

(attributed rather oddly to 'authoritative professors') that the ideas are not to be understood as transcendent metaphysical realities but as methodological principles for our thinking; and he makes a sharper distinction than most students of Plato would approve between the content of the Socratic and the non-Socratic dialogues. Of course there *are* important differences; but Lodge seems rather too anxious to separate as widely as possible the highly respectable, conservatively progressive social scientist who wrote the *Laws* from that disruptive, disturbing, and altogether somewhat tiresome person Socrates. And in general, though it is often difficult to say what, if anything, has been left out or what precisely has gone wrong, the impression given of Plato's thought is somehow very different from that given by a reading of the Dialogues, even the later Dialogues. It is rather like Aristotle's account of Pre-Socratic philosophy (or, indeed, of Plato's); one feels that the philosophy is being interpreted by a very different kind of mind and in terms which do not really suit it.

The best way, after all, to find out something about Plato is to read Plato, if not in the original, then in a translation. To anyone proposing to do this the translations of the *Philebus* and *Epinomis* by A. E. Taylor can be thoroughly recommended. They have been edited from his manuscript in the Edinburgh University Library by Professor Klibansky with the co-operation of Professor G. Calogero and Mr A. C. Lloyd. The *Philebus* has a substantial introduction by A. E. Taylor himself, the *Epinomis* a shorter but extremely interesting introduction by A. C. Lloyd. Another volume is to appear containing Taylor's translations, with substantial introductions, of the *Sophistes* and *Politicus*. Taylor, though his views on many subjects did not receive general assent, was one of the very greatest of English Platonic scholars and the publication of so much hitherto unknown work on Plato by him is very welcome.

A. H. ARMSTRONG

PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS OF BIBLICAL TRANSLATION. By W. Schwarz.
(Cambridge University Press; 25s.)

This book is furnished with the valuable testimonial of a commendatory foreword from Dr C. H. Dodd. The author's learning is applauded by his eminent sponsor, and he is also acclaimed for his penetration. The praise of the wise is not of course lightly to be set aside; and of the learning here exhibited and the industry which has served it there can be no doubt. But penetration? It was for precisely the want of any such quality that one reader at least found the book a sore trial to his patience.

The author wholly misunderstands the function of authority in the Church with regard to biblical studies and translations, and is con-

tinually drawing conclusions about it to which the facts he himself provides are as continually giving the lie. Space does not permit us to meet his misstatements with the retort courteous; we can only give the more outstanding of them the somewhat ruder treatment of contradiction flat and denial categorical.

1. That the Vulgate is the authentic version of the Latin Church does *not* mean that it replaces the original in every respect; or that all Catholic translations of the Bible must be based on the Vulgate; or that the Catholic exegete must be concerned with the Vulgate rather than with the original Greek and Hebrew texts.

2. No theologian could possibly maintain that the Vulgate is divinely inspired in the sense in which the original, and in St Augustine's opinion the Septuagint, was inspired; nor that it is a translation wholly free from mistakes. All that its authenticity means is that even where it mistranslates, it does not contain anything contrary to faith or morals.

3. The Church has not, does not, and indeed cannot fear that the progress of studies on the Greek and Hebrew text of the Bible is dangerous to its traditional teaching.

4. There is nothing therefore really odd about the fact that the early humanists were good Churchmen, or that Reuchlin died a member of the Roman Catholic Church, or that Erasmus never dreamt of leaving it.

5. The Church is not opposed to exegesis based on personal thought. For its authority is there to guide and stimulate thought, not to provide the intellectually hide-bound with a substitute for it.

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

GOD'S IRON. A Life of the Prophet Jeremiah. By George A. Birmingham. (Geoffrey Bles; 16s.)

Those who in the days of their youth, like the present writer, enjoyed *Spanish Gold* and the other hilarious Irish tales of George A. Birmingham, probably learnt with some surprise that the author was a reverend clergyman; though they need not have been so surprised for the clergy are by no means the least merry of men. There must have been good reason why people used to speak of the jolly old monks. The book under review proves that the late author (who was known in Dublin as Canon Hannay of St Patrick's Cathedral) was equally successful in writing a very different kind of book, one in fact in which there is not a suspicion of humour from the first page to the last. But the subject hardly lends itself to humour. Indeed it might be called a depressing book; but then Jeremiah was a depressing sort of person, as the popular use of his name shows. Nevertheless, he was a man whom Canon Hannay evidently held in great reverence, and the study of