

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. IX. No. 2.

December 1956

SAINT THOMAS ON THE SALVATION OF INFIDELS

A careful study of the revealed doctrine on the absolute necessity of faith for salvation gives rise to a number of interesting problems which have captivated the interest of many theologians throughout the centuries. One of these problems, and undoubtedly one of the most complex in all theology, is that which concerns the salvation of infidels¹.

The problem. It is certain and Catholic doctrine that to all adults without exception is offered before death sufficient opportunity for eliciting an act of supernatural faith. This doctrine is really a theological conclusion from two revealed truths: the universal salvific will and the absolute necessity of faith for salvation². The problem of the salvation of infidels can be set down more clearly as follows: how can an adult, who through no fault of his own is invincibly ignorant of the Church and Her Founder, elicit an act of supernatural faith? Since such an act presupposes a knowledge of divine revelation, the chances for such an adult eliciting an act of faith and obtaining justification would seem to be very small indeed, unless we are prepared to admit some sort of miraculous intervention on the part of God. Therefore the heart of the problem comes down to this: how can a negative infidel come to a knowledge of divine revelation in order to elicit an act of justifying faith?

Broadly speaking, the theories advanced by theologians in their attempt to answer our question can be reduced to three:

(a) the theory of an evangelization of the dead, which is held by many Protestants³ and Oriental Schismatics⁴, but which has been condemned

¹ The following two works are among the most complete discussions on the problem of the salvation of infidels: L. Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles*, Toulouse: Grand Sém., 1934; (vol. i, *Essai historique*, vol. ii, *Essai Théologique*); R. Lombardi S. J., *La Salvezza di chi non ha Fede*, Rome, Civiltà Cattolica, 1949.

² DB 799, 801, 200, 1096, 1294. Cf. Lombardi, op. cit., p. 84.

³ E. G. Martensen, *Dogmatique chrétienne*, Paris, 1879, pp. 484-574.

⁴ See M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, t. IV, Paris, 1931, pp. 318 f.

by the Church⁵;

(b) the theory of the existence of a limbo for adults, which was advanced by some Catholic apologists⁶;

(c) the theory of some special intervention of God at some particular time in life, at least at the moment of death.

Though the Magisterium of the Church has never taught anything explicit on this matter, the third theory is the only one that is in accord with Catholic teaching. It is up to the theologian to inquire further on the nature of this special intervention of God. Here again many theories have been put forward by Catholics, ranging from an interior inspiration whereby God reveals Himself directly to the soul⁷, to a miraculous private revelation through an angel⁸. In this paper we will examine one of the solutions proposed by St Thomas Aquinas in his theory of the *puer veniens ad usum rationis*.

Thomistic Theory. According to St Thomas, to every unbaptized person attaining the use of reason is immediately offered sufficient knowledge of divine revelation for eliciting an act of supernatural faith and thus obtaining justification. Whereas the baptized child, already possessing the infused habit of faith, need not immediately elicit an act of that virtue at the attainment of the use of reason, the unbaptized adult can be justified only by eliciting an act of faith and therefore it must be possible for him to elicit such an act from the very beginning of his adult life, that is from the moment of his first human act. One would indeed be tempted to discard from the beginning such a daring and, at first sight, oversimplified theory if it did not enjoy the authority of the Angelic Doctor. We shall therefore begin by showing how this theory is actually contained in St Thomas, and then we shall proceed to examine its merit and value in the light of Thomistic commentators and modern theologians⁹.

How taught by Aquinas. We can distinguish three steps in this theory as proposed by Aquinas. In the first place it is beyond doubt that, according to St Thomas, as soon as the child attains the use of reason,

⁵ Cf. DB 530, 531, 693.

⁶ Mancini, *De Auxiliis, Palestra del Clero*, 1939, pp. 219-37.

⁷ See Capéran, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 124.

⁸ The theory of the angel is commonly taught by theologians following St Thomas; see *De Veritate*, q. 14, a. 11, ad 1.

⁹ It may be well to emphasize that in this article we are discussing only the requirements for the act of faith, and not those for first justification in general. Hence the doctrine of the Council of Trent (DB 796), on the *votum baptismi* (which in the concrete is an act of perfect charity) as the only possible substitute for the sacrament of baptism, is presupposed throughout our entire discussion.

that is, as soon as the child has become an adult in the fullest sense of the word, he will necessarily make a choice through his first human act with regard to his ultimate end in order to give a direction to his whole life. This transition from childhood to adult age need not be considered as a sudden event taking place in one single instant, but is rather a gradual and complex process of intellect and will of the child. It is at the conclusion of this process that the first free and truly human act takes place. Here are the words of the Angelic Doctor: 'For the first thing that occurs to a man who has the power of discretion, is to think of the object to which he should refer all things as to their end, since the end is the first thing in the intention. Therefore this is the time when man is bound by God's affirmative precept which the Lord expressed by saying (Zach. 1, 3) "Turn to Me... and I will turn to you" ¹⁰.

The second step of the theory is equally clear and unequivocal in St Thomas. If a man, when eliciting his first fully responsible act, does direct his life towards his ultimate end, he immediately receives sanctifying grace, unless of course he already possesses it through baptism. But if he refuses to direct his life to its end, he thereby sins mortally and becomes deserving of hell. These are Thomas's own words: 'And if he then directs himself to the due end, he will, by means of grace, receive the remission of original sin; whereas if he does not then direct himself to the due end, possessing as he does the ability of doing so at that particular age, he will sin mortally for not doing that which is in his power to do' ¹¹. And again: 'It is impossible for an adult to be in the state of original sin alone, without sanctifying grace; for, as soon as he attains the use of reason, if he has prepared himself for grace, he will receive grace; otherwise this very negligence will be imputed to him as a mortal sin' ¹². It is important to notice here that the passing to the state of grace after the completion of the first honest act is conceived by Aquinas as being so sudden, that he even excludes the possibility of venial sin co-existing in the soul with original sin alone. 'It is impossible for venial sin to co-exist with original sin, unless there

¹⁰ 'Primum enim quod occurrit homini discretionem habenti, est quod de ipso cogitet, ad quem alia ordinet sicut ad finem. Finis enim est prior in intentione. Et ideo hoc est tempus pro quo obligatur, ex Dei praecepto affirmativo, quo Dominus dicit: Convertimini ad me, et convertar ad vos, Zach. 1, 3' (I-II, q. 89, a. 6, ad 3).

¹¹ 'Et si quidem se ipsum ordinauerit ad finem debitum, per gratiam consequetur remissionem originalis peccati; si vero non ordinet seipsum ad debitum finem, secundum quod in illa aetate est capax discretionis, peccabit mortaliter, non faciens quod est in se' (Ibid. corp. art.).

¹² *De Veritate* q. 24, a. 12, ad 2; cf. *ibid.* q. 28, a. 3, ad 4; *De Malo* q. 5, a. 2, ad 8; *ibid.* q. 7, a. 10, ad 8.

is also a mortal sin in the soul¹³.

The Act of Faith. But what are the conditions that are absolutely necessary for the justification of an adult? Here we have reached the third step in St Thomas's theory, which brings us to the heart of our problem. Aquinas, of course, professed the fundamental Catholic teaching that the first requisite for justification is the act of faith. 'Those who enjoy the use of their free will', he says, 'are obliged to add their own merits to the merits of Christ. Now merit consists in the act of a virtue. But the act of a virtue depends on the act of faith, which regulates the intention; hence an act of faith is required for salvation in those who possess the exercise of free will'¹⁴. Some theologians were so far from doubting that Aquinas held the necessity of strict faith for justification, that they claimed he even held a stricter view than is commonly admitted with regard to the object of the act of faith. There is therefore no way of reading Ripalda's theory of *fides late dicta* into St Thomas's text¹⁵.

There is a text in *De Veritate* which seems to admit the possibility of a considerable lapse of time between the first free act and the grace of justification: 'If a man, brought up in the woods (*nutritus in silvis*) keeps the natural law by seeking what is good and avoiding what is evil, it is to be held that God will either reveal to him, by an internal inspiration, the truths that are necessary for salvation, or send him a preacher of the faith just as He sent Peter to Cornelius'¹⁶. This text, however, can be easily reconciled with the theory of St Thomas; since Aquinas held that an explicit act of faith in the Incarnation, Redemption and the Trinity is indispensable for salvation in the present dispensation, it follows that no adult who has kept the natural law will die before having known these mysteries. This does not necessarily mean that he will not be justified before having known them¹⁷.

Thomistic Commentators. Having established how the theory known as that of the *puer veniens ad usum rationis* is contained in the writings of St Thomas¹⁸, we now proceed to a closer view of it in the light of

¹³ 'Dicendum quod impossibile est quod peccatum veniale sit in aliquo cum originali peccato absque mortali' (I-II, q. 89, a. 6, corp.art.).

¹⁴ In III Sent., q. 25, a. 2, sol. 1; cf. *Summa Theol.*, q. 68, a. 1, ad 1.

¹⁵ Cf. S. Harent S.J., 'Infidèles', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Paris: Letouzey, t. vii, col. 1864; cf. also Lombardi, op. cit., p. 449, note 2.

¹⁶ *De Veritate*, q. 14, a. 11, ad 1.

¹⁷ Capéran, op. cit. vol. ii, p. 59.

¹⁸ Impossible d'élever ici le moindre doute: la doctrine de l'option nécessaire pour ou contre Dieu, des l'éveil du sens moral, est un point de doctrine thomiste des plus fermes' (Ibid. p. 65).

Thomistic commentators and theologians. From the foregoing it is clear that the parts of the theory that need further investigation are only the first two, as it is beyond discussion that an act of faith is absolutely required for justification. With regard to the first part of the theory, namely the strict obligation in conscience of directing one's life to the ultimate end at the attainment of the use of reason, most theologians agree with Aquinas, provided emphasis is laid on the fact that the attainment of the use of reason is considered as a psychological process of fairly long duration, and not as an indivisible physical instant in time. The second part of the theory, which claims that justification follows immediately upon the first free human act, if that is morally good, has met serious opposition on the part of most commentators and modern theologians; in fact even those who agree with Aquinas on this score do very little more than rephrase the Thomistic doctrine and consider it quite unnecessary to develop further arguments in support of the theory. A number of other theologians, perhaps more sincere, are not prepared to grant the theory as a whole more than a note of probability. What follows is a brief review of some of the outstanding commentators and theologians.

The Dominican School. Capreolus, the Prince of Thomists, arguing against Durandus, refers to the theory of Aquinas with approval and considers the arguments put forth against the theory as 'manifestly false'¹⁹. Elsewhere Capreolus simply rephrases the theory without proving it: 'The child, when the time comes when he is capable of using his reason, refers to God his whole being (*se et sua*); if he fails to do so, he sins mortally *juxta imaginationem Sancti Thomae*'²⁰. Cajetan is less optimistic than his predecessor in his interpretation of the Angelic Doctor. In his refutation of Gregory of Rimini, who had defended the view that all actions of infidels are sins, he refers to this theory of St Thomas and recalls that infidels can avoid mortal sin because they are capable of tending to God, their ultimate end, at least implicitly; this they do when they tend to the *bonum honestum*, which they can know by reason. But this implicit tendency to God, adds Cajetan, is not sufficient for eternal salvation because it is not an act of perfect charity and therefore is not of itself justifying²¹. Hence Cajetan admits that an adult infidel can place a morally good act at the attainment of the use of reason without thereby being justified; in other words, Cajetan teaches, against the opinion of St Thomas, that original sin can remain in an adult infidel without personal mortal sin.

¹⁹ Capreolus, *In IV Sent.*, Vives, 1893, t. vi, pp. 344 ff.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, t. iv, p. 462.

²¹ Cajetan, *Comment in I-II*, Rome; Leon., 1892, t. vii, p. 147.

Soto and Cano. The remaining Dominican commentators of the sixteenth century are likewise reserved in expressing their views on the theory under discussion. Thus Dominic Soto, in a work dedicated to the Fathers of the Council of Trent, regards the theory as 'not certain'²², though in a later work he prefers to say that it is 'not without foundation'²³. Melchior Cano believes that the theory is only probable, and claims that it is so also in the mind of St Thomas himself, because the argument that he uses (*facienti quod est in se, etc.*) is one of fitness only²⁴.

