

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. X

1958

No. 2

ST THOMAS AQUINAS' BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES*

To every student of Theology St Thomas Aquinas is a great philosopher and theologian, the greatest philosopher and theologian of the scholastic age and of all ages, the author of a *Summa Theologica* and a *Summa Contra Gentiles*. But outside the philosophical and the theological fields the luminous figure of the Angelic Doctor fades away into complete obscurity. Nothing is known of his biblical learning and his biblical commentaries except perhaps for references to biblical passages and their interpretation as are scattered in his *Summa*. And yet St Thomas was a great biblical scholar and the greatest of all Mediaeval biblical scholars, not only for his contributions to many fundamental problems on biblical Introduction and Hermeneutics, but also and mainly for his commentaries on many books of the Old and New Testament.

It is not my intention to delineate the figure of St Thomas as a biblical interpreter. That would exceed by far the brief limits of this paper. I intend simply to review St Thomas' biblical works touching upon some of the manifold problems of Thomistic literary criticism and indicate a broader outlook of Thomistic studies with the purpose of encouraging students to enter confidently into the field of Thomistic literary research, Scholastic research and Theological research in general.

St Thomas' biblical commentaries originated from his lectures in the Universities of Paris and Naples. It is therefore in the light of the academic methods of those times that they must be viewed. In those days the study of Theology was mainly and almost exclusively concentrated on Holy Scripture, and the Master of Theology, a degree higher than a professorship, was called Master of Holy Scripture, *Magister in Sacra Pagina*. The Bible, with its Glossa, and the Sentences of Peter Lombard were the ordinary text-books and the bases of theological study. A Professor would read the sentences of Peter Lombard and another a book of the Bible. This latter was sometimes called *cursor*,

* A paper read to the Royal University Students' Theological Association on the occasion of the feast of St Thomas Aquinas.

because he read the Biblical text, cursorily, summarily, with passing references to the glossa. The Master, however, would explain a whole book chapter by chapter and verse by verse, not in a cursory way but as fully and exhaustively as possible, bringing out the theological doctrine and illustrating it by parallel passages and extensive quotations from the Fathers, refuting errors and winding up his exposition by the so-called *quaestiones quodlibetales*. The newly elected Professors and Masters inaugurated their courses by a lecture called *principium*, which was a general introduction to Holy Scripture dealing mainly with the canonicity and authenticity of the sacred books.

Another important point to remark is that a Professor or Master did not always write his commentary himself. Sometimes it was one of their students or *auditores* who put into writing his master's biblical exposition which, whether revised or not, by the master, went under his name. A technical term for such a composition was *Reporiatum* in contrast with the *Editum* which was the master's work by his own hand¹.

It is against this academical background that St Thomas' biblical activity must be viewed. His two inaugural lectures have been discovered and published in 1912. The first, delivered in September/October 1252 when St Thomas became a *baccalarius biblicus*, is extremely important on account of the doctrine of the biblical canon which, according to St Thomas, includes both the proto- and the deutero-canonical books. The second was delivered in March/April 1256 on his election as Master of Theology of the University of Paris².

The first commentary of the new Master was an *Expositio in Isaiam prophetiam* being the lectures delivered in the University of Paris during the three-year course 1256-9. The autograph written in St Thomas' unintelligible handwriting, the *littera inintelligibilis* of the Middle Ages, is preserved in the Vatican Library. It is a literal, allegorical and theological commentary, inferior to St Thomas' later commentaries, but not unworthy of the great Master. This is how he explains the 'virgin' prophecy in 7,14: *Nullum signum esset si juvencula concepisset et etiam virgo corrupta... Ideo autem apud eos ponitur magis alma quam juvencula, quia alma significat virginem, secundum nominis originem, et adhuc plus, custoditam, de qua non possit haberi mali suspicio*³.

In 1259 St Thomas left Paris and returned to Italy where he remained

¹ A. Kleinhaus, 'Der Studiengang der Professoren der Hl. Schrift im 13 und 14 Jahrhundert' in *Biblica* 14 (1933) 381-399.

² P. Synave, 'Le Canon scripturaire de Saint Thomas d'Aquin' in *Revue biblique* 33 (1924) 528-533.

³ C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse Latine au moyen age*, Paris, 1944, 300 ff.

till 1268. During this period he wrote an *Expositio in Lamentationes*, *Expositio in Jeremiam*, *Lectura super Paulum* and the *Glossa super quatuor Evangelia*. He wrote also, or at least is believed to have written an *Expositio in Canticum*. Later he composed a commentary on the book of Job, and another on Psalms. We shall first speak of his commentaries on the O.T., then on those on the N.T.

