

tred towards profiteers (168), he does not incorporate it into his analysis. In this way, class-based dissent and opposition to the war is dismissed more than it is discussed.

To his credit, Millman's comparison of Canada to other countries does lead him to some very interesting conclusions. Having written a similar study on Britain's home-front, *Managing Domestic Dissent in First World War Britain* (2000), Millman is able to distinguish characteristics of Canada's wartime repression and state regulation. Canada's legal system provided exceptional flexibility to use repression, as it was still largely based on challenges to the state during the nineteenth century. For instance, distributing prohibited literature could easily lead to a jail sentence and heavy fines, and mere association with a person held guilty of sedition could help substantiate charges of conspiracy. This allowed the Canadian state to target particular dissidents more effectively, such as advocates of strikes and left-wing radicals. Perhaps the most striking characteristic unique to Canada was how the Borden government made a minimal effort to denounce and quickly dismantle the repressive measures as was being done in Britain and the United States. It would appear that "Canada ... was not ashamed to use them" (28).

Considering both its strengths and weaknesses, *Polarity, Patriotism and Dissent in Great War Canada, 1914–1919* is a fascinating read. Each chapter is filled with diverse and detailed accounts of Canada's home-front during the Great War. The scope of conflict and violence, whether pertaining to German saboteurs, French-Canadian *dynamitards*, or riotous Great War veterans, helps contextualize the challenges faced by the Borden governments and their decisions to use repressive measures. Although the Borden government's strategy to achieve stability and an effective war effort was far from coinciding with democratic ideals, it was, ultimately, "the lesser evil" (7).

Ryan Targa  
York University

**Francis Young, *A History of Exorcism in Catholic Christianity*. Palgrave Historical Studies in Witchcraft and Magic (New York: Palgrave, Macmillan, 2016). 275pp. Hardcover \$99.99.**

Demons matter in the Christian tradition. The ancient, cross-cultural idea of the existence of the semi-divine *daemon* is imbedded in earliest Christian scriptures, and that fact means that Christianized concepts of demons can never be exorcised from historical and global Christian interpretive traditions. Therefore, any study that attempts to address the history of Christian rituals intended for the exorcism of demons is welcome.

In his *A History of Exorcism in Catholic Christianity*, Francis Young endeavours to chart an institutional history of exorcism rituals in the Catholic Christian

tradition, for the reason that “no scholarly work dedicated to the entire history of exorcism exists in English” (7). In addition to creating this historically comprehensive study in English, Young also intends to provide a corrective to the growing research on the topic of Catholic exorcism, in which he perceives a problem in that contemporary scholarship has not adequately perceived “the enduring nature of exorcism” throughout distinct historical periods up to the present day (5).

Young supports his argument for liturgical continuity throughout sixteen centuries by providing English translations of historical Latin liturgical texts, and this important element in Young’s study stands as one of its most valuable contributions. The non-specialist reader will appreciate access to translated primary texts, a gesture of respect not always offered to readers by academic authors.

In the first chapter, Young introduces his intentions and the methodological limits for this study. Here, he resolutely approaches a number of fraught and controversial issues concerning method, terms, and definitions regarding “exorcism” and “possession,” as well as “magic” and “witchcraft,” with respect to the relationship of such historical constructs to Catholic liturgical rituals of exorcism. This first chapter is crucial for determining how Young attempts to orient the reader to his point of view. The specialist reader may rightly contest Young’s definitions. Nevertheless, he provides an appreciable review of selected current literature in which he assesses several perceived problems in historical-critical studies of exorcism. These problems include: the privileging of certain historical periods to the neglect of others, blurred distinctions between exorcism and witchcraft beliefs, and a scholarly focus trained more on interpretations of possession rather than on actual practices of exorcism.

At the start, Young distinguishes between “Catholic tradition” and the “institutions and regulations of a reified church” (5), and he intends to shape his study according to the former, which includes lay perceptions of, and interactions with, theologies and rituals of exorcism over time. Thus, Young’s subsequent discussions include contests of authority among “Catholic lay exorcists, charismatic clerical exorcists and a centralizing church,” particularly concerning the fourteenth-through the seventeenth-centuries (17). This valuable distinction, nevertheless, remains governed by two interpretive categories: institutional Catholic orthodoxy, and what Young identifies as “authorized” exorcisms; but this distinction seems not to be realized as fully as it might have been in subsequent chapters, in which Young spends more time reporting and explaining than analyzing according to his own stated intentions. Yet this weakness is also a strength for the simple reason that his study conveys a wealth of historical cases that heretofore were not easily accessible for non-specialist readers.

Young’s solution to the problems he identifies in contemporary scholarship is to mobilize the historical-critical method of “church history.” Young defines this method as theological, liturgical, and legal. It is Young’s idea that his particular definition of the “church history” method will counteract perceived analytical prob-

lems present in contemporary scholarship, which he believes are the result of scholars operating “under anthropological influence” (15) and utilizing a “functionalist approach” (22).

Apart from rejecting “functionalism,” Young signals clearly his stance on two critical issues of method. First, Young insists that a study of the history of Catholic exorcism rituals should be separated from the history of the development of sorcery, magic, and witchcraft beliefs, and their social and legal consequences. While one may appreciate Young’s initial thinking about why this separation should be valid, one may also observe that this attempt at distinction has more to do with Young’s own parochial stance. Magic, sorcery, and witchcraft beliefs have always been drivers for theologies and rituals of exorcism in the Latin Catholic tradition. Young seems aware of this but does not adequately explore these connections. While Young’s initial attempts at addressing questions of defining “magic” and distinguishing “magic” from Catholic rituals of exorcism sound good at first, they have no staying power in subsequent chapters.

Second, Young’s refusal to engage the significance of historical constructions of social gender in relation to cultural, moral, religious, and legal elements in the evolution of rituals of exorcism is simply inexplicable. Young’s rejection of “anthropological” approaches and “functionalism” lies underneath his choice to ignore gender as either a subject or tool of historical analysis. His own choices of method are contradicted by his use of the historical statistic which acknowledges that the majority of subjects of exorcism over the period covered here are women. This, along with remarks in the first chapter about the dynamic relation between exorcism rituals and “authority,” “power,” and “women,” and subsequent random remarks in the following chapters about the relationship between female gender and male exorcists, and his willingness otherwise to discuss social “functions” of exorcism rituals in historical contexts, add up to a profound inconsistency. Young appears to perceive “church history” as a method which must, by nature, exclude gender analyses. This is simply not the case, and such a limited understanding of “church history” constitutes a significant flaw in Young’s study.

Nevertheless, Young’s research and scholarly temper are sound, and both make his study notable. With dense footnotes and a rich bibliography, he allows the reader to see other points of view, even as he pursues his own anti-“functionalist” agenda. Here is another sign of Young’s respect for his reader and for scholarship in this area. Young’s study constitutes an important, but not unproblematic, contribution. Any study that raises more questions than it answers is valuable indeed, and Young’s work has advanced this less-trodden area of research.

Leslie Hayes  
University of Toronto