Medina. Among the Dominican commentators of St Thomas, Bartholomew Medina was the first one to discuss the theory in detail. Commenting on the theory, Medina begins by saying that it has given rise to innumerable discussions and occasioned some grave errors among subtle theologians. Subsequently he analyses the various objections that have been raised against the theory, and concludes by stating that the theory is highly probable²⁵. He also lines up a number of arguments in its favour, like the following: (a) a man is obliged to accept a law from the moment it is promulgated to him; but the natural law is promulgated to every man when he attains the use of reason, and acceptance of a law implies a sincere resolution to keep it, i.e. to regulate one's life according to its dictates; therefore at the attainment of the use of reason every man is obliged in conscience to accept the natural law and to direct himself to his ultimate end to which the law is ordained; (b) it is a sin of grave negligence to fail to do as soon as possible what is supremely important in one's life, or to postpone it without sufficient reason; but the supreme thing in one's life is to ordain one's life to the ultimate end, nor can there be a sufficient reason for postponing it since by hypothesis the end is already sufficiently known by reason; therefore it is a grave sin not to ordain one's life to the end at the attainment of the use of reason. (c) If the child were not bound in conscience to take such a step at the attainment of the use of reason, it could happen that he commits a venial sin before he actually does take the step; in that case venial sin would co-exist in the soul with original sin alone; but this is quite impossible, because if he should die in that state he could not expiate his venial sin after death, for he cannot be admitted to hell, limbo or purgatory.

Bañez, John of St Thomas, Gonet. In the seventeenth century the theory of the Angelic Doctor was more favourably received by his commentators.

²² Dom. Soto, *De Natura et Gratia*, Salamanca, 1561, p. 127.

²³ *De Justitia et Jure*, Anvers, 1567, p. 44.

²⁴ Cano, *Relectio de Sacramentis in genere*, Venice, 1776, t. ii, p. 342.

²⁵ Medina, *Expositio in I-II S Thomae*, Venice, 1590, pp. 472 ff.

Bañez, after repeating Medina's arguments, puts forth what seems to be a most convincing argument in favour of the first part of the theory. The first thing, says Bañez, that occurs to a child at the attainment of the use of reason is to think of himself: because the child knows and loves himself more than anything else around him and naturally relates everything to himself. But should he not relate his own being to something superior than himself, as to the ultimate end? It would surely constitute a grave disorder if he should establish himself as the ultimate end contrary to the dictates of his conscience²⁶. Nevertheless, when Bañez comes to examining the second part of the theory, he is satisfied by saying that it is 'a pious belief'. Both John of St Thomas and Gonet accept the Thomistic theory as certain and without reserve, but they too consider it quite unnecessary to advance fresh arguments in its favour. To the objection that a child cannot possibly learn in one instant the articles of faith which are necessary for the act of faith, John of St Thomas replies that the child learns these articles of faith successively and yet within the limits of the intellectual process that precedes the first free human act. He thus assigns a beginning and an end to the first use of reason, and it is only at the termination of the process that the precept of turning to God obliges²⁷. Gonet is more vigorous in expressing himself in favour of the theory. 'The Angelic Doctor', writes Gonet, 'speaks so clearly, so unequivocally and so repeatedly about this doctrine, that to my mind whoever departs from him on this score has no right to be called Thomist'²⁸.

Billuart. Billuart, writing in the middle of the eighteenth century, falls back on his sixteenth century predecessors by defending the first part of the theory as certain and rejecting the second part. As regards the strict obligation of directing one's life to the ultimate end when eliciting the first human act, Billuart insists that by 'use of reason' we must understand a full and perfect use of the spiritual faculties such as is necessary and sufficient for man to distinguish between right and wrong and to direct himself to the ultimate end. The instant in which this takes place is one only in the moral sense, for it comprises in itself a series of physical moments. Hence the thesis of Aquinas, according to Billuart, should read as follows: At the first moral instant in which man makes the first perfect use of his reason, he is held, under pain of mortal sin, to turn to God either implicitly or explicitly²⁹. As to the

²⁶ Bañez, *Scholastica Commentaria in II-II Angelici Doctoris*, Douai, 1615, pp. 245 f.

²⁷ John of St Thomas, *Cursus theol.*, Ed. Vives, 1886, t. VII, p. 99

²⁸ Gonet, *De Vitiis et peccatis*, Ed. Vives, 1876, t. IV, p. 431.

²⁹ Billuart, *Summa S. Thomae hodiernis accademiarum moribus accomodata sive*

second part of the theory, Billuart follows Cajetan's interpretation that there is no certain reason why justification should follow immediately after the first good human act. Billuart's views are shared by Hugueny, who asserts that while God can give an illuminating grace to the infidel at the beginning of his moral life, He has not promised to do so in every individual case³⁰.

) *Other Schools.* We now pass to examine briefly some of the more outstanding non-Dominican theologians. Among these too we find a difference of opinion with regard to the theory of the Angelic Doctor. St Bonaventure, the first one to comment on the theory, was also the first one to reject it as a whole, admitting the possibility of venial sin existing in the soul with original sin and without personal mortal sin³¹. The Camelites of Salamanca, on the other hand, are in agreement with Gonet in their whole-hearted acceptance of the Thomistic theory. They affirm without hesitation that 'this theory constitutes an essential part of the whole system of the Angelic Doctor, nor can one abandon it without ceasing to be a Thomist'³². Peter of Aragon, an Augustinian monk who also taught at Salamanca in the sixteenth century, believes that fidelity to St Thomas can be reconciled with a certain liberty and considers the theory only as probable³³.

Suarez. Among the opponents of the theory, Suarez seems to have been the most vigorous of all. According to Suarez neither part of the theory has been sufficiently proved, either by St Thomas or by Thomists. His main objection to the first part of the theory is his contention that determining one's way of life for the future is a matter of such importance that it requires prudence and mature judgement; it is therefore hard to see, claims Suarez, how a child can be obliged in conscience to make such a choice with the very first free act of his will³⁴. The second part of the Thomistic theory is equally false to Suarez's view, nor does it necessarily follow from the first part, for God is not obliged to give the light of supernatural faith immediately after the position of the first good act. The dogma of the universal salvific will, adds Suarez, is sufficiently saved if we hold that God will give the necessary proximate means of salvation some time before death. Furthermore, to save the gratuitous character of grace, it is necessary to exclude every infallible

cursor theologicus, Wircemb.: Stahel, 1758, t. VIII, p. 379.

³⁰ P. Hugueny, O.P., *Revue Thomiste*, 13 (1905) pp. 667 f.

³¹ Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, q. 42, a. 2, ad 2.

³² Salmanticenses, *De Vitiis et Peccatis*, Ed. Palme, t. VIII, p. 491.

³³ *Commentaria in II-II Sancti Thomae*, Venice, 1625, p. 79.

³⁴ Suarez, *De Vitiis et Peccatis*, Ed. Vives, t. IV, p. 540.

link between man's disposition and the granting of justification. Hence it is more probable that God does not offer it at all at the beginning, even though the first human act be according to natural law³⁵.

Lugo. Lugo is more favourable to the theory and regards it as common opinion among theologians. He believes, however, that it should be interpreted rather broadly and in such a way as to allow the possibility of a delay between the first good act and justification itself³⁶. Lugo's favourable opinion was followed by two Benedictines who wrote towards the end of the seventeenth century, namely Cardinal d'Aguirre³⁷ and Paul Mezger³⁸, both of whom accepted the Thomistic theory without restriction. The latter was the first one to point out that from the theory it follows that negative infidelity, understood as invincible ignorance of faith, is an impossibility.

Modern Theologians. Coming now to examine some of the modern theologians who have discussed the theory of the Angelic Doctor in their works, we will not be surprised to find the same difference of opinion that existed among earlier writers. Thus while Schiffini³⁹ and Beraza⁴⁰ find the theory 'hard to understand', Capéran⁴¹ and Van der Meersch⁴² accept the theory without reserve. Two other modern theologians, Harent⁴³ and d'Alès⁴⁴, after examining the opinions of some of their predecessors, declare that no convincing arguments have yet been advanced in favour of the second part of the theory. Cardinal Billot touches upon the Thomistic theory only in passing, when developing his own doctrine

³⁵ *De Gratia*, Ed. Vives, t. VIII, pp. 348 ff.

³⁶ Lugo, *De Incarnatione*, Ed. Vives, t. II, p. 425.

³⁷ D'Aguirre, *Sancti Anselmi theologia commentariis et disputationibus illustrata*, Rome, 1688, t. I, p. 145.

³⁸ Mezger, *Theologia Scholastica secundum viam et doctrinam D. Thomae*, Augsburg, 1719, t. III, p. 51.

³⁹ Schiffini, *De Gratia Divina*, Freiburg, Herder, 1901, p. 548.

⁴⁰ Beraza, *Tractatus de Gratia Christi*, Bilbao, 1929, p. 403: 'Doctores Catholici de hac doctrina varie loquuntur. Plures enim, clausis mentis oculis, toto corde illam amplectuntur; alii suis commentariis illam obscure videntur; alii ei aperte contradicunt; alii denique, quos et nos sequimur, summa cum reverentia suo auctori relinquunt'.

⁴¹ Capéran op. cit., vol. ii, pp. 65 ff.: 'Si Dieu accord aux infidèles, en temp et lieu, des grâces de salut suffisantes, ce sera assurément à l'heure suprême, mais aussi à d'autres moments de la vie et tout d'abord, ce semble, au premier éveil de sens moral'.

⁴² Van der Meersch, 'Grâce', *Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique*, t. VI, cols. 1601 ff.

⁴³ Harent, art. cit., cols. 1863-94.

⁴⁴ D'Alès, 'Salut', *Dictionnaire apologetique de la foi catholique*, t. IV, cols. 1166 f.

on the existence of moral infants, that is of persons who are adult with regard to their age and physical development, but infants as regards spiritual and moral development⁴⁵. Without formally pronouncing himself either in favour or against the theory of Aquinas, Billot sees in it a confirmation of his own doctrine, because 'the Angelic Doctor teaches that a man, to be truly adult in the moral sense, must not only know God as the ultimate end of human life, but have the consciousness of an obligation to relate himself to Him by an act of perfect charity'⁴⁶.

Lombardi. In Father Lombardi's recent book, 'La salvezza di chi non ha Fede', which deals at great length with the whole problem of the salvation of non-Catholics, we have one of the most detailed analysis of the Thomistic theory⁴⁷. After examining the various arguments that have been advanced either for or against the theory, Father Lombardi very reluctantly departs from the Angelic Doctor. While admitting a degree of probability for the first part of the theory, he adheres to Suarez in rejecting the second part, without however subscribing to all the Suaresian objections against it.

Summarizing our historical inquiry on the interpretation and views of commentators and theologians with regard to the theory of the Angelic Doctor, we can state the following: of the twenty-five authors we have examined, ten accept the theory in its entirety, four consider it as only probable, and four others reject it as a whole; the remaining seven accept the first part but reject the second. Hence it is clear that, as far as extrinsic probability goes, one cannot hesitate to say that the theory of Aquinas is probable. But what about its intrinsic probability?

Intrinsic Probability. As we come to examine the arguments advanced by St Thomas and his commentators in favour of the theory, we must again distinguish the first from the second part. The arguments for the first part are, in our view, quite conclusive and it is therefore no wonder that they have been rejected as false only by four out of the twenty-five authors mentioned in this paper. The best of these arguments is that proposed by St Thomas himself and developed by Medina⁴⁸. It can be formulated as follows: The activity of a non-baptized person is not yet habitually referred to the end; it therefore remains unrelated to the end until the person knows the end and formally refers himself to the end through a free human act. But every man already knows the end by reason

⁴⁵ Billot, 'La Providence de Dieu e le nombre infini d'hommes hors de la voie normale du salut', Etudes 1919-23.

⁴⁶ Ibid. 1920, pp. 515 ff.

⁴⁷ Lombardi, op. cit., pp. 444-66.

⁴⁸ I-II, q. 89, a. 6, ad 3; cf. ibid. q. 88, a. 1.

when he elicits his first human act: that is, as soon as he becomes a true adult in the moral sense. Therefore, every man can direct himself to the end when he elicits his first human act. But if he can, he is obliged in conscience to do so; otherwise he is responsible for a free act that is unrelated to, and therefore averted from, the end. Such an act is a grave deordination, a mortal sin. It cannot be a venial sin, because a venial sin is an action substantially in conformity with the end. Hence the first part of St Thomas's theory follows logically: the first human act of a non-baptized adult is necessarily either a mortal sin or a morally good act. The force of this argument is more easily perceived if one recalls the remark made by Billuart and others, emphasizing the fact that the attainment of the use of reason does not take place in an indivisible physical instant, but is rather a psychological process made up of several physical acts.

Facienti quod est in se. The argument advanced by the Angelic Doctor to support the second part of his theory is substantially as follows: God gives grace to a man who prepares himself for it by doing what is right, i.e. *facienti quod est in se*⁴⁹. But the unbaptized adult who substantially refers himself to God through his first human act does what is right. Therefore, God gives grace to the unbaptized adult whose first free act is morally good⁵⁰. Conclusive as this argument seems at first sight, it is open to one rather serious objection. Granted that the condition implied in the principle *facienti quod est in se* is already verified in the first human act, it is not yet clear that the grace immediately given by God is sanctifying grace and not merely an actual grace; or, to put it inversely, if the grace that God has promised to give is sanctifying grace, it is nowhere revealed that God has promised to grant it immediately after the first free good act⁵¹. This objection, however, does not at all deprive the theory of its intrinsic probability, since its contention is that God has not revealed to us whether He actually grants justification immediately after the first good act or waits for further dispositions in the good adult. The objection, in our view, contains nothing that positively militates against the theory. What is more, as Capéran remarks⁵², if there is a convenient time for God to be liberal with His

⁴⁹ Ibid., q. 112, a. 3; Aquinas does not here mention explicitly the first human act, but treats the problem in general: 'utrum necessario detur gratia se praeparanti ad gratiam, vel facienti quod est in se'.

