

garian monarch Boris decided to receive Roman missionaries and to expel all those whom Byzantium had sent. That Bulgaria should be her obedient pupil was an economic and military necessity for Byzantium and the fact that the statesmanship of Pope St Nicholas I had made the Bulgars look westward is the most probable cause of the sudden anti-Roman outburst of 867. But though in the Council held that year at Constantinople the customs and practices of the Latins and Nicholas himself personally were attacked, the evidence that any attempt was made to deny the Roman primacy is shown to be very meagre. Much of what was said was designed to persuade Boris and his people to come once again within the Byzantine religious and political orbit. Deposed later for political reasons, Photios was restored on the death of Ignatius. The negotiations between Pope, Patriarch and Emperor on that occasion are extremely complex, but Dr Dvornik shows conclusively that Photios was *not* excommunicated a second time.

Throughout the whole story Photios impresses us by his evident desire to keep in the background. For a short time in 867 he holds the centre of the stage. Otherwise he seems to be the victim of events in which Bulgars, Saracens, Franks, Romans, Lothair and his divorce, Leo the Wise and the troubles of his youth, all play their part. Except when Pope St Nicholas bereft him of his favourite child the Bulgarian mission Photios appears always as a man of peace and reconciliation. Perhaps the most fascinating part of Dr Dvornik's book is that in which he takes us through the literature of the great controversies of Christendom between the ninth century and our own, showing how long it took to piece together that picture of Photios to which we have become accustomed.

The book in which Dr Dvornik has handled this complex story makes hard but rewarding reading. In spite of the author's efforts there are still, it must be confessed, a number of minor points which puzzle us. Further, the character of Photios as it appears in these pages is rather negative. Will not Dr Dvornik give us some day a study of his hero as the beloved professor, the capable administrator, the organiser of successful missions to the heathen, the leader of the resistance when the 'City guarded by God' was beleaguered by the barbarians, as the vast majority of his contemporaries knew him?

RICHARD BLUNDELL, S.J.

THE ORIGINS OF THE GREAT SCHISM, A study in fourteenth century ecclesiastical history. By Walter Ullmann, J.U.D., F.R.Hist.S. (Burns Oates; 18s.)

The purpose of Dr Ullmann's present work is to answer the question, what was the cause of the Schism? To do this he examines first, in close detail, the events of 1378. Including the introduction, this occupies the first ninety pages of the book. In this portion of his work Dr Ullmann makes it clear from a com-

parison between *Factum Urbani* and the *Declaratio* of August 9th (both documents given in full in the text) that much of the evidence which is usually interpreted as substantiating the possibility that Urban's election was invalid because of the fear felt by the cardinals that an election of other than a Roman would endanger their lives, can be interpreted with at least no less supporting evidence as indicative of expressions of feeling natural to the time, place and circumstances. Thus when Dr Ullmann argues that the presence of the mountaineers in Rome at the time of the election by no means proves that they were there in connection with the election, and that their indecorous behaviour while there 'cannot be held surprising', he speaks the language of common sense. On the political side, and quoting the second (anonymous) biography of Gregory XI to support the behaviour of the cardinals towards the city officials, Dr Ullmann affirms the correctness of his interpretation of their fear—'the interpretation, namely, that *their fear was based upon the assumption that their elected candidate would be unacceptable to the Romans*' (p. 82, italics the author's.)

In successive chapters Dr Ullmann demonstrates the confusion and distress which arose from the rival claims. The case of England is set out with great care and chapter VII is of special interest to those who see in the reign of Richard II the England of Chaucer's Pardoner rather than of Shakespeare's Gaunt. In the chapter on *The Opinion of Legal Experts*, the views of Baldus de Ubaldis and of Johannes de Lignano are cited, with especial reference to the former, on the questions of the credibility of the cardinals and the authority, if any, of the cardinals over the pope.

There is always the risk, when one is dealing with the Schism, of setting the cart before the horse, and this book, though written without controversial intent and phrased with moderation, does well to draw attention to the importance of putting in their proper place the parts played by the racial and national questions in influencing the split. 'The nationality question', says Dr Ullmann on page 170, 'was not in itself a cause of the outbreak of the Schism: it became decisive when the break had already occurred, and the break was, in a sense, contributory to it.'

Dr Ullmann devotes his final chapter to answering the question as to why the cardinals broke away. As in his handling of the problem of the election of Urban VI he again attempts to see the answer through the eyes of the chief protagonists, the cardinals themselves. The characters of Urban and Clement and their social backgrounds have already been discussed; the knowledge of canon law possessed by the cardinals shows what facts must have been apparent to them. Their failure, then, to foresee the effects of his great position on Urban's character, their realisation within a month or two of what Christendom was to learn only too well in later years, Urban's total unsuitability for the office, drove them to have

recourse to the regulation that election of a pope under the impulsion of fear was null and void. So the moment came when they no longer had canon law behind them for their decision that in them lay the power to determine that their fear had been unjustifiable and to depose the pope whom they had gone through the form of electing.

Here the narrative of fact must end so far as the origins go; yet the problems involved are apparent and must appeal even to the lay mind unversed in canon law which is of course the key to the problem in the next forty years and thereafter through the ages.

It is with a suggestion of the trend of these problems and of the thought and argument that they evoked that the book closes, with an appendix which is an apologia of Cardinal Zabarella, in which the author applies once again the method of insisting on seeing the man and his problem against the background of his age.

In conclusion it is worth recalling Dr Ullmann's Preface where he speaks of the book's deficiencies and of 'a very modest attempt'. In so far as one's interest is continually being aroused by aspects of the subject which the title of the book forbids the author to pursue to any length, the deficiencies are there; to the success of the attempt this reviewer pays willing tribute.

C. J. ACHESON

SIX CENTURIES OF RUSSO-POLISH RELATIONS. By W. P. and Z. Coates. (Lawrence and Wishart; 21s.)

This is a curiously mistitled book. The authors are at pains to expound the current Russian propaganda about Poland. As such the book is useful. It is incontestably most convenient to possess a carefully documented and consolidated presentation of this particular thesis. Unfortunately the publishers' blurb on the dust cover presents the book as a serious history of Russo-Polish relations during the last six centuries, a work of scholarship, fully documented, weighed and balanced.

This is unfair to the authors. To begin with, such a book would demand scholarship of a high order, allied with that ordered concision which comes only from a full mastery of the materials. It would, in fact, have to be History in the full meaning of the word; no longer, in Acton's phrase, a burden on the memory but an illumination of the mind.

The book is based on the old nineteenth century nationalistic thesis of a Russian unity, partly but not irreparably damaged by wicked Poles and Lithuanians, and restored by the Partition of Poland. It is the old Tsarist thesis of Pan-Slav Orthodoxy. Quotations from Marx and Engels and the sedulous interpretation of everybody and everything in terms of the Marxian dialectic fuse the old thesis with the new orthodoxy. There is no bibliography and the authorities quoted are often of the most flimsy variety.