There are two commentaries on Canticles attributed to St Thomas. The first beginning with the words: *Salomon inspiratus divino spiritu, composuit hunc libellum de nuptiis Christi et Ecclesiae* and believed to have been dictated by St Thomas in the Monastery of Fossa Nova shortly before his death, is the work of Haymo of Auxerre who lived in the ninth century. The other, which begins with the words: *Sonet vox tua*, is held to be the work of Gilles of Rome by many Thomistic scholars, although Mandonnet is inclined to consider it as the work of St Thomas revised by Gilles. The earliest lists of St Thomas' works make no mention of any commentary on Canticles. The first mention occurs in 1319 in the list by Bartholomew of Capua. Although the commentary bears striking resemblances with the genuine works of St Thomas, certain features, such as the classification of the four causes, the *causa materialis*, the *causa efficiens*, the *causa instrumentalis* and the *causa formalis*, applied to the interpretation of Canticles, take us far away from St Thomas⁴.

The *Expositio in threnos Jeremiae* is an exposition of the literal sense of Lamentations with occasional references to the allegorical and tropological senses. Jerusalem in the literal sense is the capital of the Jewish kingdom; in the allegorical sense it is the Church militant; in the moral sense it is the faithful soul⁵.

The commentary on Lamentations was followed by an *Expositio in Jeremiam prophetam* which was left unfinished as St Thomas had to return to Paris. Like the commentary on Isaias it is a literal exposition with a few quotations from the Fathers. The chronology however of St Thomas' works is far from certain, and some Thomistic scholars prefer to place the commentaries on Lamentations and Jeremias in the beginning of his teaching career, when he was still a *baccalarius biblicus*⁶.

In his *Expositio in librum Sti Job* St Thomas breaks with all his predecessors. While St Gregory in his *Moralis libri Job*, which exercised such a strong influence over the interpreters of the Middle Ages, indulged in allegorical, typical and moral interpretations neglecting the

⁴ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 303 f.

⁵ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 304 f.

⁶ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 305.

literal sense, St Thomas declares that it is his intention to investigate the literal sense not to repeat what has already been said. In the prologue he writes: *Intendimus enim compendiose... librum istum, qui intitulatur beati Job, secundum literalem sensum exponere; eius enim mysteria tam subtiliter et discrete beatus papa Gregorius nobis aperuit, ut his nihil ultra addendum videatur*. It must be remarked that the expressions *expositio literalis, expositio ad literam* in Scholastic exegesis mean doctrinal, theological, rational interpretation as opposed to the Glossa or Patristic interpretation⁷.

The commentary on the Psalms *In Psalmos Davidis expositio* is unfinished. Very probably St Thomas had planned a complete commentary on the Psalms according to their distribution in the divine office. In fact the Psalms explained by him are those that are recited at Matins in the Sunday office and in the ferial office of Monday and Tuesday. Three more Psalms forming the beginning of Matins for Wednesday were discovered and published in the year 1875. The commentary was written two or three years before his death, and was interrupted probably because St Thomas had to attend the second General Council of Lyons in 1274, the year in which he died.

The commentary on the Psalms is the most impersonal of all the commentaries of St Thomas. Contrary to the usual division in five books the Psalter is divided into three groups of fifty Psalms each corresponding to the threefold state of the faithful Christian, that is, penitence, righteousness and everlasting glory. The several Psalms, therefore, are not independent songs or prayers, but parts, logically connected together, of one definite doctrinal plan. The first Psalm is an introduction to the Psalter. The penitential Psalms are seven because seven are the gifts of the Holy Ghost which make the sinner return to God. St Thomas draws largely upon the Glossa. St Jerome's influence is apparent in the terminology. Thus on Ps. 3 he writes: *In quo Psalmo possumus ponere fundamentum historiae, et postea ponere sensum allegoricum, et ulterius moralem*⁸.

Far more important both for their theological doctrine and for their literary problems are St Thomas' commentaries on the N.T. Both exegetical methods, the Glossa interpretation and the literal interpretation, representing two different stages in St Thomas' exegetical formation and not simply two different lines of interpretation, are more conspicuous than in the O.T. commentaries.

⁷ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 310 f.

⁸ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 312-315.

St Thomas' Gospel commentaries are: *Expositio in Matthaeum Evangelistam*; *Expositio in Joannem* and *Glossa continua in quattuor evangelia*, later called *Catena Aurea*.

The commentary on the first Gospel represents the lectures delivered in the University of Paris during the course 1257-59 simultaneously with the lectures on Isaias. It was not unusual for a Master of Theology to lecture on these two books at the same time, and the custom, if it may be so called, is based on the doctrinal relation between the two books. It is a *reportatum* written by his disciples. The commentary is on traditional lines and is characterized by the frequent and often monotonous enumerations, so dear to scholastic writers. Thus commenting upon Jerome's prologue *Matthaeus in Judaea primus* writes: *Evangelio Matthaei Hieronymus premittit prologum in quo tria facit. Primo... secundo... tertio...* And a little further on: *Consequenter ipsius Evangelii mysteria aperit. Et primo aperit... secundo ostendit... in principio autem Evangelii duo tanguntur. Primo... secundo... etc.* Questions and answers often introduced by the stereotyped forms *Sed quaerendum*, *Sed dicendum*, *Sed quid est? Dicendum quod*, *Responsio*, follow each other in rapid succession. Though the commentary is inferior, under many respects, to that on the fourth Gospel, written ten years later, it is not unworthy of the Great Master especially for the way in which he brings out the logical connexion and development of ideas⁹.

