18 Ibid, 486
19 "Within such knowledge [i.e. by faith], we will then affirm a virtuous and not futile reciprocal spiralling between the visible and the invisible: a benign circulation for which, instead of mutual cancellation, the finite visible is known as upheld in its finitude only by the infinite invisible, and inversely, the infinite invisible is known as intrinsically the giver of the shapes of the finite" Ibid, 489.
20 Ibid, 490. This then leads to his conclusion that, in giving, "The reciprocating circles of twin souls must not be superseded by one impersonal circle, but must be themselves given, in their twin, never-interlocking circularity, by an elevated otherness. If, all the same, the gift they are offered is not merely an empty gift of one-way circularity, but rather, the gift of reciprocity, then what is disclosed is transcendent Otherness that is itself personal exchange: eternal spiralling, not an eternal and impersonal unity." Ibid, 505.
21 Milbank, 'Can a Gift be Given?' 132
22 125-7
23 127
24 The work of Dr. Ennio Mantovani S.V.D in the *Point* series (Goroka: Melanesian Institute. P.O. Box 576, Goroka, PNG) has parallels from the closely-related Chimbu people.
25 Marcel Mauss reports a similar status for gift-giving as the basis for social interaction, as described by Radcliffe-Brown in *The Andaman Islanders*. However, neither he nor Radcliffe-Brown bring out the importance of the gifts' *incommensurability*, and instead minimise it by reducing gifts to items of comparable value. It is beyond the scope of this paper to enquire as to whether or not their analysis adequately represents the substance of what they observed. It is however tempting to view their interpretation as the mapping of western values on a different sort of economy. See Marcel Mauss, *The Gift* trans Ian Cunnison [1954] (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969) 17f.
26 See Langdon Gilkey, 'Creation, Being and Nonbeing' in David B Burrell and Bernard McGinn (Eds) *God and Creation. an Ecumenical Symposium* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press 1990) 226-241
27 Also the Johannine 'whoever knows me knows the Father'
28 Lk 19^{1-10} I am indebted to a participant in the aforementioned SST Conference (whose name I failed to remember) for this insight.

Correction

November 2002

Paragraph 2 Page 522 should read:

James Alison expresses this providential element very clearly as he asserts that in the death of Jesus we see 'a loving God who was planning a way to get us out of our violent and sinful life. Not a human sacrifice to God, but God's sacrifice to humans.'[15] Given what I have written about the whole trajectory of Christ's life, death and resurrection in the previous section, I would rather say, more comprehensively, that in Jesus Christ it was both God's and Jesus the man's sacrifice to humans and to God.[16] Another author, Sebastian Moore, while ruling out the concepts of sacrifice that are nonapplicable to Christ, also has the audacity to call the passion a sacrifice: 'the death of Jesus on a cross is a sacrifice only in its full expression as a feast of love.'[17] For Moore, the risen Christ who invites his disciples to share in the eucharist turns his passion into a feast of love'.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2002.tb01843.x Published online by Cambridge University Press