

*La beauté sauvera le monde; . . .* (Author's italics.) These ideas call for more than statement, and for more interpretation, elucidation and guidance than it was M. Porret's purpose to provide. 'Notre désir', he tells us in conclusion, 'a été de raconter aussi clairement et aussi sobrement que possible, notre découverte de ce monde si nouveau pour un Occidental, et d'entraîner ainsi le lecteur non initié dans ce pèlerinage spirituel au coeur même de la Russie orthodoxe'. Is it perhaps unkind to ask whether so sober a recounting of such a strange and disconcerting discovery is an adequate invitation to undertake a hazardous pilgrimage? English readers should pack Dr Lampert's study *Nicolas Berdyaev and the New Middle Ages* also in their scrip before setting out on the journey.

CHARLES VEREKER.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH IN THE WORKS OF KHOMYAKOV AND MOEHLER. By Serge Bolshakoff. (S.P.C.K.; 18s.)

M. Serge Bolshakoff has devoted an excellent monograph to the idea of the Church and its unity in Khomyakoff's works and, secondarily, in Moehler's. The author follows the thought of these two theologians in its historical development. We see the Slavophile theologian's ecclesiology forming by way of answers to questions asked by the Tractarian, W. Palmer. Khomyakoff's synthesis is stated first according to his letters to Palmer, then according to the pamphlet *The Church is One*, finally as it appears in the polemical treatises which he wrote in French. In the same way we witness the awakening of Moehler's thought in the synthesis of *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, and then in the rather different synthesis of his *Symbolik*.

In this sufficiently detailed and well documented statement the author shows considerable balance and even a conciliatory spirit. He admits that orthodox theologians like Khomyakoff and Pitzipios are one-sided. As to Moehler, he interprets his thought with sympathy, but perhaps with too great dependence on the Protestant historian Vermeil, who, as is well known, saw in Moehler one of the fathers of Modernism.

The author rightly emphasises a profound similarity between the two theologians—both to some extent self-taught, both rich in deep spiritual intuitions, both incomplete and rather distrusted by the hierarchies of their respective Churches. Khomyakoff knew Moehler, and was possibly inspired by him. In their profound likeness the author sees an earnest of a rapprochement between East and West. For this likeness turns on the fact that both theologians conceive the Church as being above all a society of love, in which the external features are the expression of a spirit and a life. There is indeed, in Moehler as in Khomyakoff, a common tendency which I would readily characterize in the following way: each has tried to see the Church not as a 'thing', to which the faithful are exterior and spectators, but as a life in which the faithful are active. I believe moreover that in this respect Moehler's thought goes deeper than Khomyakoff's, not only because he has recognized better the rôle of the hierarchy (I am

speaking of the Moehler of the *Symbolik*), but because he has recognized the fact of development which alone gives its full dimensions to the conception of the Church indicated above, a fact which Khomyakoff has not recognized.

It will always be difficult to know how far Khomyakoff can be considered as representative of an Orthodox theological tradition. For myself, I believe that he can be so considered, just as I believe that the essentials of Khomyakoff's ecclesiological teaching can be and should be integrated in a Catholic ecclesiology. (The difficulties raised by M. Bolshakoff, pp. 166, 285, are not really important.) M. Bolshakoff, although maintaining that Khomyakoff's ecclesiology agrees with the Orthodox 'Symbolical books' (p. 169), does not conceal the fact that with respect to the rôle of the hierarchy Khomyakoff follows a line peculiar to himself, to which M. Boulgakoff's adhesion is not sufficient to make traditional (pp. 154-5). In this connection the letter of Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira, published at the beginning of the book, is very interesting. This expert theologian, well known in the œcumenical movement, shows plainly that Khomyakoff's theory is not entirely consonant with that of the Orthodox Church.

YVES CONGAR, O.P.

FOOL OF LOVE: *The Life of Ramon Lull*. By E. Allison Peers. (S.C.M.; 6s.)

Ramon Lull's disability was that he could find no collaborators for his great missionary schemes. Whether this was due to a defect in his roving character or no, it is certain that had he found men to work with, not only would his missionary colleges have anticipated the college of Propaganda Fidei by hundreds of years, but also they would have been rooted in contemplation far more thoroughly than the post-reformation activist age has been able to conceive. For Lull was, in spite of his *Arts* for automatically convincing all heathens of the truth of the Catholic faith, essentially a contemplative; he was a restive contemplative, but one whose life was spent in love of the Beloved. Professor Peers has written well of this self-styled 'Fool of Love', showing the importance of such a missionary with his wide-spreading sympathy. The author had plenty of romantic material to draw upon, and his deep understanding of Spanish literature makes it possible for him to wed the drama of Lull's active life with his achievements as one of the most accomplished, and surely the most prolific of writers during the 13th century.

A lay missionary who was martyred by the Moors as an old man of over eighty, a Franciscan tertiary who had begun life as a refined and courtly troubadour, Lull supplies a subject which is irresistibly attractive to the non-Catholic. But he was an intensely loyal son of the Church despite his constant disappointments from the Popes—he was even an eager promoter of the Crusades. He was well-known in Paris shortly after St Thomas's death, and much of his work of confuting the Averroists and converting the Gentiles was striving for the