The commentary on St John's Gospel belongs to St Thomas' later years, probably 1270-1. With the exception of the first five chapters, the rest is a *reportatum* written by his colleague Reginald of Piperno, and revised and approved by St Thomas. It is preceded by the usual triple preface a proem, St Jerome's prologue *Hic est Joannes Evangelista*, and a commentary on Jerome's prologue. We notice here the same love for schematic enumeration. This is the beginning of the commentary on the prologue. *In quo duo intendit Hieronymus exprimere... Dividitur ergo in duas partes. Primo ergo describit... secundo ostendit... Circa Primum duo facit. Primo ostendit... secundo probat... Describit enim auctorem quantum ad nomen... Secundo quantum ad officium... Tertio ad dignitatem... Quarto quantum ad castitatis virtutem... Quinto ab electione... Sexto a modo vocationis...* The commentary is fuller than that on Matthew; questions are discussed with greater detail. Chrysostom and Augustine are quoted almost on every page; the interpretation is literal, theological and symbolical¹⁰.

But St Thomas' greatest achievement in the field of Gospel exegesis

⁹ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 302f.

¹⁰ C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 311f.

is the *Expositio continua in Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, Joannem*, or *Glossa continua* to which in the sixteenth century the title *Catena Aurea* was given. It is a commentary made up exclusively of quotations from the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers forming a continuous exposition of the four Gospels. The *Glossa in Matthaeum* was completed in 1263. The quotations mostly from Latin writers, are, to a large extent, derived from the *glossa ordinaria* and the *glossa interlinearis*; but St Thomas, contrary to his predecessors, gives also the source of his quotation. Owing to his lack of knowledge of the Greek language, St Thomas could not make use of the writings of the Greek Fathers except through translations insofar as these were available and reliable. This explains the absence of Greek writers, except St John Chrysostom, from the *glossa* on Matthew. But for the other Gospels St Thomas had many Greek works translated to him. In the dedicatory letter prefixed to the *Expositio in Marcum* he writes: *Et ut magis integra et continua praedicta sanctorum expositio redderetur, quasdam expositiones graecorum in latinum feci transferri; ex quibus plura expositionibus latinorum doctorum interserui, auctorum nominibus praenotatis*. Not less than twenty-two Greek writers are cited.

Although St Thomas' work is an invaluable storehouse of patristic interpretations of every single verse of the Gospels, it is deplorable that it lacks the scientific accuracy required by modern standards. Some of the quotations, naturally derived from the *glossa ordinaria*, are referred to the wrong sources; others are taken from spurious works. Thus he quotes from the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* believed to be the work of St John Chrysostom, but which is in reality the work of an Arian writer¹¹.

Besides the Gospel commentaries, on whose genuineness there is not the slightest doubt, there are two others mentioned in the lists of St Thomas' works, a *lectura defectiva super Matthaeum* and an *expositio ad litteram* of the four Gospels, two works on whose existence and identification there is still some controversy.

The *lectura super Matthaeum* must certainly be identified with the printed commentary on St Matthew. Both are *reportata*. Bartholomew of Capua in 1319 writes: *Lecturam super Matthaeum; idem frater Petrus quondam scholaris Parisiensis, (recollegit) quae defectiva est*. And Nicholas Trevet informs us: *Item lectura super Matthaeum incompleta; quam partim idem frater (Petrus), partim saecularis quidam recollegit*. That the commentary is a *reportatum* is confirmed by the frequent appeals to the students' attention *Notandum; Notate*. Now as both the *lectura*

¹¹C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 307-310.

and the *expositio* are a *reportatum*, and as no other work on the first Gospel by St Thomas is known to have ever existed, we are led to conclude that the two titles refer to the same work; that is to our printed commentary on the first Gospel. Against this identity it may be objected that the commentary is complete, while the *lectura* is unfinished, defective. The clue to the right answer is provided by Nicholas Trevet who attributes the *reportatio* of the *lectura* partly to Peter and Andria, and partly to an anonymous secular scholar. It appears therefore that Bartholomew of Capua had an incomplete copy, *defectiva*, of St Thomas' commentary containing the first fifteen chapters written by Peter of Andria, while Nicholas Trevet had a complete copy. If this explanation is correct, we must read in Nicholas' list: *Item lectura super Matthaem completa*, instead of *incompleta*¹².

Has St Thomas written another commentary on the four Gospels besides the Glossa and the commentaries on Matthew and John? Bartholomew of Capua in his list of the writings of St Thomas drawn up in the year 1319 on the occasion of the process of canonization, mentions an *expositionem super quattuor evangelia ad litteram* besides the *glossas super quattuor evangelia*. The list by Nicholas Trevet omits the *expositio ad litteram*; there is however a strong probability that the omission is due to an oversight on the part either of the copyist of the manuscript or of Nicholas himself. Another testimony is provided by a list discovered by Denifle in the monastery of Stams. In it we read: *Scripsit super Matthaem, Marcum, Lucam et Joannem dupliciter, per modum postille et glosse*. On the ground of this explicit evidence Mandonnet retains that St Thomas wrote, besides the Glossa, a literal commentary on the four Gospels. On the contrary, Grabmann, another Thomistic scholar of high reputation, arguing from the fact that no other Gospel commentaries are known except those that are printed, strongly denies that St Thomas has written an *expositio litteralis*.

