

position are often wild and represent interpretations against which I had guarded myself quite explicitly, and on the whole I feel myself to have been little touched by his attack, much less refuted; indeed, it hardly even suggests to me that my position has to be rethought, which for me would be an advantage. Sometimes he seems to understand poorly the theological background of my book; for instance, he is disturbed by my suspicion of idealism, and appears not to realize that this was no peculiar idea of my own but was largely shared by both sides in the 'biblical theology' movement. As for his own approach, though he calls it an idealist one, it strikes me rather as a generally empirical one which is not rigorously or analytically so, and which (again characteristically of British Protestant biblical scholarship), rather than follow out the lines of his own empiricism, tends to escape prematurely into a world of ideas. As I see his line of thinking, he wants to say that there is

not only a linguistic level but also other levels, and this is entirely justifiable; but, instead of pursuing the study of linguistic level to its end, he prematurely brings in the other levels, not seeing that they do not work in the same way or have the same function, and cannot be used to *replace* the analysis of the linguistic level.

The idea that a theological structure or pattern can be read off from a survey of the lexical stock, which idea was the main focus of my own previous criticisms of Kittel and other such works, seems to me to have been tacitly abandoned by Dr Hill. His word-studies are disparate, so that one or another could be added or subtracted; the sum of them provides no unified soteriology. Word-studies, even when thus improved, seem after all to furnish no map of the theological world.

I hope to discuss the issues raised by this book at greater length in the pages of *Biblica*.

JAMES BARR

THE INSPIRED WORD, Scripture in the light of language and literature, by Luis Alonso Schökel, translated from the Spanish by Francis Martin. *Burns and Oates, London, 1967. 418 pp. 63s.*

Fr Schökel, S.J., now professor of Old Testament exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, rose to fame in a notorious controversy in 1960. In that year he wrote a forward-looking article in *Civiltà Cattolica* asking 'Where is Catholic exegesis headed?' It produced a wail of indignation from Msgr Antonino Romeo who denounced Fr Schökel, among others, by name for his views on inspiration and much else besides. Time and sweet reason have consigned Romeo's outburst to the museum of literary curiosities. Instead, chapter 3 of the Council's dogmatic constitution *De Divina Revelatione*, and the eminently sane writings of Levie and Grelot, have insured that inspiration can be now discussed in an adult manner.

Fr Schökel's special concern in this book is with the literary aspect of inspiration. For the Bible, he says, being a written book, 'must be read as an integral literary work embodying all the functions of language' (p. 137). The first concern is with the inspired author and the way he uses language and the extent to which he is inspired in it. Schökel insists that the 'literary work' of a biblical author 'in all its dimensions is an inspired message' (p. 198). That is to say the very technique and literary style are 'elaborated under the influence of the Holy Spirit'. But this is not all. For it is

not the authors who are presented to us in the canon of scripture but their works (p. 256). In many cases the books as we now have them were redacted by somebody other than the original author, or transmitted in a community over a long period, or translated into another language. Inspiration is preserved in this gradual formation and tradition by what Schökel calls the 'energetic power' of the word. He goes on to show how God himself has endowed his word with a saving power (p. 357) which persists throughout the Bible and is effective now in the Church's liturgy.

It will be seen that Fr Schökel covers a lot of ground. He admits frankly at the outset that he has sought 'in these reflections to achieve breadth rather than depth' (p. 14). Inevitably therefore some areas have to be covered somewhat thinly. But he avoids fatuous generalities by studying concrete examples of inspired writing in detail. To do this he goes outside the confines of the Bible itself: for the literary problems that preoccupy him are common to all creative writing. So that if Hosea is a great poet (p. 188) then he can only be understood like other great poets who have the same 'unifying intuition' (p. 186) like Keats, Calderon or Valéry. Similarly Jeremiah 1, 11ff., can be compared in its creative process and intuition with the poems

of Ruiz and Hopkins (p. 195-6). Furthermore he enters into the semantics of language in general to illuminate the particular usages employed by the biblical writers. In doing so he incorporates the ideas of certain philologists and students of semantics like Spitzer and Alonso, whose theories he has summarized elsewhere in *CBQ* (1963), pp. 371 ff. Only by this open method of study, our author thinks, can inspiration be understood realistically. Otherwise it becomes some romantic handing down of the divine message ready made.

