

that in the Passion story it escapes mention altogether. Robinson would take its high concentration at the commencement of the Gospel as indicating it as a main theme for the whole' (p. 22).

Dr Best argues further that the sin which Jesus comes to overcome does not – in the view of Mark, current Judaism and the New Testament writers in general – originate solely or even predominately from Satanic temptation. Thus Dr Best would not allow that the words to Peter 'Get thee behind me, Satan', imply that Peter is motivated by Satan. At this point Dr Best slips into a small inconsistency. In considering Cullmann's position he remarks that 'for us it is illegitimate to introduce Matt. 4.10' into a discussion of Mark 8.33. Yet on the very same page he uses Matt. 16.18 (where 'Jesus calls Simon Peter', implying that 'he is to perform the role of a rock in steadying his fellows') to interpret Mark 8.33 as meaning that Peter is merely 'behaving after the manner of Satan' (p. 29). Add too the fact that Peter's role as rock lies in the future. How would this tell against his acting here as Satan's agent?

In the second part Dr Best associates Mark's soteriology with I Cor. 15.3–4, where Christ's

work is seen as atonement for the sins of men. Jesus' ministry is directed primarily not against cosmic forces of evil, but towards men, to bring them into relationship with God. For Mark the coming Kingdom preached by Jesus is considered in terms of men receiving it or entering it; it is not connected with the defeat of the demonic world (as in Matt. 12.28 = Luke 11.20). In Mark, Jesus dies to deliver men from sin and create true disciples; at the Last Supper he has already interpreted his death in advance as establishing a new covenant for the benefit of men. This is all excellently argued. A grim (dogmatic) note intrudes when Dr Best suggests that 'Mark sets forth Jesus as smitten by God in God's judgement over his people Israel' (p. 158); in bearing for men the judgement of God, Jesus becomes 'the object of the wrath of God' (p. 153). The supporting exegesis is not convincing, in particular on Mark 10.38f.

But all in all this is a learned, well argued and delightfully clear work on an important topic. It sets a very high standard of scholarship for coming monographs in the series. Has an inverted comma been reversed on p. 15, line 11?

G. G. O'COLLINS, S.J.

JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT by Anthony Tyrrell Hanson. *S.P.C.K.*, 30s.

THE STUDY OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS by Cardinal Bea. *Chapman*, 16s.

Professor Hanson's contention is that the principal use which New Testament writers make of the Old Testament is not typological much less allegorical but consists in representing Christ as really present there, 'the real Presence of the pre-existent Christ in Old Testament history' (p. 7 cf. 176). He supports this claim by a detailed interpretation of three Pauline passages, five from *Hebrews*, four from Stephen's sermon in *Acts*, five from *John* and three from the Catholic epistles. There is a further chapter on Prophetic Prayer and Dialogue in Paul and he concludes with a brief examination of New Testament terminology associated with typology, finally summarizing his conclusions.

The first example from Paul is the preacher's headache about the tame rock which followed the Israelites in the wilderness. We know that this derives from the rabbinical idea of the God of Sinai who stays with his people implying (for the rabbis) that the rock of Sinai also stays with them. Paul applies this to Christ as part of his allegory (I Cor. 10:4). In this

context we can hardly conclude that, since *Numbers* 16:16 (LXX) has 'this is the bread which the kyrios has given you to eat', Paul understood that it was the lord Jesus who gave spiritual food to the Israelites in the desert. If it is an allegory, as Paul says it is, it would be much more natural to understand *pneumatikon* in the Philonian sense, especially since Paul clearly speaks of being 'baptized into Moses' and eating and drinking spiritual food and drink in order to direct his readers' attention to the Christian mysteries. Here as elsewhere Paul, a convert rabbi familiar with the scriptural exegesis of diaspora Judaism, employs a method a little less than typology and a little more than rabbinical midrash.

