

*spiritual*, by which those very realities in turn signified certain other realities. It is with this second sense of scripture that typology is wholly concerned.

FABIAN RADCLIFFE, O.P.

GOD'S LIVING WORD, by Alexander Jones; Chapman, 18s.

The bulk of this collection of thoughts on the Word was first delivered as a series of lectures to the first biblical congress of the Catholic Biblical Association of Australia in August 1959. Those who attended are greatly to be envied. Fr Jones has style, and humanity, and breadth of mind, and a certain poetic feel for scripture. His constant warfare is with all those wooden preconceptions which the devout layman or the earnest seminary student all too often pushes in front of himself as he approaches the sacred writings simply in order to trip himself up, and preserve himself from understanding them. He never ceases to remind the reader of what sort of language the Bible is really using, of what God is really meaning to do in giving us his Word in scripture, of what we really ought to be looking for when we read it. And so this is a most useful book to put in the hands of people when they are first girding themselves to tackle the scriptures at all seriously. It will save them from worrying about all those ultimately unreal questions—how can light have been made before the sun and the moon? how can the whale really have swallowed Jonah, and Jonah have survived in the monster's stomach? what about the many wives of the patriarchs? and so on—which have so often made study of the scriptures arid, vexing, and futile. Not that Fr Jones either intends to or does save his readers from worrying; he himself remarks that the Bible is a disturbing book, and as such he presents it—disturbing *inter alia* to habits of mind which are too often uncriticized, disturbing to the cosy and the comfortable and familiar in religion to which most of us cling so tenaciously.

In tracing the growth of God's word in scripture, the author deals with many of the great biblical themes, salvation, election, God's marital love for his people. He achieves a lively transposition of St Paul's teaching on the law, sin, death, and grace in *Romans* into a miracle play in three acts:

*Prologue.* The scene is the upper and filthy air to which Hamartia and Thanatos enter dancing. They embrace.

*Hamartia:* Thanatos, where is thy sting?

*Thanatos* (holding her admiringly at arm's length): The sting of Thanatos is Hamartia.

*Hamartia:* Yet Hamartia reigns by grace of Thanatos, and Thanatos is Hamartia's reward.

*Thanatos:* But Hamartia shall bring forth fruit to Thanatos. Without her he is nothing. Should she die, Thanatos dies too.

(Exeunt rapturously)

Whether St Paul's difficult doctrine about sin and death is really more intellig-

ible at the end of the performance is open to question, but it has certainly caught the imagination.

The weakest chapter seemed to me to be the last, 'The Inspired Word', in which Fr Jones is trying to see if the difference between Catholic and Protestant ideas of biblical inspiration are not perhaps more apparent than real. One is left with the feeling that the real issues are being avoided. While we entirely agree with the author that excessive pre-occupation with the principle of inerrancy is stultifying, and makes the difference between Catholic and Protestant seem wider than it is, we also feel that the principle has to be discussed between them, and would have liked to hear Fr Jones discussing it. Instead he shelves it.

We would also dissent from his use of the contrast between the Greek and the Semitic outlook in order to bring out the strangeness of the Bible to the modern mind. The contrast is a very convenient commonplace, but it is also a very inaccurate generalisation. After all, the Semitic Syro-Phoenicians did not find assimilation of the Greek mind so very difficult; their respective paganisms had much in common. Again, would the Aristotelian *actus purus*, which is contrasted with the Hebrew consciousness of God, have meant much to the average religious Greek? Does it mean much to the average religious modern, and does he really have to adjust his mind from this congenial abstraction to the alien concreteness of scripture? There are, to be sure, innumerable contrasts to be made between outlooks expressed in the Bible and outlooks common in the great Hellenistic world, not to mention those to be found in the great modern world. But to generalize these into a comprehensive contrast between, for example, Semitic-existentialist and Greek-essentialist can be theologically harmful. For while Fr Jones is very careful to deny that he is evaluating the two poles of his contrast, it is more than likely that his readers will unconsciously give a superior value to what they are given to understand is the Bible's way of looking at things. And they will perhaps feel that the other inferior way has been a misfortune in the Church; the thought may occur to them that, for all Fr Jones' careful qualifications, the only really *valuable* sort of theology is one expressed in biblical language, perhaps even—*reductio ad absurdum*—one expressed in Semitic language.

In using so much the contrast to which we have taken exception, we feel that Fr Jones is not really being fair to himself, because the value of so much of what he says in this book, for example on our Lady, or on the Word in the Church, is that it brings out precisely the biblical value of the Church's scholastically expressed dogmatic teaching.

This book, unfortunately, is not much credit to the publishers. Fr Jones, being in charge of bringing out an English edition of the Jerusalem Bible, must be one of the busiest priests in any English seminary. The initiative for publishing his lectures was not his in the first place. It was incumbent then on the publishers to give him every assistance in the way of proof reading, references, correction of errors, lay-out. Here is a melancholy list of *errata*:

p. 44 l. 8 for 'Later Prophets' read 'Former Prophets'.

p. 59 l. 17 for 'Cham' read 'Japhet'.

l. 18 for 'Japhet' read 'Cham'.

p. 149 l. 29-30 for 'In so far as this last is impervious . . .' read, presumably, ' . . . not impervious'.

p. 163 l. 12 for 'Heb. 3. 18' read 'Hab. 3. 18'.

p. 193 l. 12-13 for 'misunderstanding or respective positions' read 'misunderstandings of respective positions'.

p. 198 l. 12 for 'not so much light and rock' read 'not so much light as rock'.

p. 210 note 2 for 'Herbert *op. cit.*' read 'Hebert *op. cit.*'

p. 102 and elsewhere we have the wholly peculiar transcription of the Greek word for 'gospel', *euaggelion*.

From chapter 4 to chapter 6 there are no references given for the frequent biblical quotations. On page 119 there is mentioned 'John's peculiar quotation from the prophet Zacharias', which the reader will be unable to verify or understand unless he reads the comment of C. H. Dodd, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 300 on John 2. 16 in which it is suggested that the allusion is to Zach. 14. 21, understanding 'Canaanites' in that verse as 'merchants'. A most convincing suggestion, but the reader of the book should not have to turn to a review for his references.

These blemishes make an apparent reflection on the scholarship of the author that is entirely unmerited.

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

THE REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE OF JULIAN OF NORWICH, in a new translation by James Walsh, S.J.; Burns and Oates, 18s.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF OURSELVES AND OF GOD, edited by James Walsh and Eric Colledge; Mowbrays, 7s. 6d.

This new edition of Mother Julian's *Revelations*, together with a first publication of the Westminster Cathedral Library florilegium, discovered in 1955, will come as a gratifying surprise to many of us who consider ourselves already highly favoured by the recent work of Fr Molinari and Sister Reynolds. With Fr Huddleston's and Miss Warrack's editions of the *Revelations* still in print, there obviously has to be a good reason for Fr Walsh's work. The reason is to be found, interestingly enough, in the florilegium.

Miss Warrack based her edition on the Sloane MS in the British Museum, since it seemed to preserve Julian's fourteenth century English rather better than the earlier Paris MS in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The readings of the Paris MS, however, are consistently favoured by the extracts from Julian in the Westminster Cathedral florilegium (c. 1500), against those of the Sloane. Fr Walsh has therefore taken the Paris MS as the basis of his new edition, although he adopts Sloane readings wherever these are linguistically or textually superior.