⁵⁰ All proportion between the naturally good act of an unbaptized person and sanctifying grace is, of course, excluded; it is possible, nevertheless, that the same honest act be elevated to the supernatural order through actual grace and thus have proportion to sanctifying grace to which actual grace itself is ordained.

⁵¹ Cf. Lombardi, op. cit., p. 459.

⁵² Op. cit., vol. ii, p. 65; cf. note 41, supra.

grace, that time surely must be when man directs himself to God through his first free act. To Suarez's main objection, that the Thomistic theory destroys the gratuity of grace, we can reply that the infallible connection between the good act of the unbaptized adult and justification is, in the mind of St Thomas, not in the nature of things, nor is it to be attributed to the intrinsic merit of the action, but is exclusively due to the free choice of God who will never let Himself be overcome by men in generosity⁵³.

Conclusion. It is therefore sufficiently clear from the foregoing that the theory we have discussed in this paper enjoys sufficient intrinsic probability. While among the several objections that have been raised against it there is not a single one that positively weakens its plausibility, the very authority of the Angelic Doctor throws such a great weight of extrinsic probability on it, that one can safely accept it without fear of contradicting any of the truths of faith⁵⁴. There is no way of knowing here on earth how many souls actually benefit from this 'extraordinary' way by which God communicates himself to souls; but meanwhile the theory of Aquinas cannot but inspire fresh hopes in every Catholic who has at heart the salvation of his fellow men.

MAURICE EMINYAN S.J.

⁵³ Cf. I-II, q. 89, a. 6, ad 3.

⁵⁴ The dogmatic axiom '*extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*' remains universally true. Such souls justified and eventually saved apart from the sacramental system of the Church, are nevertheless justified and saved through the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. They are therefore 'invisible' members of the one visible Church. On the subject of 'invisible membership', see: Yve de Montcheuil, *Aspects de l'Église*, Paris: Cerf., 1949, p. 138; P. Lippert, *Die Kirche Christi*, Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1931, p. 268; A. Léonard, 'Simone Weil et l'appartenance invisible à l'Église', *Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle*, 1952, pp. 137-67.

CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION IN THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES

The term Catechesis is derived from the Greek *κατηχέω* which means to sound over or through and therefore to make echo, hence, in its figurative sense, to teach in such a way that the words of the master are an echo of the students' questions and the replies of the students are so to say the echo of the teacher's questions. Hence *κατηχέω* has come to signify instruction by word of mouth given chiefly by the method of question and answer.¹

We find the word *κατηχέω* used in the meaning of instruction by word of mouth in St Luke², in St Paul³, in Clement of Alexandria⁴, and others; while in the particular meaning of instruction in the truths of the faith we find it used in a general way by all Christian writers. In the Acts Apollo appears to us as instructed in the way of the Lord (*κατηχημῆτος τῆν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου*)⁵; St Luke wrote his Gospel so that Theophilus might know the truth of those things in which he had been instructed (*περὶ ὧν κατηχήθη*)⁶; St Paul says that he had rather speak five words with his understanding that he might instruct (*κατηχήσω*) others also⁷, and he instructs him, that is instructed in the word (*ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον*) to communicate with him that instructeth (*τῷ κατηχούντι*) in all good things⁸. The word therefore passed into ecclesiastical use with a technical meaning implying both the act of instructing and the subject-matter of instruction. We find the same thing in the English Language: the term catechism was formerly also used to indicate the act of instructing, but nowadays it is only used for the subject-matter of instruction—for the book in which religious knowledge is given by the method of question and answer⁹.

In the very first days of Christianity, those who wished to embrace the Christian faith received very short instructions for they were Jews and already adored the true God. For the Gentiles a longer preparation was required: they had to become used to Christian life and doctrine for they had no idea of the Scriptures and their moral code was rather

¹ Liddel-Scott, *Greek English Lexicon*, vol. i, p. 927 (9th ed., Oxford)

² Acts 21, 21, 24

⁴ PG 8, 348

⁶ Lk. 1, 4

⁸ Gal. 6, 6

⁹ *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. i, p. 276 (3rd ed. Oxford).

³ Gal. 6, 6

⁵ Acts 18, 25

⁷ 1 Cor. 14, 19

different from the ten commandments. This preparation took more than a few days and only those who gave an assurance of becoming good Christians were finally admitted into the Church for the Church had to be careful whom to admit: among those asking for admission into the Church there might be those who would turn back to pagan practices and so be a scandal to the Christian community and a reason for an attack on the Church; or there might be those who wished to become Christians so as to be able to live on Christian charity or worse still to spy on Christians and then accuse them in time of persecution. So the Church had to establish a systematic organization for those asking to be received into the Church: an organization whose chief scope was to prepare would-be Christians by instructing them in the faith and making known to them the Christian way of life. This organization, the catechumenate, reached its peak in the third-fourth century, but traces of it already appear in Apostolic times.

Oral instruction by means of question and answer had been one of the most common methods of instruction used by moral and religious teachers of all countries and all ages. We find this method practised among the Hebrews¹⁰ who had three forms of catechizing: domestic, scholastic and ecclesiastical. The first was given by the head of the family for the benefit of his children and servants, the second by teachers in schools, the third by priests and levites in the temple and in the synagogues. Proselytes were carefully instructed before becoming members of the Jewish faith, while the regular instruction of children began when they were twelve years old. In fact we read about Jesus in the temple sitting in the midst of the doctors hearing them and asking them questions: 'and all that heard him were astonished at his wisdom and his answers'¹¹. Jesus Himself often made use of this method: 'whom do you say the Son of Man is? But whom say ye that I am?'¹² We can therefore conclude that the Apostles used the same method of instruction. But what was the subject matter of the instruction given to those who sought admission into the Church in the first two centuries? To answer this question we have to refer to the New Testament writings and to the Fathers of the first two centuries.

Before Christ ascended into heaven, He bade His Apostles to go and teach, that is, to make disciples among all nations, instructing them — διδάσκοντες — to observe all he had commanded them to do, and in this way to admit them into the Church baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost¹³.

In obedience to Christ's command St Peter, on Pentecost Day, stood

¹⁰ Cfr. Ex. 12, 26. 27; Dt. 6, 20. 21

¹¹ Lk. 2, 47

¹² Mt. 16, 14. 15

¹³ Mt. 28, 19. 20

up with the eleven and declared to the Jews and proved to them from the Scriptures that Jesus was truly Lord and Christ, and when he convinced them he invited them to do penance and be baptized in the name of Jesus¹⁴. In this speech St Peter proved the messianic character of Jesus from the Scriptures and from the fact that Jesus rose from the dead. The authority of the Bible was beyond dispute: it was only necessary to find that quotation so evidently applicable to Christ that it could in no way be gainsaid, and so it would be impossible to refuse belief in Him to whom it was applied. The whole speech revolves around two points: the messianic character and the person of the Messiah Himself. The person of the Messiah is altogether different from that imagined by the Jews and so to render less harsh the scandal of the Cross one insisted on the glory of the Resurrection¹⁵.

We find again these two main ideas in the discourse St Peter held at the Beautiful Gate after the miracle of the lame man¹⁶: but they are presented in a totally different way—we cannot expect to find in these early times a rigid formula of doctrine though we have fixed themes of doctrine which however, through improvisation, are presented in a variety of ways.

A new element is to be noticed in St Stephen's speech before the Sanhedrim: the historical proof. St Stephen, besides, showed that belief in Jesus as the Messiah meant the ending of the Old Covenant and the coming in of the new¹⁷.

Finally we must not leave unnoticed a very important and convincing element in the apostolic catechesis: the insistence the speakers made that they were eyewitnesses of the events about which they preached: 'whereof all we are witnesses'¹⁸.

We must also note that instruction was not only limited to dogmatic truth: from his very first speech St Peter insists on a moral renewal: penance so that one might be baptized and receive remission of his sins and the Holy Ghost¹⁹. Philip the deacon after proving to the eunuch of Candace from Isaias that Christ is the Son of God, makes no invitation to repentance and penance as the eunuch was a just man anxious to do God's will²⁰. For the same reason Peter gives no moral instructions to Cornelius but instructs him only on Jesus Christ, 'how God anointed Him with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were mastered by the devil, because God was with Him. And we are witnesses to all that he did in the country of the Jews

¹⁴ Acts 2, 22-39

¹⁶ Acts 3, 12-26

¹⁸ Acts 2, 32

²⁰ Acts 8, 26-40

¹⁵ DA CL ii, 2535

¹⁷ Acts 7, 2-53

¹⁹ Acts 2, 38

and in Jerusalem, whom also they slew, hanging him upon a tree. Him God raised up on the third day and granted that he should be made manifest... even (to) ourselves who ate and drank with him after he had risen from the dead; when he charged us to preach to the people and to testify that He it is who hath been appointed by God judge of the living and the dead; to Him all prophets bear witness testifying that through his name everyone that believeth in him is to receive forgiveness of sins²¹.

These points of doctrine were also touched by St Paul in his discourses to pagans: he taught publicly from house to house testifying to both Jews and Gentiles penance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. But in the case of pagans the approach was different. The Scriptures not only were not helpful but could easily be a hindrance; the appeal to the prophets would lead nowhere: what was required was to show to pagans the reasonableness of the Christian message and the futility of paganism. Whether speaking to the peasants of Lystra or to the philosophers of Athens, St Paul insisted on the fundamental truth of the existence of a just God, Creator and Redeemer of mankind, on the need of doing penance and of believing in the risen Christ.

A quotation from the Epistle to the Hebrews²² may help us to fix the main points on which the catechetical instruction of the early Church centred. The author of the epistle tells us: 'Wherefore leaving the word of the beginning of Christ let us go on to things more perfect, not laying again the foundation of penance from dead works, and faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and imposition of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgement. And this we will do if God permit.' We can therefore distinguish four sections in the catechetical instruction of the early church²³: a historical catechesis (the word of the beginning of Christ), a moral catechesis (the foundation of penance from dead works), a dogmatic catechesis (faith towards God), a liturgical catechesis (doctrine of baptisms and imposition of hands).

The historical catechesis comprised an account of the life, teachings and miracles of Our Lord; though each speaker would colour this account according to his own character, yet there would be agreement as regards what events and what teachings had to be recounted to the hearers. In fact there is no reason to doubt that the Synoptic Gospels are examples of this historical catechesis which comprised that period *quo intravit et exivit inter nos Dominus Jesus incipiens a baptisate Joannis usque in diem qua assumptus est a nobis*²⁴. St Peter's discourses in the Acts all follow this scheme, more or less, and one can legitimately conjecture

²¹ Acts 10, 38-43

²² Hebr. 6, 1-3

²³ F. Prat, *Theologie de St Paul*, vol. ii, ch. 2, Sec. 2

²⁴ Acts 1, 21. 22

that it was the prince of the Apostles himself who fixed the subject matter of the historical catechesis²⁵ which, first given orally, later on became fixed for all time in the synoptic gospels.

As to the dogmatic catechesis one can recognize in the New Testament writings traces of a form of doctrine (τύπος διδασχῆς)²⁶ which moulded as it were the faith of the new converts to Christ's law, and which involved not only the word of the faith believed in the heart but, with the mouth, confession made unto salvation²⁷. In close connection with this we might recall the profession of faith in Christ exacted from the eunuch of Candace²⁸ as a preliminary to his baptism, as well as the formula of Baptism itself in the name of the three persons of the Blessed Trinity. Moreover as soon as we begin to obtain any sort of detailed description of the administration of Baptism we find that before the actual conferment of the Sacrament, a profession of faith was always required from the candidate for the sacrament, a profession of faith which from the earliest times consisted in a clear and distinct confession of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. The oldest profession of faith which has reached us is the Apostles' Creed, though in its present form it cannot be dated prior to the end of the fifth century. It has developed from a combination of a Christological and a Trinitarian formula already in use at Rome in the second century. According to ancient tradition the Creed had to be learned by heart and never to be consigned to writing: this explains the fact that in no primitive creed has the text been preserved for us in a complete and continuous form — what we know of the earliest formulas is what we can piece together from quotations more or less scattered in the works of the early Christian writers.

