

The author is most at home in the intellectual world of the Apologists, and in the Alexandria of Clement and Origen. None will quarrel with his presentation of these as the 'pace-setters' in the assimilation of Christianity into the Graeco-Roman world; the reader is properly reminded that the works of Justin and Melito were *libelli* submitted to the Roman emperor as respectful pleas for justice and recognition—with them Christianity took its place alongside those interests in the Roman world waiting on the attention of the emperor. But the emperor, for his part, rarely took notice of the Christians, and even if he did he would, like Marcus Aurelius, view them in an unfavourable light. The Apologists and the Alexandrian school were important, as Professor Grant well shows, not for any conversion of the Roman authorities to a sympathetic view of Christianity, but rather for their conversion of Christianity itself to an attitude of convergence with the state and an acceptance of the Graeco-Roman heritage.

This conversion also made possible the transformation which, by the reign of Diocletian, had brought Christians into the imperial court (even to the fringes of the emperor's family), and into the army and the offices of state, and which saw the Church in Nicomedia stand facing the imperial palace. Professor Grant regrettably devotes little space to this social aspect of the Christian 'thrust' into the Roman world—regrettably, because this proved a potent factor in the ultimate triumph of the faith in the next generation or two, as was demonstrated by the late Professor A. H. M. Jones in Momigliano's *The Conflict*

*between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*. Much of the evidence which Grant himself adduces might have been turned to advantage here. It is not without its significance that a contemporary bishop could invoke the prayers of Christian soldiers to explain an event so memorable in the life of the empire that it was recorded on the column of Marcus Aurelius at Rome; a similar point emerges from the incident in the reign of Caracalla when the actions of one (and only one, it seems) 'conscientious objector' aroused the anger of many fellow-Christians in the ranks, who criticized his provocative behaviour. On another social question, Professor Grant notes Celsus' criticism of the Christians' disruption of family life—why not a reference specifically on this point to the telling evidence of the *Acta* of Ptolemaeus and Lucius, or to the *Passio Perpetuae*?

Professor Grant's brief, however, is a large one, and we must beware of demanding too much. In the short chapter which is all that can be allowed for the complexities of Constantine's reign the author manages to combine a succinct narrative with an assessment of the emperor which captures the essential ambiguity of his position, at once *pontifex maximus* and 'bishop of all mankind'. Such are the characteristics of the whole book: the evidence of much learning is presented in a manner which is concise and unburdensome, while the theme of the progress of Christianity into the Roman world emerges always clear and secure.

E. D. HUNT

**THE WORKS OF ST CYRIL OF JERUSALEM: Volume 2: The The Fathers of the Church: Volume 64.** Translated by Leo P. McAuley, S. J., and Anthony A. Stephenson. *Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C.*, 1970. 273 pp. \$8.65.

This second volume rounds off the first complete version, I think, of the surviving works attributed to St Cyril to appear in English (and the first entirely fresh translation of his catechetical lectures in their entirety since that made in 1839 for the Tractarian *Library of the Fathers* by the future Dean Church). Of the two collaborators, Fr McAuley appears only to complete his version of the (pre-baptismal) Lent lectures. The remainder is introduced, translated and commented on by Fr Stephenson (now a lecturer in the department of theology at Exeter), and it is his treatment of the Easter week series of lectures on the sacraments of initiation that constitutes the main interest of this volume.

These lectures stand rather apart from the rest, and for the past thirty years or so it has been known that there is at least a serious critical case against Cyrilline authorship; but Stephenson is, so far as I know, the first to set this out at length in English, a task which he discharges modestly, objectively, and, to my mind, convincingly. If it is accepted, and the lectures accordingly belong to the end instead of the middle of the fourth century, the usual version of the liturgical history of that century needs to be modified in certain respects; Jerusalem can no longer be regarded as the solitary pioneer of developments in eucharistic doctrine and of the dramatic build-up and emphasis on mystery which went along with it,

but simply as one centre among several in the Christian East in which these made themselves felt.

