

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

with Asia, but they fail to distinguish between the raw materials of a historical development and the use to which these are put.

To emphasise and elaborate this distinction, to show that though historical Russia was on the margin of the West she was never outside Europe, is the aim of Professor Weidle's brilliant essay. Yet he is by no means a 'Westerniser' of the old school wishing merely to imitate and assimilate the rationalist civilisation of the West; nor does he, with the 'Slavophiles', regard his native country as a world apart. He shows indeed that Stalin accomplished the aims of both these schools of thought in the anonymous Eurasian Empire which combines Western science and dialectics with the nationalist self-sufficiency of the old Muscovy. But M. Weidle's primary concern is not with the political ancestry of the U.S.S.R. but with the much more important problem of Russia's spiritual existence.

He explains how the gulf between the Russian people and its rulers through the centuries prevented the formation of a Russian national consciousness. While in the West this problem was solved in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Russia had to postpone it until the nineteenth century when European society was already beginning to disintegrate. The century of Pushkin and Dostoevsky which discovered Russia's spiritual home in the European past, simultaneously nourished the conflict between the revolutionary ideas of France and of German socialism. German Marxism finally prevailed, yet it prevailed at a time when intellectually it was already a spent force, but when Lenin had forged it into an instrument of revolution for that new generation which had neither faith nor hope in the cultural tradition of St Petersburg. According to M. Weidle the revolution has been, and is, a terrible purgatory for the Russian soul, but it is a purgatory for which the West has supplied the instruments of torture, and Russia will not be herself again until the West itself has recovered its faith once more in the common tree of Golgatha.

ROLAND HILL

GALIGAI. By François Mauriac. (Paris, Flammarion. Distributed in Great Britain by the French Book Club.)

THE LITTLE MISERY. By François Mauriac. Translated by Gerard Hopkins. (Eyre and Spottiswoode; 9s. 6d.)

M. Mauriac's latest novel, though it presents the familiar domestic tensions, the appetites, frustrations, delusions and hatreds of a suffering and far fallen humanity which is peculiarly his own artistic domain, has its sombreness faintly relieved by a discreet light. The cathedral of Dorthe is, it seems to me, a symbolic presence, never far from sight, and therein clearly resides that reality of love which Galigai fails to discern beneath the unprepossessing appearance, the hasty and seemingly mechanical prayers of a few old women and schoolgirls. Against