

exist before Christianity. This would have led on to a clear distinction between true moral fervour and secular fanaticism, with some account of where they parted company. But to blame Christianity for every kind of fervour over the last thousand years or more is a *post hoc* argument of the weakest kind. And this, with evasive leaps over the most threadbare parts, is what the argument amounts to. It is also noteworthy that Polanyi, like his predecessors, fails to discuss the relationship between scientific advancement and moral improvement. Social improvement is substituted for moral, and science and technology are barely mentioned. The theme of this interesting but unsatisfactory lecture is the relationship of Christianity to political and personal extremism.

RUSSIAN OPINION

Theological Studies in the U.S.S.R.

IN Moscow, the Patriarch has recently permitted the publication of a new annual under the title *Theological Proceedings*. Its editors describe it as a re-institution of the tradition of periodical publication of the work of Russian Orthodox theologians. Its aims are threefold: to reveal the spiritual treasures of Orthodoxy; to acquaint other Christian bodies with modern Russian theology, and to broaden the outlook of the Russian clergy themselves. 'Volumes will contain works devoted to dogmatic and moral theology, sacred history, the liturgy, patrology, sacred art and other matters affecting the life of the Orthodox Church.'

The first volume does in fact cover a wide range of subjects. It opens with a discussion of the Orthodox rite of Vespers, written by Professor Uspensky of Leningrad. His approach is unusual for a Russian in that he rejects the symbolical interpretation of the details of the rite which sufficed for all previous Russian theologians in favour of a study of the existing rite as the result of a long process of historical development. He therefore begins with the Jewish ceremony of prayer and the lighting of a candle at evening, a practice taken over by the early Christians with a symbolical interpretation of the light as a representation of Christ in his Church. He then traces the development of the Russian ritual from that of Jerusalem described by Aetheria in her *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*. Although the ritual has altered considerably within Russia, Professor Uspensky shows that it is derived from this source and not, as one might expect, from the rather different liturgy of Sancta Sophia.

Another article, by Fr Paul Cheremukhin, is devoted to the Council of Constantinople in 1157. Only the Orthodox were present, but the dogmatic decree of the Council on the Mass is accepted by the Russians. The point at issue was whether Christ could be said to offer the sacrifice and, as the second Person of the Trinity, also receive the sacrifice. The problem has not been raised in this form at any General Council, but the Orthodox decided that the words of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, 'Thou art the offerer and the offered, the receiver and the received', must enshrine the doctrine of the Church, and therefore Christ must in some way both offer and accept the sacrifice. Soterichus Pantucogenes, Patriarch-elect of Antioch, refused to accept this decree, and was excommunicated. He held that there was a logical inconsistency in the assertion that the same Person could both offer and receive the same sacrifice and that this assertion regarding Christ necessitates the Nestorian assumption of two distinct persons in Christ. Fr Paul considers that this application of logic to determine the truth of Christian doctrine is one of the signs that Soterichus was a Latinizer, but his principal object is not to show this, but to trace the influence of Nicholas of Methone, a bishop who did not sign the Council's decrees, on the arguments of the Orthodox Fathers, since Nicholas was personal theologian to the Emperor Manuel Comnenus who was active in the Council. He further remarks on the Council's importance in showing that the Great Schism did not immediately quell the theological life of the Eastern Church.

Professor Ivanov of Leningrad catalogues the material for establishing a text of the Greek New Testament. The classification of the Greek manuscripts and the list of translations into other languages which would have to be considered in a recension of the Greek text is a long one, and it seems to be included primarily to bring to the attention of the Russian clergy how much work could be done in this field.

Protopriest Borovoy contributes an attempt to identify the collector of the *Collectio Avellana*, a collection of documents from the Papal archives of the years 367 to 553. The original solution which he propounds is that Rusticus, a deacon who worked in the Papal archivium and was a nephew of Pope Virgilius, collected these documents for his personal library of ecclesiastical documents.

The final article is a sympathetic, but not wholly approving, study of the Old Catholic movement in its early years, for the author, Protopriest Sergeyenko, finds in the sect both Orthodox and Protestant tendencies. (It is, of course, the hope of the Muscovite Patriarchate that the sect may be persuaded to accept the jurisdiction of Moscow, since Western Europe is without its 'proper' Patriarch since the Great Schism; it is not the only case in which Western Europe has become a battleground for supremacy between the Patriarchates of Moscow and Constantinople, both claiming the area whilst the Pope remains in schism from the Orthodox.)