The most primitive form of the Creed is that preserved for us in the Acts of the Apostles²⁹: I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Together with this Christological formula there must also have existed in apostolic times a Trinitarian confession of faith for the baptismal rite which later on became the dominant form. In the canonical writings, we may add, we find other Christological formulas more formal in character and more extensive in scope which might have also had liturgical use³⁰. From these formulas A. Seeberg³¹ has tried to reconstruct the formula of faith used by the Apostles, a formula implying belief in a living God, creator of all things, who sent His Son, born of the seed of David, Jesus

²⁵ G. Ricciotti, *Vita di Gesù*, par. 113, Tip. Ed. Vaticana

²⁶ Rom. 6, 17

²⁷ Rom. 10, 8. 10

²⁸ Acts 8, 37

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Rom. 1, 3; 1 Cor. 15, 3; 1 Tim. 3, 16; Phil. 2, 5-11; 1 Petr. 3, 18-22; 4, 5 etc.

³¹ A. Seeberg, *Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, p. 85, Leipzig, 1903

Christ who died for us according to the Scriptures, was buried and rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures, who sat on the right hand of the Father having made subject to him the angels, the powers and the virtues, and will return from the heavens full of power and glory. The reconstruction is very well done but we can never say that it is the creed used by the Apostles — examining the various texts from which Seeberg has reconstructed his creed we can clearly see that the statements are never made as forming part of a baptismal creed, and, besides, certain expressions, v.g. of the seed of David, have never found their way in any Creed formula³².

The first statements that our Apostles' Creed was composed by the Apostles themselves dates only from the fourth century. Rufinus is the first to state that the Creed was composed by the Apostles on Pentecost Day according to a tradition received from earlier ages³³. This statement cannot be accepted as a historical fact, but, on the other hand, the earliest Christian writers insist emphatically that the rule of faith is part of the apostolic tradition. This leads many to admit that perhaps St Peter and St Paul themselves, or their immediate successors, gave a primitive Creed to the Roman Church which during the third century passed from one church to another and finally prevailed in the universal Church. Though all agree that the primitive Roman form is the mother of all Western Creeds, we cannot say the same thing as regards the Eastern Creeds, though the Eastern Creeds might be considered as offshoots independently developing from the same stock from which the Western Creeds developed, a stock having its roots in the East. In fact, though the Eastern Creeds are different from the Western types, yet we may notice many analogies, and this can be explained from the fact that each bishop would adapt the Creed formula according to his own particular needs³⁴.

This formula of faith was certainly the subject matter of catechetical instruction. The Creed was taught to catechumens and before being baptized they would be questioned about it; later on this developed in the ceremonies of the *traditio* and the *redditio symboli*. Not all would be able to learn the Creed after having heard it once, and therefore we must suppose that after the solemn *traditio symboli* the catechists would teach the Creed to all the candidates for Baptism in such a way that they would recite it without hesitation on the day of the *Redditio symboli* from which none of those to receive baptism were certainly exempted. Insistence on a good catechetical instruction on the Creed would have been necessary on account of the fact that Christians had to know it well to avoid any alterations in its text; to which it was certainly sub-

³² DAEL II, 2543

³³ PL 21, 337

³⁴ J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. i, chp. 1, Sec. 1, Spectrum, Utrecht, 1950

jected by the various sects³⁵.

On what was the composition of the Creed based? Most probably its author or authors based themselves more on the oral teaching than on the written Gospels, though both the Creed and the Gospels speak in the same way about Christ's life on earth, his crucifixion, burial and exaltation. The main idea is the miracle of His earthly life: true Man born of the Virgin Mother, and true God, Son of the Father. The Creed gives us the same impression of the Lord as St Peter received when he was asked by Christ: Whom think ye to be the Son of Man? And Peter replied: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God³⁶. This impression is expressed in words which recall St Paul³⁷.

From the letter to the Hebrews³⁸ we know that the liturgical instruction of the faithful certainly included Baptism and Confirmation (the doctrine of baptisms and imposition of hands). It also included instruction on the Eucharist³⁹ and on the Lord's prayer⁴⁰, which was recited three times a day, probably at the Jewish times of prayer.

Finally with regard to the moral catechesis, some have thought that its basis is a writing of Jewish origin in which moral doctrines were imparted through a system which has come to be known as the system of the two ways. There are various Christian writings which contain more or less the same moral precepts imparted through this method. Foremost is the *Didachè*: with it we may mention the Epistle of Barbanas, the seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions, the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome, the Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles, the *Syntagma Doctrinae* falsely attributed to St Athanasius. All these writings seem to be dependent on the *Didachè*, though some have thought that all depend directly on some Jewish source adapted to Christian concepts. Some even say that the *Didachè* itself is of Jewish origin: a moral catechism for proselytes which Christians adopted for the instruction of the candidates for Baptism adding to it chapters on liturgy and ecclesiastical discipline. A full discussion of this question would lengthen this article too much: we can, for the present, just conclude that there are convincing arguments to show that the *Didachè*, the oldest, so to say, Christian catechism extant, is not of Jewish origin⁴¹.

Treating of the dogmatic catechesis of the apostolic times we have spoken of traces in the NT of a body or form of doctrine which moulded, so to say the faith of the new converts to Christ's law. We read, for

³⁵ DA CL II, 2545

³⁷ DA CL II, 2545

³⁹ I Cor. 11, 23-8

⁴² DA CL II, 2531

³⁶ Mt. 16, 16

³⁸ Hebr. 6, 1-3

⁴⁰ *Didachè*, 8, 2. 3; cfr. Rom. 8, 15; Gal.

example, that those who were converted on Pentecost day persevered in the doctrine of the Apostles (τῆ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν αποστόλων)⁴²; in his second letter St Peter exhorts the faithful to be mindful of the commandments of their apostles and of the precepts of the Lord and Saviour⁴³; St Paul exhorts Titus to hold fast to the word which is according to the teaching (κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν)⁴⁴ and to speak the things that become sound doctrine (διδασκαλίᾳ)⁴⁵ and he proclaims that those who teach otherwise are besotted with pride and know nothing⁴⁶. This body of doctrine hinted at by the passages referred to just now is also designated by the term ὁδός, v. g. 'my ways in Christ' (τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ)⁴⁷ and 'He was instructed in the way of the Lord'⁴⁸. Could the Didachè be this body of doctrine? The title under which the Didachè has reached us (Διδασχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων) corresponds exactly to the expression used in the Acts (τῆ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων) but this cannot prove anything, so many apocrypha exist.

Oral teaching was a custom long established in all Jewish schools: the teacher would say a sentence, recall the various comments and explanations given by doctors, and finally add his own elucidations. These sayings were orally transmitted for at least two centuries before they were laid down in writing. We must suppose that the Apostles followed this custom, but because the subject matter of their preaching was very limited compared to the casuistry of the rabbis, it soon became fixed. We must not forget that the Apostles were persons of limited culture and so they tended to use the same expressions once they had adopted them, and to repeat the same things using the same phrases: they preferred Christ's own words and this gave a fixity to their dogmatic teaching. The same can be said with regard to their moral teaching based as it was on the Decalogue and on Christ's own precepts. St Irenaeus and St Clement both witness to the fact that the faithful remembered not only the ideas imparted but the words themselves, and Papias of Hierapolis⁴⁹ is a clear example of the keenness of the first Christians to know the exact sayings of the Apostles. And therefore we can reasonably suppose that in the Didachè we have at least the subject matter of the moral catechesis of the Apostles. In fact the nature of the teachings imparted, the style, the language, its date and place of origin, are all favourable points to support the opinion that the Didachè is an example of the preaching of the Apostles who had to adapt themselves to the intellectual capacity of their audience and to support their statements with

⁴² Acts 2, 42

⁴⁴ Tit. 1, 9

⁴⁶ 1 Tim. 6, 3, 4

⁴⁸ Acts 18, 25

⁴³ 2 Petr. 3, 2

⁴⁵ Tit. 2, 1

⁴⁷ 1 Cor. 4, 17

⁴⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 39, 3-4

references to the OT so familiar to the people hearing them, without at the same time ignoring the spirit of Christ's teaching. The Didachè is planned on a method suggested by Christ himself: 'Enter ye at the narrow gate'⁵⁰; it lists the sins mentioned in St Paul's letters; it follows the plan suggested by Hebr. 6, 1-3 already quoted; its language is similar to that of the New Testament (of its 552 words 504 are found in NT) but different from the post-apostolic writings, the apocrypha, Philo, Josephus and the Septuagint. Together with the Gospels therefore, the Didachè gives us the apostolic catechesis, but while the Gospels in telling the life of our Lord teach moral and dogmatic truths in a manner which is in no wise didactic, the Didachè presents to us precepts for a Christian rule of life in the manner of a catechism text-book⁵¹.

That the Didachè was written in Greek is no argument against the opinion just mentioned: one can easily suppose that the Apostles, not very familiar with the Greek language and ignoring its niceties of style and the shades of meaning of Greek vocabulary, limited themselves to a series of phrases, simple and easy to remember, which they were careful not to change.

This opinion explains the various similarities and dissimilarities which are found in the various documents which reproduce the teachings of the Didachè. It is not a coherent product but an artless composition of various texts: in fact we must not suppose that any of the Apostles ever co-ordinated the various moral precepts he preached or wrote fixed rules of liturgy and ecclesiastical discipline. Some unknown person gathered the matter contained in the Didachè from the lips of one or other of the Apostles or of one of their successors, adding to it quotations from the Gospels. Perhaps this may have happened in Jerusalem itself, while parallel versions of the Didachè (in the Pseudo-Barnabas, the Apostolic Constitution, etc.) would represent the same catechesis as preached in other places v.g. Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage. The various dissimilarities between these versions can be easily explained through an elasticity natural in an oral tradition; and the text incorporated in these various works would, besides, be subjected to the adaptations their authors would have made in using it⁵².

Actually only the first six chapters are of a catechetical nature, and it is these six chapters which for a long time maintained their usefulness, for the liturgical and disciplinary precepts found in the remaining chapters, describing a very primitive state of Christian community, soon became obsolete. In actual fact the first six chapters were still useful for teaching catechumens of the eighth century on the banks of the

⁵⁰ Mt. 7, 13, 14

⁵¹ DAEL II, 2540

⁵² J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. i, Chp. I, Sec. 2, Spectrum, Utrecht, 1950

Rhine: St Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, made use of the doctrine of the two ways in his catechetical sermons.

In what way is this doctrine imparted?

The Way of Life is to love God and our neighbour. The writing treats more fully love of one's neighbour, the basis being the golden rule in its negative form: do not do to another what you do not wish to be done to yourself. Various extracts from the Sermon of the Mount follow, concluding with a curious passage on giving and receiving. The second chapter contains the commandments against murder, adultery, theft, coveting and false witness together with additional recommendations. In chapter three we are told that one vice leads to another: anger leads to murder, concupiscence to adultery, augury to idolatry, lying to theft grumbling to blasphemy. Chapter four exhorts us to keep the various virtues: honour for preachers of God's word, contact with the saints pacification of contending parties, just judgement, almsgiving with a good heart, good treatment of one's slaves, abhorrence of all shame, no neglect of the commandments. This chapter ends with the words: 'Such is the way of Life'. The fifth chapter gives the Way of Death which is nothing more than a list of vices to be avoided. Chapter six exhorts to keeping the way of teaching; and the conclusion is: if you are able to bear the Lord's yoke in its entirety you will be perfect; if you are not able then do what you can. And in the matter of food do what you can stand; but be scrupulously on guard against meat offered to the idols; for this is the worship of dead gods.

Concluding therefore we might state that even before the New Testament writings existed, there was a body of doctrine which was expected to be known by all those who wished to embrace the true faith: this body of doctrine was slowly developed. With all probability we can affirm that this body of doctrine comprised an account of the life of Our Lord from the Baptism of John to his Ascension into heaven, those elements of dogma which presented God as Creator sending His only Son to redeem mankind, King of Angels and Powers and Judge of Men at the final resurrection of all mankind; instruction of Baptism and on the imposition of hands to receive the Holy Ghost, and on the Eucharist; and finally a series of precepts on moral behaviour. We can also affirm that the propagation of the faith was not left to private initiative but was disciplined and regulated. The teaching imparted was not from any written texts but yet there was certainly an official elementary catechesis i.e. certain points of doctrine and moral teaching on which all had to insist but each in his own way. Later on we get these elements developed: we get the canonical writings, the beginnings of liturgical formulas and canonical legislation (the Creed and Didachè) and finally what is an irregular

development of Christian catechesis, the Christian apologists who by their writings tried to interest pagans to seek out fundamental truths of Christianity – but this leads us out of the scope of the present article.