Schökel's knowledge and understanding of European language and literature is enormous.

The fitness of some comparisons is open to question and the point of relation occasionally superficial. But in a general discussion of this kind that can scarcely be avoided. The book is of special interest to theologians and scriptural students and will help to expand their horizons. But it is clearly intended for a wider audience. Technical discussions are trimmed and the patristic and magisterial references consigned to the footnotes. The frequent excursions into literature—and English writers are well represented—will bring the book within the range of any ordinary reader.

AELRED BAKER, O.S.B.

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE. Vol. VIII: Creation, Variety and Evil (la xlix-xlix), Thomas Gilby, O.P. 42s.; Vol. XIX: The Emotions (I. II. xxii-xxx), Eric D'Arcy. 35s. *Blackfriars*; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; New York: McGraw-Hill.

The treatise on Creation in the *Pars Prima* is, of course, very central to St Thomas's thought; as Fr Gilby says in his Introduction, 'One of St Thomas's original contributions to religious thought is to have developed the truth that creatures wholly dependent on God are also real in themselves'. The treatise on Evil is hardly less central, with its insistence that evil is neither an existent nor a good, but is a defection from good. The theses argued here are particularly congenial to Fr Gilby's racy and often colloquial style, always with the proviso (which, of course, is here fulfilled) that we have the original Latin with which to compare his rendering. The very ample footnotes make up for the comparatively brief Introduction and Appendices. The latter contain welcome translations of the opusculum *De aeternitate mundi* and of the dubious article 3 of question 47 from the codex Monte Cassino 138, though unfortunately without the Latin originals. Appendix I, on Derived Existence, is instructive and illuminating; in commenting on St Thomas's avoidance of the verb *existere* Fr Gilby might have remarked that St Thomas does use the word (as in, e.g., I, Q. 48, 3) when quoting from the Pseudo-Areopagite. Among non-trivial misprints we may note: p. 34, I. 14, *creationem* for *creationem*; p. 142, I. 7, *principiorum* for *principium*. On p. 53, something has gone wrong with II. 25 to 27. On p. 83, I. 25, 'one' should be inserted before

'causal'. On p. 95, I. 14, *res esse distinctae* is not translated. On p. 99, I. 28, should not *optimum* be rendered by 'very good' rather than 'best', so avoiding lining up St Thomas with Leibnitz on the best of all possible worlds? These are, however, comparatively minor points in a very useful volume.

Dr D'Arcy had indeed a difficult task, as he explains in his Introduction, partly because of the lack of unique equivalents in English for the terms of Aristotelian psychology and partly because of St Thomas's close adherence (too close, it is suggested) to physical movement as a model for the emotions or *passiones animae*. There is in fact a very useful, though brief, discussion of the use of models in intellectual enquiry in general. One would have welcomed some attempt to relate the concepts of St Thomas to those of twentieth-century psychology, but one cannot ask for everything and Dr D'Arcy has performed very skilfully a complicated and exacting task.

One general point. Is it really necessary, in these days of high costs, for each volume to contain the same ten pages of general introductory matter? When the series is complete this will add up to 590 pages of repetition, equivalent in bulk to something like three or four additional volumes. Might not this space have been better utilised or, failing that, dispensed with altogether?

E. L. MASCALL

THE LOGIC OF SAINT ANSELM, by Desmond Paul Henry. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1967. 258 pp. 50s.

St Anselm has attracted the attention of British philosophers more than any other medieval writer so far; Dr Henry has published

a translation of his dialogue *De grammatico*, Mr M. Charlesworth a translation of the *Proslogion* and Gaunilo's reply on behalf of the