

during this century, and this serves to sharpen the regret that so great an opportunity is being lost of creating a cathedral which would look forward instead of backward. Lutyens' original conception, always a very long-term dream, has passed into the realm of fantasy. It is no compliment to him to produce a laundry-shrunk version of it, the eternal English compromise. It seems that it is to be left to our Anglican friends at Coventry to build the one great church of our age which, because its design is as essentially inventive and original as were all the great medieval churches, can claim to be in the true tradition of English cathedral building.

DONOVAN PURCELL

REVIEWS

I PETER; A PASCHAL LITURGY. By F. L. Cross. (A. R. Mowbray & Co.; 3s. 6d.)

The lecture here printed as a booklet of some forty-five pages is a good example of how one field of study can benefit from the interest of a man who is learned in the cultivation of another. Dr Cross, as he says himself, has been chiefly occupied in patristic and liturgical studies; and it is precisely this close but not exclusive concern which gives him a clue to I Peter that the *ex professo* exegetes have missed. In some of the earliest liturgical texts that have come to light, namely the paschal homily of Melito of Sardis and one of Hippolytus of Rome (the reference of this in Migne, by the way, not given in Dr Cross's notes, is PG 59, 735 among the spuria of Chrysostom), he notices that great play is made with the likeness of *Pascha*, the Hebrew for 'Passover' transliterated into Greek, and the Greek word *paschein*, to 'suffer'. The Pasch is the occasion of the redemptive sufferings of Christ, and according to Melito at least is prophetically, if not etymologically, named from them.

Then Dr Cross happens to observe that the word *paschein* and its derivatives occur unusually often in I Peter. The author of the epistle habitually refers to the sufferings of Christ, where St Paul would have talked about his death. At times he strains the use of language a little to bring in the word *paschein*. Dr Cross makes the shrewd guess that the author's preoccupation with suffering is really a preoccupation with the Christian significance of the Pasch, that he is using the word 'suffer' almost as a code-word, a key-word for 'celebrate', or 'share in', or 'undergo' the true Pasch, which is the death and resurrection of Christ.

I say that the *ex professo* exegetes have missed the clue, because in fact both the most substantial commentaries of recent times, Dr Selwyn's and Dr Beare's, while differing in almost everything else, seem to be at

one in considering that neither Melito nor Hippolytus throws any great light on I Peter. This is understandable, since these elaborate rhetorical pieces, dwelling with quite excessive vividness of detail on the Exodus and the plagues of Egypt, and positively labouring the typology, bear little resemblance to the restrained simplicity of I Peter, carefully composed though it be.

Besides this leading clue Dr Cross draws attention to some secondary points. The reference to milk (ii, 2) suggests the baptismal rite, described in the 'paschal rubrics' of the *Apostolic constitutions* of Hippolytus, of giving the neophytes a cup of milk and honey together with their eucharistic communion. The remarks to women on their hair, their ornaments, and their clothes seem to echo, or be echoed by, what the same rubrics have to say about women's hair, ornaments, and clothes when they are being baptized.

On the strength of these considerations Dr Cross proposes his thesis that I Peter is a liturgical document, in fact what he calls the celebrant's or the bishop's part in the paschal liturgy as it proceeded. Thus i, 3-12 is his solemn opening prayer; i, 13-21 his formal charge to the candidates for baptism; between vv. 21 and 22 they are baptized, and in i, 22-5 we have the bishop's welcome of them from the font—the tenses of the verbs being suddenly and significantly changed to the perfect. ii, 1-10 a 'fervorino' on the sacramental life and unity in Christ, preparing for the eucharistic communion; ii, 11-iv, 11 the sermon after communion on the duties of the Christian life.

The paschal character of I Peter has indeed been generally recognized by commentators, and is in fact taken for granted by the Church in her present liturgical use of the epistle in Paschal time. But no one has analysed this paschal flavour with such precision as Dr Cross. It is perhaps worth asking ourselves then, how far his very concrete hypothesis, if accepted, will affect either or both of those two contrary points of view represented by Dr Selwyn and Dr Beare. Dr Selwyn assumes that the epistle is an epistle, and Dr Cross's thesis, if substantiated, would naturally mean that this view would have to be modified—but not, I think, simply given up. After all there is the opening and the ending of the epistle, the 'Ave' and the 'Vale': furthermore there is that last section from iv, 12-v, 11, addressed *inter alios* to the 'presbyters among you', bidding them 'care for God's flock among you' or 'in your place', which is not so unepistolary in quality, surely, as Dr Cross would suppose. It is hard to say that these passages are merely added by another hand, because in tone and style they are very homogeneous with the rest. The trinitarian formula of the opening salutation is a most apt heading for the paschal theme. So we could say, and Dr Selwyn would probably not object to this, that we have what we would call nowadays

a letter enclosing another document. Only instead of putting the letter and the document on separate pieces of paper, the author quite literally encloses his document, by putting his 'Dear X' at the beginning and a few parting words with 'Love from Peter' at the end. The section, iv, 12-v, 11, Dr Cross frankly admits is not easily fitted into his paschal liturgy framework. Unless we suppose then that the solemn Easter baptism was followed by a solemn Easter ordination, this last section makes better sense if we take it as addressed to the clergy of another Church than the author's own, i.e. if it is a letter.

Dr Cross refrains from giving an opinion on authorship and date, but he does point out how primitive and unelaborated is the theology of the epistle, and this would favour the Dean of Winchester in his arguments for its apostolic authenticity.

Dr Beare, arguing mainly from that section (iv, 12-v, 11) which we have been considering, and its more urgent reference to persecution, dates the letter to the reign of Trajan, and identifies the persecution with Pliny's action against the Christians as governor of Bythina. And so just because his argument rests on the one section which Dr Cross cannot fit into his paschal liturgy, the contention that the frequent reference to suffering in the epistle alludes to the Pasch and not to persecution, scarcely impinges on Dr Beare's case.

Thus with admirable courtesy and discretion does Dr Cross, as a sort of visiting lecturer in the N.T. schools, make his valuable contribution to their studies without alienating either of the rival parties, or claiming to judge between them.

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

THE SYSTEM OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN. Edited by Allan Flanders and H. A. Clegg. (Basil Blackwell; 30s.)

The editors, together with Professor Kahn-Freund, Mr J. D. M. Bell and Mr T. E. Chester, have provided here a most comprehensive guide to the history, law and institutions of the complicated relations between worker and employer that have grown up in Great Britain since the Industrial Revolution. The social background is sketched in most skilfully by Mr Asa Briggs in a preliminary chapter which does not shirk the difficulties caused in modern times by the impact of the managerial revolution on trade union officials. Although collective bargaining is one of the central points of the British system, Professor Kahn-Freund brings out the interesting fact in his chapter on 'Legal Framework' that there is no general provision in the statute book to force employers to negotiate with trade unions. 'Our law has seen to it that trade unions are not unlawful, it has removed all those provisions and rules that led to the suppression of the unions, but it has, generally