The argument *ex silentio* has in our case a great force. It is hardly conceivable that such work as a commentary on the Gospels by such a Master as St Thomas should entirely disappear without leaving at least some faint traces in the works of contemporary and later writers. The presumption against the existence of this commentary is further corroborated by the absence of this work from the lists of Tolomy of Lucca, William of Tocco and Bernard Gui.

It is not impossible, however, to account for both the disappearance of the *expositio* and its omission in some of the early lists. In fact St

¹²F. Pelster, 'Echtheitsfragen bei den exegetischen Schriften des Hl. Thomas von Aquin. 2. Die Lectura in Evangelium Matthaei' in *Biblica* 4(1923) 300-307.

Thomas' commentaries or expositions, as has been said above, fall into two classes: the *expositiones ad litteram* and the *glossae*. The former belong mostly to his early years. The commentaries on Isaias, Lamentations and Jeremias were written between 1256 and 1262 before the *Catena Aurea*. No wonder therefore that the early commentaries were little known. Of the commentary on Isaias Tolomy says: *Raro invenitur* and of the commentaries on Lamentations and Jeremias he seems to have no knowledge. If therefore these commentaries were very little known, still less known was the *expositio ad litteram super quattuor evangelia* after St Thomas had given his major commentary or the *Catena Aurea*.

Reference to this lost commentary on the four Gospels occurs in a Catalogue of the books of the papal palace in Avignon published by Fr Ehrle. In this catalogue written in the year 1369 we read: *Item expositio sancti Thomae super quattuor evangelia cooperta corio viridi...* This can hardly be the *Catena Aurea* which was usually bound in two volumes. Another list of the sixteenth century enumerates the *Glossa continua* or *Catena Aurea*, the commentary on Matthew, and adds another commentary *super Lucam et Johannem*. As no other commentary on Luke is known besides that in the *Glossa*, it is most probable that we have here another reference to the lost commentary¹³.

There seems to be, therefore, undisputable evidence for the existence of a commentary on the four Gospels by St Thomas, a commentary which was completely superseded by his major commentary and soon fell into oblivion. Further research among the mass of anonymous manuscript expositions is required for the possible recovery of this commentary that will place, I am sure, both theologians and interpreters, under a heavier debt of gratitude towards the Angelic Doctor.

St Thomas' greatest exegetical work is, by general consent, his commentary on the Epistles of St Paul, a work which no interpreter of Paul can afford to ignore. Naturally, St Paul's writings, veritable theological treatises, could not but make an irresistible appeal to St Thomas' theological mind. By means of numerous, sometimes excessive, divisions and subdivisions, a method so strongly characteristic of the Scholastic period, he analyses each Epistle into its constituent parts, defining the Apostles' doctrine, tracing the development of the theme and bringing out the nexus of ideas better and clearer than any other interpreter. St Thomas, however, does not analyse the text just to follow the academic trend of the times; by means of his logical divisions he endeavours to

¹³ F. Pelster, 'Echtheitsfragen bei den exegetischen Schriften des Hl. Thomas von Aquin. I. Hat Thomas eine *expositio ad litteram* zu den vier Evangelien verfasst?' in *Biblica* 3 (1922) 330-338.

discover the link connecting together not only the parts of each Epistle, but also the several Epistles into one organic whole, a *corpus theologiae Paulinae*. Thus for example every *lectio* is linked with the preceding one by the introductory words: *Postquam Apostolus ostendit* or a similar expression. In the prologue to the Epistle to the Romans he writes: *Est enim haec doctrina* (i.e. the doctrine of all the Epistles) *tota de gratia Christi*. In the prologue to the first Epistle to the Corinthians he states: *Cum enim in Epistula ad Romanos gratiam Dei commendasset, quae in sacramentis Ecclesiae operatur: hic, scilicet in prima Ep. ad Cor. de ipsis Ecclesiae sacramentis agit; in secunda vero de ministris sacramentorum*. In the commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians 1, 1 St Thomas again links up this letter to the preceding: *Ordo autem huius epistolae congruus est* (that is, its place after the two Epistles to the Corinthians) *ut post duas epistulas ad Corinthios, in quarum prima agitur de sacramentis Ecclesiae, in secunda de ministris horum sacramentorum, necessario sequatur Epistola ad Galatas, in qua agitur de cessatione sacramentorum* V.T. The letters of St Paul, are, therefore regarded by St Thomas, not merely as occasional writings determined by the particular circumstances of the communities to which they are addressed, but as parts logically connected together by one theme — the grace of Christ. None will deny that this analytico-synthetic method has considerably contributed towards a clearer understanding of the Apostle's doctrine.

