

rather than on ideas, and that its re-Christianisation must be based on real conversion rather than on ideas of universal history, we shall be unable to answer Mr. Reeb's question: Christianity, at its end or at its turning-point?

Mr. Reeb concludes with the characteristic antithesis of our age: Here Christ, there Anti-Christ! He acknowledges that the whole of the modern world is Satan's work, and at its main stages, a perversion of correct ideas held by the Church. Whilst the Reformers claimed that for a thousand years the world had been surrendered to Satan, Mr. Reeb says that since 1300 it has more and more come under the rule of Anti-Christ. With regard to the present age, he actually speaks of a considerable part of mankind being "without grace," and accordingly without any communion with Christians. This lack of communion between Christians and non-Christians however is less the result of different ideas than of the increase in the complexity of material reality, and in the difficulties of life.

I only mention these points because they appear rather typical of a certain class of Catholic literature which, in recent years, claims to have superseded the traditional methods of controversial tracts. If we intend to overhaul these methods, we must trust our lay-readers and their intellectual capacities a little more. We must teach them again the great art of distinction. This is indeed difficult in times of emergency when we would rather receive large-scale maps in order to regain orientation in the maze around us. Less than ever, however, Catholics can avail themselves of the simple methods, cleverly adopted and elaborated by their antagonists. Even the simplest layman cannot be spared the cumbersome task of seeing truth in detail, and, in fact, it will be one of the great duties of modern popular theology by and for laymen to teach again the great truth that intellectual work is as troublesome as any manual, professional work.

JOHN HENNIG.

THE RUSSIANS AND THEIR CHURCH. By Nicolas Zernov, Ph.D. (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d. net).

EASTERN CATHOLICS UNDER SOVIET RULE. By Michael Derrick. ("Sword of the Spirit," 1s. 6d.).

Dr Zernov here gives us a skilfully compressed and very readable conspectus of Russian history and of the Russian Orthodox Church in relation thereto. The view of Orthodoxy presented is rather that of one school of thought, and therefore may give a somewhat misleading impression to non-Orthodox; on the other hand, the English reader gets some salutary instruction on some of the historical reasons for Russian suspicion of the Catholic West since the thirteenth century. But we are already indebted to Dr Zernov for several books about his people and their church, and it is therefore permissible here to

take up only one point in his latest work, and that in relation to the subject of Mr Derrick's pamphlet.

Chapter X of *The Russians and Their Church* is devoted to "The Orthodox in Poland and Lithuania." We are here presented with a picture of the Union of Brest-Litovsk in 1595-96 as a political conspiracy of the Poles, dovetailed into an ecclesiastical plot of the Roman Church and abetted by misled and ambitious Orthodox bishops in Byelorussia and The Ukraine, to force the Orthodox people of those regions into communion with Rome by the cunning device of "allowing" them to keep their own Slav-Byzantine rites and customs. Since then, it is implied, those Catholics of Slav-Byzantine rite whose territory did not (till our own day) return to Russian rule, principally the Ukrainians (or Ruthenians) of Eastern Galicia, have been kept in unwilling submission to the Holy See only by the coercion exercised by Austrian and Polish governments and by time-serving hierarchs.

That is a common view among the Orthodox; it has been accepted in good faith by many Anglicans; it has found its way into reference and other books. It is time it was modified.

To present the Union of Brest as a spontaneous movement of Slav-Byzantine Christians into unity with the West would be equally false. The motives were mixed, there were abominable things done on both sides. A tree is known by its fruits; most "human trees" are both good and bad, and the Union of Brest was no exception: its fruit accordingly was both good and bad. Dr Zernov presents the whole tree and the whole harvest as rotten.

It would be possible to criticize Mr Derrick's *Eastern Catholics under Soviet Rule* by going deeper than he does or by examining the matter from an angle different from his: but he does give documented contemporary facts and show some of the good fruit of the Union of Brest.

After the partition of Poland that began in 1772, many Slav-Byzantine Catholics, at the "invitation" of the Tsar, abandoned communion with Rome; other many were forced exteriorly to do so, by the knout, by the spectacle of their recalcitrant neighbours being deported to Siberia. No doubt today many Slav-Byzantine Catholics in Galicia and elsewhere are quietly abandoning communion with Rome at the "invitation" of certain atheist-sponsored Russian ecclesiastics. But not one of their bishops is at liberty there, and several have already died in Soviet prisons; hundreds of priests have been executed, imprisoned or exiled; five hundred priests, gathered in the cathedral at Lvov to protest, were all arrested, except those who were shot; the lay people are given the alternatives of repudiating their church or of deportation. Many of them have refused to submit; and of well over 2,000 clergy, only 42 were recorded to have thrown in their lot with the oppressors by June 30 of last year. Mr Derrick writes of these things; Dr Zernov ignores them and their meaning.

Their meaning is—as another reviewer of *The Russians and Their Church* has pointed out—that there were more and better things in the Union of Brest than Polish politics and ecclesiastical scheming; for men and women do not voluntarily give their lives or suffer persecution and exile for the sake of 350-year-old clerical intrigues and the political dodges of foreigners. Just as there are some things that Catholics can learn to their profit from the non-Catholic East, so there are things to be learned by Russian Christians from their Catholic brethren: among those things is the meaning of œcumenicity and unity. The Catholic must recognize as his brethren invisibly in the Church all men of good will in good faith, “Jews, Turks, infidels and heretics.” Are “uniates” alone excluded from *sobornost*?

DONALD ATTWATER.

LA THEOLOGIE DE L'ÉGLISE de saint Clément de Rome à saint Irénée, par Gustave Bardy (Editions du Cerf; 120 frs.).

A valuable addition by an eminent patrologist and historian to the “Unam Sanctam” series published by the French Dominicans. It will add little to what is already familiar to the expert, and its judgment on controverted issues is mostly conventional and sober, but it provides a comprehensive, inspiring and synthetic account of how the Church was viewed and how her life was lived in post-apostolic times.

V.W.

ATTACK UPON “CHRISTENDOM,” By Soeren Kierkegaard, translated by Walter Lowrie (Oxford University Press; 15s.).

“This is Kierkegaard’s last work, and almost the last to be translated.” We may be thankful indeed that it was not by these bitter and sometimes shallow polemical diatribes that Kierkegaard was introduced to us in England as he was in Germany.

Of course there is a great deal of truth in them; truth which is still a challenge to complacent Christians and to “defenders of Christian civilization.” Kierkegaard in his later days saw more and more clearly what Christianity is not; it is less certain that his almost obsessional preoccupation with contemporary hypocrisy and “twaddle” had not obscured even his own previous insight into what it is. It would be easy for a theologian to reduce many of his more extravagant utterances to perfectionist heresy and for a psychologist to suspect paranoia. It is trite but necessary to point out that he had driven both his opponents and himself on to the horns of a dilemma which could not be resolved outside the Catholic Church.

V.W.

THE ABBE EDGEWORTH—1745-1807. By M. V. Woodgate. (Brown & Nolan; 7s. 6d.).

Our grandfathers were very familiar with the name of Edgeworth of Edgeworthstown. For two members of that family had won considerable prominence for themselves—Richard Lovell Edgeworth, the busy bustling versatile inventor who just missed being a genius, and who sank into Byron’s “worst of bores, a boisterous bore”; and