

warmly affectionate woman, for whom, after years of bitterness and humiliation, there awaited a crown that brought a little happiness, much sorrow and the obloquy of history.

Mary Tudor could have found happiness as a nun, for her religious practice was true; she might even have found happiness as a simple wife with many children, for she loved babies. Her destiny was otherwise and led her along the path of sorrow. Against the splendid pageantry of her age, and its ugly turbulence, Mary Tudor appears in these learned and most readable pages as she was: very much a woman, very much the daughter of her father, misguided, ill-advised, but a good woman, and an honest one.

KIERAN MULVEY, O.P.

WILLIAM LLOYD. By A. Tindal Hart. (S.P.C.K.; 30s.)

JEREMY TAYLOR. By Hugh Ross Williamson. (Dobson; 15s.)

The importance of the Caroline Church of England is today receiving its proper recognition among the historians. It is important that English Catholics should share in that recognition for the Caroline divines are probably more important from the point of view of the historian than their Elizabethan forerunners. In the century-long process of the English Reformation they had the last, if not necessarily the decisive, word; and their influence is heavy, if often unrecognised, upon much of what the jargon of today likes to call the English way of life.

Lloyd provides an interesting contrast with Taylor. The one was a Welsh bishop in England, the other an English bishop in Ireland. Lloyd came of the gentry and was in the right line of those clerical aristocrats from the Principality who figured so largely in seventeenth-century Anglicanism. They were part of the Tudor inheritance and a consequence of the British Crown. Taylor was the son of a Cambridge barber, a scholar and a man of God. The tradition which Lloyd represented came to an end with the Revolution whose success he did so much to ensure. He was the last of the line. Taylor left to his country a more enduring and a more splendid, if less glittering, inheritance. Each, in a different sense, outlived his day and died apart from his fellows, and each was a true child of the Caroline Church of England. Each of them found himself unwillingly swept by the events of the day into the Roman controversy. The moral theologian from Cambridge turned to invective and the politician from Oxford used with vigour the traditional weapons of the Apocalypse and chronology. In a sense it was a trifle old-fashioned, yet Lloyd survived until 1717, and his Anglicanism is in its view of the relations of Church and state, implicit in the whole of Ellis Wynne's prose classic, *Y Bardd Cwsc*, to students of which Dr Hart's book will be of real interest.

While Mr Ross Williamson's book claims to be no more than a sketch

for the general reader which will give him, at the same time, a large number of extracts from Taylor, Dr Hart's book is a work of solid scholarship which puts everyone who is interested in the history of the Caroline Restoration and of the Revolution in his debt.

To describe Bleddyn ap Cynfyn as 'another medieval tribal leader' is so infelicitous as to border on the inaccurate; Llywarch ab Bran is not much better served as 'a Welsh bard of the Middle Ages'; and there is, if I am not mistaken, another portrait of Lloyd at Cefn, near St Asaph. So far as Mr Ross Williamson's book is concerned, many students of Jeremy Taylor will remain unsatisfied with his interpretation of his subject's character; and I, for one, must deny that the Anglican view of the relations of the Church with the State in the seventeenth century was necessarily 'Erastian'.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

CHAUCER. By Raymond Preston. (Sheed and Ward; 25s.)

Mr Preston's intention is to 'try to interpret the work of Chaucer to the reader of today'. The book is constructed around quotations. Mr Preston comments on situations, makes comparisons and provides a résumé of bits of narrative which must be omitted. The comments are just, the manner not intimidating and the whole is well informed from the corpus of Chaucer criticism ancient and modern. The difficulty for the reader with procedure of this sort is that of skipping constantly from quotation to comment. Those who do not read Chaucer may find it harder to concentrate on countless disjointed pages and half pages of text than to read the collected works. Those who read Chaucer may find Mr Preston's comments too chatty and too short. It is the natural disadvantage of trying to write criticism for so wide an audience. Extensive quotation has justified itself for Elizabethan and later poetry when accompanied with line by line, even word by word, analysis to show how the whole is created by the parts. No one has successfully analysed Chaucer in this way. The reason for this may be that medieval poetry requires a different and broader approach, or it may be that we deceive ourselves in thinking we understand the associations of Chaucer's words just because their primary meanings have not altered beyond all comprehension. Mr Preston assures us that we can understand the archaic text, but if 'the reader of today' feels more at home with Chaucer for references to Mr Ezra Pound, Mr Benjamin Britten, Yeats and Appalachian folk-songs, he may omit to notice that the propounding of 'the problem of evil' might be more expected from Mr C. S. Lewis than from the contemporary of John of Gaunt.

PETER LIENHARDT