We have now to determine how far is the commentary on St Paul's Epistles the work of St Thomas. That the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is an authentic work written by St Thomas' own hand has never been contested. All the ancient catalogues of St Thomas' works enumerate this commentary and classify it as an *editum*. As regards the rest, the catalogues attribute the first ten chapters of 1 Cor. to St Thomas himself and the rest of this letter and all the remaining letters to his students who wrote them down while he was lecturing. Thus Nicholas Trevet writes: *Super epistolam vero ad Romanos et super decem capitula epistolae ad Cor. (edidit)... Alia quidem inveniuntur sibi attributa, quae tamen ipse non scripsit, sed post eum legentem vel praedicantem ab aliis sunt collecta, ut puta lectionem super epistolam ad Cor. ab XI capitulo usque ad finem*. The last words *usque ad finem* mean: to the end of the last of the Apostle's letters, not to the end of I ad Cor. Bartholomew of Capua says the same thing: *Super Epistolam ad Romanos; super epistolam ad Cor... Si autem alia sibi adscribuntur, non ipse scripsit et notavit, sed alii recollegerunt post eum legentem vel praedicantem, puta Lectionem super Paulum ab XI capitulo primae Epistolae*

ad Cor. usque ad finem. These two catalogues, despite verbal agreement, are independent of each other and go back to a common source. The catalogue of the Harley Library is more explicit, because it adds *et omnes alias* after *usque ad finem*. On the strength of the evidence of these catalogues we must admit that St Thomas wrote the commentary on Rom. and the first ten chapters of I Cor. while the rest up to the end of St Paul's Epistles is a *reportatum*.

There is yet another literary problem. The editor of the Venice edition of 1562 of St Thomas' works makes this remark on I Cor. 7,10: *Advertas, candide lector, quod in quodam manuscripto exemplari, quod Venetiis in Divi Dominici a Castello, ut aiunt, bibliotheca extat, habebantur haec verba: Nota quod hinc usque ad XI Cap. exclusive non est expositum secundum Thomam, sed sumptum est de verbo ad verbum de expositione cuiusdam fratris Nicolai Gallici ordinis Praedicatorum.* If this information is reliable, the commentary on chh. 7,10-11,34 of I Cor. is neither an *editum* nor a *reportatum* of St Thomas. Now on the one hand two MSS of the fifteenth century existing in the Vatican Library have this section as an integral part of the commentary. On the other hand, the commentary on that section agrees verbally with the commentary by Peter of Tarentasia, later Pope Innocent V, a contemporary of St Thomas', a commentary retouched by Nicholas of Gorram and attributed to him in MSS. It is therefore probable that St Thomas' *editum* ends in I Cor. 7,10, and the *reportatum* begins in ch. 11, the gap being filled up by a commentary which is nearest to St Thomas both in time and doctrine¹⁴.

From this brief survey one may notice that certain literary problems of Thomistic studies have not yet been solved. Apart from the chronology of the biblical commentaries, other problems such as the authorship of the commentary on Canticles beginning with the words *Sonet vox tua*, the existence and, possibly the discovery of the *expositio ad literam super quattuor evangelia*, the dependence, if any, of St Thomas on previous interpreters are still awaiting deeper investigation not only in the field of Thomistic studies, but also in all the field of Scholastic research. The field is immensely vast. But if one cannot follow the Master up in the heights of philosophical and theological speculation, one should try at least to follow him down among his manuscripts and those of his age.

P.P. SAYDON

¹⁴C. Spicq, *Op. cit.* 305 f. F. Pelster, 'Echtheitsfragen... 3 Die Erklärung der Paulinischen Briefe' in *Bibliotheca* 37 (1922) 307-311.

MODERN PHENOMENOLOGY AND EXISTENTIAL EXPERIENCE*

Existentialism has almost become the philosophy of the day in non-catholic circles; and several catholic writers endeavour to give it an orthodox interpretation. It is an exaggerated reaction against the excessively abstract philosophy of Hegel. S. Kierkegaard (1813-1855), a Dane, who was its founder gave it a religious but lutheran tone. At first he did not have any noteworthy follower, and it seemed as if the seed he had sown were to bear no fruit. Some fifty years after his death, however, and exactly after the first World War, Existentialism was revived by M. Heidegger. His principal work *Sein und Zeit* appeared in 1927 and provoked a great storm. With few exceptions the author was accused by catholics and protestants alike of nihilism and, consequently, atheism. And both charges seemed well-founded. The first, namely that of nihilism, is based on the thesis *Was ist Metaphysic?*, where nothingness is placed side by side with, nay regarded as the basis of being, and on the general tendency of the whole work to consider death almost as the ultimate end of existence: Dasein is Sein zu Ende, ultimately Sein zum Tode. Atheism is the inevitable consequence of nihilism. And in fact J.P. Sartre¹ soon proposed to the world, as the last conclusion of the ontology of *Sein und Zeit*, his atheistic existentialism.

In *Brief über Humanismus* (1947) Heidegger strongly rejected both charges. He insisted that his interpretation of being was new, but positive; and he dissociated himself from the atheistic existentialism of Sartre. Yet, one must admit that his views on God totally differ from those of all Western theistic philosophies².

