

forced to scrutinize more carefully interpretations previously taken for granted.

There is nothing in the book to which a Catholic need take exception, though a reader unacquainted with current biblical theory may well see error where there is none. Thus, on pages 71 and 197, the author interprets the 'sons of God' of Genesis vi as angels. This does not mean that he thinks the angels capable of sexual functions; careful study of pages 127-8 should make clear to such a reader the theory which makes the interpretation acceptable. The text commented upon is the authorized version, but this is corrected where necessary. No use is made of the deuterocanonical books which the author, as a Protestant, thinks apocryphal. Even this point, however, is stated quite inoffensively (p. 213).

There is an occasional slip, as when the great eighth-century prophets are described as '*virtually* monotheists' (p. 26; italics mine), and when the author quotes Isaias xlii, 8: 'My glory will I not give to another', he comments: 'i.e. to another people, *not* to another god; and certainly not to a graven image' (p. 289). The synonymous parallelism of the verse, one would think, sufficiently refutes this contention.

One is also surprised to find a modern scholar adhering as closely as does the author to Welhausen's unfounded application of evolutionary theory to the religion of Israel. There is no evidence that this latter was ever henotheistic, and it is surely going too far to maintain that temple prostitutes (Deut. xxiii, 17-18) were considered by orthodox Yahwism at any period as 'holy unto the Lord' (p. 91).

FR RUDOLPH, O.F.M.CAP.

THE LIVES OF ANGE DE JOYEUSE AND BENET CANFIELD. By Jacques Brousse; edited from Robert Rockwood's 1623 translation by Anthony Birrell. (Sheed and Ward; 18s.)

A FLORENTINE PORTRAIT. By D. B. Wyndham Lewis. (Sheed and Ward; 12s. 6d.)

If one is not to be irritated by Mr Birrell's book one has to remember that the object of all historical writing, until a relatively short time ago, was never simply to inform but almost always to persuade. (Whether the modern historian is always the impartial arbiter of the past is doubted by some sceptics.) Facts which helped the case could be introduced at intervals; nothing adverse would be mentioned except as an Aunt Sally.

This gave to historical figures a curious and not really credible flatness, portraits without perspective. The good were incredibly good and the bad depressingly consistent in their evil doing. Lives of the saints, written for edification, suffered greatly from these disadvantages.

One must not therefore expect that the lives of Ange de Joyeuse and Benet Canfield will give a rounded picture, will make them live; the lives must be read, if they are, for other qualities.

Ange de Joyeuse was born in 1563 of an aristocratic family. He and his brother were employed from the earliest possible age by the king as commanders and administrators. Yet when Angel was twenty-four, a month after the death of his wife, he entered the austere Capuchin order. The king, Henry III, himself a Capuchin tertiary, was angry and disappointed, but complied.

In 1592, Angel's father and brother having been killed in battle, the people of Toulouse, alarmed by the approach of the Huguenot army, demanded that Angel be made their governor. He was rapidly and reluctantly exlaustrated. He did not re-enter the order until 1599 when peace was temporarily restored in France (the year of the edict of Nantes). Later in the same year Angel was briefly concerned in a clash of Church and state but the rest of his life was non-political. He died in 1608.

Benet Canfield was born in Essex in 1562 of a Puritan, country gentry family. He was converted in 1585 and joined the Capuchins in Paris. He came to England in 1599 (after being involved in the Church/state affair in Paris), was immediately arrested, imprisoned at Wisbech and in 1603 banished. He is known mainly for his book, *The Rule of Perfection*, an instruction in the mystical life. He died in Paris, 1610.

The historical background and an outline of the lives are given in a cleanly written introduction. The biographies add little to these facts, although in the life of Benet Canfield there is his own account of his conversion—starting with a virulent attack on the Protestants. One is therefore tempted to ask of this book: Is it worthwhile? Prompted by 'modern' requirements, one wants to know on the political level, what issues lay behind the clash of Church and state jurisdictions in this period of transition from organic unity of Church and state to their separation and their becoming institutionalized. One does see that the structure of behaviour was still medieval, society was still on a small enough scale for loyalty to be personal and for love of people for king and of king for people to mean what it said—not that it always did!

On the personal level one would like to know what were the motives and thoughts of Angel in first renouncing power and later changing from Capuchin to fighting general and back again, and what the other religious and laymen thought of these actions. In short, one is asking for a book which Mr Birrell might well have written himself using these lives as occasionally quotable sources.

