

can, if he wants to, ignore the element of pious supposition and commentary, while the reader in quest of inspiration and devotion can be confident that he is not being offered an unhistorical "saint" to admire.

The revision has been carried out with remarkable consistency; I noticed hardly any places where there are bits of the original text stranded by the elimination of explanatory material which has disappeared in the course of the revision. However, one problem which was already there in the first edition has become, if anything, worse in the second: the bibliography, which also serves to explain abbreviated references, is seriously incomplete, so that references given in the notes are sometimes, as they stand, unintelligible.

The first edition is not completely superseded. The detailed appendices are not reproduced in the new edition. We are also given an almost entirely new set of illustrations, which complement rather than replace those in the first edition.

My chief regret (which avowedly reflects my own concerns) is that, in spite of his periodic hints that all was not well with MOPH XVI, Vicaire has never yet turned his mind to a critical textual study of the primary Dominican historiographical sources. This leaves him vulnerable on several points of detail. Thus he dissents from Scheeben's inclusion of the text *Solet divina* in Jordan's *Libellus*, but only to return to the older belief that it was an encyclical by Jordan. He does not attempt to answer Scheeben's arguments against its being an encyclical, and he simply asserts that there must have been manuscripts containing the work in this form. But a study of the tradition of this text has convinced me that there can be little doubt that the ascription to Jordan rests simply

on a sixteenth century conjecture and that there never was any manuscript presenting it as an encyclical. Vicaire also treats the alleged "second edition" of the *Libellus* as having special authority, but it is doubtful if there ever was any such "second edition". Vicaire himself refers to Altaner's account of the development of the story of Napoleon's resuscitation, which makes it clear that Ferrandus, at any rate, had an unrevised text of the *Libellus* before him. Vicaire also complains that Scheeben's apparatus makes no mention of any variant in *Libellus* 55; he does not appear to suspect the sad truth: Scheeben records no variant because there is no variant. The reading *et quidem*, which Vicaire accepts on the authority of the "critical edition", is simply a mistake (either Scheeben's or the printer's). The only reading which is actually attested is *et quidam* (which, as Vicaire says, rather destroys his interpretation). It would have been nice, at least if Vicaire had used his authority to clamour for a new, seriously critical, edition of the primary sources.

However, in spite of a few small blemishes like those I have mentioned, Vicaire's *Histoire* is a great achievement, and the thorough revision of it which he now offers us is an incalculable service, especially to Dominicans. It is to be hoped that an English publisher will take the occasion to secure a new English translation – and to brave the expense of leaving it in two volumes, and not give us another high-density tome, like the English translation of the first edition, which was almost intolerably unwieldy to handle and (thanks to a confusion in the notes) almost impossible to use.

SIMON TUGWELL O P

THE TRIUNE CHURCH: A Study in the Ecclesiology of A. S. Xomjakov by Paul Patrick O'Leary O.P. Dominican Publications, 1982, pp 257.

The author has worked hard and taken the subject seriously. He clearly believes that the Eastern Churches have influenced change in the Western Church in the last half-century. This influence has come through the philosophy and theology of the Russian emigration, where all lines

lead back to the Slavophiles. Their influence in Russia itself is believed to be increasing. But to one who has been familiar with the essays and letters of Khomiakhov, as we have been accustomed to spell his name, in their French form for many years, and would wish to know more of his Rus-

sian works, the book is disappointing.

It is said on page 85 that 'He fails to distinguish between the Apostolic Tradition and Apostolic witness and subsequent tradition', identified as 'the continuing living experience of the Church'. On the next page 'The Creeds do not contain any new revelation, but as criteria of the validity of the Church's preaching he places them on the same level as the Scriptures'. This view is called 'rather strange' but 'in harmony with what has been seen of ecclesiology. His emphasis is firmly on the presence of Christ in the Church, through the action of the Spirit, at the expense of the revealing and salvific role of the historical Jesus'.

The author in places cites Germans in German, but it does not seem to occur to him that 'the historical Jesus' could mean the Jesus accessible to historical research of the kind that Germans were doing. The passage cited on pp 66-7 as 'startling confirmation of this a-historical view of Christ' can be read as concerned with the irrelevance of such events as can be critically explored in comparison with the interior reality of the life of Christ in the Christian and in the Church. It is difficult for any Catholic, Western or Eastern, to deny that

eucharistic and Marian dogmas have grown up out of the Church's life. There is a case for saying that the same is true of Christology and of the Trinity, but also that the *filioque* developed into a dogma in disputations 'against the errors of the Greeks'. This was and is the real objection to it. At Florence it was qualified and could have been accepted, but the obstacle to the reception of Florence was the absence of Christians under Turkish rule, who could not receive it without adhering to a crusade. It may well be true that the present Eastern Orthodox position on the authority of ecumenical councils was constructed to justify this, but it is relevant to their present difficulties in assembling a council on either side of the iron curtain.

It seems to me that more use could have been made of Khomiakhov's English contacts in assessing his position. What impressed him about London was the silence of Sunday. No doubt he was wrong about this, but it does throw light on his interest in the adherence of a whole community to traditional sanctities. It may also be noted that his use of German philosophy is curiously Coleridgean.

GEORGE EVERY

THE PROPHETS, VOLUME I, THE ASSYRIAN PERIOD,
by Klaus Koch, SCM Press, London 1982. pp viii + 182. £6.95

The English translation of this lively German work first published in 1978 is to be welcomed. Koch's aim is to present the prophets (in this volume down to the end of the Assyrian period) as thinkers. While recognising additions and glosses, his emphasis falls on the prophets themselves. In this he selects a different approach from the now fashionable attempts to understand the prophetic books as reflecting a continuing and developing tradition mediating God's word to successive generations of his people. As a consequence of his methodology, Koch is more willing to assign material to the prophets themselves than many contemporary scholars. So with the exception of *berit* in Hosea (where the idea is dismissed), no mention is made of any Deuteronomic redactional work within the prophetic corpus. Yet surprise is expressed at the absence of the canoni-

cal prophets in the Deuteronomic History, itself explicable once it is recognised that for the Deuteronomists the law and the prophets were to be taken together, Deuteronomic covenant theology being the end of a long process of theological development finally systematised in the Deuteronomic History and applied to prophetic material.

After discussing the origins of prophecy and their ninth century antecedents, Koch concentrates on the classical prophets. There is much that serves as a necessary corrective to some popular ideas particularly in his comments on the prophetic attitude to the cult and the future. For Koch, all the prophets remain prophets of salvation 'in the sense that they presuppose that life will go on in an undoubtedly positive sense, for both God and the world'. His work is carefully backed up by val-