

masters at apparent cross-purposes, this is a very catalytic of thought; it is the way to the truest understanding of both. Edith Stein, translating and commenting on the *de Veritate*, rendered into living language the metaphysical concepts of St Thomas. These concepts in such language she developed in her major work *Ewiges und Endliches Sein*. It is much to be hoped that this, with her other work, may soon find translators.

But there was a third master. The immediate occasion of her conversion had been St Teresa of Avila's *Life*. From that moment she was by desire a Carmelite, and when years later she was outlawed from her more obvious vocation as lecturer and university teacher by Hitler's anti-semitic legislation, it was but the opening of the path to Carmel. Here was the master of those other works of hers, *Ways of Knowing God* and *The Science of the Cross*—this, with persecution. From the Carmel at Cologne she fled, perforce, to Echt in Holland. There she was arrested, to disappear for ever into the machinery of hatred and violent death; she died, almost certainly, in the gas ovens of Auschwitz. A scribbled note from her prison marks the perfect completion of her work: 'One can only learn a *Scientia Crucis* if one feels the Cross in one's own person. I was convinced of this from the very first, and have said with all my heart, *Ave Crux, spes unica*.'

COLUMBA RYAN, O.P.

MEDIAEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES. Supplement I: *Ailred of Rievaulx: De Anima*. Edited by C. H. Talbot. (University of London: The Warburg Institute; 25s.)

When Ailred of Rievaulx died in 1167 he left behind him a great reputation for sanctity and some writings of a spiritual nature, one of which, the Dialogue *De Anima*, has for the first time found an editor. This edition by Dr Talbot is prefaced by a striking introduction of some sixty pages in which, among other good things, the philosophical and theological background to Ailred's thought is sketched with rare effectiveness: no detail which might help readers the more fully to appreciate the work is considered too insignificant for their attention.

The text of the edition is based on MS Bodley E. Mus. 224. It is unfortunate, however, that many inaccuracies have crept in, most of which, no doubt, are due to those problems of printing and proof-reading that break the heart of every editor of such texts. The fact that at least a quarter of the foliation is at variance with that of the original MS indicates that like problems were not wholly absent in the present case. Their extent may further be surmised from a few of the slips that we have remarked in the edition itself.

First of all there is some inconsistency. Thus on the first page of the edition in a note to line 14, the immediate import of which is in fact

unsubstantiated by the MS, we find 'Iohannes *om. B.*' evidently implying that 'Iohannes' is being used in the printed text as the spelling for Ailred's interlocutor. Yet 'Ioannes' is the spelling actually adopted by the editor at the first occurrence in line 3; and this indeed, unhappily, since the MS contraction here suggests rather 'Iohannes'. Again, it is a pity that the critical apparatus which on occasion can be painstaking is at other times inadequate or simply lacking. On the second page, for instance, there is no apparatus whatsoever; and we are left in complete ignorance of an inversion (line 9: 'est necesse'); a correction (line 18: 'aer' for 'aqua'; 'aqua' for 'aer'); a substitution (line 12: 'sciscitatus' for 'sciscitantibus'); and a suppression (line 22: 'nobis' between 'talis' and 'prescribatur'). An intimation that the MS has 'sciscitantibus' instead of 'sciscitatus' would have helped us to unravel with more ease 'Cum olim puer cum pueris disputarem, sciscitatus ab alterutro quomodo Deus esset ubique'.

Any record of omissions or of slips in transcription cannot, of course, be expected of an apparatus. A number of these are of small importance, e.g. 'nondum' for 'necdum' on the fourth page, line 12; but others are serious enough to affect the sense of a sentence, or at least render less ready our approval of Ailred's style. Thus we are halted on the sixth page (p. 70, line 10) by having to brood over 'credibile est: Huius immortalitatis non sint vel ipsi participes?', while the MS gives us the more intelligible 'credibile est *ut* huius immortalitatis non sint vel ipsi participes?'. Clearly *homoeoteleuton* has a hand in some of the omissions that may be noted, as when on page 77 the entire phrase 'et audires aliquem disputantem de iustitia' is wanting after 'iustitia' in line 6—and a particularly insidious hand in wrecking Ailred's version of the Augustinian mental trinity on page 106: 'discernens, ex memoria cum ratione et voluntate' has been dropped after 'voluntate' at the beginning of line 11; and 'usus eius perversus mala voluntas' after 'voluntas' towards the end of line 20.

LEONARD BOYLE, O.P.

RUSSIA: ABSENT AND PRESENT. By Wladimir Weidle. Translated by A. Gordon Smith. (Hollis and Carter; 15s.)

It is often difficult for the western mind to conceive that the Byzantine and the Roman traditions are two fruits of the same tree, and that the Europe which 'is the faith', historically and geographically transcends the limits of the Latin Christian world. The schism was no absolute division of Christendom; and Russia, through the Byzantine tradition which derived from Greece and primitive Christianity, culturally became part of Europe. The opponents of this view, notably Professor Toynbee, have pointed to the impact of Asia, to the two centuries of the Golden Horde, and to Russia's geographical, language and cultural ties