

Ireland. It is true that Pius, on one occasion, could not resist saying that 'he admired the power and energy of Englishmen in the suppression of revolution, such as in the Ionian Islands, India and lately in Jamaica, where they hung 2,000 negroes and met with universal approval, while he could not hang one single man in the Papal States without incurring universal blame.' It is possible that, on this occasion also, Russell did not quite see the point of the Papal laughter.

The benevolence of these two Italians to the British representative, who was a very likeable person anyway, was partly due to the fact, which they acknowledged, of 'the perfect liberty and independence enjoyed by the Catholic clergy in England.' This was, of course, a recognition of the harmlessness of the English hierarchy but few other governments would have tolerated, for instance, Cardinal Wiseman saying that a victory of Napoleon III over Great Britain would 'prove beneficial to the interests of the Church' as 'His Imperial Majesty would concede a Roman Catholic administration to Great Britain, and once relieved of the heretical thralldom of her Protestant statesmen she would rapidly return to the bosom of the Mother Church.' The report of this statement seemed so monstrous to Russell that he personally checked it with the Cardinal.

Although Russell's mother became a Catholic he himself always remained a convinced liberal Protestant. None the less, there is a curious atmosphere of appreciation of Catholic things in these documents. It is not only that Russell loved being in Rome, which would have been impossible if he had hated the Church, but he succeeded in fascinating successive administrations with his reports. The despatches of their unofficial Roman envoy were always the first to be read in Cabinet, though they rightly maintained that the internal affairs of the Church were no business of theirs. Odo Russell's insight into the developments in Rome, especially during the period of the first Vatican Council, was nearly always correct. It is strange, at first sight, to find him saying that a full definition of Papal Infallibility would, in his opinion, prove beneficial to the world, but all he meant was that it would unmistakably show the incompatibility of the Church with what he termed 'civilization.' It is also interesting to remember how influential two Englishmen were over this great issue, Acton in opposing the definition, Manning in supporting it.

This is an excellently edited and produced work, with photographs that are really illustrative, revealing the flaccidity of Napoleon III, the hyper-thyroid intensity of Pius, the mutton-chop serenity of Lord Clarendon, the beautiful and sombre face of Cardinal Antonelli.

PAUL FOSTER, O.P.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND, 1787-1833, by Ursula Henriques; Routledge & Kegan Paul; 35s.

omewhere there is a girls' school on the walls of whose sixth-form room should be a plaque acknowledging the debt which we all of us owe to some of its past

occupants for their inability to write an essay to which Miss Henriques could conscientiously award more than the most undistinguished of marks. 'Some years ago', she tells us in her Preface, 'I set a sixth form General Essay class to write an essay on 'Religious Toleration.' On reading the results, I said, 'Never mind, I will write one myself.' The ultimate outcome of that rash promise was this book'. It is a nice variation on the theme of St Augustine that the providential function of the bad is to 'exercise' the good.

To begin with, Miss Henriques has chosen a theme which is of permanent and massive importance. It matters, too, since it is essential for the comprehension of the background of nineteenth century England in politics, religion and literature. Moreover we are at a sufficient distance today from the generation with which the book deals to be able, with guidance, to see the business in clearer perspective. Miss Henriques provides exactly the guidance which is needed.

Her book falls into eight chapters. After a very useful Introduction, there is a first-rate chapter on the theory of religious toleration which is followed by chapters on Church and State, Burke, Catholic Emancipation, Jewish Emancipation, and a fascinating chapter on Evangelicals and Infidels. Finally, in a concluding chapter, the whole of a very complex subject is set in perspective. It might, perhaps, be argued that the book would have been even better if Miss Henriques had been able to command sufficient space to be able to set her subject firmly against the background of Hooker's thesis on the relations of church and state. How right she is in suggesting that the real weakness of the English Evangelicals was their distrust of reason, a point which Newman made.

It may also be emphasized that to one reader at any rate Miss Henriques has provided a great deal of, one hopes, not entirely malicious enjoyment by her exposition of the delightful mixture of idealism and rascality, of muddled thinking and clear principle, of emotive reaction and political jiggery-pokery which enveloped the controversy. Apart from the obvious interest which the book possesses for Dissenters, Jews and Catholics, it provides a fascinating illustration of the complex tangle of motives, theories and policies which go to make up or to obstruct a great movement of reform. This, one says to oneself, is how things happen; this is the real stuff of politics.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

REQUIEM FOR A PARISH, by John Foster; The Newman Press; \$3.00.

On reading that one of the tasks to which the Vatican Council would be addressing itself was the reform of the parish, there must have been many people, both clerical and lay, in this country who murmured 'What on earth for? Our parishes are doing very well.' Such complacency needs the explosive treatment of Fr Foster's lament. The sub-title of this work is 'an enquiry into customary