

theories. It should be added that Jeauneau manifests another French trait: the love of his own language. Care is taken to make even the most technical discussions elegant: *le plaisir de l'esprit*.

As for *la prudence et la lenteur*, Jeauneau never attempts to present a comprehensive, synthetic account of Eriugena's thought. That would be out of character. He always considers some particular aspect of it.

Of the studies that come most clearly under the third category, two are the articles that appear in print here for the first time. In 'Jean Scot et la métaphysique de feu', from a talk given at the Maison Française in Oxford in 1984, Jeauneau shows how Eriugena adopted from the ps.-Denys the metaphor of fire to explain the manner of God's presence in creation. A particular physical theory of fire is put at the service of ontology. Fire is considered to be all-penetrating and omnipresent, being present even in ice, and yet for the most part unmanifest. It is manifest only in its effects of heat and light and not in itself. To become manifest it requires some grosser material to act upon. In these respects fire is a metaphor for God. It is both manifest and hidden, a fitting image of the ways of affirmation (*kataphasis*) and negation (*apophasis*).

In 'Le thème du retour', based on a course given at the University of Rome in 1982, Jeauneau examines Eriugena's use of the Neoplatonic theme, again taken from the ps.-Denys, of emanation and return. This was to be Eriugena's most lasting and profound influence on subsequent Latin thought, although this influence has rarely been acknowledged, even to this day. But Eriugena's speculations about the return led him to posit an eschatology that would be completely unacceptable to the main stream of Latin theology. In his view there must be some universal return or *apokatastasis* of all beings to their source. But how to square this with the belief in final judgment and the separation of the sheep from the goats? As Jeauneau points out, the question here is not merely that of whether there is a physical hell, with flames and sulphur: John Scottus had no doubt that this should not be understood literally. To solve the deeper problem, John distinguished the general return, in which all will participate, from the special return of the elect. The former pertains to nature and the latter to grace. By one human nature will return to the integrity of the 'earthly paradise' and to the *data naturae*; by the other the elect will be divinized and will pass over to the *dona gratiae*. With great ingenuity, John finds support for his theory in an allegorical interpretation of the parable of the wise and foolish virgins.

I fear that this collection will be read only by specialists. It deserves a much wider readership.

P.L. REYNOLDS

SACRIFICE: ITS NATURE AND PURPOSE by Geoffrey Ashby.
SCM Press, 1988. Pp. 151. £7.50.

The heart of this book is a sustained argument for interpreting the death of Christ in terms of the passover sacrifice. That requires the recognition that the western world lacks an awareness of sacrifice that is still present elsewhere (e.g. in Africa and India), requires therefore that the proper meaning of cultic sacrifice be recovered particularly with the help of ancient Hebrew sacrifice, and also requires that this revived understanding should

dislodge erroneous Catholic ideas of eucharistic sacrifice and overcome Protestant horror of it. The author, formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Witwatersrand and now Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Leicester, writes with some confidence about anthropology, semitic studies, patristic theology (he has previously published on Theodoret as an exegete of the Old Testament), and liturgical studies—though perhaps less securely on New Testament matters.

Sacrifice serves many purposes in many cultures but *au fond* it is 'the stated means of converse between God and man, in which the transforming of the thing sacrificed into the domain of the holy is the action through which that most powerful conversation of all flows, the dialogue between God and man' (25). In the Hebraic tradition sacrifice is 'the language through which relationship is established and communication carried on in material things'. By this means the threshold of danger is crossed, the *rite de marge* is carried out, sin is removed, impurity cleansed, and reconciliation effected (47). When it was no longer possible for animal sacrifices to be offered in the Jerusalem temple, and when Judaism moved out into the hellenistic world where sacrifice was improperly understood and so rejected, the sacrificial tradition was carried on in passover. But Paul, writing for people incapable of proper sacrificial understanding, was forced to devise juridical, commercial, and political language to interpret Christ's death to them, although to anyone within the sacrificial tradition of Israel it would be obvious that Christ's death was *the* sacrifice (and hence the New Testament seldom mentions it).