J. LUPI

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following:

- Analecta Tertii Ordinis Regularis S. Francisci* – Vol. VI (1956)
Australasian Catholic Record – Vol. XXXIII, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Biblica: Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus – Vol. 37 (1956)
Carmelus – Vol. 3, no. 2 (1956)
Catholic Biblical Quarterly – Vol. XVIII, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Cistercium – Año VIII, nos. 47, 48 (1956)
Il Convento e la Chiesa di S. Francesco di Valletta (Malta) – Roma 1957
 Editrice *Miscellanea Franciscana* di P. Bonaventura Fiorini O.F.M.Conv.
Irish Theological Quarterly – Vol. XXIII, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Liturgy – Vol. XXV, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Lucerna – Vol. II, nos. 10, 11, 12 (1956)
 **Method and Foundations of Social Science*, by Prof. Guido Menegazzi –
 Published by the Institute of Economics and Finance of the University
 of Bari, Italy, 1957
 **Methods of Prayer in the Directory of the Carmelite Reform of Touraine*,
 by Kilian J. Healy O. Carm. – ed. by the Institutum Carmelitanum (1957)
Relations – nos. 187-192 (1956)
Rivista del Clero Italiano – Anno 37^o, Fasc. vii-xii (1956)
Salesianum – Anno XVIII, nos. 1-4 (1956)
Scientia – Vol. XXII, nos. 2-4 (1956)
Scripture – Vol. VIII, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Scuola (La) Cattolica – Anno LXXXIV, nos. 5, 6 (1956)
Theology Digest – Vol. IV, nos. 3, 4 (1956)
Unitas – Vol. VIII, nos. 3, 4 (1956)

* A review of this book will appear in the next issue of *Melita Theologica*.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARS

The Second International Congress of Old Testament Scholars was held in Strasburg from August 27th to September 1st, 1956. The congress was attended by 246 members, including wives of members, representing twenty-three countries. The largest number of members, naturally, came from France with fifty-six members. Germany came next with forty-three representatives. England was represented by twenty-five delegates. The U.S.A. and the Netherlands had eighteen each; Italy, sixteen; Switzerland, thirteen; Belgium, eleven; Denmark, eight; Sweden, Israel, Ireland and Austria, six each; Jordania, four; Japan, two; Spain, Norway, Malta, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Luxemburg, Scotland and Jugoslavia, one each. An outstanding characteristic of the Congress, in contrast with that held in Copenhagen in 1953, was the prominent part taken by Catholic scholars. Eight out of fifteen papers were read by Catholics, and a large number of members were Catholics.

The Congress opened on Monday, 27th August under the presidency of Mr Jean Babin, Rector of the Academy of Strasburg, who delivered the inaugural speech. Then Mr Hauter, Dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology in the University of Strasburg and Director of the Centre of Research in the field of the History of Religions addressed the members. He was followed by Professor G.R. Driver, President of the International Association of Old Testament Scholars and by Fr R. De Vaux, O.P., Director of the École biblique of Jerusalem and President of the Congress. The proceedings of the day were closed by a reception given by the Prefect of the Lower Rhine.

The following is a summary of the papers read during the Congress:

D. Winton Thomas. *Some observations of the Root* לָחַץ. The Hebrew verb לָחַץ and its Arabic equivalent لَحَضَ generally mean 'to forsake, to abstain from aiding, to hold back' from'. But there are some passages in the Old Testament to which this meaning does not seem to fit. Thus in Is. 53, 3 לְאִישׁוֹ לָחַץ, Vulg. 'novissimum virorum' means 'forsaking men', not 'forsaken by men'. In Is. 38, 11 and Ps. 39, 5 לָחַץ is probably, according to the Rabbinic view, a phonetic variation of לָחַץ and no emendation is necessary. In 1 Sam. 2, 5 'et famelici saturati sunt', the verb לָחַץ is related to Arabic لَحَضَ 'to become fat' and not to لَحَضَ. In conclusion reference is made to the view of older scholars

who believed that הָלַל means primarily 'to become faint', but doubt is expressed whether the Arabic meaning of ظَلَّ supports this view. It may be remarked that this last meaning is the only meaning of Maltese *hedla*, *hedla*.

A. Diez Macho. *Importants manuscrits hébreux et araméens aux Etats-Unis*. The lecturer described some important Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts existing in American Libraries, with special reference to their system of vocalization. He mentioned the following manuscripts existing in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York: Ms. 152, which contains Genesis in the Aramaic text of Onqelos which has disappeared; Ms. 153 containing five chapters of Exodus of Onqelos with the Babylonian vocalization; Ms. 191 containing almost the whole of Exodus in Aramaic sephardi with variant readings added by a Yemenite; Ms. 133a containing Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy of Onqelos with the Babylonian vocalization; Ms. 131 containing almost the whole of Deuteronomy of Onqelos with Babylonian vocalization. New fragments of of the Palestinian Targum have been discovered in Mss. 501 and 605. The Babylonian text of Jonathan ben Uzziel of 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings — so far unknown — has been recovered from Ms. 229, a very important manuscript which has been copied from a Hebrew Babylonian text. Ms. 607 f. 5 contains a long fragment of a Targum of the Prophets, which is entirely different from that of Jonathan ben Uzziel. Its language is Oriental Aramaic, while Ms. T. S. B 13/2 of the University of Cambridge contains the same text in Palestinian Aramaic. Ms. 240 contains many chapters of Isaiah in Babylonian Hebrew. Ms. 508 has a number of Psalms in Babylonian Hebrew, and Ms. 456 contains almost the whole Psalter, with Yemenite interpolations, copied from a Babylonian original. Of the Palestinian text some more manuscripts have come to light. Ms. 594 Box B marks the transition from the Palestinian to the Tiberian system of vocalization; Ms. 403 f. 2 has variant Palestinian readings to a Babylonian Hebrew text; Ms. 504 f. 11 has the Palestinian accentuation. Ms. 607 ff. 1-2 as well as Ms. d 44 ff. 1-4 and d 37 of the Bodleian of Oxford present a mixture of the Tiberian and the Palestinian systems of vocalization.

P. A. H. de Boer. *Texte et traduction des paroles attribuées à David dans 2 Samuel 23, 1-7*. This passage is called 'The last words of David' and is generally considered to be a sort of short Psalm. In reality, however, it is only a collection of proverbs not unworthy of a king like David. The construction of the first verses is very similar to that of many sentences of the books of Proverbs. The contents of the whole

passage is the glorification of wisdom, and it is now generally held that the appreciation of wisdom in Israel is much older than it was hitherto believed. The development of ideas is this: the proverbs of David are a proof of the wisdom of the Elected One of God; David will have a numerous posterity as a reward for his righteousness; the wicked will perish without leaving a posterity.

G. Ryckmans. *Résultats archéologiques et épigraphiques d'une mission en Arabie séoudite*. The orator, well known for his studies of the South-Arabian inscriptions, has given the results of an expedition in South Arabia undertaken in 1951-2. Along the route of about 5,400 km. some 12,000 graffiti have been discovered, of which 9,000 were in Thamudæan dialect and 3,000 in Sabaean dialect. The Thamudæan graffiti were found in widely separated areas, mostly on the rocky sides of valleys. The Sabaean graffiti were found mostly along the routes of the caravans, especially the route from Nejran to the Persian Gulf. Many of these graffiti belong to the sixth century A.D. Among these inscriptions, the most important of which have already been published, deserves special attention a Christian inscription of king Abraha of Saba who defeated the Judaist king of Saba, who persecuted the Christians of Nejran. The ruins of two Sabaean cities, which emerged out of the soil, were minutely investigated: Uhdud, in the oasis of Nejran, on the boundaries of Yemen, and Qariya, a Sabaean advance-guard and a halting-place of the caravans on the way to the Persian Gulf. The paper was richly illustrated by slides.

B. Mazar. *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine*. The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak in Palestine in the fifth year of king Jeroboam of Judah is mentioned twice in the Bible, in 1 Kings 12, 25, 26 and 2 Chr. 12, 2-9. The author of Kings mentions only the attack on Jerusalem and the plundering of the temple treasures, while the Chronicler adds that Shishak took the fortified cities of Judah before attacking Jerusalem. A fuller account of the campaign is read on the Southern wall of the temple of Amun at Karnak (Egypt). The inscription is a list of Shishak's conquests in Palestine. The first part, consisting of five short lines, presents some difficulties regarding the route followed by Shishak. But the difficulties are eliminated if the first four lines are read *boustrophedon*, that is line one from right to left, line two from left to right, and so on. Thus we obtain a consistent list of place-names describing the campaign across the Kingdom of Israel. The first place to be invaded is Gaza in Southern Palestine, on the Mediterranean coast; then the invader moves to Gezer, further North; thence he continues to Ayalon,

Gibeon and the Jordan Valley; thence to Beth-Shean, the Valley of Jezrael and back to Egypt. The archaeological finds confirm this route. The second part of the list contains a great number of names of settlements, fortresses and regions many of which bear a close resemblance to the genealogical list of 1 Chronicles.

J. Coppens. *La bénédiction de Jacob (Genèse 49). Son cadre historique et philologique.* Jacob's blessing of his sons in Gen. 49 in one of the most obscure texts of the Bible. It is difficult to place it in its proper historical context. During the last years the attempt has been made to explain many passages in the light of Ugaritic literature. The lecturer, however, is very sceptical about the value of these apparent parallels and to their contribution to the problem of the origin of these ancient documents.

E. Vogt. *Die neubabylonische Chronik über die Schlacht bei Karkemisch und die Eroberung Jerusalems.* In this paper E. Vogt summarizes D.J. Wiseman's book *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum* (London, 1956), as he had already done in *Biblica* 37 (1956) 389-97. The following dates seem to be certain: the battle at Karkemish, in which the Egyptian armies were defeated by Nabuchodonosor took place in the year 605 B.C. In December 604 Nabuchodonosor conquers Asqalon and Baruch reads Jeremiah's scroll before king Jojaqim (Jer. 36). In January-February 603 Nabuchodonosor conquers Jerusalem. In January 600 King Jojaqim revolts against Nabuchodonosor. In December 598 Jojaqim dies and is succeeded by Jojakim. In December of the same year Nabuchodonosor marches against Jerusalem. Jerusalem fell on March 16, 597.

O. Eissfeldt. *Silo und Jerusalem.* The juxtaposition of Silo and Jerusalem may at first sight appear surprising and unjustified. The history of Jerusalem since the beginning of the second millennium B.C. is so well known from available biblical and extra-biblical information, that it is not difficult to write its history from 2,000 B.C. down to the present day. On the contrary our biblical and extra-biblical information about Silo is extremely scanty. But yet Silo can be compared to Jerusalem. Without Silo Jerusalem would have never been what it became. In its earlier days, from about 1,200 to about 1,000 B.C., Silo was to the Israelite tribes settled in Canaan a national-political and a cultic-religious centre of the highest importance. There had the Ark, the symbol of Yahweh's presence, its seat, and, consequently, Silo seemed to be the place chosen by God as the abode of his Name. It was for this

reason that the Philistines, about the year 1060 B.C., destroyed Silo and captured the Ark. And it was for the same reason, that is the political and religious significance of the ark and its abode, that David, some sixty years later, transferred the Ark from Silo to Jerusalem, which he had captured from the Jebusites and made the capital of his kingdom. The transference of the Ark from Silo to Jerusalem is the fulfilment of Jacob's prophetic blessing to Judah in Gen. 49, 10 where the Hebrew word Silo must be preserved unemended and interpreted as a symbolical name of all the tribes of Israel. The lecturer concluded expressing his wish that the Danish excavations of the site of ancient Silo may yield more information about the early history of Silo.

P.W. Skehan. *The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism*. The textual evidence of the Qumran manuscripts has been the object of many publications, and the lecturer does not intend to repeat what has already been said. He limits himself to the Qumran cave materials on which he is working. As regards Isaiah, the complete scroll from cave 1 remains textually the most important, and there is nothing particularly interesting among the thirteen manuscripts of cave 4. For the Psalms, the oldest manuscript available, presents the standard Massoretic disposition of the text and titles. There are no important various readings. As regards the Greek fragments of the LXX, we have now a broader understanding of the transmission of its text before Origen. A text of Numbers from cave 4, first century B.C., gives some variant readings unsupported by manuscript evidence. A text of Leviticus from the same period gives the current Greek form with the tetragrammaton written IAO. Another copy of Leviticus, seemingly first century A.D., gives the same text but in a form that shows a clear priority over any extant codex.

W. Eichrodt. *Ist die typologische Exegese sachgemässe Exegese?* The lecturer begins by defining typology as an hermeneutic method which considers persons and events of the God-directed course of Old Testament history as prefigurations of corresponding persons and events of New Testament times. It is, obviously, different not only from the historic-critical method, but also from the allegorical method, from spiritualistic exegesis, from symbolism and from any such method which views ordinary past events as foreshadowing higher spiritual realities. The typological method rather takes the activity of the Old Testament notabilities as a prefiguration of Christ's work, as it appears in the New Testament, without being bound, in the several cases, to the New Testament method. The origin of typology lies not outside the spiritual world

of Israel, but essentially in the eschatological thought of the prophets, who describe the continuity of God's work of salvation through the correspondence of type and antitype. Typology, therefore, is a part of the prophetic mission.

The relation between the historical facts of the Old and the New Testament has nothing to do with the literal exposition of the text. The several historical facts must rather be considered in the light of the general history in the context of the development of the history of salvation. This gives a comprehensive view of Old and New Testament events as a continuous history of salvation which has its meaning and purpose in Christ. The relation between type and antitype is, therefore, not the mere repetition of events, but their higher evaluation either through confirmation and fulfilment or through antithetic correspondence.