Since the publication of *Sein und Zeit* different writers have proposed different forms of existentialism. One must mention at least Karl Jaspers in Germany; J.P. Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Albert Camus and Simon Beauvoir in France; Nicola Abbagnano and Enzo Paci in Italy; Dostoyeski, W. Solovief and L. Chestof in Russia. Swiss existentialists are Heideggerians.

* The purpose of this article is to give a short exposition and refutation of Existentialism for the benefit of those readers that may not have the leisure to read long works on this important subject.

¹ Cfr especially his *L'Etre et le Néant*, 1943.

² Cfr C. Fabro, 'Il Problema di Dio nel pensiero di Heidegger' in *Analecta Gregoriana*, vol. lxvii, 17 ff.

Existentialism cannot easily be reduced to a system, for it takes different, obscure and still changing forms. Nevertheless, under all variety one notes the same basic ideas. The two main sources of this new philosophy are the transcendental phenomenology of Husserl and the so-called existential experience.

Transcendental phenomenology endeavours to clarify the *cogito* that marked the beginning of modern philosophy. It remarks that all perception of something is *my* perception of something, the ego being thus the invariable component element of all consciousness of anything. Yet the ego thus perceived does not reveal its being: it can become, however, the object of reflex consciousness and be examined in its being; but thus it will be one of all the beings we observe empirically. Likewise, the ego of *cogito* is the necessarily component element of all consciousness of something, but not as an empirical being. Whereas, therefore, the *cogito* of Descartes means the perception of the soul and of its existence as an empirical fact, phenomenologists merely note the invariable presence of the Ego in every thought of something. The *cogito* so understood introduces us into the order of the *cogitata*, that has its peculiar characteristics. Phenomenology stresses the relations of the *cogitata* to the ego, and limits itself to the pure transcendental analysis of the meaning of each *cogitatum* in our consciousness, without investigating the objective relation of the essence thought to the extra-mental object. Husserl alludes to the problem of the relation of the Ego to my soul and to the world of which I am conscious, but without expressing his mind thereon. Existentialists regard this necessary ego as a necessity of fact, as a contingent necessity, which can only serve to illumine us on contingency, on being³.

It is asked whether Husserl's phenomenology be after all a new form of transcendental idealism. It is at least certain that existentialists such as Heidegger, rejecting the traditional notion of truth, refuse to admit that theoretical thought perceives any reality distinct from itself⁴. Existentialism may be regarded as a form of nominalism and anti-intellectualism. All reality, it holds, is concrete and singular. Essences or natures, as absolute and universal, do not exist, and equally fictitious are the properties derived from such essences. Hence our intellectual ideas as abstract and universal, first principles as consisting of universal ideas, and abstract reasoning as formed of universal ideas and judgements, have no objective value. Reality is perceived otherwise.

³ Cfr K. Mytrowytcz, 'La Philosophie de l'existence etc.' in *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 1957, 470.

⁴ Cfr A. De Vos, 'La théorie Heideggerienne de la vérité' in *Analecta Greg.* vol. lxvii, 35 ff.

Existentialists mean to construct true philosophy. Up to now philosophy has based itself on fictitious universal concepts, essences and possibilities; and it has vainly investigated abstract being. Existentialism must investigate the nature of being as such, but of concrete and real being and, exactly, of man as the concrete and real being most obvious to us⁵. Through such an enquiry it will come to know the nature of real being as being, which is the aim of all true philosophy. And this brings us to the second source, existential experience.

The problem of being is not a purely theoretical one: it is forced upon us by experiences that deeply touch us, and that question our whole selves no less than the world and all that is. That is the existential experience, which, according to Heidegger, means anguish (Angst) in front of Nothing: Why is there anything and not Nothing?⁶ This Nothing reveals itself in anguish. Anguish, other than fear, is felt in front of Nothing; but we and all beings are in question. In front of this Nothing we feel annihilated and menaced with depersonalisation. What shall we become? What will being become? What is this menacing Nothing? Such anguishing questions are at the bottom of the ontological inquiry of Heidegger, who blames traditional metaphysics for having neglected the problem of 'Nothing'. In K. Jaspers existential experience involves the experience of the limits of the objective reality of the world and of our being. The basic experience of G. Marcel is the distinction between the mystery of being, which reveals itself as the Absolute Thou, and the problems of things. But what is the real value of feelings such as anguish, expectation of death, experience of limits etc. in ontology? It is generally answered that such feelings mean something, not as feelings, but as revealers of the structures of being and of the structures of our question on being.

Is a solution of the tragedy of life possible? Some, losing all hope of reaching any solution, end with Sartre in materialism and epicureanism. Others hold that this feeling of anguish arouses hope in and love for something that is the remedy to such anguish and the explanation of our contingency. Thus we come into contact with the transcendent that, according to K. Jaspers, is the unknown and unknowable of which we only know that it is transcendental.

Even in catholic existentialists one notes different shades. We may mention at least L. Lavelle, G. Marcel⁷ and R. Le Senne in France; A. Curtini, C. Guzzo, La Via, Pareyson, Sciacca and Stefanini in Italy; and

⁵ Called by existentialists *Dasein*.

