

minutes earlier every day to say an extra prayer. Otherwise we feel we would be like a man going into the boxing ring after a bottle of beer and a week in bed! We do not know whether we are right to feel like this, but it is our experience.

Finally, I congratulate your correspondent on his resolve to pass on the results of his studies to others. We too in our 'freak' societies—LOCK, KSC, CYMS, SOS, etc. (we number tertiaries and oblates among us too)—are doing the same thing. We are catechising, selling Catholic papers, helping parish priests, taking part in local housing problems, fighting local authorities about birth control and schools, bearding Communists in our unions, badgering the press and politicians, doing whatever comes to our hand, and have been for some time. This is the first time we have heard all this called 'futile'.—Yours, etc.,

THE AUTHOR OF *The Foot of the Ladder*.



REVIEWS

THE CHURCH IS ONE. By Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov. With an introduction by Nicolas Zernov, D.Phil. (S.P.C.K.; 1s.3d.)

It is a little difficult for a Western Catholic to understand how it was that this little treatise by a layman, written just over a hundred years ago, should have acted as a catalyst on Russian Orthodox theology. Dr Zernov, in his informative introduction, points to the history of the Russian Church as the explanation of why that church had to wait until the middle of the nineteenth century for a statement of its ecclesiology; but the reason why Khomiakov's treatise had such effect is revealed, perhaps unwittingly, in this passage: 'The most controversial part of his teaching is connected with the question of the supreme authority in the Orthodox Church. Khomiakov ascribed it to the entire body of the faithful, and he subjected the decisions of the bishops to the final approval or disapproval of the whole Church. The majority of Eastern theologians, especially since the seventeenth century, considered that the Episcopate gathered at the Oecumenical Councils possessed the charisma of the Apostles, and was entitled therefore to define the Faith without further reference to the Church. The disagreement between these two points of view has not yet come to an end.' (p. 9.) At the same time and given the disunion among the Orthodox Patriarchs themselves, it is not altogether surprising that Khomiakov should have sought another source for the authority of the Church. Having rejected the Papacy and the episcopate, he had to fall back on what Catholic theologians call the *sensus communis fidelium*, and there is at least that point of contact between his thought and the classical Catholic theology. But it is surprising he did not see that not only is that source of authority

evanescent without the other two but that in practice it just will not, indeed cannot, work. Perhaps if Khomiakov had lived longer or in a later age he might have taken the course of Soloviev, his most authentic heir.

But probably the reason why he did not see the inadequacies of his own theory is the deep-rooted Orthodox dislike of the juridical, institutional element in the church, and the rest of his treatise is largely of the church as what we should call the Mystical Body. He speaks with deep understanding of this inner and liturgical aspect of the church, and there, it seems to us, he is in the tradition of the great Orthodox theologians. From the point of view of re-union, which, alas, as the years go by seems less and less practical politics, the importance of the modern re-presentation of the church as the Mystical Body is obvious, but also the wisdom of the Holy Father in insisting on the juridical aspect of the church is not less clear.

Perhaps, then, this apparently innocuous treatise on the Russian Orthodox Church is important because it has raised so many questions it did not answer. No doubt Catholic theologians in this country study these matters but they keep remarkably quiet about the results of their lucubrations. It is to be hoped that this convenient edition, which is, I imagine, the first English translation, will stimulate the sort of discussion that has been proceeding in France for some years. At any rate, we should be grateful to Dr Zernov for his excellent introduction, long but not long enough, and for his work in making this revealing treatise available to the English public.

J.D.C.

LA SAINTE EGLISE CATHOLIQUE. By Chanoine G. Philips. (Casterman, Tournai; n.p.)

The usual *De Ecclesia* textbook is a formidable and vastly dull production in which the reader loses himself in technical complexities and archaic controversies, while his synthetic powers are frustrated by the rigid morcellation of the subject matter under thesis headings. In one's struggle with such a work it is only too easy to lose sight of its true aim and to slip into the rôle of a participant in a debate, which may be interesting enough as an historical exercise, but which does not seem to have any vital relevance.

Canon Philips's book quite escapes this category. It is readable and has a real unity throughout. In simple and straightforward language the author tells us what the Church is and points to her existence as a living, God-guaranteed factor in history. Without effort he makes use of modern research to clarify the problems he encounters, and while his writing is traditional in the best sense of the word, he always writes in a contemporary context. It is refreshing to find a book on this subject which is up to date without being full of superficial chatter about post-tridentine legalism and