

show very clearly that the historian has a very important part to play in supplementing the work of the sociologist here. There is, for instance, a very important question Marc Bloch asks here: How far do historians assume that the distance between social classes was the same in the past as it is in their own day? He thought that we commonly exaggerate this distance and that whilst medieval society was far from egalitarian, at least the different social groups were within hailing distance of each other. It is by continuing to ask questions like this that we shall come nearer to understanding our own as well as medieval society.

Marc Bloch had his weaknesses. His technique in the handling of literary sources was not so good as an English scholar of comparable standing would be expected to show. It is this fine technique that is the strongest side of contemporary English medieval studies. I think Bloch himself would not have worried very much about this. I don't think he was the kind of man to mind being found out in a mistake; I think he was much more concerned to be relevant and avoid the trivial. More serious then is that he was not diachronic enough. He was too influenced by the social science of his day with its emphasis on the synchronic. This comes out in his studies of early medieval social structure which would be much more penetrating if he had seen that the logical direction of his arguments was to stop talking about France and Germany, or the 'State', which is to impose later categories and confuse a similarity of names with an identity of things. It does not seem to help to speak of a man being ineligible for election to the German crown because he had not got German nationality. It is true people of this day do talk in terms of nationality. Abbot Suger thought William Rufus an Englishman, for instance, and Archbishop Lanfranc called himself one too. They clearly do not mean what, or anything very

like what, we mean when we use words like nationality. Again in the discussion of the history of the Empire it would help if Bloch had clarified what he meant by words like election. Of course, he was writing in the 30's mainly when it was inevitable that the differences between France and Germany and the significance of words like election should loom large in any scholar's mind. But, however excusable, by taking Germany and France as existing in the twelfth century, as being more or less *there*, he precluded himself from asking the key questions about the making of France and the marring of Germany that seem to be important. Otherwise I cannot think Bloch could have written as he does of the eastern frontiers of the Empire, 'which are not of interest to us here'. I do not think myself we can hope to understand much of the real legacy of the medieval world unless we pay more attention to the relations of Teuton and Slav.

Something needs to be said about the translation. Marc Bloch does not go easily into English and the translator has caught his style rather well. Unfortunately he is not a historian, apparently, nor has any historian vetted it, and several serious errors occur. On page 4 the 'kingdom of Eastern France' was obviously the kingdom of the Eastern Franks, i.e. Germany. On page 19 there is a terrible mix-up over Paschal III which I cannot sort out. Both these errors occur in a text not easily available in the original French. On page 29 Joachites should presumably read Joachimites and on page 38 Henry II is given for Frederick II and the mistake is confirmed in the index. It is not accurate to speak of the Common Law, especially with capital letters, in a continental connexion as we find on page 104. Nevertheless the book and its English version were very well worth while, warts and all.

ERIC JOHN

THE TECHNIQUE OF STAINED GLASS, by Patrick Reyntiens. *Batsford Books, London: Watson-Guption Publications, New York. 84s.*

Mr Reyntiens's style is excellent and there is much interesting and informative detail on all aspects of his subject. The arrangement of the book is clear and it is easy to refer to the copious index. Moreover, all the topics discussed are dealt with in a personal and highly efficient manner deriving from Mr Reyntiens' own experience in carrying out such commissions as the Baptistery window at Coventry Cathedral (in painted and leaded glass) and the Lantern

at the new Cathedral of Christ the King at Liverpool (carried out in dalle-de-verre).

The traditional technique of stained glass in lead is dealt with very comprehensively and occupies 138 out of the 175 pages of text. Of especial interest are the contemporary techniques of painting (pp. 71-78). But space is also given to various modern techniques such as dalle-de-verre in concrete or epoxy resin; also to antique and fused glass set in polyester resin

of clear epoxy resin. The use of layers of fibre-glass to bond antique glass together is touched upon. An unusual topic is the problem of exhibiting stained glass.

With regard to the illustrations, we realize that the question of cost limited the use of colour, but we could have wished that the number of black-and-white illustrations of artists' work had been reduced to enable more than three of the illustrations to be in colour. Such a wonderful work as the Baptistery Window at Audincourt by Jean Bazaine loses nearly all its appeal when colour is lacking. The photographic illustrations do, however, bring out interesting contrasts in the use of leads of different sizes, as in the windows by Georg Meistermann (pl. 156 & 158).

The line drawings illustrating the techniques

are drawn by Ann Powers and are generously distributed throughout the text. Though they are usually adequate, some would be improved by the use of a tone to clarify the different planes, e.g. in plates 6-10, and later on in the section on the process of leading up the glass. The 'plan of the ideal studio' is a mixture of plan and perspective which does not read too clearly (pl. 12); while in the illustrations on 'cutting', plates 42 & 43 suggest (in contradiction to the text) that the glass is tapped from above.

To end as the book does on a positive and practical note, there is an excellent glossary, bibliography and list of suppliers of materials both in England and the U.S.A., which should be of great value to stained-glass artists and students alike.

PHILIP BROWN

THE LAST THREE POPES AND THE JEWS, by Pinchas E. Lapide. *Souvenir Press*. 42s.

The author of this well-documented study, which endeavours to put the activities of three Popes with regard to the Jews during the years of their European martyrdom at the hands of the Nazis into their proper perspective, knew Pius XI, Pius XII and John XXIII personally. As a founder member of the first American *Kibbutz* in Israel, former Israeli consul in Milan and Deputy Editor of the Government Press Bureau in the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem, where he is working for inter-faith rapprochement, Pinchas Lapide possesses that intimate knowledge of his subject which enables him to argue his case conclusively, and especially to vindicate the conduct of Pius XII against such attacks as those voiced by Hochhuth in his play *The Representative* or the famous criticisms of Camus and Mauriac. Besides the works mentioned in the extensive bibliography which covers more than six pages and includes books in English, French, Italian, Dutch and German, the author has drawn mainly on Jewish sources: the Zionist Central Archives, material at the Hebrew University, accounts from survivors, and the archives of the Yad Vashem, one of the world's largest collection of documents on the fate of European Jewry, to establish his claim that the Catholic Church saved at least 700,000 Jewish lives, if not 860,000. Above all he refutes the recurring argument of those whose idealism outbalances their sense of realities, the argument that the Pope should have publicly branded all anti-semitic activities, concentration camps and gas chambers as *totally un-Christian*. Not only would

such a statement have had no influence on the extermination policy of the maniac Hitler: it would merely have led to intensified persecution as was the case in Holland and Poland. 'Perhaps a solemn protest would have gained for me the praise of the civilized world, but it would have brought upon the poor Jews a still more implacable persecution than that which they now have to suffer . . .', Pius XII is reported to have said to Don Pizzo Scavizzi, an Italian Field Chaplain during the war, quoted in the April issue of *La Parrocchia*, Rome, 1964 (p. 245). But more than that, so deeply ingrained was anti-semitism in the hearts of German Catholics, that any papal call to oppose Jewish persecution would have been left unheard. In his book *Die Kapitulation*, Munich 1961, the German Catholic author Carl Amery writes: 'It is my firm conviction that the majority of German Catholics would not have obeyed, had the German bishops insisted on their rejection of Nazism. The German Catholic milieu was ripe for capitulation, and nothing, literally nothing, not even the voice of the bishops or the voice of Rome would have prevented this capitulation' (p. 242).

The fact that the author does not ignore the sad history of Christian-Jewish relationships—nearly one quarter of the book is devoted to the description of these from the times of Christ to the accession of Pius XI in 1922—lends to his arguments an added weight. For it is only against the grim background of ritual murder, lies, persecutions and pogroms throughout the