

his present relevance. Dr Simon correctly considers it the commentator's task to throw what light he can on both these factors.

As to the question of date (which is not given the disproportionate amount of space it has in most modern commentaries), he favours the view of C. Torrey which would place it much later than the time of Cyrus. Whether or not this is to be expected, the line of argument in this present book is sufficiently strong to render this view no longer one to be peremptorily ruled as out of court as it has been up to now.

R.T.

THINKING IN OPPOSITES. By Paul Roubiczek. (Routledge and Kegan Paul; 21s.)

'I accept the fundamental theses of Kant as my starting point in this book.' This is the cause both of its merits and of its defects. It makes no concessions to readers who are accustomed to the more light-hearted fashions of today, but well repays the effort required to read it.

Mr Roubiczek has made an acute and thorough investigation of the way in which human beings think. He believes that 'we apply opposites whenever we think at all, and accurate thinking, therefore, depends upon their correct application'. He maintains a fundamental opposition between internal and external reality, the respective realms of morals and science, but connects more closely than Kant did by showing that many concepts pass over from one to the other. The investigation also indicates that final knowledge of a metaphysical kind is impossible to an intellect which can never grasp unity because it is bound to use oppositions; but this deficiency is corrected by the use of feeling, through which we can experience unity without being able to think it. This refusal to identify man with his mind is an important modification of Kant's rationalism.

Nevertheless the whole study is limited by its Kantian presupposition that all thought is discursive. To justify the mind's power to think metaphysically is a long task, but in the present context we might suggest as a line of enquiry the opposition implied in this passage of St Thomas: 'The processes of metaphysical science are said to be marked with insight, for there most of all is to be found the fullest understanding. Reasoning differs from understanding as multitude from unity, as time from eternity, as circumference from centre. Reasoning is characteristically busy about many things, but understanding rests on one simple truth.' (*De Trinitate*; 6, 1.)

R.L.B.

TUDOR PRELATES AND POLITICS, 1536-1558. By Lacey Baldwin Smith. (Princeton University Press: London, Geoffrey Cumberlege; 32s. 6d.)

Historians have nowhere found objectivity harder to achieve than

in the study of the English Reformation. It has been so easy to interpret the hectic events of the mid-sixteenth century in terms of what followed them: so easy for Protestant historians to point to the unexpectedly rapid conversion of a nation to a new faith, and so easy for Catholics to forget, in practice, that the Council of Trent was far in the future, that the Papacy of Pius V was yet to come; while even so distinguished a Tudor historian as Mr A. L. Rowse can make himself ridiculous by his quixotic refusal to understand the significance of religious convictions in that intensely religious age.

Mr Smith makes none of these mistakes, and it is because he so successfully avoids historical hindsight that his book is so valuable. He sets out to analyse the English episcopate, man by man, to classify them into reformers and conservatives—a more historical terminology than Catholic and Protestant—and to seek some explanation of their actions and attitudes in the habits of thought which they acquired from their various avocations. Stated with brutal oversimplification, his conclusions are these: the conservative bishops had been trained in the law, and had found their careers in the service of the state, as administrators or as diplomats. The reformers had been theologians or religious; their formative environment, the university or the cloister. The statesman-bishop, accordingly, was marked by a strong regard for legality, for social order, for tradition, for ‘human prudence’. Mr Smith obviously approves of him. The reforming bishop, the Churchman, on the other hand, cared more for salvation than for legality, and was prepared to risk everything in this world in order to advance the cause of ‘the Gospel’. In fact, he was more interested in religion than in the state, while the conservative really considered sedition a more terrible thing than sin. In the twenties, and even in the thirties, in the era of what Mr Smith calls humanist and liberal Catholicism, it was still possible to regard religious debate (so long as it was not conducted by the inferior sort) as a theologian’s parlour game; the issue only became real when the consequences of innovation were seen in their eventual frightfulness: civil war in Germany and the threat of it in England. By that time, two things had happened: first, events had swept far past the tolerance of the conservatives, who now found that only the full and papal faith offered an escape from the turmoil of reform; and secondly, the Church itself had woken up, the Council of Trent had begun, and Catholicism had responded to the Protestant challenge by expelling, under Caraffa, the liberal and humanist worm that had crept under its skin.

