

bare the innermost recesses of the great libraries of Europe. It is difficult to place the work under review in its proper position between the two extremes. The expert, wishing to verify some fact, may or may not find what he wants, while the beginner who, after standing through a Ukrainian Liturgy in his parish church, wants to know why the Pope allows this sort of thing, might have difficulty in finding out the answer and be forced to go away content with the information that the tradition which points to Mount Ararat in Armenia as the place where the Ark came to rest is unknown to the fifth century writer Moses of Khoren.

But even if some topics do seem to be dealt with rather summarily and others treated with rather too much detail for a general work (e.g. the origin of the word 'Coptic'), the two volumes are a mine of fascinating information for those who take an interest in the subject. Such tit-bits thrown out at random as that John of Monte Corvino translated part of the Mass into Tartar, or the Venerable Bede's distaste for Greeks (as shown by his comments on Theodore of Tarsus) make one clamour for further information. In its full description of the various rites, with many extracts in excellent translation, this work is most useful and is an excellent investment for any centre of Christian learning. The introductory chapter of Volume I should be read by every educated Catholic. 'Catholic Faith as expressed in the Eastern Liturgies' is a valuable section, though one would hesitate to say that transubstantiation, as distinct from belief in the Real Presence in some mysterious way, 'is clearly admitted in all the Rites'.

The mass of historical, philological and archæological information requires some previous knowledge of the subject in order that a proper sense of proportion may be maintained. To those possessed of such knowledge the book will be valuable.

R.B.

THE LITERARY IMPACT OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION. By C. S. Lewis.
(The Athlone Press; 2s.)

'There is no possibility of considering the literary impact of the Authorised Version apart from that of the Bible in general'. Mr Lewis is suspicious of the 'Bible as literature' and the 'aesthetic approach'; it is too authoritatively sacred a book to be so approached. So while he believes that as a canon of thought and behaviour the Bible has exerted an influence on English letters, he cannot find sufficient evidence to support the belief in the 'literary' influence of the Authorised Version to any remarkable extent. Without sharing Mr Lewis' gloomy views on the future of the Bible (which depends on views about the future of religious belief) one must welcome this deflation of a popular superstition.