

the Word. The Bible is not to be considered simply as a historical document to be judged by rational analysis, but as the witness to the Word of God which can only be grasped by faith. This Word is essentially a historical message; it is a *kerugma*, a heralding of a divine event, which took place in the life and death and resurrection of Christ. But the historical event cannot be separated from the divine message and judged by merely human standards. 'The person and history of Jesus are present in the *kerugma*, present with the same historical presence as that with which He is present on each separate occasion both with the disciples and with the Church of our own day and the Church of the future.' This conception of Christ as present always in the Church communicating himself to his disciples through his Word is one which a Catholic will have no difficulty in accepting. We should only differ in our conception of the precise nature of the Church and in our belief that the Word communicates himself primarily through the Church as the 'Spirit-bearing' community and only secondarily through the Bible.

Professor Gogarten bases his view on a very profound conception of man as an essentially historical being, which owes much to the philosophy of Heidegger, but it is a pity that he finds it necessary to reject not merely the dualism of Descartes, but also the whole metaphysical system of Christian thought and to claim that 'metaphysical thinking has been superseded by historical thinking'. In actual fact there is no difficulty in reconciling this historical conception of Christianity with orthodox Christian doctrine. It was already clearly formulated by Origen and developed by St Augustine and so passed into the medieval tradition. Doubtless we are more definitely aware of this fundamentally historical character of man and of Christianity than before, but it is a development of doctrine, not a supersession.

BEDE GRIFFITHS, O.S.B.

THE EASTERN SCHISM. Steven Runciman. (Oxford University Press; 21s.)

Dr Steven Runciman is one of the major historians of our time and his present study is a vitally important contribution to our slowly increasing knowledge of the developments of the schism between Greeks and Latins. It is essentially a supplement to his three volumes on the Crusades and would have been best described by the cumbersome title of 'the effect of the crusading movement on the growth of the Eastern schism'.

This is a subject which has never before been adequately explored, but Dr Runciman reaches the same conclusion as other scholars who are specializing on other facets of the schism. It is becoming increasingly

clear that the schism was a very gradual process of mutual alienation. Dr Runciman concludes that it is impossible to give it a fixed date. It has become apparent that the significance of the Cerularian schism has been grossly over-estimated; this is now proved by Dr Runciman in his second and third chapters. Most important of all, Dr Runciman has provided fresh evidence not only for the strictly sporadic but also the strictly local character of the schism in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; perhaps the most permanently valuable section of his study is his analysis of the relationship with the Latins of the Greek clergy at Antioch in the kingdom of Jerusalem and in Egypt and his emphasis on the disastrous effects of the intrusion of Latin Patriarchs.

The least satisfactory chapter is the first, 'The Historical Background', for the historical background of the schism is also the theological and Dr Runciman has never shown much interest in the elaborate technicalities of late patristic thought. He asserts that Western theological tradition 'tended to maintain that the Trinity was a single interchangeable hypostasis' and asserts that the Reverend George Every 'goes a little far in saying that Greek theologians taught that each of the Persons has his own hypostasis'. He would seem to hold that the principle of economy was applied by Byzantine theologians to doctrinal error as well as to defect in rite, and can state that 'right worship was really more important to the East Christians than right belief'. But it is right belief and right belief alone that has always been the touchstone of orthodoxy even if thus held to find expression inevitably in right worship.

Yet even if these criticisms are admitted they cannot spoil a great achievement.

GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.

SAINT DOMINIC DE CALERUAGA d'après les documents du xiiiè siècle.

Par M. H. Vicaire, O.P. (Les Editions du Cerf.)

Of all the works on St Dominic this probably comes second only to the original Latin texts which form its sources. One is tempted to quote at length from the preface by Father Terence McDermott, Vicar General, O.P., which is in itself an excellent review. He describes the book as '*un ouvrage contenant les principaux documents primitifs sur saint Dominique et les commencements de son Ordre; tels qu'ils se présentent avec leur vérité objective . . . sans interprétations ni commentaires personnels. Les introductions et les notes ont le même caractère.*' Would that many other saints might find biographers to do them the same service!

The chief documents here used are: the *Libellus de principiis ordinis praedicatorum* by Blessed Jordan of Saxony, the 'Legends' of Peter Ferrand and Constantine of Orvieto ('legend' having its original mean-