Not all of this is new, and not all of it is true, but Mr Smith’s purpose has consistently been to see the events of these wild years as contemporaries saw them, and his thesis is reinforced with a wealth of

quotation. He has realised that contemporaries are influenced by their own view of events, and that neither Gardiner nor Latimer was troubled by the researches of twentieth-century historians. Mr Smith is well aware of the vast importance of economic change as a cause of the unrest which frequently assumed a religious complexion, but he also knows that 'wily Winchester' traced the whole trouble to innovation in the Church: not indeed because he regarded the troubles of the time as the vengeance of God, as the reformers tended to do, but because to him and to the conservative bishops, a challenge to one authority threatened a challenge to another. Deny the Pope, and you are free to deny the King: and the bishop, the landlord, and the magistrate.

There can be no doubt that Mr Smith's book, by uncovering some of the motives that influenced their policies, by revealing their worldly wisdom, their preoccupation with social propriety, is (though its author intends, perhaps, the opposite) a scathing indictment of the spirituality of the English episcopate on the eve of the Schism, and for many years after it. It also demonstrates how, when twenty-five years had gone by, the Catholic bishop of Mary's reign tended to be what the Henrician and Edwardian reformer had been: a man of religion, not a councillor of state. One suspects that in the days when Christianity was a revolutionary religion, Gardiner and Tunstal, Bonner and Heath and the rest, would have been ruthless provincial governors under the Roman Empire: and one can be sure that Latimer and Hooper would have been in the catacombs, along with the new Marian bishops like Goldwell and White. And yet how soon after the year with which this book closes did the Protestant Archbishop Parker assume all the conservative anxieties of the Henrician age!

This discussion can convey nothing of the stylistic vigour Mr Smith displays, but a word must be said to commend the documentation and the evidence which is unfailingly adduced with every assertion. There is no space to do more than refer to the careful but brilliantly told account of the manoeuvres of the religious parties between 1540 and 1546, or to the lucid introductory chapter which tells of the educational atmosphere of the Cambridge which most of these bishops knew.

The faults in this work are perhaps due to its brevity. Although a wholly admirable account is given of the conservatives, too little is said, with too little precision, of the reformers. The dissolution of the monasteries, too, one feels, is more relevant to Mr Smith's thesis than his discussion suggests. Apart from their international, and so papal, character, he seems to regard them as significant chiefly because they implied belief in purgatory, and although this view was all too common among both reformers (who therefore hated them) and Catholics (who therefore valued them for their prayers), even on the eve of the

Reformation they meant something beyond that. Again, one is tempted to ask why the conservatives of Henry VIII's reign should so confidently have regarded heresy as sedition and orthodoxy as its antidote, when the Catholic fifteenth century had been so greatly disturbed. Had the early Tudors really done their work of consolidation so well that their achievement led their subjects to forget the past? Finally, a fuller discussion of the Protestant reaction in the last year of Henry's reign would have been valuable. The problem is relegated to a footnote, rather undeservedly.

The volume is equipped with five appendices, the last two of which are especially valuable, giving the academic and ecclesiastical status of all the bishops of the period; there is a bibliography of printed books (which disappointingly omits Fr Philip Hughes's recent work) and an excellent index. On page 108, note 11, 'Magdalene' should be so spelt, and on page 200, note 41, 'Henry VIII' should of course be read for 'Henry VII'.

THE TUDOR AGE. By A. J. Williamson. (Longmans; 25s.)

This is an honest and very competent text-book of the period 1485-1603. Political and economic history are treated in detail, and excellent pages are, in particular, devoted to the Navy, and to the oceanic enterprises of the sixteenth century. Constitutional history is sadly neglected, so that the reader loses a total view of the development and significance of the period; and strangely enough, for all the economic pre-occupations of the book, the vital changes inside English society in these years are rather scantily discussed. It is perhaps to be expected that the literary and intellectual background should be wholly neglected, although religious history, if told without much enthusiasm, is given very fair treatment.

Mr Williamson has very properly avoided controversial judgments, but rather refers the reader to more detailed or partisan works; and similarly, while he has incorporated the latest research into his book, he has been laudably tentative in his approach to new theories that have yet to prove themselves. Altogether, Mr Williamson's book can be safely recommended as an introduction to Tudor history.

There is an excellent table of contents, a good index, and a short bibliography. In future editions, the books and articles referred to in footnotes might well also be listed at the end.

T. G. I. HAMNETT

STUDIES IN STUART WALES. By A. H. Dodd. (University of Wales Press; 15s.)

In these six studies Professor A. H. Dodd has given us a masterly survey of what is to a great extent an untilled field. To the general