

is the way in which the essential but too easily forgotten fact that the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation were two aspects of one movement is emphasised and illustrated. Inevitably and rightly, since he is writing for Englishmen, the English Reformation is in the foreground against the background of the Continent. At the same time the Continental Reformation is never allowed to be merely a background. It is shown as being, again and again, the decisive field. One is glad, too, to see both Eastern Europe and the Orthodox churches brought fully into the picture, though one would have liked an explicit account of that more civilised and tolerant moment in the Polish Reformation when conflicting divines were able to debate keenly during the day, and then to dine together as gentlemen in the evening.

Again, Professor Chadwick has to a notable degree what Chesterton called the Higher Impartiality 'which can speak passionately on behalf of both sides'. For example he makes the perfectly valid point that whether the Elizabethan priests 'were executed for high treason or martyred for religion since the two had now become identified' is impossible to say. High Treason is, after all, primarily a topic on which the lawyer has the last say. Then, in order that his readers should not suppose that this is the end rather than the beginning of the matter, he gives them the intensely moving altercation at the July Assizes at Durham in 1594 between the President, the Judge and the priest, Ingram.

Are there any reservations? The Catholic reader will, of course, be ready for, and will take in good part, the author's ambivalent use of 'The Church'; he will probably suspect and, I think, rightly the author's estimate of the number of Englishmen at the end of the sixteenth century whose personal allegiance would still by preference have been to Rome; and he will feel that the price for reform—theology apart—was quite unnecessarily high. Was Thomas à Kempis ever officially declared a saint? Borromeo was 'austere', but was he 'grimly' so? Finally and perhaps more important, the clash at Dart between Calvinism and Arminianism is insufficiently treated. And orthodox Calvinism was to find better and less repellent exponents than Gomarus, men closer to the moderate Augustinian tradition of St Thomas. After all, subsequent history did much to justify the Calvinist suspicion that beyond Arminianism, there lurked Pelagius, and that the conclusion of the matter would be Socinianism. Englishmen in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries who debated so hotly the famous Five Points were not wasting their time.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

ROGER ASCHAM, by Lawrence V. Ryan; Stanford University Press and O.U.P.; 45s.

Roger Ascham, who died in 1568, has lacked a full biographical study until now. This in some ways is surprising, as he has long been included in the school-boy's compendium as a scholar who knew Lady Jane Grey, coached Elizabeth I in Greek, and believed that Eton boys were too much whipped. He wrote a

small book in English on archery. It was published in his lifetime and remains worth reading, even by those with no enthusiasm for bows and arrows. His other, better known treatise, *The Scholemaster*, was only issued posthumously. It is something of an exaggeration to talk, as some have done, of Ascham's literary career. In so far as there was such a career it was a matter of unfulfilled ambition, of works unfinished, unprinted, or not even begun. He could write well. He was more than a competent classical scholar, one of the best in Britain at the time, and appreciated abroad. He managed to ride all political and religious storms, serving as Latin Secretary both Mary and Elizabeth. He seems to have been a pleasant, gentle man. Yet there is a heavy sense of failure and disappointment about his life; there was great promise in it, but little achievement.

Even Professor Ryan's thorough study leaves this impression unchanged; it is, if anything, strengthened by his sympathetic effort to present Ascham in a full-length portrait. The man who emerges is something of an ineffectual don, born a little too soon to be comfortable. He would have been happier in the eighteenth century than in Tudor England. His biographer has sifted great quantities of material, and carefully describes Ascham's writings, giving useful summaries and excellently chosen quotations, but he strains the evidence to give him heightened significance. Others have tended to do this when speaking of Ascham in histories of literature. For example, the fact that Ascham's *Toxophilus* is in dialogue form is hardly as remarkable as his biographer suggests. Not only were there the classical models which Ascham imitated, but also More's *Utopia* and Castiglione's influential work *Il Cortegiano*, both known in educated circles. An English work in dialogue form, more extensive and more profound than anything written by Ascham, had been presented to Henry VIII in the thirties: Thomas Starkey's *Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset*. There is a tendency for modern scholarship to think too much in terms of printed editions when looking for links in earlier periods and to overlook the influence of an educated social environment often more cosmopolitan and polyglot than our own. It is perhaps the main defect of Professor Ryan's useful book that it sees Ascham too narrowly, too much in terms of his own *corpus*. How little really is the contribution of Ascham's prose when placed beside the Prayer Book and Coverdale's Bible. How small and tame his style after the pages of John Knox!

ANTHONY ROSS, O.P.

THE CATHOLIC LAITY IN ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND 1558-1603, by William R. Trimble; Harvard University Press and O.U.P.; 45s.

Mr Trimble is an Associate Professor of History at Loyola University, Chicago. His study of the Catholic laity in Elizabethan England is based primarily on material in the State Papers, the Cecil Papers and the Acts of the Privy Council, with the main emphasis on the various enquiries and investigations made by the central government into the strength of Catholicism at different points