

does not put over the Hengist and Horsa stuff, then the word is inevitable. This manifesto makes articulate something stubborn if silent, the challenge of an old culture to the raw ideologies of Race and of Class. Often we may differ, and pungently, and that is the point; we can if we want to. For the ideal is one of experimental variety and an open world, not dogmatic uniformity and a closed system. And if the solemn frivolousness of cricket is sometimes present, who will misunderstand?

The argument is that there is a Grand Tradition of human values, formed by Christianity from Judæa, Hellas and Rome, corroborated by Confucianism, agreed upon by men of insight throughout the world. The very norms of civilization spring from this perennial culture and decency. Within this general tradition, a specific stream is noticeable, common to the Anglo-Saxon people, but not nationalistically limited to them, which takes its rise in the sixteenth century and continues to this day. This Anglo-Saxon Tradition has certain definite notes: humanism and respect for personality, liberty, experimentalism, tolerance, accommodation in social method, federalism, democracy, and certain qualities of moralism and of public spirit.

These notes are considered at length, the author leaving on one side such themes as the Common Law and Constitutionalism. St. Thomas More is the pattern of the English humanist, with his sense of liberty under law, his rejection of the vulgarity of Tudor power. The spirit still lives, if only in the distaste for barbaric tribalism and the boss in jack-boots, though we may suffer from him in slippers. The author is not unaware of the devils that attend on freedom, Whiggery on one side, intellectual immorality on the other: or of those that attend on moralism, hypocrisy and the idea that England expects every American to do his duty. Not least interesting are the contacts he indicates with the French Catholic Tradition, the spirit of respect for reason and personality, and the regard for voluntary societies.

THOMAS GILBY, O.P.

CUTHBERT TUNSTAL. By Charles Sturge. (Longmans; 21s.)

In giving us so much on so prominent an historical personage as Cuthbert Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, Dr. Sturge is at once to be congratulated and thanked. But I think Catholic readers will agree that he has not by any means arrived at a complete, probably not even at a correct estimate of his hero, for hero Tunstal was, although it was not until his eighty-fifth

year that he made full amends for his scandalous time-serving under Henry VIII.

His biographer, whilst admitting his weakness, does not make anything like enough of it, but we cannot expect a non-Catholic fully to appreciate the crime of schism. Tunstal had all the requisite learning and knowledge to lead him along the same glorious road as traversed by his greatest friend and intimate Saint Thomas More, but not the courage. Dr. Sturge suggests, with some plausibility, that Tunstal was taken in by Henry's protestations that his assumed supremacy in ecclesiastical matters involved in no sense any encroachments on the rights of the clergy in matters relating to sacerdotalism. He is also careful to set forth Henry's suspicions of Tunstal, and his estimation of the bishop's value to his cause. For this reason he employed him elsewhere when Parliament or Convocation were debating on these points, or otherwise prevented his attendance. But it is not possible to live long in had company without being contaminated, and Tunstal finished up as a firm adherent of the Royal Supremacy, even to the length of writing in its favour and making rather feeble answers to Pole's pointed questions in *De unitate ecclesiae*.

Dr. Sturge is unconvincing in his views concerning Tunstal's theories on Transubstantiation. The bishop was no heretic, and his alleged objection to the use of that word comes from the poor authority of Bishop Carleton of Chichester, a pupil of Tunstal's Protestant nephew, Bernard Gilpin. That Tunstal was blameworthy in shielding his nephew and frowning down those of his entourage who objected to Gilpin we can readily accept.

In spite of the author's statement that Tunstal was leniently treated, we still remain convinced that Father Phillips' proofs to the contrary are sound, and that Dr. Sturge has not successfully rebutted them. He would, we venture to think, have been more successful had he taken a Protestant prelate, Parker for example, as his subject, rather than a Catholic bishop forced by fear into schism but resolute not to accept the tenets of Protestantism.

WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P.

NOTICES

PIE XI CONTRE LES IDOLES. Par André Saint-Denis. (Plon; 18 frs.)

The 'idols' are Bolshevism, Racism, and 'Etatisme' in the form of Italian Fascism. Depending almost entirely on the