Typology contributes to the understanding of the history of salvation inasmuch as it brings to light, in central points, the continuity and purposefulness of God's operation. It shows the development of salvation through a history, which has been formed among the Old Testament as well as among the New Testament community in such a way that the benefits of salvation, shorn of all spiritualistic character, will appear a concrete historic reality. Therefore typology shows a constant in God's relations to man, which confirms the clarity and absoluteness of God's love throughout the ages. Consequently typology in its origin, method and purpose has an exegetical and theological relevance. As, however, the extension of its application is limited, it serves only as a subsidiary means of positive exegesis.

G. Castellino. *Les origines de la civilisation d'après la Bible et les textes cunéiformes*. The lecturer limits his investigation mainly to chs 2 and 3 of Genesis and to the Sumerian myths published by S.N. Kramer in his Sumerian Mythology. The problems dealt with are: (1) What is the relation between ch. 1 and ch. 2 of Genesis? Are they two narratives of creation or only one? (2) Exegetical questions regarding chs 2 and 3. (3) What is the relation between ch. 2 and ch. 3? Are they one homogeneous narrative, or are they derived from independent mythological narratives? (4) Do the cuneiform texts provide information about the origin of social life described in ch. 4?

As regards 2, vv. 4b-7 contain three tableaux showing a progressive delimitation of the field of view. The word רָאשׁוֹן 'land' of ch. 1 becomes שָׂדֶה 'field' and אֲדָמָה 'soil' in ch. 2. The second section, or vv. 8-17, describes the garden of Eden thus completing the 'scenario' on which the drama is to be played. The analysis of the two terms גַּן 'garden' and חַדְרָא helps us with the aid of cuneiform texts to grasp the real

meaning and to estimate rightly the secondary character of the description of the four rivers. The third section, or vv. 18-25, relates only the creation of the animals and of the woman. The lecturer concluded this part by emphasizing the unity and homogeneity of ch. 2.

The literary structure of chs 2 and 3 is similar to that which we have in cuneiform texts, that is, introduction and body of the narrative, ch. 2 being the introduction and ch. 3 the body of the narrative.

The comparison of the Sumerian texts with the *enûma elish* throws further light upon the differences between the poem which narrates the creation and the Sumerian texts which describe the development of the earth or the land of Sumer. We notice the same difference between ch. 1 which narrates the creation of the world and ch. 2 which narrates the development of the land of Eden, or the abode of the first man. There is, therefore, no opposition between the two chapters.

The study of the cuneiform texts provides us with some information about the ideas of the Ancient East concerning the origins of the social life in its different manifestations. Some light is shed upon ch. 4 of Genesis.

H. Junker. *Das Messiasbild des Propheten Isaias*. The figure of the Messiah in the sense of an expected king of salvation receives its definite form in the announcement of Emmanuel (Is. 7). The meaning of this section must be sought for in the exact interpretation of the original situation as indicated by the prophet. Isaiah tries to dissuade Achaz from turning to Assyria for help, because this will certainly lead both the people and the dynasty into disaster. As Achaz persisted in his plans, it became clear to the prophet that the house of David too, in which God, in his prediction to Nathan, had placed the salvation of his people, will perish. What will now become of that prediction? The answer to this question is given by the revelation of Emmanuel: It has for its gloomy background the judgment and fall of the people and the kingdom which Achaz, through his wrong decision, has called upon himself and his people. Therefore, there is for him and his contemporaries no sign of deliverance but of perdition. To him, who has refused the mediator of salvation, the prophet opposed the true king of salvation in the person of Emmanuel, whose name represents the opposition to Achaz's policy. Therefore, this new king of salvation does not appear as an ordinary successor to the throne of David, but as an entirely new beginning set up by God after the fall of the previous people and kingdom. He will bring something new and nobler than what has perished. This seems to be the prophetic meaning of the sign of the $\text{Im} \text{An} \text{Nu} \text{Im}$ Emmanuel's mother. As all this occurs to the prophet by divine inspiration, it must

be assumed that both for his contemporaries and for himself it was shrouded in darkness. Perhaps there is a link in the exhibition by the prophet of the 'holy seed' (6, 13) from which a new people of God was to come forth. Accordingly the son of the בן־דָּוִד must here be thought of as the new 'holy seed' of the house of David to which God will fulfil the prediction. It is more reasonable to be content with this answer and the indication of the mysterious character of the sign than to try to identify accurately the person of the בן־דָּוִד .

It is more difficult to determine the point of time for which the prophet is predicting the coming of Emmanuel. There is no clearly defined time perspective. The prophet has seen the divine judgment and the downfall of the people and the kingdom in the near future and placed the Emmanuel in close connection. The judgment, considered as a separation between the present generation destined to destruction and the intense expectation of the future gave this vision an eschatological character similar to that of the expectation of the Parusia by the first Christians.

Geo. Widengren. *Quelques rapports entre Juifs et Iraniens à l'époque des Parthes*. These relations are considered under three aspects: political and social; cultural; religious.

While Rome was engaged in war against the Parthians, Iranian forces helped the Jews to defend Jerusalem. The Jews not only revolted against the Romans during the reign of Trajan and Hadrian, while these were fighting against the Parthians, but very probably there was a coalition between Jews and Parthians. Iranian influence upon the constitution of Jewish society is visible in many instances especially in the Jewish feudal system, in their agrarian system in Mesopotamia and in their colonial system in Mesopotamia and Media.

The synagogue of Dura shows marks of influence of the Iranian art during the age of the Parthians. The decorations are essentially Parthian. There are traces in Jewish literature of Iranian influence. There are also a few words in Hebrew and Aramaic of Parthian origin.

The points of contact between the Jewish religion and the Iranian religion are reduced to the following: dualism, apocalyptic doctrine, eschatology, the resurrection of the dead, the incarnation of the Saviour, angelology, the devil and the demons, mythical description of Paradise and Hell, the ascension of the soul, the rites of baptism and communion.

Conclusion: The Jews lived in very close cultural contact with the Parthians. We must no longer speak of a 'Parsism' which is compared with the Jewish religion, because this term is altogether inexact and the product of wrong ideas. The Iranian religion at the time of the

Parthians is not a Parsism, the result of a long historical evolution. A new analysis of the apocryphal writings and of the Pehlevi writings is absolutely necessary.

W.F. Albright. *Le Haut-Lieu dans la Palestine ancienne*. The terms 'haut-lieu' and 'high-place' are the translation of the Hebrew word בֹּמֶה which occurs very frequently in the Old Testament and has religious and cultic associations. What is its exact meaning? The explanation given by Albright himself in 1942 in his *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 105-7, 202-4 and by Fr L.H. Vincent in *Revue Biblique*, 1948, pp. 245-78, 438-45 is now abandoned on account of later discoveries. The proposed meaning is 'funereal monument'.

This meaning receives striking confirmation from the first scroll of Isaiah 53,9 where instead of the enigmatic בְּמֹתָיו 'in his deaths' we read בְּבֹמָה 'his bomah'. In the Vulgate, which is a faithful rendering of the Hebrew text, the verse reads thus: 'Et dabit impios pro sepultura, et divitem pro morte sua'. Albright renders the verse thus: 'Sa sépulture sera mise avec les méchants / et son installation funéraire avec les démons (Albright reads רְשָׁעִים instead of רְשָׁעִים). In 1951 I have translated independently of the Isaiah scroll: 'U tawh qabar mal-hiziena, u ma' dawk li jaghmlu d-deni d-difna ueghu'.

There are other passages where בֹּמֶה means 'funereal monument', as Ex. 43, 7; Job 27, 15 where instead of בְּמֹתָיו we must perhaps read בְּבֹמָה .

Albright's conclusions are these: The word בֹּמֶה is a contraction of 'barmatu' which means 'a vertical projection, back'. The original meaning developed a secondary meaning 'a commemorative heap of stones, a cairn' erected on the top of a hill. Such burying-places were generally provided with funereal steles set up on the cairns and became later places of cult of the ancestors. There were also temples with one bamah or more bamoth, as in Megiddo, and commemorative steles. The frequent juxtaposition of בֹּמֶה and בְּמֹתָיו is probably the source of the secondary meaning 'stele'.

The full text of the papers may be read in the fourth volume of the Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*.

* * *

An important item of the Congress were the receptions given by the civil and University authorities of Strasburg. On Monday, 27th August, after the inaugural sitting, a reception was offered to us by Mr Trémaud, Préfet du Bas-Rhin at the hotel de la Préfecture. On Tuesday,

28th August, another reception was offered by Mr J. Babin, the Rector of the Academy of Strasburg at the Hotel du Rectorat. On Thursday, 30th August, we had an excursion across the Vosges, visiting Mount St Odila and, on the way back, the city and Library of Sélestat; afterwards we were cordially received by the Mayor of the city at his Hotel de Ville. An official banquet closed the proceedings of the day. On Friday, 31st August, another reception was given by Mr Altorffer, the Mayor of the city of Strasburg, at the Hotel de Ville.

These international congresses are very important not so much for the papers read as for the opportunity they give to make new acquaintances and to renew old friendships. I have so far attended many international congresses, I have met almost all the leading biblical scholars, I have a number of friends in all countries, and the influence I have received on my intellectual development is incalculable.

P.P. SAYDON

CONGRATULATIONS!

In October 1956 the Rt Rev. Mgr Prof. P.P. Saydon, B.Litt., B.L.Can., D.D., Lic.S.Script., completed twenty-five years as occupant of the Chair of Holy Scripture in the Royal University of Malta. On this occasion the Editorial Board of *Melita Theologica* wish to congratulate the distinguished Professor for his outstanding University career and to thank him publicly for the great service he has rendered to the students of the Faculty of Theology and to our Association in particular.

Prof. Saydon needs no introduction to our readers. He has been one of our chief and constant contributors and his scholarly writings have always elicited admiration and praise. His great Biblical erudition has been amply shown in his substantial contributions to the *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, as well as in his masterly translation of the Bible into Maltese from the original languages and in numerous articles published in leading Biblical reviews.

But surely none has had as much opportunity to appreciate Professor Saydon as we, his students, who have had the privilege to know him more intimately from his lectures and to be constantly illuminated by his profound and up-to-date knowledge of the Scriptures. We cannot therefore but wholeheartedly thank him and hope that successive generations of students will long continue to enjoy the fruits of a mature and consummate scholar.

CASUS MORALIS

DE TRANSPLANTATIONE ORGANORUM HUMANORUM

Remigius pater est quinque filiorum quorum unus tantum est masculus. Accedit quod non semel Remigius filiae suae primogenitae e proprio extractum sanguinem dedit ut ipsa vivere potuisset; infimam partem auriculae suae dexteræ abscindere sinit ut auricula filiae suae secundogenitae perfecte curaretur; filio vero, anno quinto aetatis suae totaliter fere caeco facto, saltem unum ex oculis suis, vel sic dictum *pelliculum corneum* vel *corneam* ardentissime dare cupit. Ante tamen operationem hanc confessarium suum accedit consilii petendi causa. Qui confessarius non solum libenter beneplacitum suum ei dedit, sed sacrificium patris summis laudibus extollit uti opus summae caritatis nobilissimum quodque multi sancti exercuerunt imo et Christus ipse qui vitam suam pro nobis dedit.

QUAERITUR:

- I. Utrum extractio sanguinis, abscissio infimae partis auriculæ et extirpatio saltem unius pelliculi corneæ Remigii mutilationem constituent.
- II. Utrum igitur licitæ vel illicitæ evadant.
- III. Quid de modo ratiocinandi confessarii dicendum.

SOLUTIO

Ad I. Antequam responsum detur huic primo quaesito necessarium est ut prae oculis exactam mutilationis definitionem habeamus. Fatendum tamen est hanc exactam definitionem dare non est sat facile quia Auctores sive antiqui sive hodierni, paucissimis exceptis, definitionem mutilationis omittunt.

Genicôt-Salsmans sequentem definitionem habet: "Actio qua membrum quoddam aufertur"¹ et Jorio-Tummulo illam dat quam exhibet P. Vermeersch in 2a ed. Theologiae Moralis, anno 1928 facta, i.e. "Abscissio (alicujus membri) vel aequivalens actio qua functio organica vel definitus usus membrorum supprimitur aut directe diminuitur"².

