

establishment of the Irish Church and the Public Worship Act of 1874, theological and ritualistic controversies including subsequent legal battles, and other questions such as the rôle of the Church in education.

Tait had not been a 'safe' candidate and the 'layman's archbishop' was more attracted by his national or 'secular' responsibilities than his exclusively ecclesiastical duties. He tended to follow liberal, erastian and Protestant policies in an effort to secure the establishment, popular support and national influence. Thus in spite of his behaviour over *Essays and Reviews*, he usually tried to prevent the influential 'orthodox' party from alienating educated opinion. Such policies inevitably involved a degree of compromise as well as conciliation and his opposition to High Churchmen, for instance, who often consciously defied public opinion, eventually resulted in an uneasy truce. When they adopted a policy of civil disobedience, Tait was forced to concentrate on the unity of the Church rather than its national influence.

As archbishop, Tait supported the concept of a religious State and a national or established Church. In this context, it is perhaps significant that his last speech to the Lords was opposing an Affirmation Bill in the Bradlaugh case, whereas more liberal or more conservative

ecclesiastics both supported Bradlaugh. The fact that the Lords ignored him for the first time in twenty years was also symbolic. Parliament as a whole was ignoring ecclesiastical claims and the needs for ecclesiastical legislation. Tait's own attempts to secure this illustrated Parliament's unwillingness to 'waste' time debating ecclesiastical affairs. Largely as a result of a decline in the influence and importance of the Church, parliamentary indifference was becoming the practical alternative to disestablishment. Ecclesiastical leaders were no longer automatically figures of national importance and the last effort to make the Church of England the Church of the English had failed.

Such being the general situation, Tait could hardly have been 'successful' but he deserves more credit than Marsh sometimes seems to suggest. The function of an established Church in a voluntarist situation cannot be a simple one, and it is still by no means obvious what policy the Anglican Church should adopt on the question of establishment. One of the great merits of Marsh's work, however, is that it contributes towards an understanding of the historical background which cannot be ignored when this question is to be decided.

J. DEREK HOLMES

**EPHESIANS, BAPTISM AND PENTECOST**, by J. C. Kirby. *S.P.C.K.*, London, 1968. 207 pp. £1.75 (35s.).

Discussion on the authorship of Ephesians and the purpose for which it was written has gone on inconclusively for over 150 years. Professor Kirby in this book sets out to resolve the debated points, but first he surveys all the recent work on Ephesians (pp. 1-56), devoting special attention to Dr Ernst Percy's work which represents the most thorough defence of the Pauline authorship. This is all the more necessary as our author opts wholeheartedly for the opposite thesis. Having thus cleared the ground, he proceeds to examine Jewish religious tradition. This is undoubtedly the most interesting part of this work, even if a great deal of the content smacks rather of the *déjà vu*. But there is no doubt that the *berakah* of the Old Testament and Jewish religious tradition forms the background and is in a sense responsible for the *berakah* of Ephesians. Thus to take one example from many fascinating pages, it is useful to set side by side the basic parts of Ephesians 1-3 and a whole series of Synagogue

prayers (as is done on p. 133). Ephesians is thus seen both to echo and 'correct' the Synagogue prayers in the light of Christian revelation, e.g. in the *Shemoneh Esre* the reference to giving life to the dead is to physical death: but in Ephesians it is to spiritual death (cf. Ephes. 2, 1, 5).

In the last section of his work our author becomes convinced that Ephesians was written by someone with a knowledge of rabbinical exegetical works, that the Ephesian area was the place of origin of Ephesians (p. 165)—or in other words the letter long styled 'to the Ephesians' was really *from* Ephesus, and that the main part of Ephesians 1-3 is a *berakah* for use in public worship, possibly at the Eucharist (p. 138). Modestly Professor Kirby avers, 'all that we have attempted to do is to take seriously the judgment of competent scholars that Ephesians is written in a liturgical style, and to give an answer to the problem that the style itself raises' (p. 172).