But the appearance of *Theological Proceedings* cannot blind one to the existence of a much larger number of publications devoted to the eradication of religion and the propagation of atheism. It is highly probable that Russians in general would be much more impressed by a visionary article

written by I. A. Kryvelyov on the causes of religion and Communist society. This appeared in the annual 'Topics in the History of Religion and of Atheism', and the conclusion of the article is worth quoting in full to reveal current anti-religious thought in Russia:

'Some qualities of the human consciousness which were causes of religion in mankind's pre-history are qualities of consciousness itself, and have a definite bio-physiological basis in the structure and norms of activity of an organism. Such, for instance, is the emotionality with which man perceives natural and social phenomena. Another is the tendency of consciousness to associate different stimuli whose external sources are, in reality, distinct—a tendency rooted in the physiological mechanism of nerve-contraction and of conditioned reflexes. The same is true of the orientating reflex and the mechanism of abstract thought. Some of these qualities of the conscious which give rise to religion under favourable social conditions continue to exist in Communist society. For example, whilst any abstraction contains the danger of idealism, it does not follow that reason will refuse to abstract in order to avoid this danger. Not only is abstract thought preserved as mankind develops: it acquires even greater power and ability to comprehend the essences of things. This is true in no less degree of many other qualities of our consciousness which have hitherto been incorrectly orientated and have led reason along the wrong path. But, inasmuch as in a Communist society there will be no social conditions capable of engendering religious beliefs, the possibility of religion and idealism will remain an abstract potentiality, not realizing itself and without even the chance to do so.

'At the same time, one cannot fail to see that many causes of religion and idealism completely lose their meaning in a Communist society.

'Here it is interesting to consider the fate of the feeling of fear, so important for religion's existence. Even if it does not vanish completely under Communism, it will at least entirely change its content. Man's fear of hostile social forces will disappear, as these forces—class-exploitation, war, unemployment, economic rivalry, national and racial barriers—will not exist. Even the natural fear of death will change both in content and in intensity. Complete material security, the liquidation of social evils, the inevitable future colossal advances in therapeutic and preventive medicine, the development of means of avoiding and curing senility and, as a result, the maximal prolongation of human life will cause death to cease to exercise its repressive influence on the conscious. And this, in turn, will mean that it will cease to be a significant cause of religion.

'This applies even more to such factors as the human capacity for logical error, and the tendency of thought to reason rigidly where a more flexible approach with dialectic method and logic are required. Mankind will abandon forever the metaphysical method with its woodenness and rigidity. The high level of culture will not permit the appearance and free play of religious phantasy in explaining the natural phenomena of human life and death.

'The colossal development of science, whose prospects are unlimited will permit men in a Communist society to solve those world enigmas which still checkmate their analytical reason. Thus the most important conditions for the genesis and existence of religious prejudices will disappear.

'But the most important factor in ensuring the demise of religion will be the inevitable eradication of its social causes.'

This requires only one short explanation: Communism is, to a Communist, still a future state of society, a stage not yet achieved even in Russia.

D. W. BLACK

HEARD AND SEEN

Picasso: Olé et Vale

IS it possible to write anything about Picasso which has not been written already: or which, though hitherto unsaid, is not boring? To judge by my own reactions: no. If I so much as suspect that an article I am reading is going to discuss him I simply throw it aside. I've had enough of picassology and picassophily, not to say picagiography, to last me a lifetime. All the same, I find myself wanting to record a few retrospective thoughts on the Retrospective—that stupendous display of paintings, from the pre-Blue through to the scarce-dry series of variations on *Las Meninas*, which the Tate set before us last summer. All other impressions apart, I was overcome at the time of my visit with a sense of *fin d'époque*. What *époque*? Why *fin*? If I attempt to answer these questions, and if in doing so I adopt a tone which is not exclusively panegyrical, it must be understood at the outset that my role will be that of a tick talking about—and perhaps presuming to criticize—a lion. Our relative magnitudes, his and mine, are as indicated; so also in great measure is the mode of our symbiosis. I have been nourished for many years from his bloodstream, and been carried, more or less helplessly clinging, wherever it has occurred to him to go. Nevertheless for some time past I have occasionally muttered to my neighbour-ticks in the same patch of fur, 'Blood's not quite what it used to be, don't you think? Bit thin. I've more than half a mind to move on.' And sure enough, after one last big suck, I drop off into the car park at Millbank: satiated, awestruck, humbled, elated, conscious of a curious disappointment as well as of the pettish resentment of the parasite towards its host. The great beast, meanwhile, stalks away into the unknown, propelled by muscles still as lithe and lubricated as when, fifty-one years ago, they carried him from Malaga to his first hungry kills in Paris.

Perhaps, for many of us, the Tate exhibition came five years too late. Up till 1955 or so he could have done anything he liked with us. He had