Dicitur

Abscissio, quae idem est ac extirpatio, extractio, ablatio etc.
aequivalens actio, quae habetur in qualibet laesione corporis quæ hujus functionem totaliter vel partialiter tollit. Sic v.g. extractio etiam

¹ Genicôt-Salsmans, *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*, 1921, Bruxelles, I, n. 363

² Jorio-Tummolo, *Theologia Moralis*, Neapoli, 1934, I, n. 391 bis

unius ovariorum vel testiculorum mutilationem constituit. Necessè non est ut laesio haec exteme percipi possit.

quae functio organica vel definitus usus membrorum... Ergo requiritur ut pars corporis quae abscinditur propriam habeat functionem aut operationem, ita oculi functionem habent videndi, pedes ambulandi etc. Sed nil refert utrum illa pars quae abscinditur habeat operationem in se, v.g. manus, pes, vel cum aliis operationibus conjunctam, uti nervus ocularis.

supprimitur aut directe diminuitur. Non requiritur ergo ut tota functio organica impossibilis reddatur ut vera mutilatio habeatur, uti accideret v.g. in abscissione duorum crurium vel duorum testiculorum, sed sufficit si haec functio directe et permanenter diminuitur uti accideret in abscissione unius cruris vel unius digiti quia homo ad bene ambulandum amba crura, et ad aliquid manu bene tenendum quinque digitos indiget.

Aliam similem definitionem mutilationis dat Sac. Tullo Goffi: "... mutilazione è solo il prelievo che cagiona una lesione permanente sia della integrità biologico-organica che di quella funzionale.... Si ha mutilazione ogni qualvolta la funzione non è assicurata mediante organi naturali, anche se viene conservata con organo artificiale (es. stampelle, denti artificiali)"³.

Ex dictis patet quod ad proprie dictam mutilationem duo essentialiter requiruntur: (a) abscissio partis corporis propriam functionem aut operationem habentis; (b) suppressio aut diminutio perpetua hujus functionis aut operationis. Haec duo simul sumptae nemo non videt deteriorationem corporis humani afferre⁴.

His praemissis ad quaesitum respondeo:

1°. Sanguinem ad corpus humanum pertinere nemo est qui negat. Sed pertinetne eodem modo ac ratione qua pes, manus, oculus pertinet? Aliis verbis estne eadem deterioratio in homine cui manus vel pes abscinditur et in alio cui aliqua quantitas sanguinis extrahitur? Verum est quod per extractionem sanguinis debilitas in corpore consequitur; sed hic non agitur de illa quantitate qua vita et sanitas hominis in periculo constituitur. Hic agitur tantum de restricta sanguinis quantitate, datur enim variatio quantitatis sanguinis in corpore, quae quamvis, hic et nunc, aliquam debilitatem affert, post breve tempus restituitur. Coeternum et labor etsi ordinarius debilitatem virium humanarum affert. Estne ergo labor hic dicendus mutilatio? Ita etiam et extractio restrictae quantitatis sanguinis veram mutilationem non constituit.

2°. Quoad vero abscissionem infimae partis auriculae et extirpationem

³ Sac. Tullo Goffi, *Valore morale di trapianti o innesti umani*, Rivista del Clero Italiano, 37, (1956), 491-95

⁴ *Perfice Munus!*, XXXII, (1957), 85

comeae Remigii res totaliter diversa evadit. Nonne per istos actus corpus Remigii deterius fit? Hoc clarum est si sermo esset de extirpatione comeae duorum oculorum Remigii, quia hoc in casu Remigijs totaliter coecus evaderet. Imo etiam si ageretur de extirpatione comeae unius oculi quia etiam in hoc casu haberetur suppressio operationis specificae illius oculi, quamvis alius oculus remaneret. Et praecise hoc est quod constituit mutilationem. Coeterum homo creatus est cum duobus oculis et omnes admittunt quod ad recte videndum non sufficit unus oculus praesertim in percipiendis dimensionibus, rebus distantibus etc. Ergo extractio sive amborum sive unius comeae veram mutilationem constituit⁵.

Et idem videtur dicendum quoad abscissionem infimae partis auriculae, quia et haec abscissio in detrimentum perpetuum corporis fit. Illa utique infima pars auriculae non est tam necessaria ac oculus. Sed hoc tantum significat quod extirpatio comeae est gravis mutilatio, dum abscissio infimae partis auriculae levis tantum. Aliis verbis, mutilatio admittit parvitatem materiae sicut furtum. Furari centum libellas anglicas et furari unum nummum non est idem; sed ratio furti semper remanet.

Dixi *videtur* quia non desunt Auctores qui propter istam parvam portionem auriculae rationem mutilationis negent, saltem si juxta aestimationem populi ad elegantiam corporis augendam fit. Nota tamen quod isti Auctores non loquuntur de foramine vel de pelle sed de abscissione partis auriculae⁶.

Ad II. Omnes fere Doctores S. Thoma duce, docent quamlibet mutilationem esse actum intrinsece malum. Ratio est quia non solum mutilatio fieri non potest *absque totius corporis detrimento*⁷ eo quod quodlibet membrum est pars hominis, sed etiam quia quilibet homo creatus est propter suam perfectionem. Animalia irrationalia tantum non sunt creata propter se. Ergo pes vel lingua bovis, etsi scindi non possint sine detrimento totius corporis bovis, possint praescindi si hoc fieret ad nostram utilitatem. Unica tantum exceptio, et quidem in modo absoluto, datur i.e. *l'innesto di glandole sessuali di animali sull'uomo*⁸ quia hic agitur de medio originis speciei diversae.

⁵ Sed res non ita certa esset si ageretur de testiculis vel de renibus quia haec sunt proprie dicta organa duplicia, h.e. ablato uno testiculo vel rene eadem remanet perfectio peragendi eandem functionem. Sed dato non concessio quod *eadem perfectio* remaneat, sequitur ex hoc quod in casu non haberetur mutilatio? Nonne corpus integrum ex dispositione Creatoris non tantum duos pedes, duo brachia etc. sed et duos renes et duo testicula habeat? Estne haec duplicitas sine sua utilitate? Estne ablato unius renis vel testiculi absque attendibili nocimento vel incommodo?

⁶ *Perfice Munus!*, XXXII, (1957) 80

⁷ II-II, q. 65, a. 1.

⁸ Cfr. *Discorso di S. S. Pio XII sul trapianto della cornea nell'occhio umano*,

Quilibet homo, dixi, et quidem ex divina ordinatione, tendit ad suam perfectionem, aliis verbis, homo non habet dominium plenum in corpore suo ejusque partibus. Igitur quilibet actus qui natura sua ducit ad hominis deteriorationem est actus intrinsice malus et ita illicitus ut nulla ratione quomocumque gravi justificari possit. Huic tamen principio generali Doctores, ipso S. Thoma praeunte⁹, has duas exceptiones ponunt i.e. (a) ad salvandum totum corpus et (b) ad delictum puniendum. Attamen ut revera licitae sint hae duae exceptiones Doctores requirunt ut fiant servatis servandis seu ut servetur proportio inter effectum nocivum et effectum bonum ad quem dirigitur et inter gravitatem poenae et delicti commissi. Igitur non liceret hominem sterilizare ne filios infirmos vel noxios nascantur¹⁰.

Hoc praemisso redeamus ad nostram quaestionem, nempe:

1^o. Utrum extractio sanguinis e corpore Remigii et in corpus filiae suae transfusi licita sit necne. Uti ad I diximus, extractio modicae quantitatis sanguinis e corpore humano non constituit mutilationem et circa hanc rem omnes moralistae conveniunt. Ergo licita.

2^o. Utrum abscissio infimae partis auriculae licita sit necne. Etiam hic, ex dictis ad I patet hominem per hunc actum deteriore fieri, non quidem graviter sed leviter tantum et quidem pro remanente vita sua, quia pars abscissa non crescit amplius. Ergo, juxta saltem opinionem communiorem, haec abscissio fieri nequit etsi sub levi tantum; est enim intrinsice illicita sicut mendacium. Sicut nunquam licet mentiri, ne quidem ad vitanda damna proximi, ita etiam nunquam licet infimam partem auriculae abscindere. Repeto, hic non agitur de simplici perforatione, sed de vera abscissione auriculae.

3^o. Utrum extirpatio saltem unius comeae licita sit necne. Si abscissio partis auriculae est illicita, a fortiori extractio comeae sive amborum oculorum sive unius oculi tantum erit illicita et quidem graviter. Ratio patet ex dictis.

Sed actus de quibus supra non sunt sumendi et intelligendi *in se et per se* tantum sed *relate ad alios*. Aliis verbis hic non agitur de simplici mutilatione sine ulla necessitate, sed de *transplantatione* organorum humanorum, h.e. de ablatione vel scissione organi vel partis organi hominis sani ut corpori infirmo vel deficienti alterius hominis inseratur vel

4 maggio 1956, in AAS XXXXVIII, (1956), 459-67 (gallice) et in *Perfice Munus!*, XXXI, (1956), 385-91 (italice)

⁹ II-II, q. 65, a. 1

¹⁰ *Encyc. Casti Connubii*, in n. 13 AAS, 31 Dec. 1930, publicata, sterilizationem pro reis puniendis evidenter damnat. Sed in n. 14 ejusdem ephemeridis quaedam correctio et quidem authentica facta est vi cuius adhuc videtur disputari licet an sterilizatio in reorum poenam licita sit necne. Cfr. P. Tabone, *Human Sterilization*, Malta, 1950, p. 11.

implantetur. Nonne hoc in casu actus de quibus supra, liciti evaderent? Pater Vermeersch videtur hanc theoriam voluisse saltem subjicere attentioni moralistarum propter quamdam ordinationem seu relationem membrorum nostrorum erga proximi corpus¹¹. L. Scremin liceitatem admittit ubi agitur de extirpatione organi duplicis, quia functio remanet; D.A. Gennaro liceitatem admittit "quoad comeae cessionem si acies oculorum minuitur sed penitus non amittitur", ob motivum caritatis et quidem sive gratuito sive pacta mercede, quae opinio placuit etiam cuidem Buongiovanni S.D.P.¹². Tandem G. Kelly S.J. favet liceitati quia, ut ipse putat, transplantatio incompatibilis non est cum doctrina SS. Pontificum¹³, quod idem tenet G.B. Guzzetti Pont. Fac. Theologiae Mediolanensis Professor¹⁴.

Ne igitur et mihi imputetur *un'imperdonabile presunzione* de qua Bosio S.J.¹⁵, non velim uti nullius valoris rationes tantorum Doctorum rejicere. Sed ex alia parte si admittenda esset "quaedam ordinatio" ad alios, ordinatio haec non videretur existere in membris nostris ad corpus alienum. Homo enim non est bellua. Membra et corpus animalium ordinata sunt ad homines, et praecise quia animalia creata sunt propter hominem. Homo vero creatus est propter se et ne quidem propter societatem cujus homo est pars moralis non physica. Membra humana sunt partes physicae integri vel 'totius' hominis.

Relatio hominis ad alios homines est aequalitatis tantum non vero subordinationis. Si homo fuisset subordinatus alio homini et occisio sui ipsius et innocentis evaderet licita. Doctrina insuper catholica Deum semper docuit dominum vitae et totius corporis humani et hominem usum tantum habere. Dare membrum sanum aliis etsi indigentibus et etsi aliud membrum remaneat, est actus dominii. Ergo homo non potest neque partialiter mutilare seipsum ad bonum aliorum quin laedat jus divinum. Finis utique esset nobilissimus, sed medium seu methodus mala et omnes concedunt quod *non sunt facienda mala ut eveniant bona et propter finis non justificat media*. Homo potest dare aliis modicam copiam sanguinis vel particulam pellis non quia hae ordinantur ad corpus alienum sed quia, ut diximus, mutilationem non constituunt.

Neque dicendum est quod si licet totam vitam sacrificare pro aliis

¹¹ *Theologia Moral*, 1928, II, n. 323

¹² *Perfice Munus!*, XXIX, (1954), 700. Cfr. etiam *La Rivista del Clero Italiano*, 37, (1956), 493. Huic Buongiovanni respondit Sac. G. Borg et L. Bender, O.P. in *Perfice Munus!*, XXX, (1955), pp. 164 et 209 respective

¹³ *Pius XII and the principle of totality*, *Theology Digest*, IV, (1956), 158-63. *

¹⁴ *Il trapianto di organi nella Morale e nel Diritto*, *La Scuola Cattolica*, XXXIV, (1956), 241-62. Nota quod hic Auctor et aliqui ex praecitatis post allocutionem Pontificis scripserunt

¹⁵ Cfr. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, An 107 (1956), 39

ergo a fortiori licitum est aliquod organum aut pars organi indigentibus dare, quia in primo casu agitur de voluntario indirecto dum in secundo de voluntario directo. Numquam licitum est *directe* se privare vita, sed potest quis ob rationes proportionate graves vitam exponere periculo quo vita perimatur. Hoc in casu ageretur de *usu* et non de *donatione* alicujus boni. Jure ergo meritoque Pius XI in Encyc. *Casti Connubii* dixit: 'quod ipsi privati homines in sui corporis membra, dominatum alium non habent quam qui ad eorum naturales fines pertineant, nec possint ea destruere aut mutilare aut alia via ad naturales functionas se ipsos ineptos reddere nisi quando bono totius corporis provideri nequeat...'¹⁶. Similia dixit Pius XII in diversis allocutionibus, praesertim in illa habita die 13 Sept. 1952 ad participantes ad '1^o congresso internazionale di Istopatologia del sistema nervoso' ubi aiebat: 'Per quanto riguarda il paziente, egli non è padrone assoluto del suo corpo... non può dunque disporre liberamente di se medesimo a suo piacimento... Possiede diritto d'uso...; è usufruttuario non proprietario, non ha un potere illimitato di porre atti di distruzione o di mutilazione di caretere anatomico o funzionale'¹⁷. Quod similiter repetit in allocutione habita die 19 Oct. 1953, ad participantes sessioni XVI 'Ufficio internazionale di documentazione di Medicina militare'. En verba Pontificis: 'Quanto al paziente, il medico non ha diritto ad intervenire più di quanto il paziente gli conceda. Il paziente, dal conto suo, lo stesso individuo non ha diritto di disporre della sua esistenza, dell'integrità del suo organismo, degli organi particolari e della loro capacità di funzionamento, se non nella misura che esige il bene di tutto l'organismo'¹⁸. Quomodo doctrina haec conciliabilis sit cum liceitate transplantationis, fateor me non videre.