⁶ K. Jaspers asks the same question in similar words.

⁷ A sincere convert to catholicism from idealism.

P. Wust in Germany. These, foremost among them Marcel, have restored to existentialism the religious tone it had lost through Heidegger: theirs, however, is a catholic interpretation. The Transcendent is the Christian God. Since we are dependent on God, Who is present in us through conservation and concurrence, a phenomenological observation of ourselves must bring us into contact with Him. Marcel speaks of an unconscious intuition of God, of which in the trials of life we become aware by intuitive reflection on ourselves helped by solitude and trust. And death is not a return to nothingness, but the dawn of eternal bliss upon pure souls.

Undoubtedly existentialism in its various forms is open to many objections. It is praiseworthy for stressing the reality of the individual against idealism, which dissolves individual personality and regards the individual ego either as merely phenomenal (Kant) or a phase and modification of the Absolute Ego or Spirit or Thought (Absolute Idealism). But the Schoolmen long before, following on the steps of St Augustine, had underlined the experimental perception of the soul. And against this new philosophy the following remarks have been passed.

1. It is based on philosophical prejudices. Universal ideas are not fictitious: the nature each expresses exists in extra-mental reality though in a different way, being abstract and universal in the mind, but concrete and singular in reality, e.g. the group of notes expressed by man really pertains to Peter. It is, therefore, equally false to say universal judgements and first principles as well as reasoning proper have no objective value. Were they not valid, universal scepticism would become inevitable. In fact, existentialists insist on the knowledge of concrete and individual reality; but it is only by universal ideas and judgements that we perceive the individual: how can I say that I am, I think and will etc., if I do not know what being, thought and will are? And it is indeed funny that existentialistic literature consists of universal ideas, judgements and reasonings, nor is it true that existence is the only reality of man, and that it must effect essence, or that there is nothing permanent in man.

2. Atheistic existentialism regards human life as vain and meaningless, because it ignores God: it denies to man any knowledge of God, because of its unwarranted mistrust of reason. Besides, a philosophy that chooses not to be rational cannot logically exclude God's existence as irrational.

4. Theistic existentialism admits an immediate knowledge of God: Does it mean thereby an immediate intuition of the Divine Nature? If so it only differs from Ontologism in that it regards this intuition as

suprarational or arational. But no finite creature can perceive the infinite God immediately. Or does it mean that by faith or trust we admit God, owing to the sentiments aroused in us by the contemplation of our misery? Well, if we do not see any connexion between such sentiments and the existence of God, we shall be asserting God's existence quite gratuitously and *quod gratis asseritur, gratis negatur*. If on the contrary existentialists think that we do see such a connexion, ours will be a real deduction: I feel these sentiments; such sentiments cannot be felt, if there is no God; therefore God exists. Existentialists, mistrust reasoning and cannot logically admit any argument. Besides, the minor premiss is highly questionable: such sentiments may be due to prejudice, to one's character, to the environment etc. It is quite true that from the data of our conscience, such as the sense of our contingency and the perception of moral obligation, etc., we can easily come to know God, but mediately, arguing, at least implicitly, from effect to cause.

4. Existentialism has not freed itself, as it pretended to do, of all Kantian influence. It is based on agnosticism and voluntarism. But this is the very essence of Kantism: in *The Critique of Pure Reason* Kant holds that the intellect cannot know things as they are in themselves; and in *The Critique of Practical Reason* he adds that, though speculative reason cannot know God, the immortality of the soul and moral obligation, we admit voluntarily these practical truths as postulates of practical reason.

5. The phenomenological description of our contingency and misery is new only in form; while the underlying truth has been stressed well enough by Christian ascetical writers.

G. SAPIANO

CATHOLIC PENTATEUCHAL STUDIES (1906-56)*

It was at a very indecisive stage of Catholic Pentateuchal studies that the Pontifical Commission for Biblical Studies issued a Decree on the authenticity of the Pentateuch in 1906¹. This decree was fundamentally a disciplinary measure, and in no way did it solve the question; its gist was that the documentary theory as a whole, as proposed and defended by the independent critics, was not yet apodictically proved as to command unreserved assent. Neither did the decree condemn those Catholics who adopted critical methods as such in their Biblical studies; on the contrary the Commission, in admitting the possibility of later additions and even of scribes in collaboration with Moses, encouraged such lines of investigation. All Catholic critics as distinguished from traditionalists admitted the Mosaic origin of the Pt but not in the strict sense of the term. Notwithstanding all this the Decree, promulgated in the height of the Modernist crisis, was not fully understood. Non-Catholics launched a sarcastic campaign against it², conservatives hailed it as their *Magna Charta* and Catholic critics practically desisted from their investigations. It happened then that Pt criticism was slowed down, so much so, that Fernandez himself admits that the literary problem of the Pt has been little studied by Catholics³. Fortunately the Pt has again drawn the attention of the Catholic scholars, who are increasing in number.

Like their predecessors the Catholic writers of this period fall into two classes: the conservatives and the critics.