What remains? It is claimed (rightly) that something of the flavour of French baroque is conveyed by Brousse's style, its sweetness

somewhat salted by Rookwood's translation. It would be unfair to condemn the book for not being a modern 'psychological' biography. Its values are indirect: the type of mind and thought which the style reveals (the tone is that of the kindest of obituaries), the recommendation of a way of life—and the inference of the deficiencies of the then accepted standards; it is a period piece which conveys the religious atmosphere of a time immensely different from the present, especially in its attitude to penance and mortification. The book is worth reading finally for the subtler taste which can savour the irony of lives of great austerity wrapped in layers of sweet luxuriant language.

How different is Mr Wyndham Lewis' study of St Philip Benizi! His aim is not simply to edify but also to inform and to entertain. But the attempt to make the saint 'live' is an impossible task. The use of various devices, the frequent 'must have been's and 'surely's cannot overcome a chronic lack of genuine information. There is really only enough for an extended biographical note. And, as in Mr Birrell's book, but for different reasons, a flat picture of the saint emerges.

Philip Benizi (1233-85) came of a well-to-do Florentine family. He joined in 1254 the order of Servites formed in Florence in 1249. He became the fifth general of the order in 1267 and travelled in various parts of Europe, founding new houses, and, in Italy, acting as peace-maker for the papacy.

The order was officially confirmed in Philip's lifetime. Popes followed each other in rapid succession; the ones who favoured the order did not live long enough to confirm nor the unfavourable ones long enough to disband it.

This uncertainty seems to have had no effect on Philip and when he died the order was firmly established in Europe.

This life makes no claims to be a scholarly work; sources are not usually quoted; imaginary conversations are constructed; probable meetings between St Philip and Dante and St Philip and Jacopone de Todi are posited; what is apocryphal is not always clearly stated; descriptive detail which could not possibly be known is included (this makes the portrait less convincing, not more); and a good deal of extraneous, if interesting, material pads out the book.

Again, what remains? A readable account of Italy and especially Florence in the thirteenth century with what is known or has been written of St Philip Benizi interposed. Something of the atmosphere of loyalty and opposition and devotion is put over, although perhaps Mr Wyndham Lewis is too pleasant a writer to convey its violence, the context in which St Philip and his companions found it possible to take literally the injunction to take the kingdom of heaven by force,

and inflicted the force on their own bodies to a degree which could not be admitted publicly in the present day of 'norms'.

By both books one's main desire in reading them and their like is left unsatisfied. One really wants to *know* what sanctity is like. Can it be that such knowledge cannot be found in books? or perhaps only in those written by saints?

S. H. TODD

THE GOSPEL OF THE INCARNATION. By George S. Hendry. (S.C.M. Press; 15s.)

This new book of Professor Hendry's which represents the Croal Lectures that were delivered in New College, Edinburgh, in October 1951, is called by him 'a work of theological integration'. The undue stressing by different Churches of one particular aspect or perspective of the gospel to the relative neglect of others lies at the root of the unhappy divisions in Christendom, and has resulted in a fragmentation of the total gospel of Christ. Nowhere is this more evident than in the isolation of the doctrine of the incarnation from the atonement, caused by the neglect of the historical Christ. The drawing together of these two central doctrines of the Christian faith by relating them with the life of the Jesus of history, is the theme of this book.

This relative neglect of the incarnate life by theologians is attributed by Professor Hendry to the misconstruction of the humanity of Christ by the Church in the west. He points out how some of the Alexandrine Fathers, St Athanasius, St Cyril of Alexandria and others, interpret the incarnation as the assumption by the Second Person of the Trinity of a universal human nature, so that by the very fact of the incarnation man is changed, redeemed, deified. Although only a few of the early Greek Fathers expressed this idea, it seems to have been something that was inherent in the faith from the beginning. For Professor Hendry the importance of this is that the incarnation is recognized as the source of the atonement, and a definite ontological relationship is set up between God and man which goes far to explain the vicarious nature of Christ's atoning work.

Although this idea of the consubstantiality of Christ with mankind is not unknown among the Latin Fathers of the west, it never seems to have flourished there. In general the doctrine of the consubstantiality of Christ with man was interpreted in the west in a less exact sense than the Chalcedonian definition seems to demand; and this according to Professor Hendry was the root cause of the rise of the various theories of the atonement in the early Church in the west, and resulted in destroying the objective ground for the vicarious character of Christ's atoning work. Thus one of his criticisms of St Anselm's theory is that