Of special interest is how our author relates the Epistle to the Ephesians to the Fourth Gospel and to Ephesus. As all recognize, Ephesians is not addressed to a specific church, it has more the character of an encyclical 'to the Saints and faithful in Christ Jesus', yet it must have been connected with Ephesus in some way, or it would never have received the title 'to the Ephesians' (p. 165). And then, tradition, and some critics, have it that the Fourth Gospel was written at Ephesus. Scholars have detected many striking parallels between Ephesians and the Fourth Gospel. These are set out on pages 166–168.

The whole work takes on the character of an essay in Biblical Theology, and shows a laudable awareness of the essential unity of Old and New Testaments. It shows, too, in part the stages by which Christianity transformed its inheritance from Judaism, and particularly in the domain of liturgy. Indeed, what can be called the liturgical approach to the New Testament is often most fruitful in results. Thus Professor Kirby arrives at the 'high probability' that Easter and Pentecost were feasts of the Christian Church almost from the beginning (p. 82).

More puzzling is the assertion that 'confession of sin as part of an act of Christian worship is not found in any Christian liturgical document until the Middle Ages' (p. 144)—

because precisely in the act of eucharistic celebration we read of such a confession of sin in the Didache (14, 1). And why (p. 139) do commentators make such heavy weather of Ephesians 5, 18: 'do not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery, but be filled with the Spirit' (R.S.V.)? It would seem that erudite exegetes, who so often handle difficulties, lose the sense of plain statements without a catch. Ephesians 5, 18 is perfectly in accord with the teaching of Ephesians generally which is both hortatory and full of the theme of the Holy Spirit. In fact, Ephesians 5, 18 is perhaps best explained by 4, 30: 'do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God'. Then again, 'the careful way in which 1, 3–14 and 2, 11–22 have been constructed makes it highly likely that these passages had been written before our author wrote his letter' (p. 189, n. 85). Why should careful writing be suspect, when there is no evidence that our author ever wrote loosely or carelessly?

However, these are small points alongside the very considerable contribution of Professor Kirby's work. He may well win over many to his point of view by the very modesty of his claims. Yet much is propounded tentatively or by way of suggestion, and we may well wonder whether the problem of Ephesians has really been solved even now.

ROLAND POTTER, O.P.

LET ME EXPLAIN, by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. *Collins*, London, 1970. 189 pp. £1.50 (30s.).

THE ONE AND THE MANY: TEILHARD DE CHARDIN'S VISION OF UNITY, by Donald Gray. *Burns and Oates*, London, 1969. 183 pp. £2.25 (45s.).

The first of the books under review is an admirable compendium of Teilhard's writings, prepared by Dr Jean-Pierre Demoulin, the Director of the Belgian Teilhard Centre, and senior editor of the significant journal *Etudes Teilhardiennes*. Published originally in France in 1966, it has been translated mostly by René Hague, who shows once again his sound understanding of more difficult passages, and also by others where quotations are taken from works already available in English. The book's purpose is explained in the Introduction: 'I'd like to read Teilhard, but I don't know where to begin.' That sort of remark must be familiar to anyone who admires Père Teilhard and accepts his teaching; and yet, for all his anxiety to share his sense of wonderment with others, he finds himself at a loss for an answer. What advice can one give a beginner? As an initial introduction, *The Phenomenon of Man* is not only often difficult reading for a person who has

not a scientific turn of mind, but also rather lengthy. It seemed a good plan, accordingly, to compile a selection of comparatively short passages (confining ourselves to Père Teilhard's own words) that would give a complete panoramic view of his thought.'

Dr Demoulin's method has been to take the compressed statement which Teilhard sent to a Belgian colleague in 1948 under the title 'My Intellectual Position'. Written (despite its title) in the third person, this two-page statement was published in *Les Etudes Philosophiques* shortly after Teilhard's death in 1955, and it is now made available for the first time in English. Dr Demoulin analyses and expounds it phrase by phrase by using extracts taken from the full range of Teilhard's *oeuvre*. Following a useful summary, in the opening pages, of some of the key words in Teilhard's vocabulary, the book is divided into three sections, namely, Phenomenology, Apologetics, and Morality and