Ad III. Confessarius de quo in casu ratiocinatus est sicut et coeteri homines qui effectus utiles vident quin ad altiora et nobiliora mentem elevent. Quaestio enim nostra non est solvenda juxta motus cordis sed juxta dictamina intellectus. Hic non agitur de tollendo organo aut parte organi ab homine mortuo sicut in casu Sacerdotis Caroli Gnocchi qui, moriens, disposuit ut oculi ejus, post mortem, darentur cuidam parvulo caeco. In hoc casu nulla ratio dubitandi habetur circa liceitatem transplantationis, etiamsi spes felicitis exitus minima esset. Ratio est quia *mortuus* non est amplius *homo* sed *cadaver* quod, qua tale, stricte loquendo, non est subjectum juris¹⁹. Neque hic agitur de transplantatione

¹⁶ Cfr. AAS, XXII, (1930), 583

¹⁷ *Atti e Discorsi di Pio XII*, Ed. Paoline, XIV (1952), 349-63

¹⁸ *Atti e Discorsi di Pio XII*, Ed. cit., XV (1953), 462-76

¹⁹ Cfr. *Discorso di S.S. Pio XII sul trapianto della cornea etc.* l.c. Ast.R.P.

in eodem individuo cum simplici mutatione sedis quae, vulgo, *autoin-
nesto* vocatur. In hoc quoque casu operatio haec evaderet licita quia
homo potest disponere de membris suis ad bonum totius corporis. Sed
agitur de tollendis membris ab homine vivo ad alios, qui homo, divina
ordinatione, non est res utilis neque proprietatem habet membrorum
suorum sed tantum usum. Ultimae donationes Remigii videntur tantum
esse actus caritatis, sed de facto laesivae justitiae, et omnes admittunt
quod officia caritatis pugnare non possunt cum officiis justitiae. Ut
diximus, numquam licitum erit furari ad sublevandam inopiam pauperi.

Mutilationes suisque quae a sanctis virginibus factae leguntur, aut
ex inspiratione divina aut ex bona fide imo etiam ex ignorantia explicari
debent²⁰ et factum quod Christus vitam suam pro nobis dedit non sibi
vult quod ipse Christus se privavit vita, sed Ipse missionem suam exer-
cuit quae missio mortem sibi meruit. Hoc sensu Christus dilexit homi-
nem usque ad mortem, cujus exemplum ejus discipuli imitati sunt et
hodie imitantur multi missionarii et alii animarum pastores. Hoc sensu
intelligendum est etiam illud Joannis 15, 13: *Majorem hac dilectionem
nemo habet, ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis.*

A. TABONE

statim adjunxit: 'Ciò non significa affatto che nei riguardi del cadavere di un
uomo non vi potrebbero essere, non visono in vero obblighi morali, prescrizioni
o proibizioni... Il cadavere umano... merita tutt'altro riguardo... In generale
non dovrebbe essere permesso ai medici di intraprendere asportazioni o altri
interventi su un cadavere senza un accordo con coloro che ne sono depositarii.

²⁰ Noldin H., *Theologia Moralis*, Oeniponte, 1941, ed. 27, II, n. 328

BOOK REVIEWS

P.P. SAYDON, *Il-Kotba Mqaddsa bil-Malti:*

L-Atti tal-Appostli, Malta (Empire Press), 1955, pp. xii, 85.

L-Ittra lir-Rumani, Malta (Empire Press), 1956, pp. xxxviii, 50.

Two other volumes are added to Saydon's Maltese Biblical translation; the time is fast approaching when we shall have the complete work in our hands, indispensable for preaching to Maltese congregations and for academical studies alike.

The two volumes under review present the same characteristics as the preceding ones: one finds an introduction, the text and short notes at the bottom of the page, only* the notes are more abundant than before.

The introductions deal with the usual subjects, i.e. questions of date, place and historical background, authorship, argument of the book and doctrine. In the Epistle to the Romans there is a fairly long biography of Paul followed by a Chronology of the Apostle's life and works. Naturally the latter cannot claim finality on each and every point, but it is based on the results of the latest research. The translator puts the year 60 as the date of the Shipwreck admitting the possibility of the year 59. It would have been more practical to have this chronological study printed in the Book of Acts accompanied by a chart and map of the Apostle's travels. The authorship and integrity of these works are generally admitted with some slight dissent here and there; there is nothing special to note about the position of the translator on controversial points. He maintains that the last chapter of the Epistle belongs to St Paul explaining its absence from certain MSS by the fact that these personal salutations were not read in the liturgical meetings.

The introduction is followed by the text; the translation is based on the original Greek text as reconstructed by modern research. The translator does not hesitate to emend where such corrections are demanded by the sense and by MSS evidence. Such emendations are generally of small importance. He rejects the longer text of Acts 15, 20 retaining the shorter one. The text is divided into chapters and paragraphs and thus the understanding of the movement of events or argumentation is more easy to follow.

In these books, especially in the Epistle, one finds that the notes are longer than usual and more abundant. This is indispensable in dealing with the Apostle's writings where one is forced to have recourse to circumlocution to render the mind of Paul clear and unmistakable. Whoever has at some time or other perused even hurriedly the writings of the Apostle knows very well what a great amount of newly coined words,

abstruse constructions and digressions are found in his writings. Clearly this would necessitate many additional explanations.

One should not leave these books without taking note of the style. In the other books of the Old Testament and the Gospels the work for the Maltese translator is comparatively easy in so far as he is working on a language akin in its structure and idiom to Maltese itself. In the writings of St Luke and St Paul the semitic element is diluted and we are nearer to the involved structure of European languages. But even here the translator tackled his task extremely well. One must remain struck by the crisp language in this passage: 'Wara li qlajna l-gustifikazzjoni bil-fidi, għandna s-sliem ma' Alla permezz ta' Gesu Kristu, Sidna, li tana d-dhul bil-fidi għal din il-grazzja li fiha qegħdin u niftaħru bit-tama fis-sebħ ta' Alla. Mhux dan biss, imma niftaħru wkoll bit-taħbit, għax nafu li t-taħbit inissel is-sabar u s-sabar iġib is-saħħa fit-tigrib, u s-saħħa fit-tigrib it-tama; u t-tama ma tqarraqx, għax l-imħabba ta' Alla msawwba fi qlubna b'Ruh il-Qodos li hu mogħti lilna...' This is the heart of the whole epistle and the translator is worthy of it. At times he broke up the compound words in their component parts according to Maltese measures. Another point to be stressed is the style in the introductions where technical questions are tackled. Maltese is a language up to a certain extent still in its making. The Maltese language has come into its own only in the last thirty years or so and since Maltese life has become more varied and complicated, the language is feeling the impact of these new forces. The old semitic substratum, though still very strong and moulding the inrushes of new words and expressions, is not enough to express the complex problems of modern times. Here in these introductions one finds the way to tackle such a problem. The translator whose views on the status of our language are no less known than his expert knowledge of semitic philology has given us precious models to imitate in dealing with technical questions: new words and new idioms indeed, but not without controlling them and subjecting them to strict scientific philological rules to make them harmonize with the essential semitic structure of the language. To take one example from the Epistle to the Romans: 'Tassew li l-verb grieg li jfisser *iġġustifika*, barra mit-Testment il-Gdid ifisser dejjem *iddikjara* u mhux *għamel ġust*. Imma b'daqshekk ma nistgħux ngħidu li Pawlu kellu bil-fors juża dik il-kelma f'dak is-sens. Pawlu kien iġħallem tagħlim ġdid li fuqu l-Griegi ma kienu jafu xejn, u għalhekk seta' jagħti tifsira ġdida lil kelma qadima...' Here we have a perfect semitic structure enriched by new phrases and words from modern languages. This is the way for a true modern Maltese style.

X. LEON-DUFOUR S.J. *Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels in Seven Colors*; translated from the French by Robert J. O'Connell S.J., Desclée; date of Imprimatur 1957.

This is an unusual book both in its contents and format ($4 \times 11\frac{1}{2}$ ins). It is not a book in letters but a book in colours and reminds one of the so-called 'Rainbow Bible' although it differs from it in many respects. Every Bible student is aware of the different features of the synoptic problem: matter common to two or three Evangelists, matter proper to only one Evangelist, common matter in identical or different context, verbal agreements and disagreements, repetitions, inversions, etc. All these features are represented in different colours, so that the reader can at one glance catch all the elements of the synoptic problem.

Each Gospel is printed or rather presented on folder leaves. Each leaf contains a series of coloured bands or stripes, each band corresponding to a section or a synoptic unit, and the different colours denoting whether a unit is proper to any one Evangelist or is common to two or to all of them. On each band there is inscribed the heading of that band. Other devices indicate other features. Let us take some examples: Mt. 4, 1-11 is represented by an orange band having its extremities in brown and violet respectively. The heading is 'The triple temptation' and is followed by three black triangles which mean that there are three biblical citations in that passage. The left-hand extremity is in brown to indicate that the beginning of the section is common to three synoptists. An arrow pointing rightward means that the section has geographical indications. The greater part of the band is in orange, the colour indicating the parts common to Matthew and Luke. The right-hand extremity is in violet, the colour corresponding to the matter common to Matthew and Mark. On the right side of the band there is a brown disc with the number three inscribed on it. Three is the number of the section, and the brown colour means that the temptation tradition is recorded by the three synoptists in the same context, that is after the baptism of Christ. The coloured discs indicate the context. If both band and disc are of the same primary colour (red, blue, yellow), there is no question of difference of context, as the episode or discourse is recorded only by one Evangelist; cp Mt. 1, 1-2, 23; 5, 21-24, 33-35; etc. If both have the same secondary colour (violet, orange, green, brown), there is identity of content and context. If the band is in several colours and the disc is a single colour, there is identity of tradition and diversity of context; thus in Mt. 21, 12 ff., the expulsion of the vendors from the temple is narrated by the three synoptists with some omissions by Luke, hence it is in brown with the central part in violet, but the disc is

orange, that is that of Luke and Matthew, Mark placing the episode in a different context. Sometimes a band is bordered by a coloured line; that means that the section represented by the band is paralleled by another Gospel, though not with the same words; thus Mt. 1, 1-17 containing the genealogy of Christ is underlined by a yellow border, which is the colour of Luke, because there is a parallel genealogy in Luke. Naturally the yellow band of Luke representing Christ's genealogy is underlined by a red border, which is Matthew's colour.

The system may appear to be too complicated for an easy use of the book, but the accompanying booklet (pp. 1-21) explains in a clear and easy way all the devices of the book.

The book is neither an attempt to solve the synoptic problem nor an exposition of its varied features. These are supposed to be known and the reader can at one glance catch sight of the synoptic condition of any passage, without need of going through the Gospel narrative and comparing it with the parallel narratives of the other Gospels.

Although the main features of the synoptic problem are fully represented by different colours, there still remain certain features which, despite their significance and importance for the solution of the problem, are not represented. Thus in the temptation narrative we are not told that the order of the temptations is different in Matthew and Luke. The narrative of the healing of the paralytic is common to the three synoptists, Mt. 9, 1-8, Mk 2, 1-12, Lk. 5, 17-26, but the linguistic differences are not indicated. Both Matthew and Luke use the Doric form of the perfect ἀφέωνται while Mark has the present ἀφίενται. Moreover Matthew uses the word κλίνη for 'bed' (9, 2. 5), Mark has κράβατος (2, 4. 9), Luke prefers κλινίδιον (5, 19. 24). Finally Luke avoids the Koine word used by Matthew and Mark and prefers the classical verb πορεύομαι. Although these and other literary peculiarities throw floods of light on the synoptic problem, they are in no way indicated by any of the devices used by the author. But this is, perhaps, asking more than is intended by the author whose aim seems to be that of providing a panoramic view of each Gospel, thus helping the reader to read the several episodes and discourses in the light of the literary setting intended by the Evangelist. The book is useful also to students of the synoptic problem who can see at one glance the main feature of the problem and save the time of going through the Gospels in order to discover them.