

TOWARDS A REFORMED UNITY

IS CHRIST DIVIDED? Edited by William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. (Penguin Books; 9d.) A CHRISTIAN YEAR BOOK. 1943 edition. (Student Christian Movement Press; 2s. 6d.)

Neither of these books lives up to the expectations which their titles arouse. The first—a collection of essays enjoying distinguished editorship—makes it plain that a considerable measure of charity reigned between the Reformed Churches ‘across the frontiers and above the battle.’ But despite frequent and usually well-informed references to the Catholic Church an imperfect sympathy with our position and very scanty reference to the Orthodox point of view make it questionable whether another text than I Cor. i, 13, might not have been chosen for the enlightenment of the book-stall purchaser.

The second edition of the *Year Book*, perhaps because its ‘general standpoint is that of the non-Roman Churches’ and yet finds room for two concise articles on Roman Catholics and the Eastern Churches, is a better guide to the growing interest in, and work for, Unity. The need is great, but the path is not easy. Rock-climbing necessarily precludes all short-cuts, even in an emergency. Yet ‘charity prevaleth above all things.’

H.K.

THE CHURCH OF THE EASTERN CHRISTIANS. By Nicolas Zernov, D.Ph. (S.P.C.K.; paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 4s.)

This is an essay towards understanding, in the form of a ‘description of the Eastern Church by one of its members who has lived among Western Christians for some years’; subject to a serious *caveat* mentioned below, it certainly should help the Westerner to a better appreciation of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

It is inevitable that some of Dr. Zernov’s historical and other judgements should be disputed. For example, he stresses the possible effect of early Celtic Christianity on the formation of the English religious character. But he overlooks the fact that in *England* the Romano-Celtic church was completely destroyed (at the barbarian invasions, and that the British Christians of Wales were on the worst possible terms with the nascent Christians of England after the coming of Augustine. Again, he says that Catholics would say that ‘if the Russians had been under the rule of Rome, the (bolshevik) persecution would never have happened.’ The present reviewer has never heard such a view expressed by any Roman Catholic. On the other hand, Dr. Zernov puts a very proper emphasis on the part of the Crusades (especially the Fourth) in making the schism between East and West definitive, and on the political origins of the schism in general. There are a few slips here and there: e.g., the monophysite split is put before the Nestorian