'At the Last Supper Jesus is not only identifying himself with Passover but also with the covenant... Within that context, the blood of the Passover lamb not only cleanses away sin but reestablished the covenant' (103). 'The Eucharist is not in fact the sacrament of Christ's sacrifice—it is what the Last Supper says it is, the *anamnesis* of his sacrifice, the whole sacrifice of the life of Christ made relevant, through the offering of bread and wine, by dominical command, to the present Christians, who are then identified with him' (118).

It is a lively and provocative discussion in which, at times, the quickness of the hand is intended to deceive the eye. For instance 'John indicated clearly what Jesus was by his identification of Jesus' death with the slaying of the Passover lambs at the Temple' (80). But John says nothing about passover lambs. If his readers were familiar with customary procedures for the afternoon of 14 Nisan they could *deduce* that Jesus died during the period when the lambs were sacrificed, but John makes nothing of it. Nor did John say that 'in the beginning was the sacrifice' as the stated means of converse between God and man, but 'in the beginning was the *logos*'. Nor can passover be regarded as a *Kompendium der Heilsgeschichte* (97). Despite the much-repeated opinion that passover blood came to be regarded as expiatory though originally only apotropaic, where is the evidence in the passover seder or in M. Pesachim 10? Although the author never defines covenant (which is very important to him), he probably regards it as a kind of advantageous tenancy agreement with a landowner who acknowledges only offerings in kind. It is better regarded as a device (to which God is party) for ensuring the stability of social groups of moderate size. That explains certain prophetic rejections of sacrifice, and

the minor role of covenant in the New Testament where the stability of hellenistic groups needed different devices. Even if sacrifice is still valid language for expressing the meaning of Christ's death, it is still metaphorical language; it is *as if* a sacrifice were being made, a verdict were being given, a debt were being paid. Even if we could bring ourselves to learn the meaning of sacrifice as the author describes it (perhaps by substituting *thysia* for 'sacrifice' to keep our minds from wrong associations) what would it actually mean as I receive eucharistic bread and wine? He made *the* paschal sacrifice: how is that made relevant to me when I consume bread and wine? How am I identified with *him* (and what does 'identified' imply)? I seem to make no offering to God, nor am I involved in *thysia* (i.e. slaughter). I need a pattern of words to help me do what I ought to do—simply to do it because it is commanded (as the author implies) is not enough.

KENNETH GRAYSTON

HELPING THE HELPERS: SUPERVISION AND PASTORAL CARE
by John Foskett and David Lyall, *SPCK*, 1988, Pp. xi + 164. £5.95.

The increasing value attached in pastoral work to the insights of psychotherapy should by now have led many pastors (lay or clerical) to seek the same type of supervision or consultancy for their ministry as do professionals in other caring positions. But they don't. The time is right for this latest volume in the excellent *New Library of Pastoral Care*. But should such a volume be written for the supervisors (*in situ* or in the making) or for potential supervisees? That is a question I would have addressed before putting pen to paper, although it is not clear whether the authors have a particular readership in mind. Their constant use of illustrative material suggests that they are appealing to those who know little about the content of supervision. On the other hand the complications inherent in their examples suggest the need for the reader to have considerable experience of supervising or being supervised. What are missing are clearly stated principles and insights into the supervisory process: simple points (a,b,c, etc) drawn out of the examples which would illustrate for the potential supervisee the value of the exercise, and for the potential supervisor the dimensions of the task.

After the briefest of introductions (I felt the need for a much fuller explanation of the value and the necessity of supervision) the authors plunge us into the subject: I say 'plunge' because it felt to this reader that the supervisor in the first example moved in too quickly to personal material in the student's background. That is not my style, but even if it were, I am doubtful about the value of such a rapid introduction of the actual supervisory relationship to clergy who are often (despite their interest in the intimacy of pastoral ministry) initially scared of anyone getting too close. Indeed, in their commentary, the authors suggest the supervisor should have dealt with some of this personal material in a preliminary interview. But is it actually helpful to introduce mistakes in the supervisor's interventions when the reader requires at this early stage a straightforward account of what goes on? This is one point where I am not sure what reader the authors have in mind. As a supervisor I am glad to be shown such errors of judgement; as a potential supervisee I think I would like my meat a little

157