

other words, stands under the constant discipline and chastening of God.

Renewal, then, as an operative element in Christian life consists in exposing oneself to the life-giving work of God.

Dr Visser 't Hooft is clear that Christ has come as a great high priest to sympathize and support, but he also seems quite certain that apart from this 'the spiritual and sacramental gifts which the people in the desert received were fundamentally the same as those which have been granted to the new people'. One might argue for long over the 'apart' and the 'fundamentally'; but leaving that aside it is surely quite wrong to confuse the typical experience of the Old Testament (however important for our instruction) with the presence in the flesh of Christ, and the whole miracle of renewal through that flesh. If the Old Testament is the story of man's failure before God, the New is the story of how man in his failure is made one body with Christ.

If it be objected that St Paul constantly talked of renewal, it can be replied that he also talked of the strength of faith and charity. It is, of course, true that the Church is always renewing herself in persecution and in repentance before God. But why the 'Roman Church' should be unable to do this radically because she is so 'institutional' is beyond the reviewer.

The people were recalled by the mouth of the prophet, who was himself the mouthpiece of God. The ministry of the Word, a Spirit-conditioned gift, is exercised by the Bishop witnessing. But, it is objected, he is an official. Well, so was every one of the Apostles. The comparatively unimportant question of the shape organization takes in each age must be distinguished from the witnessing office of the successors of the Apostles.

It does not appear very sensible to say that institutional authority is wrong because it is unbiblical (*pace* at least St Matthew's Gospel, the Book of Acts and the letters to the Corinthians) and then to say that it is unbiblical to say that the Word is opposed to the Spirit. Both the teaching Church and the recorded Word of God confront man and impose a shape on his believing. This does not make it of no value. What the Catholic says is that the shape is God's and part of our renewal consists in living this shape—putting on the person of Christ. Living it means living it by and in the Holy Spirit which by the royal power of Christ makes even of water and bread a new life and a foretaste of the fullness of the Kingdom.

IAN HISLOP, O.P.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN MODERN RESEARCH. By Herbert F. Hahn.  
(S.C.M. Press; 16s.)

EARLY ISRAEL IN RECENT HISTORICAL WRITING. By John Bright.  
(S.C.M. Press; 9s. 6d.)

THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Helmer Ringgren. (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.)

The S.C.M. Press continues indefatigably to produce a great body of books and studies on the Old and New Testaments, and seeks to pass on the findings of English and continental Protestant scholarship to a wider circle of readers. Certainly they have made much accessible to students in England. When so few read German, and when books anyway are so expensive, the S.C.M. Press has been a good friend to many.

Dr Hahn's *Old Testament in Modern Research* purposes 'to examine the various approaches to the interpretation of the Old Testament that have predominated in biblical studies since the "higher critics" revolutionized the basic principles of research with reference to the Scriptures' (p. v). Certainly Dr Hahn has succeeded admirably in the design which he sets himself, and we are given a panoramic and (in its own order) a valuable survey of The Critical Approach to the Old Testament, the Anthropological Approach, the Religio-historical School, Archaeology and the Old Testament, and so on.

It remains true that the variations in interpretation of the Old Testament outside the Church are a matter of quiet wonderment for the Catholic whose very first principle is that the Old Testament is the Word of God, as is the New Testament; and that the ultimate meaning of either Old or New will best come from a consideration of both. The Catholic who holds firmly to such principles can then welcome all sound scholarship and all findings that would conduce to a better understanding of that Word of God. The massive output of numerous scholars over the last hundred years, has often been intrinsically self-destructive. And yet there remains a valuable *apport*, or shall we say, residue of critical, archaeological, linguistic and other findings which are now the ordinary instruments of Catholic biblical scholarship. This last hardly comes within the purview of Dr Hahn, whose whole study is consistently protestant in approach. Incidentally, Alexander Geddes would turn in his grave were he to hear himself described as 'an early English critic' (p. 123), for he was a Scot, and furthermore a Catholic priest.

*Early Israel in Recent Historical Writing* is very rightly called 'a study in method'. The author asks himself: By what method can we evaluate the historical worth of Israel's earliest history—the traditions of Patriarchs, Exodus and the Conquest? That is his general question, but this particular book is preoccupied with the methods of the Altnoth school as it is called. This school is marked by brilliance of scholarship and consistency of method but arrives at a 'totally negative evaluation of the historical worth of the early tradition of Israel' and a

'surprising reluctance to call upon the results of archaeology' (p. 55). Professor Bright starts by analysing something of the work of Y. Kaufmann, a contemporary Israeli scholar who has vigorously attacked the Alt-Noth points of view; but not always rigorously, for his logic can be at fault. He then proceeds to attack by examining parallel situations in American popular traditions, for, as he says rightly enough there is 'an abundance of popular tradition which can be found with a clear aetiological factor (i.e. with the explanation of some known custom and landmark) where the factor is *demonstrably secondary*. This should at least warn us against a doctrinaire evaluation of the same factor in Israel's traditions' (p. 94). Professor Bright does seem to have countered the negatives of the Alt-Noth school, and to have proved the bankruptcy of their method. His positive suggestions are neither so developed nor so convincing, though he recognizes that archaeological finds are enlightening and important.

*The Messiah in the Old Testament* is representative of that appetite for Scandinavian theological writings which has been much in evidence, since World War II, among our separated brethren for whom, quite often, 'continental theologian' means protestant theologian abroad.

This little book on so great a subject can provoke thought and gives us matter for it. Certainly Psalms are 'cultic', and some are 'royal'; but we boggle at the enthronement festival, not prescribed in the Law of Moses, and whose very existence is a hypothesis on page 8, and taken as a fact on page 9 and then throughout the book. Professor Mowinkel himself (a note tells us) emphasizes that the 'Enthronement Festival' is only an aspect of the pre-exilic Feast of Tabernacles.

A number of interesting Babylonian and Egyptian parallels to the 'classic' texts are presented. For the rest the Messianic interpretations, though truncated and tenuous as given here, do in many ways approximate to the age-old Christian and Catholic tradition in the matter.

ROLAND POTTER, O.P.

PRINCIPLES OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. By Bernard Lceming, S.J. (Longmans; 30s.)

If an excuse be needed for reviewing this book so late, it is that six months is not too long a time for exploring as it deserves a major work on so vast a subject. Roughly speaking it covers the treatise on the Sacraments in General, and is particularly useful for having assembled a very considerable amount of positive and historical information such as is absolutely required for speculative discussion in this field. One's main criticism concerns the arrangement; the genial and attractive way in which this information is introduced as needed has been