

Father Dockery has, perhaps wisely, made no attempt to set Davenport in focus against the background of that most interesting of generations, the men who were born late in the reign of Elizabeth, the men who grew up with those three newly established facts in English society: Anglicanism, Puritanism and recusancy. It was a generation which the events of 1642-1660 left curiously remote and, as it were, stranded: the main current of English history moved forward into the eighteenth century without them. So it seemed. And yet in 1961 it is less easy to evaluate their significance with confidence.

Father Dockery has made it his concern to give us the facts in an admirably clear and well-documented book. There are one or two unimportant slips of the pen. On page 83, 'gilded knights' will not do for *équites aurati*. On page 86 one notices 'Shelton' for 'Sheldon', and on page 103 'Cott' should read 'Coll'. And one imagines that 'his senile pen' on page 104 began life as a joke, was forgotten, and survived in cold print.

In conclusion, two particularly interesting points clearly emerge from the book. The first is that in Davenport we have yet another example of the way in which Puritanism and recusancy met and mingled in the same families. For Christopher Davenport's brother was the famous Puritan John Davenport, 'a most religious man who fled to New England for the sake of a good conscience'. The second is the variety of Christopher Davenport's friendships and, as they say nowadays, contacts. Both points would repay further scrutiny.

T. CHARLES EDWARDS

EMPERIOR MICHAEL PALAEOLOGUS AND THE WEST. By Beno John Geanakopulos. (Harvard University Press: Oxford University Press; 60s.)

Professor Geanakopulos is a Greek American Byzantinist of acknowledged distinction. His study of the reign of Michael VIII is the result of many years of research and of careful scholarship. In two respects at least it may stay definitive. For a Byzantinist its primary attraction is as a study of Byzantine diplomacy; the whole technique of such statecraft can now be illustrated from the practice of one of the greatest of Imperial diplomats. For the Church historian its value lies in the study of the prelude of the Council of Lyons and of the uneasy union between Greeks and Latins that followed. It now seems clear that the union might have been stabilized and have survived had it not been for Latin arrogance. There had been so much to strengthen it besides political expediency; the vision and the charity of the Franciscan John Parastron, the wisdom of the Patriarch John Bekhos, the pastoral urgency of Pope Gregory X. The final responsibility for its failure must rest with the faction of Charles of Anjou within the papal curia.

GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.

PERMANENT RED. By John Berger. (Methuen; 16s.)

Nowadays a book of essays is almost bound to be a revision of already published articles, and it is hard to find a series of articles which makes a

cohesive book. Although the general theme running through *Permanent Red* is constant, the various chapters are written in so many different ways that they upset the shape of the book. But to find fault with the form is not to deny the content.

Mr Berger is that rare bird in English criticism, a Marxist realist (or idealist), and his convictions give him, naturally, a certain detachment from the milieu we tend to take for granted. His theme, broadly, is the inherent dignity and responsibility of the artist, who is forced to play the fool by society or the art-market system or his own deep-seated lack of assurance. He contrasts this lack of foundation with the qualities of artists he admires. Piero, Poussin, de la Tour, Rembrandt, Goya, Picasso, Matisse and, above all, Leger, are his heroes and vindicate his conviction that art must return to a rational, figurative basis as a result of the artist's re-integration with society—presumably a marxist society. I should have liked a fuller account of this crucial point. How far were Matisse and Leger attached to, or detached from, the society their art on the surface reflects? What explains the extraordinary power of both artists to transform and redeem their respective societies? Here I think Mr Berger's habit of simplification lets him down, because, in spite of his brilliantly succinct and accurate appreciations of Matisse, Leger and Picasso, he does not hint at the whole problem being essentially a mystery. He does not even suggest an answer in the social field except in the rather forlorn hope that Africans and Asians will learn from our plundering of their culture.

This inability to solve the question of the artist *vis-à-vis* the society in which he works seems to me a fatal defect in a marxist book. The author, needless to say, has little to give in appreciation of poetry or of the intuitive, none at all to religion. As a result all his criticisms lack that absolutely vital dimension.

PATRICK REYNTIENS

THE CONCISE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHERS.

Ed. by J. O. Urmson. (Hutchinson; 50s.)

The editor of a popular encyclopaedia is expected to give some advice on how to use it. Mr Urmson's is the best possible. Read the philosophers, he says in effect, don't merely read about them. He hastens to add (for after all he must have spent a lot of time and energy editing this fine work) that textbooks and histories have their uses, but they can never be substitutes. In the end, like Wittgenstein's ladder, they must be thrown away.

If that is granted, this book can be warmly recommended. Mr Urmson has collected an excellent team of writers (though I wish they had been allowed to initial their articles: the brief biographies of the anonymous seem rather absurd) and it takes men with a mastery of the subject to write with the clarity and lack of technicality to be found here. The plan is a good one: a number of long articles on the main themes of philosophy, a reasonably extended treatment of the ideas of the major western philosophers, and