

out, 'it is not merely the influence of Kierkegaard's physical constitution upon his psychological constitution which is in question, but the influence of his hump in the question which occupies his whole work, his faith'. This inquiry takes Haecker and his readers into the very heart of Kierkegaardian criticism.

The author relates of Kierkegaard's faithful friend Boesen, how, 'Although he knew he sat by (Kierkegaard's) death-bed, and although he loved his friend and only wished him well in his last moments, Boesen had the courage to tell him that certain things had been exaggerated in the struggle and that his statements did not embrace either the whole truth or the actual facts'. Haecker was clearly eager to emulate this candid friendship, and his hero comes in for a good deal of kindly but firm criticism as well as much undisguised sympathy and admiration. His own standpoint is sanely thomistic, though his thomism is discreetly employed as an instrument of intelligent criticism, and never as a bludgeon or a rigid standard of comparison. But his strictures on Kierkegaard's use of the category of the 'Absurd', no less than some of his observations on Kierkegaard's alleged irrationalism, might have been considerably modified had he lived to consider the more recent work of Cornelio Fabro. This writer's *Foi et raison dans l'oeuvre de Kierkegaard*¹ should mark a turning point in Kierkegaardian interpretation.

The translation is for the most part very readable: some rather startling mistakes (*Dasein* precisely does not mean essence) should be corrigible by the reader; but there are one or two odd sentences less easily reparable. In compensation we are given several contemporary portraits and caricatures of Kierkegaard hitherto unpublished in this country.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

LE SENS DE L'HISTOIRE. Par Nicolas Berdiaeff. (Paris: Aubier, Editions Montaigne; n.p.)

This volume is the French translation of an early essay of Berdyaev's, first published in Russian in 1923. It contains, as well as a new preface to the French edition written by the author before his death, a reprint of the original preface to the Russian edition. Its translation into French has only an incidental interest for English readers, who have had the English translation since 1936 (*The Meaning of History*, London, 1936, Geoffrey Bles). Note, however, should be taken of an additional short chapter appended to the French edition, which was written in 1942 and entitled: *Histoire et Eschatologie*. Here, Berdyaev emphasises the three principal problems raised in any philosophy of history: progress, time, and freedom. Secular theories of progress are carefully distinguished from Christian messianic doctrines; time seen in its threefold aspect of cosmic, historical and existential significance; and,

¹ *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXII, No. 3, July, 1948.

finally, Berdyaev insists, as always, on the absolute and inevitable demand made on free, human, creative activity in the building up of the kingdom. 'L'histoire', he tells us in his discussion of time, 'doit avoir un fin, parce que le problème de la personne et de ses destinées n'est pas résolu et ne peut l'être a l'intérieur de ses limites.' The task of persuading a confused world that this is true, and that the men of our time look in vain for personal salvation within the categories of the temporal social order of history, is perhaps the most rewarding work which Berdyaev has left us to pursue in the second half of the twentieth century. C. H. V.

THE PHOTIAN SCHISM, HISTORY AND LEGEND. By Francis Dvornik. (Cambridge University Press; 35s.)

Modern research is for ever making us doubt the truth of the judgment on historical personages that we had before taken for granted. So many of them were based on literature intended as propaganda for the writer's contemporaries. Such is the case with Photios, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century. Hitherto he has been regarded by Catholics, Orthodox and Protestants alike as the champion of religious nationalism against the Papacy, denounced by the former as an enemy of the Church and acclaimed by the latter as a saint and a hero. Dr Dvornik, by research amazing both in its breadth and in its minuteness, has considerably modified both estimates. The clear-cut story of a struggle between good and evil, between the Patriarch Ignatius, upholder of Christian morality and the rights of the Holy See and Photios the usurper, is no longer tenable. In the disturbed conditions following on the iconoclast troubles the perpetual Byzantine political warfare between the Greens and the Blues seems to have been merged with the struggle between those who advocated extreme measures against the former iconoclasts and the more moderate party. Ignatius, of whose sanctity Dr Dvornik has no doubts, was of the former party. He was probably not canonically elected but was nominated by the Empress-Regent Theodora. Being compromised, probably all in good faith, in a plot against the government, he was, as we have good reason to believe, persuaded to resign. Photios, a man high in the civil service and of great academic renown, was chosen probably because he belonged to neither party and was expected to act as a peacemaker. He was canonically elected. At the Council of 861 Ignatius denied having appealed to Rome. Pope St Nicholas sent his legates to Constantinople primarily to help deal with the problems surviving from the days of Iconoclasm. At first the Pope held an open mind on the question of the change of Patriarchs, but later changed his policy, impelled, it seems, partly by the representations of members of the opposition who had fled to Rome and partly by a desire to vindicate the patriarchal rights of his See over Illyricum and the newly converted Bulgars who lived there. In 866 the Bul-