'Christian values', which are understood as more important than, and separate from, the capitalism/socialism debate. This argument is a recurrent theme in twentieth-century politics. Experience has shown in France in the 1940s, and in Chile in the 1950s, that in a capitalist society the Christian Centre always ends up allied to the anti-socialist forces. So it is not surprising that Priestland's view of politics which faith demands is in direct opposition to liberation theology, where the unjust structures of society are seen as the main enemy. For them, faith requires taking sides against capitalism and working for radical change in the whole system. For Priestland, concern with 'systems' is both irrelevant and dangerous: change must happen within individuals.

The aspiration to a wisdom that is above politics, that is neither Right nor Left, leads him into a number of inconsistencies. For example, his honesty and his intelligent compassion bring him to a damning indictment of our society when he considers how more than one-fifth of the population are marginalized by poverty; how in their powerlessness they become 'virtually non-persons'; how our education system betrays the people, 'Britain's poor are condemned to poverty in the classroom'. But earlier in the book he wrote with affectionate approval of the British lack of system as a defence of humane values. 'What has been really important in maintaining the humanity of Britain has been the alternation of parties, our devotion to the swing betwen the party of social fairness and the party of individual freedom'. (p. 77) and he mildly refers to 'our curious class system which seems to have as much to do with heredity as with money'. Such a view could only be held by someone who had not suffered from that system.

Even his own particular idiosyncracy, his pacifism, is expressed as a personal preference. So careful is he not to be intolerant or dogmatic that he argues that the pacifist and soldier together can work for peace.

I would describe this as a quaintly old-fashioned book with its pre-sociological understanding of human nature, but the popularity of the SDP, particularly among middle-class Christians, shows that there is plenty of life left in the old liberal individualist dog yet.

MARY H. PEPPER

MUḤAMMAD AND THE CHRISTIAN by Kenneth Cragg. *DLT/Orbis Paperback.* **1984 Pp. 180. £5.95.**

I read this book during Holy Week, which seemed more and more appropriate as I followed its movement between the themes of God's sending of manifest victory in triumphal entry, and God's coming in suffering love in crucifixion. The text focusses on Muḥammad in such a way that it broadens into an exploration of, and challenge to, the self-understanding of both Islam and Christianity.

Kenneth Cragg seeks to offer at least one Christian's view of Muḥammad. It is written in the light of Christianity's 'scandalous rejection' and 'puzzling silence' and in the knowledge, which comes from his own continuing dialogue, that Muslims look for Christian acknowledgement of the prophet Muḥammad and 'do not understand why we refuse to grant to Muḥammad the respect they themselves grant to the person of Jesus'. (p. ix) He sees his interpretation and purpose as positive and mediating, which he knows will bring mixed reactions from both Muslims and Christians and from the independent academic world, despite his desire to 'use all gently'. The difficulty and potential criticisms of his task have not deterred Kenneth Cragg, and if read carefully his text anticipates and answers many of the criticisms the book will receive. To those academics who accuse him of violating the autonomous nature of Islam in drawing out comparable material he says: 'To hold this balance between due recognition of genuine religious identity, and an authentic criteria that might belong to all, is no easy enterprise' (p. 13). He refuses to allow 'that the autonomies of religions have other than one humanity'. (p. 123) To Muslims he says 'an Islam that has no mind to privatize its relevance has no warrant to immunize its claims' (p.13). To Christians he offers the challenge of 'glad recognition of what prophethood, like that of the Qur'ān, declares and serves. In the broadest terms it means the rule of God, the reality of divine power, wisdom, mercy and justice'. (p. 145). The difficulties of the task he has set himself are matched by a dense and complex style in which individual words and phrases are packed with meaning and, if grappled with, become memorable.

The first chapter is an overall view of the issues to be explored later in the book. Firstly there is the challenge of the historical picture of Muḥammad and his 'practising far too freely the sanction of power'. This theme is developed in chapters two and three and is basic to the conclusions of the book. Secondly there is the more phenomenological task of understanding the Muḥammad of sweet and rich devotion: enshrining within himself the very focus of spiritual aspiration' (p. 4). This is the subject of chapters four and five and is, I think, where many general readers will find the richest source of understanding. The third area is 'the nature of the prophetic consciousness' in relation to revelation and the event of the Qur'ān and Christian appreciation of the book of Islam. This is dealt with in chapters six and seven. The movement from consideration of the prophet to more general Islamic topics is justified by Kenneth Cragg in the following terms: 'At the end of the day there is only one question. It is the question of God. The question of Muḥammad can end nowhere else ... The Qur'ān and Muḥammad belong together ...it is only in the total context of the Book and people that an "answer" to the "question" of Muḥammad can be reached'. (p. 139 f.). Chapters eight and nine try to bring together the meaning of Muḥammad and the Christian response.

