

craftsman, simply 'a potter', though as likely as not his father would be a potter.

Kin names were used as honorifics. A female interpreter of dreams could be addressed as 'mother'. Elijah's disciples called him 'father'. No blood relationship, not even adoption, is involved. A lover calls his sweetheart 'sister' in the Song of Songs, an Egyptian fashion also. 'King's son' was a dignified title of an Israelite official.

The use of the name 'son' was important in the process of legal adoption (and also renunciation). In this sense 'son of God' could be a royal title, and a hint of a greater messianic reality. The dignity of 'sister' was important for a woman's status and legal rights in Hurrian society, and supplies background for Abraham's and Isaac's subterfuges.

Kin terms were also used with strictest protocol to express social and political stratification. In international suzerainty treaties the suzerain is 'father', the vassal is 'son'. In parity treaties the two parties are 'brothers'. Appreciation of this usage illuminates many biblical incidents and diplomatic correspondence, e.g., 1 Kings 9: 13; 20: 30-34. Since fellow-townsmen could be addressed as 'brothers' (Gen. 19: 7) blood relationship could be made clear by saying 'our brother, our flesh' (Gen. 37: 27).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Inspired Word, by Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J., translated by Francis Martin, O.C.S.O., Burns and Oates, London, 1967, Herder and Herder, 63s.

We feel that many readers of *The Bible Translator* will be grateful for having their attention drawn to this book. In volume 18 No. 1, January 1967, an article was reprinted by the author which was in a sense a summary treatment of the theme of this book. At the same time a notice appeared about the American edition. The appearance now of an English edition on the eastern side of the Atlantic affords an opportunity for a fuller assessment.

The book merits a wide welcome. It is seldom that English speaking readers of theology have an opportunity of sharing the fruits of thinking which first appeared in Spanish. Fr. Schökel hails from Latin America. He is widely known as an Old Testament scholar who teaches at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome and he is a Bible translator—several of his translations of Old Testament books into Spanish have been published.

What we have here are the reflections of one who teaches and translates the Scriptures on the meaning of his work 'in the light of language and literature'. In writing he says that he kept in mind 'the educated Christian public who have become aware of the modern Biblical movement'. He has taken for granted a fairly high standard of education, but Bible translators should not be discouraged on this account!

Of particular interest to many readers will be the chapter on Bible translation which contains a number of suggestive ideas and a firmly stated conclusion. Bible translation is the unavoidable consequence of the fact that the divine word has become incarnate in human speech. Since its original concretization in one language, one author, one work, the word of God

seeks wider scopes (*sic*) for its energy—it seeks to reach every man. ‘St Paul wrote to one city; through St Paul and through that city the Holy Spirit has written to all’ (Chrysostom).

There is much else of interest. How do we distinguish between the inspiration of the Scripture and the ‘inspiration’ we respond to in other literary works? There is a fresh treatment of this old question. Or again, language is described as being on three levels: common, technical and literary. From this analysis our author derives the principles of exegesis.

Inevitably perhaps the book is ‘aimed’ primarily at Roman Catholics and it is in effect a contribution to the continuing debate on the relationship of Scripture to authority. This debate is not confined to Roman Catholics though the rules of debate vary, in that here the author assumes familiarity with and a certain attitude towards the writings of the Fathers and the pronouncements of Church councils. But just as a sympathetic outsider can learn much from hearing the members of a family talking with each other, so there is much here for the discerning non-Catholic.

One is still left to marvel at the level of education assumed. The book is well served by an appendix and several indices. Quotations in the footnotes in Greek, Latin and several modern European languages are given in the original and each chapter has its own bibliography. Perhaps some of it could be skipped, except by advanced students in seminaries?

WESLEY J. CULSHAW

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, by Jean Héring, translated into English by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, Epworth Press, 1967, 30s.

The ideal commentary must deal fully with introduction, text, exegesis, vocabulary, modern relevance and a host of other details. Few commentaries are equally adequate on all these aspects. Many have a particular class of readers in mind, and shape their material accordingly.

For the Bible translator, the primary need is to understand the exact meanings of words before he can go on to the equally necessary task of ‘dynamic translation’ (to use the currently fashionable expression). He is not concerned with questions of date and authorship. He can ignore interesting suggestions for emendation. He must resist the temptation to sermonize in his work. But he does need to be very clear as to what words mean before he can build up intelligible sentences and paragraphs.

This commentary by the late Professor Héring of Strasbourg, written originally in French and helpfully published in English by the Epworth Press, is likely to be of outstanding use to the translator in particular. I have reviewed it elsewhere as not quite the book for the preacher or the general reader, but I think the translator will find it just what he needs. I cannot find any statement about the French translation of the text of Scripture, but I would suspect that it is Professor Héring’s own. In the English it is certainly illuminating and stimulating. It is, however, the brief but pertinent comments on the meanings of words, and on those words in their contexts, that translators will value most. Very rarely do these comments fail. I cannot quite see Héring’s point in 7: 5: in the translation of Scripture, *sarx* is rightly rendered ‘our poor body’, but the note says ‘*sarx* indicates