

absence of distinctions' (p. 55). In the New Testament the problem of the Greeks was their relation to the people of God and entry into the Church, not the dangerous nature of Greek thought-processes. 'The New Testament itself gives very little footing for a theological emphasis on the Greek-Hebrew contrast' (p. 58).

Throughout the book and especially in the final chapter Professor Barr offers much discerning criticism of contemporary theology. On Bultmann's assertion that Heidegger's philosophy fundamentally represents the New Testament position he argues that 'all such attempts at historical parallelisms produce a damaging exegetical backlash. Having pinned one's theology to the validity of this identity, one comes to be under pressure to cast the evidence from the New Testament in a form which will support this identity'. Bultmann's failure 'to discuss Heidegger as an open philosophical question means that his philosophy works in an authoritarian way in theology, in this respect not different from the authoritarianism of traditional dogmatics' (p. 175). Professor Barr deplores as disgraceful the contemporary practice of stereotyping contrary theological positions by 'giving them a label taken from the history of ideas or of

dogma (docetic, evolutionistic, nominalistic, 'nineteenth-century view of history,' etc.)' (p. 183). This procedure promotes stultifying orthodox forms of mentality and the complacent fallacy that to identify (or to think one has identified) a position is to discredit it.

He consistently pleads for a diligent study of the biblical texts, carried on in dialogue with the world's understanding. Otherwise the use of scripture in the Church could 'easily degenerate into no more than the elaboration, illustration and presentation of knowledge that the Church already has' (p. 198). On the problem of scripture and tradition Professor Barr has many worthwhile observations, even if he does make the same mistake as Professor R. P. C. Hanson in describing as the Roman Catholic position the view that the magisterium lies *within* tradition (p. 171). As can be seen in the second Vatican Council's constitution on divine revelation, the magisterium stands – in a role of service and interpretation – over against the Word of God which is scripture and tradition.

Doubtless Professor Barr's latest book will irritate and annoy not a few scholars. But it is a book of refreshingly high value, and no mere tract by some Socratic gad-fly.

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

JOACHIM JEREMIAS, *THE EUCHARISTIC WORDS OF JESUS*. Translated by Norman Perrin. pp. 278. S.C.M. Press, London, 1966. 40s.

Professor Jeremias's work, *Die Abendmahls Worte Jesu*, was first published in 1935, but it attracted little notice in England. In 1950 the then Dean of Christ Church was able to write that when, during the war, he wished to consult the book, he had been able to find only one copy in Oxford! In 1949 a revised and enlarged German edition was issued, of which an English translation eventually appeared in 1955. This translation was – judged by the standards normally attained in works of this kind – quite a presentable version, but at times somewhat stilted and tedious. Perhaps this explains why it did not make the impact it should have made.

Now the S.C.M. Press has given us, in its series *The New Testament Library*, a handsome edition in a new and worthy translation; it is based on the third German edition of 1960 and incorporates the author's revisions up to July, 1964. The book is nearly half as long again as the earlier English version (278 pages against

195), and for a work of specialist character, the price is eminently reasonable.

The hallmark of Jeremias's writing is thoroughness, deep seriousness and fairness of judgment, so that his writings are always worth reading and pondering. He makes demands on the reader, but at a time when so much theological writing is superficial or tendentious, his book is especially welcome. Indeed, its qualities may be exhibited by examining the book under three headings.

It is *thorough*. As an example, we may take the first chapter, 73 pages long, which is an overpowering demonstration that the Last Supper was a Passover Meal. It is perhaps hard for us to realise that in 1935, at least in Protestant circles, 'the severance of the Last Supper from the Passover was by the vast majority accepted as so axiomatic that argument in a contrary sense was regarded as almost freakish' (the Dean of Christ Church, in 1950). The change is due mainly to the work

of Jeremias. It is particularly fascinating to read the pages in which Jeremias argues that even in the fourth gospel there are many traces of a tradition according to which the Supper was a Passover Meal: the author believes that John suppressed the direct references in order to bring out the parallel between the death of Jesus and the sacrifice of the Passover Lamb. In all this chapter, the only relevant detail which does not seem to have been treated as fully as possible is C. C. Torrey's suggestion that the phrase 'to eat the Passover' in Jn 18:28 means 'to eat the unleavened bread': everything else is treated exhaustively.

It is a *deeply serious* work. Here the most telling example is Jeremias' discussion of Lk 22: 15–18, in which he first shows that Jesus there announced to his apostles that he would not eat that Passover meal with them. Jeremias probes into the reasons for this over 11 pages, and concludes that Jesus abstained from the Supper in order to make clear to his disciples the irrevocable nature of his decision to prepare the way for the kingdom by suffering; to show them how completely his life was detached from this *aeon*; to impart to them a sense of the nearness of the kingdom of God; and above all to intercede, by fasting, for those who on the following day were to be guilty of his death. Here, as in the section entitled '... That God may remember me' (18 pages), there is much prayerful thought.

Above all, it is a *fair-minded* book. The author patiently gathers all the available evidence on a point, and assesses it dispassion-

ately. Wherever recent studies have led him to modify his earlier views, the change is noted with full acknowledgement. And unlike some other writers, he is equally ready to take into account Catholic as well as Protestant contributions. How many German (or, for that matter, English) theologians would take into account articles published in a French Catholic review like *Lumière et Vie*? Jeremias is just as much at home in patristic studies as in rabbinical writings, and his range of knowledge makes the reader instinctively trust him. Every page shows the author's utter devotion to the search for truth.

The book is not addressed to the general public, but only to those who are prepared to work slowly and patiently at a biblical text: after all, the author (without wordiness) has written nearly 300 pages solely on the account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. And yet precisely because of this, and because of the detached and scholarly style, one puts down the book with a feeling that this work was written with intense love. No man devotes so much labour to a topic he considers of secondary importance, and it is to be hoped that reverence for the Holy Eucharist will stimulate as many Catholics as possible to read and to pore over this book. Now that so many Catholics are convinced of the need to know some theology, perhaps the next task is to persuade them that it cannot be done without hard work. Here is one of the best possible books to start the hard work on.

J. MCHUGH

A NEWMAN COMPANION TO THE GOSPELS, by Armel J. Coupet, O.P. *Burns & Oates*, 42s.

Professor William Sanday once said that it was necessary to have a Newman with science and adequate knowledge, in order to write a life of Christ. Such a remark certainly seems to underestimate Newman's awareness of scientific and historical criticism but it recognises the literary and spiritual quality which he brought to any theological or devotional discussion and writing. It must ever be a source of regret that Newman felt compelled to destroy the notes which he prepared for his introduction to the projected translation of the Bible proposed to him in 1857. It is also to be regretted that he did not write a life of Our Lord, a task which so many others, often with fewer qualifications and of lesser ability, presumed to attempt during the nineteenth century.

Father Coupet has tried to remedy the last of these losses by preparing a selection of extracts from Newman's Anglican sermons in the form of a commentary on scripture arranged in the chronological order of the Gospel revelation. He has also prepared a valuable index which outlines the doctrinal system which Newman expounded in his preaching. This arrangement enables the reader, not only to study the life of Christ in Newman's language and through his sermons, but also to follow his theological understanding of the Incarnation and the Redemption. The index itself presents in a schematic form, Newman's Christology and Ecclesiology, referring especially to passages which deal with the three offices of Our Lord as Prophet, Priest and King, and with the