

far from playing down the dependence of religion on emotion, then, we should rather be re-examining the relationship between emotion and understanding. The point of Heidegger's notion of *Befindlichkeit* (the 'state' one is in) or *Stimmung* (how one is 'attuned' to one's situation) is precisely that it is a way of overturning the traditional structure of insight and mood: understanding occurs within feeling, not outside or against it. This is obviously an important thesis, not without parallels nearer home: in the work, for example, of Ian Ramsey. But however substantially it may be argued for by Heidegger, the handling of the whole issue by Professor Macquarrie remains disappointingly tentative and exploratory.

This would, in fact, be one's only major criticism of the general line of the book. While it is of course a great relief to see the disappearance from theological discourse of the

massive, self-supporting assertion, the new habit of scrupulous diffidence tends nervously towards the half-said and the vague gesticulation. Professor Macquarrie makes many interesting suggestions: it is a pity that he has not developed more of them. There is a good deal of evidence, in the central sections of the book, that he is supremely well equipped to elaborate the sort of understanding of man which any serious reconstruction of theology would require. The book also includes valuable essays on Teilhard de Chardin and Karl Rahner, and ends with some reformulations of traditional doctrines in the light of the post-existentialist position outlined in the preceding sections. The book represents, then, work in progress, and it leaves one eager to see what Professor Macquarrie is going to do next.

FERGUS KERR, O.P.

OLD AND NEW IN INTERPRETATION by James Barr. *S.C.M. Press, London, 1966, 30s.*

The central theme of this exciting book is the relation between the Old and New Testaments. Professor Barr challenges those who find the link in terms of such formulae as promise-fulfilment or revelation through God's 'mighty acts' in Israelite-Christian history. Even within the Old Testament itself 'history' can hardly function as 'a central and mandatory theological concept' (p. 68). The complexity of the material should warn us against trying to introduce such a unitary definition. Some of the tradition, for example, did not originate within the special historical experience of Israel but 'found its way into Israel's mind . . . by a limited modification of laws, stories, images and conceptions which were fairly common currency in the ancient Near East' (p. 17). Moreover, God's verbal communications have at least as much right to be considered the central theme of the Old Testament as his 'acts'.

On the view that the Old Testament must be understood in the light of Christ the author points out that 'in the minds of the apostles' the relation 'was the opposite: the problem was not how to understand the Old Testament but how to understand Christ . . . In the ancient situation . . . there is no doubt about the Old Testament; what is uncertain is the lineaments of the Christ' (p. 139). Inevitably the problem of typology and allegory arises for discussion. It is only a one-sided choice of

examples that can support 'the idea that allegory is definitely and ineluctably anti-historical' (p. 105) and as such distinguishable from typology. Take the traditional exegesis of the Canticle of Canticles 'as referring to God's dealings with Israel or to Christ and his relations with the Church. Here a text which originally had no historical reference, or very little, is allegorized to refer to events and relations which are historical or partly so' (p. 106).

The inter-testamental relations have often been discussed on the supposition of a contrast between Hebrew and Greek thought. Professor Barr joins Minear in branding much of this commonly accepted contrast as a caricature. It is misleading to pit a Hebrew view of bodily resurrection against a Greek theme of the immortality of the soul or to claim that 'history was without interest for the Greeks' (p. 50). Jewish writers themselves had a series of stock criticisms of the Gentile world. The polemic as expressed in Wisdom 13-14 or in Romans I 'animadverted . . . on the following phenomena: polytheism, idolatry, moral and especially sexual perversity, and the absence of guidance in the form of an explicit divine law' (p. 50). But the Jews did not see their difference from the Greeks 'as lying in ontological presuppositions, forms of logic, conceptions of being, views of time and history, or the presence or

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