

speaking of the Moehler of the *Symbolik*), but because he has recognized the fact of development which alone gives its full dimensions to the conception of the Church indicated above, a fact which Khomyakoff has not recognized.

It will always be difficult to know how far Khomyakoff can be considered as representative of an Orthodox theological tradition. For myself, I believe that he can be so considered, just as I believe that the essentials of Khomyakoff's ecclesiological teaching can be and should be integrated in a Catholic ecclesiology. (The difficulties raised by M. Bolshakoff, pp. 166, 285, are not really important.) M. Bolshakoff, although maintaining that Khomyakoff's ecclesiology agrees with the Orthodox 'Symbolical books' (p. 169), does not conceal the fact that with respect to the rôle of the hierarchy Khomyakoff follows a line peculiar to himself, to which M. Boulgakoff's adhesion is not sufficient to make traditional (pp. 154-5). In this connection the letter of Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira, published at the beginning of the book, is very interesting. This expert theologian, well known in the œcumenical movement, shows plainly that Khomyakoff's theory is not entirely consonant with that of the Orthodox Church.

YVES CONGAR, O.P.

FOOL OF LOVE: *The Life of Ramon Lull*. By E. Allison Peers. (S.C.M.; 6s.)

Ramon Lull's disability was that he could find no collaborators for his great missionary schemes. Whether this was due to a defect in his roving character or no, it is certain that had he found men to work with, not only would his missionary colleges have anticipated the college of Propaganda Fidei by hundreds of years, but also they would have been rooted in contemplation far more thoroughly than the post-reformation activist age has been able to conceive. For Lull was, in spite of his *Arts* for automatically convincing all heathens of the truth of the Catholic faith, essentially a contemplative; he was a restive contemplative, but one whose life was spent in love of the Beloved. Professor Peers has written well of this self-styled 'Fool of Love', showing the importance of such a missionary with his wide-spreading sympathy. The author had plenty of romantic material to draw upon, and his deep understanding of Spanish literature makes it possible for him to wed the drama of Lull's active life with his achievements as one of the most accomplished, and surely the most prolific of writers during the 13th century.

A lay missionary who was martyred by the Moors as an old man of over eighty, a Franciscan tertiary who had begun life as a refined and courtly troubadour, Lull supplies a subject which is irresistibly attractive to the non-Catholic. But he was an intensely loyal son of the Church despite his constant disappointments from the Popes—he was even an eager promoter of the Crusades. He was well-known in Paris shortly after St Thomas's death, and much of his work of confuting the Averroists and converting the Gentiles was striving for the

same goal as Aquinas but in a different medium. His tendency to try to *prove* the dogmas of the faith is far removed from the unique contribution on the subject of faith and reason by St Thomas. But Lull was no heretic, and it is a tragedy that his ideals and his life have not become part of Catholic tradition in the realms of contemplative missionary accomplishment as those of the Angelic Doctor have become in the realms of Catholic philosophy and theology. Professor Peers's latest study of Ramon Lull will aid considerably in re-introducing the great lay preacher and mystic into present-day life.

CONRAD PEPLER, O.P.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLICAL REVELATION. By Hubert Cunliffe-Jones. (James Clarke, 7s. 6d.)

The importance of this book lies not so much in its conclusions as in its premises. For the author sets out to find a theology of the Bible. In this quest he represents the growing discontent of biblical students with the materialistic approach of the critics, who have for many years regarded the Bible as a document to be analysed but purposely overlook its divine character. That so many non-Catholics are now concerned to link up their theology with the Scriptures and at the same time to include what is of value in modern research is an example to Catholics. Catholic Biblical scholarship took the same direction more than fifty years ago with the work of Père Lagrange (whom the author fails to notice in spite of an attempted fairness to Catholic claims and scholarship), but the present Pope has had to recall the faithful to the Scriptures as one of the main sources of knowledge and life. Mr Cunliffe-Jones is impressed by this aspect of the encyclical, but he will not admit the final 'assumption' of God's authority working always through the Church 'by continuity', the principle which he rightly sees to lie at the centre of the whole encyclical. Yet he is equally dissatisfied with the out-and-out Protestantism of Karl Barth; he admits that the 'Bible is not the primary authority' and he speaks of the living Head of the Mystical Body. It would seem in fact that there lies an unresolved dilemma at the root of the author's theology of the Bible and the authority of the Church. We should claim indeed that were he quite logical he would accept the 'assumption' of the encyclical. But here we do not wish to raise old controversies, even though Mr Cunliffe-Jones has raised them in a new context and with invigorating freshness. We wish rather to point to the importance of the aims of the book and to insist that it should be read by every Catholic biblical scholar. It is an important contribution to modern Scripture studies.

CONRAD PEPLER, O.P.

EUROPE: *A Personal and Political Survey*. By C. A. Alington (Hollis and Carter; 18s.)

The sub-title of the Dean of Durham's book forestalls much of the criticism that awaits anyone having the temerity to write a history of Europe from Marathon to Munich in less than four hundred pages.