When we come to *Hebrews* and Stephen the argument is even less convincing since the typological intention is generally so plain, as can be seen not only in the use of terms which the author refers to in his last chapter but also and principally the direct juxtaposition of old and new, shadow and reality. Christ is *not* the Old Testament high priest, he is the reality of which

the Old Testament high priest was only the shadow, as his entrance into heaven is the fulfilment and supersession of the annual entrance of the high priest into the inner sanctum at *yom kippur*. The author of this epistle says explicitly that Christ *resembles* Melchisedek (7:3), a fact which Professor Hanson does not successfully account for. Similarly in *John*; the two texts in which Christ is represented as present in the Old Testament *in persona* (8:58; 12:41) are not typical but rather part of a representation which, though deeply true, will lead to the exaggerated and at times misleading way of speaking which we find in Church writers such as Mellito and Irenaeus. If we systematically applied Professor Hanson's principle throughout we should have no way of denying that, for example, since John uses the words of the Septuagint account of Isaac carrying the wood for the sacrifice when speaking of Jesus carrying his cross (Jn. 19:17 = Gen 22:6) then it must have been Jesus who was led out to be sacrificed by Abraham.

For the Christian, Christ is present not only in the Old Testament but in all history right from the creation (see Heb. 1:2). He is, however, present in a special way in the Old Testament since this has meaning (for the Christian) only as a Christ-process and because God was from the beginning, reconciling the world to himself through Christ (2. Cor. 5:19), which means that the End is present at every point along the line. This, however, is not what Professor Hanson means when he speaks of the Real Presence of Christ in the Old Testament. It would seem better to begin from the New Testament view of sacred history in its continuity and discontinuity and follow this up

with a clearer definition of different exegetical methods used in the New Testament. In this context both the value and the limitations of the author's approach would emerge more clearly.

Cardinal Bea explains in the Foreword that he was approached by some bishops during the Council who were worried about Form Criticism and wanted of him 'a brief, clear and easily understandable expose' on the subject. Those who have ever had anything to do with the Cardinal will not be surprised that he acceded to this request though an exceedingly busy man, and it would be churlish to complain that the results shows evident signs of haste as in the treatment of the relation of the form to the content of a literary unit (p. 28) or in the description of demythologization (I) as an extreme kind of Form Criticism (p. 43). One is surprised rather that so much relevant material has been crowded into such a small space.

The circumstances in which this little treatise or pamphlet was composed do not, however, provide any excuse for the English version which is not only translation-English of the worst kind (examples: 'exposed' for 'expounded', 'the very value' for 'the value itself', 'a sermon registered on tape') but at times ludicrously inadequate ('let him be damned!' for 'anathema sit', 'the cradle in which the Gospel message was born and grew') and, what is worse, misleading ('legend' is not what the Form Critics mean by 'Legende'). There is at least the 1964 Instruction in passable English in an appendix, but sixteen shillings is a lot of money to pay for that.

JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP

SYNOPSIS DES QUATRE EVANGILES by P. Benoit and M-E Boismard *Editions du Cerf*. 42 Fr.

LES EDITIONS DU CERF and the Jerusalem Bible people have done it again. P. Benoit and M-E Boismard have produced a *Synopse des Quatre Evangiles* and it is, predictably, a superb piece of work. One way of making such a synopsis is to seek behind the text of the four gospels a single narrative, a 'Life of Christ' and to present on the same page the parallel passages that refer to the same event or discourse. This was, for example, the method of Pere Lagrange whose synopsis of the Greek text was translated into French in 1927 under this same title. There are several obvious disadvantages to such a procedure. In the first place it imposes on the reader the editor's views about the order of events: are we, for example,

with Lagrange, to put all four passages about the cleansing of the Temple towards the beginning as John does or towards the end following the synoptics, or are we, like Tischendorf to put only John's account at the beginning and only the synoptics' later on. In the second place, and more importantly, this method distorts the actual literary structure of the Gospels themselves. It suggests that one evangelist has got an event in its 'right' place and the others have got it wrong. Lagrange, for example, in the case quoted, refers in a footnote to 'St Jean, témoin oculaire' in support of his view that the synoptics have put the cleansing of the temple in the 'wrong' place. Nowadays we do not think we can judge the Gospels by