

Blackfriars

pages. Even the list of Errata is itself erroneous! It does not contain all the Errata, and it does contain at least one Erratum which is not erroneous. The get-up of the book has a certain homeliness of beauty, an individuality consorting well with the contents. In our opinion, the book can go on the special shelf of high-class Catholic literature, and this is no small praise. It keeps a high level all through, and a careful reader will note many thoughts and expressions which will enrich his mental vocabulary and make him alert for still better things to come from Mr. Shewring, just as the *Angel in the House* leads up to the *Unknown Eros*. Patmore conned the *Summa* of St. Thomas twenty years before he joined the Church and began to tune his lyre to the Living Voice. In twenty years more, with some similar study, or identical, for none is better, Mr. Shewring, we may reasonably hope, will do something nearer to the Muse's own voice.

There is an exquisite epitaph on a monk of St. Benedict, a moving quatrain in Sprung Rhythm on a girl dying unwed, and a third on Thomas Hardy in Westminster Abbey. This last takes the form of a soliloquy by the veteran, drily spoken, but echoing into strange overtones through the matchless aisles built for a very different frame of mind. *Last Lines to Hermia* is very satisfactory in technique and colour, ending in a full chord of Paradisal hope containing not a vague emotion but a penetrating realism which can best be described as lyric wit, some truly distinguished work. *The Nuptial Mass* has also this quality of wide scope combined with hard stuff o' the mind, which makes it well worth learning by heart. There is power in the lines (Sprung Rythmic) *As Earthly Pilgrims* and strong piety in those to SS. Perpetua and Felicity. Three Latin poems are very good in class, but unequal in quality, the faultless one being the shortest. To Mr. Shewring we say 'Carry on.'

J.O'C.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. By Nicholas Brian-Chaninov. Translated from the French by Warre B. Wells. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne; 6/-.)

In his attempt to compile a history of the Russian Church Mr. Brian-Chaninov set himself a task demanding an expert hand, for it is by no means easy to compress so vast a subject into some two hundred pages. This work lacks a definite plan; indeed the author does not seem even to have settled the subject of his book, whether it was to be the Russian Church or the relations of Russia with the Holy See. However important

Book Reviews

the latter, they had no direct bearing upon the Russian Church, except in so far as regards the Uniate Movement in South-Western Russia. A detailed narrative of the Greek Schism under Photius and Cerularius, takes up nearly the sixth part of the book; this again only indirectly concerns the Russian Church.

Many needless details are given of the early days of the Church in Russia, and of the pagan beliefs of the Slavs, while far more important points are hardly mentioned. Though the writer correctly lays the responsibility for Russia's alienation from the Latin West upon the Greeks, he erroneously believes (p. 68) Theodosius of the Kiev Catacombs to have been a Greek and the author of the famous anti-Latin treatise (p. 107). This treatise is now generally accepted as the work of another Theodosius of Greek origin. Mr. Brian Chaninov considers that the Greek influence ceased with the downfall of Patriarch Nikon (p. 70), forgetting that it was at the end of the seventeenth century, after the great controversy upon the moment of Transubstantiation. When speaking of the struggle of the Russian Church for independence (p. 69) the author forgets even to mention when and under what circumstances the appointment of the Russian metropolitans in Byzantium was replaced by their election by a Russian Synod.

It would require a lengthy review to point out all the omissions and inaccuracies. The chapter on monachism alone would need many amendments, the passage referring to Nilus Sorsky (p. 101) being particularly unjust and ill-informed. Not only did he never plead for the monasteries' right to the ownership of lands and serfs, but on the contrary he and his followers manifested a truly Franciscan spirit in considering that property impeded the monk's perfection, and at the Council of 1503, and not of 1490 (p. 101), Nilus suggested that it would be good to deprive the monasteries of their lands and serfs.

Of the Moscow Metropolitans and Patriarchs Mr. Brian Chaninov seems to acknowledge only Nikon, whereas there were some outstanding personalities such as Metropolitan Peter, Alexis, Philip, martyred under John the Terrible for daring to denounce his crimes, Patriarchs Hermogen and Philaret Romanov, whose names the author does not even mention. He speaks at some length of Peter the Great, and has little to say about the next two centuries with the exception of a few anecdotes and legends. This was, however, the time of the final enslavement of the Russian hierarchy, and a knowledge of that period is necessary for the understanding of the present situa-

Blackfriars

tion of the Russian Church. On the other hand the author disregards the existence of a purely *orthodox* spirituality as represented by such men as Tikhon of Zadonsk, Seraphim of Sarov, or the recluse theologian and spiritual director Bishop Theophanes, who died in 1891.

The author would have done better to end his book with the election of Patriarch Tikhon. It is dangerous to write on current events otherwise than in a newspaper article; the book may not have left the printing press before it has already been outdated.

We shall not deal with the author's dissertation on Russian Church music; the pages on the Liturgy show that he has a very confused idea on the subject. He speaks of the *Missal* (p. 187), a book which does not exist in the Slavo-Byzantine rite! He probably means the *Sluzhebnik*, which is certainly not a Missal. We emphatically deny the statement (footnote on p. 189) that the triangular particles commemorating the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, the living and the dead are used for the communion of the people. Were it so, the faithful would receive Holy Communion of unconsecrated bread, which is untrue. Only the consecrated Host or 'The Lamb' separated from the first loaf is used for Communion. 'The celebration of the Eucharist is always preceded by a prayer (epiklesis).' The author, though apparently acquainted with Fr. Salaville's article in Vacant's Dictionary, seems to misunderstand the meaning of the Eucharist, otherwise he would not twice have made so great a mistake (footnotes on pp. 175 and 190). The *epiklesis* always follows the Eucharist, i.e., the Consecration of the Bread and the Wine, and never precedes it. The translation on the whole is good, but would have gained if revised. Vladimir, the 'gay pagan' (p. 15) is not a translation of the French 'gai soleil'; Fr. Pierling's metaphor that the Russian bishops 'taillaient leurs plumes' becomes unintelligible when it is rendered by the bishops 'mending their pens' (p. 140), and the last Patriarch Adrian becomes 'Andrew' for no obvious reason (p. 128).

G. B.

THE NATURAL MORAL LAW ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AND SUAREZ. By Walter Farrell, O.P.S.T.Lr. A thesis presented to the Faculty of Theology in the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, to obtain the Degree of Doctor. (St. Dominic's Press, Ditchling, 1930; pp. vii, 162.)

Jurisprudence, like other sciences, is subject to the influences of evolution, which render its study ever more complex. Law