modern Legal History, which they organised.

Historians' indifferent reception may stem in part from the ongoing definitional debates among social scientists and legal scholars. While consensus is hard to find, most agree that legal pluralism refers to a polity, society or semi-autonomous social field where two or more legal orders co-exist. The concept has run into trouble when its practitioners have tried to include normative orders, such as social rules, as legal orders—something that this volume wisely avoids. Instead, following Benton's earlier work, this volume focuses on legal pluralism as 'patterns of jurisdictional conflicts that propelled change in the structure of colonial legal orders' (pp. 5–6). The introductory chapter by Lauren Benton and Richard Ross and the concluding chapter by Paul Halliday both provide concise overviews of the definitional debates.

Legal pluralism, approached through judicial conflicts, is a ripe subject for historians, especially those of empires, since, as Philip Stern aptly shows, empires were abundantly pluralistic in matters of law. At the centre were the imperial bases of Western Europe (which, themselves, as Helen Dewar's contribution demonstrates, featured multiple legal orders). Further afield were

the colonies, and their mix of transplanted codes and practices and indigenous traditions. In between were the great trading corporations, such as the East India Company, which often possessed law-like powers, including the right to hold courts, and to enact and impose laws. The relationships between these orders were not clear and hierarchical, but rather, as this volume demonstrates, overlapping, tangled and uncertain. Indeed, it is precisely this indeterminate quality, this sense of contingency, that makes pluralistic domains attractive and productive for historians.

Five articles take an empirical approach. Helen Dewar examines how French merchant companies tried to enforce the jurisdictional boundaries of their commissions in the New World, processes that inevitably also involved multiple legal orders in the Old World (towns, villages, duchies, parliaments). Ellen Barkey shifts the focus to the Middle East and examines how the Ottoman Empire sought to assimilate non-Muslims into the Islamic court system, while seeking to maintain interreligious peace and tolerance. Lauren Benton and Lisa Ford together probe the legal treatment of slaves in the Caribbean, and convicts in New South Wales, peeling back the multiple layers of legal powers—local magistrates, territorial governors and the imperial power in England—each with its own agenda. Linda Rupert and P.G. McHugh treat, respectively, the same geographical terrain in their articles. Rupert examines the 'marronage' of slaves from Dutch Curaçao to Spanish Venezuela, where they were offered freedom and land, and sets it against the legal responses to these practices by the Dutch, Spanish and other colonial powers. McHugh charts British deliberations about how best to implement order in New Zealand in the 1830s: whether to work with or through the Maori, or, alternatively, to establish a colony.

Two articles employ a more abstract lens, and consider the ideologies of legal orders and early modern states. Brian Owensby examines Spanish deliberations about how best to govern, and whether to legally empower indigenous peoples in the New World. Richard Ross and Philip Stern examine early modern political and theological writers, such as Hobbes and Bodin, to explore the ideological basis—plural or unitary—of the early modern state.

Running through all of these articles is the theme of legal pluralism as manifested in jurisdictional conflicts. Yet, while the articles are rife with instances of legal pluralism, many of them, particularly those by Rupert, Benton and Ford, and McHugh, employ the concept only tangentially in their analysis, rather than as a substantive framework. In each of these chapters, the authors mention it in the introduction, largely prescind from further consideration, and then return to say a few words about it in their conclusion. For a volume focused on bringing legal pluralism more into historical consciousness, more explicit engagement with the concept would have been beneficial.

Taken together, this set of articles covers an impressive temporal and geographical range. Although tilted towards the eighteenth century, the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries are represented. With the exception of Barkey's piece on the Ottoman Empire, all the chapters focus on European colonial powers, principally England, Spain and France. On the one hand, one could bemoan such a Eurocentric focus, since empires and colonial holdings were not unique to Europe. On the other hand, as Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper explain in their concluding chapter, this is the start of an ongoing research agenda, and the next step is to explore Asian, African and Middle Eastern contexts.

This volume is a valuable contribution, and will be of particular interest to those working on global, colonial and legal history. It demonstrates the analytical potential of legal pluralism and should further its adoption by other historians, and not just those of empires.

JOHN JORDAN
University of Bern

doi:10.1093/ehr/cev006

Imprison'd Wranglers: The Rhetorical Culture of the House of Commons, 1760–1800, by Christopher Reid (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2012; pp. xiv + 270. £60).

A clip on the YouTube website featuring Margaret Thatcher asserting 'No. No. No', in a 1990 House of Commons debate over Europe has been viewed over 2.5 million times. In this richly detailed and engagingly written study, Christopher Reid excavates the late eighteenth-century origins of the parliamentary soundbite. He explores the complications and lasting changes that resulted from heightened scrutiny of an institution that continued to think of itself 'as a sealed space, conventionally invisible and inaudible to the world at large' (p. 31), and the contortions—as well as distortions—that accompanied the widespread dissemination of its debates. With an emphasis on the shifting 'rhetorical context[s]' (p. 3) of speech-making, Reid presents a multifaceted account of the House of Commons in England at a moment of renewed self-assertion. The result is a valuably expanded approach to the history of parliament, whose significance for the study of political culture more widely remains open to debate.

The introduction connects the sudden increase in published reports with heightened attention to parliamentary oratory, as evidenced in enthusiastic newspaper reader William Cowper's remarks about the 'imprison'd wranglers' of printed debates, in his poem *The Task* (1785). An opening chapter then surveys the development of parliament's permanent Westminster home by way of attention to its 'rhetorical space'.This opening emphasis on print culture and historical overview shifts, as the book gets to the main order of business with three thematic clusters of chapters focusing on the cases of various MPs (including Fox, Burke, North, and the younger Pitt, as well as more unusual suspects such as Isaac Barré). The first of these sections, 'Out of Doors', begins with a compelling account of how the reporting of parliamentary speeches facilitated by 'strangers' (as visitors to parliament were termed until 2006) created debates about the right of 'the people' to breach the parliamentary space and highlighted the fractured audiences of parliamentary speech-making. While the arbitrating role of 'the people' and 'the oddly ambiguous nature of … publicness' (p. 65) might have been enhanced by discussions of these topics by Mark Knights and Michael Warner, Reid's renewed engagement with Habermas and Bentham is welcome. In intriguing cases, notably that of Grenville, who courted the publication of his speeches then denied that very fact, we begin to see shifting extra-parliamentary contexts infiltrating the minds of speech-makers. A deeper history of pamphlet publication, manuscript culture and coffee-house discussion would be needed to clarify the precise significance of this shift. The ensuing chapter on the mechanics of reporting glances in the direction