

that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel shall become wife to one of her father's tribal clan, so that the children of Israel may possess every one the inheritance of his fathers. And so no inheritance shall pass from one tribe to another tribe; for the tribes of the children of Israel shall cleave every man to his own inheritance.'

(4) *Our Lady and St Elizabeth*, it can now be shown, could certainly have been kinswomen. Our Lady's descent is not explicitly mentioned, but St Paul emphatically states that our Lord was born of the seed of David (Rom. i, 3); and even from a strictly historical point of view it may be noticed that he was intimate with 'the beloved physician Luke' (Coloss. iv, 14), who in his turn was intimate with our Lady, as is clear from the first two chapters of his gospel. Some other passages in St Luke's writings point the same way, for he is especially well informed about the holy women. It cannot seriously be doubted that our Lady was descended from the tribe of Judah, no less than St Joseph. Since St Elizabeth's husband Zachary was a priest, it may be worth noting that there was no restriction of a tribal kind in the marriage of priests; it is only laid down that the high priest must marry a virgin (Levit. xxi, 14), and that the ordinary priest must not marry a woman divorced or polluted or a harlot (Levit. xxi, 7). In actual fact St Elizabeth was 'of the daughters of Aaron', and therefore of the tribe of Levi.

Our Lady and St Elizabeth, then, as a matter of fact both married into their own tribe, though there is no particular reason to think that they had inherited land. Our Lady, in particular, made the offering of the poor at her purification, which rather makes against her having inherited land (cf. Luke ii, 24; Levit. xii, 8). But in any case there is no positive reason to suppose that their two mothers (or their grandmothers) had inherited land, so that there is no difficulty in supposing that one (or both) of them might be descended in part from the other's tribe.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

How is Matt. v 17-18, to be reconciled with the abolition in the New Law of the Jewish ritual observances, the sabbath rest, the Pasch, etc?

Very early in His sermon on the Mount our Lord speaks of the relation of His mission to the Mosaic Law and to the prophets. He has not come to destroy them, to cast them out of His own religion and to deny them all force. He has come to fulfil them, to develop them into something greater. Thus, the ritual observances find their supreme expression in the Holy Eucharist, but also in the divine office: the sabbath rest remains, though transferred to the first day of the week; our own passover is Christ (I Cor. v, 7). Thus the Old Testament still lives in the New, which we cannot fully understand without it, any

more than we can understand the Old without the New. *Novum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet*. The examples which our Lord Himself brings forward belong to the domain of morals: murder, adultery, divorce, perjury, non-resistance to injuries, charity (v, 21-48). We have here the code of Christian perfection; but we cannot be quite sure that our Lord spoke all this at one time, as St Matthew has a way of collecting together sayings connected with the same topic.

But our Lord is immediately concerned with the time and work of His own ministry, and not with the results that will follow from His rejection by the Jews and crucifixion, which meant the abandonment of Jerusalem and its temple for Rome. He tells His hearers that the Law must be obeyed, but not in the way that the scribes seek their justness (or righteousness) in it. The best commentary on this is the vehement attack upon them in Matt. xxiii, where however He still maintains their authority (xxiii, 3), though He had prophesied the end of it (xv, 13-14; xxi, 39-46; cf. xxiii, 38).

Thus, until the veil of the temple had been rent in two (xxvii, 51), the Law was to have its full and literal sense and obligation; but after that it is the Law as fully developed that obliges, no longer as restricted to a single nation and temple, but with that internal and external expansion anticipated alike in the Law and the prophets. 'Are we then making void the Law through faith?' asks St Paul: 'Heaven forbid! We are establishing the Law' (Rom. iii, 31).

C. LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxoni

BOOK REVIEW

Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums by Eugen Ruckstuhl (Paulusverlag, Freiburg) 13 Swiss francs.

This third volume of the resumed series of *Studia Friburgensia* is a detailed examination of the attempts made by Bultmann to dissect the gospel of St John into an agglomerate of literary sources. Bultmann's work is scattered through periodicals and tracts between the years 1923 and 1940 while his *Johannesevangelium* appeared in 1941. Before this, in 1939, a Swiss Protestant scholar, Eduard Schweizer, with the book *Ego eimi*, had begun a defence of the unity of John, though obviously he was firing off his ammunition before Bultmann had deployed all his troops. It remained therefore necessary that someone should undertake a fuller examination of Bultmann when his position had been fully disclosed. This Ruckstuhl has done, trying to establish reliable rules of procedure for deciding when on internal evidence alone one might be justified in postulating a duality of sources for a document. He takes over