

is denied to us in this life, fulfillment awaits in the future. Meanwhile our language attempts to specify ways in which God is not. The problem is to find words appropriate on both sides of the analogy between the creatures and God.

This is the problem neither Origen nor Thomas solved. In this book, description is followed by criticism and then reconstruction. The treatment in each case is competent, and leads to consideration of the future as providing clues for the alleviating of the problems raised: To speak of God means to look on the world as an utterance, "the complex kind of utterance we call a drama" (p. 122), within which the story of Jesus provides the clue to the future, since in him the future has happened. So a sort of eschatological verification emerges. Critical conversation with Bultmann, Ebeling, Fuchs, Ott, Moltmann and Pannenberg provides the background for Jenson's own interesting law-gospel dialectic, which requires the intervention of God for its resolution.

When the ongoing discussion in contemporary theology looks very much confused and when the confusion appears to be not simply between proponents of the same approach, but between differing ways of approach, it is gratifying to find a competent suggestion of possible meeting points. But as Jenson himself suggests, to have a future-oriented perspective does not commit one to "Theology of Hope" in what have now become its recognizable (and perhaps stereotyped) forms. That is another virtue of this book. Theology of hope will show itself to have a future and may itself be hopeful if it can show itself to be versatile. That, too, is to be hoped. Jenson's book will provide the background for any serious future discussions about the theme, and will show the way for further work which he envisaged but could not undertake in this work. No doubt, prospective doctoral candidates will find his historical treatments both sufficient and exemplary.

Notttingham, England

EDWARD W. H. VICK

Lyonnet, Stanislas, S. J., and Leopold Sabourin, S. J. *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*. "Analecta Biblica," 48. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970. xvi + 351 pp. \$6.50.

The present work is a composite of three separate pieces, Lyonnet's *De Peccato et Redemptione* (1957), translated by Fidelis Buck, his article "Péché" in *DBSup* (1964), and Sabourin's *Redemption Sacrificielle* (1961), which is presented in an abridged form in English. The latter serves as editor for the whole.

Part I deals with the idea of sin as viewed in the OT, Judaism, and the various sections of the NT. This closely worked out study, as well as Part II, is marred at times by the awkwardness of the translation such as "created man to his image" (p. 5), "preludes" used as a verb (p. 9), and "what rejoices the father" for "what causes the father to rejoice" (p. 37).

Part II is a treatment of the terminology of redemption including "salva-

tion," "liberation," "purchasing or acquisition," and "expiation." Lyonnet's main objective is to show that redemption does not necessarily imply purchase or price paid to someone but refers to liberation such as that of Israel from Egypt. "Purchase" and "liberation" are used in such a way that the latter can be considered as a definition of the former. The idea of purchase and acquisition emphasizes the supreme sacrifice and the tremendous cost to the Son and the Father in making this liberation possible. Lyonnet shows quite quickly also that the word "expiation" in the Bible does not have the pagan idea of propitiation, although "by removing sin expiation removes what provokes God's anger" (p. 122). Sin, not God, is the object of the verb "to expiate." In fact, God is the subject of the verb. In an extended discussion of Rom 3:25, he opts for "propitiatory" as a translation of *hilasterion*. It is questionable, however, to interpret the propitiatory as Christ on the basis that (1) it was the place where God communicated with his people; (2) Christ is the Word; (3) he it is "in whom God in these last days has spoken to us" (Heb 1:2).

In Part III Sabourin deals historically with the various interpretations of the word "sin" in 2 Cor 5:21: "For our sakes he made him to be sin who knew nothing of sin, so that in him we might become the justice of God," Three major interpretations have been set forth: (1) "made sin" means that Christ was treated as a sinner, bore the guilt and wrath of sin, was the very personification of sin; (2) God made Christ to be "sin," according to the incarnational view, happened when God made him assume human nature; (3) sin equals "sacrifice for sin." The first view that of the early Reformers and is generally maintained by evangelical Protestants. The second was made popular by Augustine, though he combined it with the third view. Sabourin favors the third view, but the implications drawn by him would be difficult for many Protestants to accept. On the basis that this passage reflects the Suffering Servant context, he feels that the idea of imputation and redemption as juridical and forensic must be excluded. He attempts to carry through this conception of sacrificial redemption throughout the NT. His view that "the greater and more perfect tent" in Heb 9:11, 12 is the new liturgy of redemption is questionable.

Part IV contains an excellent bibliography of sacrifice in the Bible and the ancient Near East.

A composite such as this cannot be treated as a whole since there is no real unity. Sabourin deals with one small aspect, the interpretation of 2 Cor 5:21, while Lyonnet makes a wide-ranging study of many various related ideas. It would have been better to publish Sabourin's section separately as a small monograph. Catholic features are seen in the use of the Apocrypha by Lyonnet and the emphasis on inherent righteousness as against imputed righteousness, and Christ as the representative for mankind as opposed to the substitutionary view, as presented by Sabourin. Nevertheless there is much to learn from both sections, especially from the historical portions provided by Sabourin.