Stephenson exhibits a rather uneven awareness of these issues. Thus he correctly, in my view, suggests that the reason that the exposition of the eucharistic anaphora passes immediately from the *Sanctus* to the *epiclesis* is that the author is commenting only on what was audible to the people, and the practice of reciting the substance of the great prayer *sotto voce* has already crept in; but he does not seem to see that this and the relatively late date it presupposes makes unnecessary, and indeed far-fetched, the hypothesis of Dix that the anaphora in use at Jerusalem was a derivative of that found in the Syriac Liturgy of SS. Addai and Mari. Again, he rightly sees in these lectures not a little that is relevant to the dispute over whether it is the water of baptism or the chrism of confirmation that bestows the gift of the Holy Spirit; but he confuses this issue by (i) comparing the Jerusalem practice not with its contemporary neighbours but with that of the West two centuries earlier, and (ii) assuming that all Churches had both rites. A glance at the contemporary catecheses of Chrysostom

(published fifteen years ago by Wenger), to which he hardly alludes, would have disclosed that Antioch, even at this date, had no confirmation at all, and this suggests that 'Cyril' is commenting on a recent innovation in his Church, the logic of which has not yet been fully worked out. There is, on the other hand, a valuable note on 'Cyril's' doctrine of the eucharistic presence, which he shows to be by no means so close an approximation to transubstantiation as, e.g. Edmund Bishop thought and, indeed, somewhat further from it than some of his Syrian near-contemporaries.

Stephenson is critical of 'Cyril' as a stylist as well as a theologian; perhaps it is partly his determination to leave 'some of its infelicities unimproved' that has led him to desert, as a translator, the tradition established by Church. The result is readable, not to say racy, and wholly avoids, as too many patristic translations do not, any suggestion of the 'crib'; but to gloss the 'flying' of the seraphim in Isaiah's vision (the prototype of the *Sanctus* in the liturgy) as 'really "treading air"', as they are apparently stationary' seems over-scrupulous.

H. BENEDICT GREEN, C.R.

**JOSEPH ARCH (1826-1919), The Farm Workers' Leader, by Pamela Horn. Roundwood Press. £3.75.**

No man has exerted so great an influence on rural trade unionism as Joseph Arch, the first president of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union. He achieved this position because he responded to a call for action on behalf of weaker brethren who respected the strong and independent hedge-cutter who was also a Primitive Methodist local preacher. Information about Arch's career and ideas can be found in *Joseph Arch, The Story of His Life Told by Himself*, edited by the Countess of Warwick. That work, with its passionate and even revivalist tone, is very different from Dr Pamela Horn's factual study.

This author accepts Arch as a key-figure because he was so involved in decisive social action. Before the formation of the national union in 1872, landowners and farmers could think collectively of 'Hodge' and 'Johnny Raw', but Arch forced them to see farm labourers as human beings with rights and duties. The men Arch represented were simple folk blindly seeking ways to combat poverty, hunger and illiteracy; the local preacher who stepped into the limelight at the age of forty-six was pledged to fight for the labourers of

England as well as those of his own Warwickshire.

Dr Horn does not consider in any detail the career of Joseph Arch as a politician or his commitment to local preaching. She shows that he was elected to Parliament in 1885 and that he retired from such national activity in 1899 because he was said to be aged and feeble. Even so, he lived happily in his garden and cottage at Barford for another twenty years.

In this labourer's life there was a shadow, a sadness. Possibly it derived from the fact that the countryman found London life hurtful and troublesome; or from the bitter memories of his early days, or it could have been due to the total collapse of his union in 1896. Dr Horn does not answer such questions. Her 'value-free' account is, in some respects, a little bland and even patronizing as, for instance, when she writes of Arch's relationship with the Prince of Wales. She makes much of the fact that Sidney and Beatrice Webb referred to the 'glorified farm labourer' who was overcome with the honour of acquaintance with the Prince of Wales. All this demonstrates is that Beatrice Webb's socialism was barely skin-deep.