

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

the sum of all the circumstances of daily life'. No commentary should be regarded as infallible, but nearly everywhere this one will prove a very good guide.

HAROLD K. MOULTON

Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms, by David Hill; Society for New Testament Studies Monograph series, General Editor Matthew Black: Cambridge University Press, pp. 333, 1967; 60s. in UK, \$10.50 in USA.

Dr Hill here joins in the dialogue which has been going on for the last few years between rival linguistic schools of thought. He has illustrated his own viewpoint by means of a series of studies on words which are important for an understanding of the Biblical teaching on salvation.

In his opening chapter he contrasts the approach to the study of the language of the Bible, and of the New Testament in particular, found in Kittel's *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* and in the writings of Professor James Barr. A good deal of recent writing on the subject of Biblical theology has been based on what Barr would consider an improper use of the material in Kittel, encouraged by the very principles upon which that massive work has been built up. Barr stresses the importance of the word, not as a unit in itself, but as part of a larger totality, the sentence, or the speech in which the sentence occurs. It is the new settings of words, rather than new words themselves, which in his view form the vital contribution to New Testament thought. Underlying much of the Biblical theology criticized by both Barr and Hill, there is the assumption that a fundamentally different world-view is to be found in the Old Testament and the New Testament, a fundamental difference reflected in the very structure of the two languages of Hebrew and Greek.

Dr Hill starts by setting out briefly the ground upon which Barr takes his stand, and then undertakes the study of certain important New Testament terms in the light of their Old Testament background. These terms are *hilastērion*, *lutron*, *dikaïosunē*, *zoē aiōnios* and *pneuma*, since they are representative of the vocabulary of New Testament soteriology, and are mutually linked together in the thought of the New Testament writers.

For each word we are given a careful analysis of the way in which it is used by various New Testament writers, and this is where the book will be of considerable value to translators, since important texts receive thorough exegesis in the light both of Old Testament usage of the word being studied and of the other occurrences in the New Testament. There is very thorough treatment of *dikaïosunē* in the letters of Paul, particularly the letter to the Romans, in which translators are cautioned against an over-simplification of some of the issues involved. Before the New Testament usage is considered, however, Dr Hill examines the meaning which the Greek word itself had in the classical period, and then the extent of its occurrence in the Septuagint. This involves an examination of the Hebrew term or terms corresponding to the Greek word found in the LXX. Dr Hill clearly recognizes the strong influence of the LXX on the language of the New Testament: 'The language of the New Testament . . . reveals in its syntax and . . . in its vocabulary, a