mal generational experience in refugee communities. More striking about the senior Russian civil war exiles is, in my view, the outrage they felt at the very existence of the Soviet regime, their insistence that they, and not the Bolsheviks, best represented or embodied their country's interests, their obsessive certainty that Soviet power must fall and soon, and their determination to alert Western opinion by whatever means they could mobilize to the dreadful Soviet reality. Other national refugee communities, the Cubans in Miami for example, have felt some of these same passions in their own cases. Unlike the Cubans, however, the Russian civil war exiles largely failed to impress their hosts with the urgency of their pleading or the justice of their several anti-Soviet causes. This was part of their tragedy. But it did not prevent the Russians from developing and maintaining, to the best their difficult circumstances allowed, an often vibrant national presence in the great cities of Europe and America. Hassell reports interesting details of this from the Russian colonies in New York and Paris.

Refugees, usually counted among history's losers, are now earning their proper attention from historians. Hassell's extended essay adds modestly to our knowledge of the first Russian exile wave, especially its American component, at an opportune historical moment. As the author remarks in his Preface, the era of Soviet history to which the refugees belonged — few would have thanked him for this label — has now ended; and their descendants, to say nothing of later refugees from the USSR, can contemplate Russia at the start of her post-Soviet age. Unfortunately, it is by no means improbable that we may yet witness more Russians fleeing from their country in search of foreign shelter.

Robert H. Johnson

McMaster University


The Russian Orthodox Church has given the modern world a number of extremely influential theologians and philosophers of religion in spite of the many hardships of church life in the former Russian empire and Soviet Union, including such figures as Vladimir Solov'ev, Nikolai Feodorov, Pavel Florensky, Georges Florovsky, and Sergei Bulgakov. Aidan Nichols has undertaken to present Western readers with the thought of another of these influential theologians, Nikolai Afanas'ev. The book is based on Nichols' doctoral thesis and unfortunately contains a number of unsightly birth marks, the most annoying of which is his penchant for citing terms in a variety of European languages with no apparent purpose other than to demonstrate linguistic aptitude. In six chapters and a very brief conclusion, Nichols attempts to elucidate the key theological insight of Afanas'ev which is that the local church, when celebrating the Eucharist with its bishop, contains the fullness of that reality known as church. While the non-theologian may smile politely upon hearing this statement, Nichols rightly points out that such a view of the nature of the church challenges
all modern manifestations of that institution and in particular the idea of a "universal" church. Such familiar Christian realities as councils, dioceses, patriarchates and the papacy become irrelevant. Instead, the difficult matter of maintaining Christian unity is resolved by appealing to the witness of certain authoritative churches acknowledged by the others as being trustworthy bearers of the tradition. Afanas'ev postulates the existence of one church which enjoys a "primacy of love" with respect to other churches. In this primatial church all other churches will discover their own self-identity, thanks to which they are able to correct any possible deviations and thus remain in perfect communion with all churches.

Nichols traces the development of Afanas'ev's thought first by presenting the reader with a useful survey of nineteenth-century and pre-revolutionary Russian religious thought and later by describing the religious thought of some contemporary Russian theologians and comparing this with Afanas'ev's own contributions. A disappointing feature of this book is its cursory examination of Afanas'ev's own writings. In the seventy-two pages devoted to these, Nichols does not always clearly distinguish between his own criticisms and what Afanas'ev himself wrote. Two features do, however, emerge: though approaching ecclesiological issues from a historical perspective, Afanas'ev is an idealist whose notion of church is strangely cut loose of cultural-historical roots; and Afanas'ev was no lover of canon law. Nichols properly attributes the latter attitude in part to Afanas'ev's experience of canonical chaos in the Russian church immediately following the October revolution. His anti-canonical bias would then lead Afanas'ev to develop a model of the church with as little legal structures as possible.

Nichols himself has a thinly-disguised bias in his treatment of Afanas'ev. Nowhere is this more in evidence than in the chapter entitled "An ecumenical evaluation of Afanas'ev's ecclesiology" in which he attempts to re-cast Afanas'ev in a Roman Catholic mold. Nichols suggests that the dogmatic constitution Pastor Aeternus, which among other things defined papal infallibility, can be submitted to a hermeneutic based on Afanas'ev without distorting either Afanas'ev or the Roman text. The difficulty with such an approach is that it ignores Afanas'ev's hostility towards any notion of a church possessing rights of jurisdiction over another church. Though Catholicism bases its teaching about papal jurisdiction ultimately on divine right, many of the claims of the papacy are the product of lengthy historical development and reflection on legal precedents. The codification of primatial rights and privileges does not sit well with Afanas'ev who holds that any and all authority in the church rests ultimately on God. It is by grace or the Holy Spirit that one church acquires the position of primacy in the Christian context, and it is by grace or the Holy Spirit that other churches recognize that church as their authenticating center. Neither of the Vatican councils teaches this.

Precisely why Nichols entitled his book as he did remains puzzling. There is very little "Russian" and a great deal of "Roman" theology in it. For the reader who has little or no familiarity with ecclesiology Nichols' book will be difficult to comprehend; for the student of ecclesiology the book will disappoint because of its lack of coherent analysis. The Slavist