The themes which emerge throughout the book and which are stated explicitly in the last chapters are the identification of Muḥammad and Islam with a truth expressed as 'prophetic experience of a destiny for conflict in which a physical victory is won' (p. 142). In 'manifest victory' Muḥammad and Islam fulfil their destiny of subduing the world to God and put away the distinction between Caesar's realm and God's. Of Muḥammad Kenneth Cragg says 'in his own person he saw them compatible' (p. 159). On this logic Kenneth Cragg sees in Shī'ah Islam the point where Muslims 'know from their own internal history the inadequacy of "manifest victory" as the fulfilment of religious meaning or the condition of spiritual truth' (p. 145). Christianity, then, is 'more than prophecy', joins 'truth and travail' and affirms 'prophetic word and wounds' (p. 142—143) and Kenneth Cragg concludes the book 'when Jesus replied to a questioner "Render to Caesar...", he did not mean that Caesar's realm was one of divine indifference... On the contrary, he meant that the things of God, in their inclusiveness, cannot be identified with the interests of Caesar or entrusted to his ways. It was Muḥammad's understanding of the "things of God" which...put away the distinction (p. 159).

Two important points need to be made about Kenneth Cragg's conclusions. He is right methodologically to compare (if comparisons are to be made) Jesus and Muḥammad on the issue of suffering and power, but the Muslim response to this is to point to Christian history as living out the Muslim position. Since Kenneth Cragg uses the example of Shī'ah Islam to show support for the deeper truth of his own poistion, the Muslim can use history too. Since the author himself introduces a Jewish dimension to the issue (p. 157) it is salutory to balance Christian claims to 'truth and travail' against the Jewish question posed as 'Which community has *lived out* the destiny of the suffering servant?' It is only fair to say that Kenneth Cragg mentions the problem of Christian history (p. 46; 51; 159) but does not draw out its implications for his discussion. This brings me to my second point. Kenneth Cragg only fleetingly mentions the Muslim claim to realism (p. 48) in God's dealings with men and the world. This is central for Muslims that I have talked to, and is set over against Christianity's beautiful ideals of peace and self-giving love which are not practicable and effective in the world, a fact borne out by the compromises of Christian history. Muḥammad is an example for life in all spheres: husband, father, judge, and statesman, to mention only a few. For the Muslim the Christian ideal has serious gaps at this point.

These points seem to me important, but do not in any major way detract from the achievements of the book. The text is supported by considerable scholarship, a selected chart of readings, a useful glossary of Arabic terms, a general index and an index of Qur'ānic quotations.

PEGGY MORGAN

THE EUCHARIST IN BIBLE AND LITURGY by G.D. Kilpatrick *C.U.P.* 1983 pp. vii and 115. £15.00

The book consists of eight lectures originally delivered in Melbourne, Australia, as the Moorhouse Lectures, 1975. The first lecture argues that, although we have inherited the Biblical tradition, we should not be surprised at the differences between present belief and practice, and that of the first century A.D. The transmission of the N.T. text, changes from the oral Aramic to the oral and written Greek tradition, and sources are briefly discussed: Mark's eucharistic narrative is judged to be the only source used by Matthew and Luke, and is considered to be 'a solid piece of tradition' (p. 6), its Greek having the impress of the Semitic idiom, in fact to a very high degree if the arguments advanced for alternative readings to the N.T., Nestle Aland 25th edition, are accepted.

In Lecture II, Professor Kilpatrick argues first that *anamnesis* in I Corinthians 11 means 'proclamation', as Paul himself makes clear, and then, by a careful comparison of the differences between the Markan and I Corinthian accounts, that Paul reproduces a Greek revision of the older tradition preserved in Mark, although it correctly interprets the intention of the original. He emphasises the substantial agreement of the two accounts. Lecture III continues the discussion of N.T. evidence with a meticulous examination of Luke 22:15 ff., which convincingly shows that the shorter reading is original, on the basis of stylistic and grammatical considerations as well as others, and that the original form had two aims: to eliminate references to blood and to make the observance more like the Passover.

Lecture IV describes varieties of sacrificial practice, reflected in the O.T. and in ancient Greek and Roman texts, to elucidate N.T. references which indicate that both Jesus and Paul saw the eucharist as a sacrifice, releasing the life and strength of the Lord (I Cor. 11; Mk. 14), to do away with sin (Matt. 26) and to convey eternal life (Jn. 6). Professor Kilpatrick suggests that 'grace' is not associated with the eucharist in N.T. texts as it is from the 4th century onwards, because the eucharist as sacrifice is already thought to effect what is later thought to be effected 'by grace'. In Lecture V, he proposes an alternative to J. Jeremias' unconvincing argument that the eucharist was a Passover: the blessing over the bread and the wine which preceded the Sabbath in Rabbinic Judaism, and similar practices described in the Dead Sea Scrolls and other contemporary Jewish literature, are said to supply the structure of the eucharist and to define its purpose as the religious meal of an exclusive community.

The pattern of charter story and ritual (Lecture VI), which is discerned in a number of examples, especially in the 1st century A.D. Jewish Day of Atonement and in the eucharistic narratives, helps to explain the command 'to repeat' in I Cor. 11. Subsequent liturgical developments, which place the institution story in the eucharistic prayer, do so as the charter story and not as constituting the factor of consecration, an interpretation common only after the 4th century A.D.

In Lecture VII, these findings are applied to liturgical practice. The disappearance of the Biblical understanding of 'sacrifice' and the creation and development of 'sacrament' are said to have had two consequences, that blessing and thanksgiving were lost from the eucharistic prayer, and that the social aspect of sacrifice was