Among the conservatives are included: MANGENOT (1907), HETZENAUER (1901), ALLGEIER (1911), MURILLO (1919), FERNANDEZ (1920), SANDA (1924), MERK-CORNELY (1928), BEA (1935), and H. POPE (1938). They do not admit authenticity in its strictest sense. They accept the possibility of additional matter and glosses and documents in Genesis. The distinction of later material from the earlier one has not been forthcoming in a way as to satisfy the enquirer. *Mangenot* explains the edges in the Pt by having Moses working in collaboration with others⁴. So also

* Cfr *Melita Theologica*, Vol. X, 16-21.

¹ *Ench. Bibl.* n. 174-177; Cfr A. Bea, 'Il Problema del Pto e della Storia Primordiale' in *Civiltà Cattolica* 99 (1948) 117-119; J.M. Lagrange, *L'Authenticité mosaïque de Gènesè et la théorie des documents*, RB 47 (1938) 173.

² Cfr Hetzenauer, *Introductio in Librum Genesis*, Viennae 1910, xxvii.

³ A. Fernández, 'La crítica reciente y el Pentateuco', in *Biblica* 1 (1920) 210.

⁴ E. Mangenot, 'Ce recours à des sources antécédentes, cet emploi de main

*Hetzenauer*⁵, whilst *Allgeier* denies the duplicates⁶, *Murillo* defends the traditional view to the minutest apex, without proposing any one of his own⁷. *Fernández* attacks Touzard but he appeals for more study of the Pt, within Catholic circles. The position of this school, if it may be called so, is adequately summarized by Pope in these words: 'There is evidence for the documentary theory. The only question is whether that evidence affords a sufficiently broad basis for the huge superstructure now erected upon it. That the Pt is a compilation no student would deny. But that we have in the Graf-Wellhausen theory the clue to its compilation, that we can by its means unravel the various threads woven into its compilation, is quite another proposition. That documents lie behind the Pt may be a fact; but attempts at dissecting them out can never be more than hypothetical. Precisely here lies our quarrel with the critics. For however much they depreciate such a charge, they persist in regarding their analysis as a demonstrated fact at any rate in the use they make of it'⁸.

There are other Catholic scholars, the Critical wing so to say, who, rejecting partially or wholly the dating of Wellhausen, admit with certain modifications more or less radical the rest of their theories. They are mostly expansionists. They use to its fullest extent the liberty granted by the decree in attempting to frame a theory as to meet all the points of the problem. *Lagrange* thus comments on the decree: 'Nous croyons cependant qu'on peut conclure que la Commission tient moins à l'authenticité littéraire de Moïse qu'à une authenticité substantielle. De plus, cette authenticité, dans les cas des additions faites après sa morte, serait une authenticité résultant du même esprit'⁹. On this basis they framed various theories to solve the problem.

BRÜCKER (1907) explained the origin of the Pt on this principle: 'Il nous est parfaitement loisible de penser que l'auteur du Pt a procédé par voie de composition successive, en produisant séparément plusieurs écrite ayant chacun son objet et son unité propres, dans les genres de ceux que les critiques reconnaissent'¹⁰. Moses wrote the four documents

étrangères expliquent non seulement les différences de style et de rédaction des parties du Pt, mais encore des répétitions et certaines diversités de fond', *L'Authenticité Mosaïque du Pentateuque* (Paris) 1907, 327.

⁵ M. Hetzenauer, *l.c.* 54.

⁷ L. Murillo, *El Génesis precedido de una introducción al Pentateuco*, Rome 1914.

⁶ A. Allgeier, *Über Doppelberichte in der Genesis*, Freiburg 1911, 13.

⁸ H. Pope, *The Catholic Student's Aid to the study of the Bible*, London 1938, vol. iii, 287.

⁹ RB (1938) 164.

¹⁰ J. Brücker, *L'Église et la Critique Biblique*, Paris, 1908, 143 ff.

extant in the Pt separately: first P for apparently official use, then J and E for popular edification in support of their religious sentiments. These last two writings were later fused in one JE. When Israel's wanderings in the desert were nearing their end Moses concentrated all the lessons of history and all the precepts in the Dt. It may at least be admitted that these mutually independent writings were transmitted separately. Later on they were combined into one. Various changes were introduced into the text through the daily use by the priests who were bent on accepting in it the language spoken at their particular age. Jewish scrupolosity in O.T. times was not so great as to withstand such textual changes. In spite of the redactional elements the substantiality of Mosaic authorship is not impaired.

Brücker then accepted the documentary theory as traced by the critics but rejected their datings. In other words he reconciled the existence of these documents with Mosaic authorship as defined by the Biblical Commission. His solution is plausible but very vulnerable especially with respect to E and J; the liveliness of the latter in contrast to the monotony of the former does not stand so easily with common origin, under identical or similar circumstances, as postulated by Brücker.

SCHULZ (1908) befriended duplicates. He reconciled the possibility of sources with inspiration and admitted that Moses in fact used documents¹¹.

HOBERG (1908) upholds the Mosaic authorship in a wider sense. Moses drew upon sources actually untraceable in the compilation of Gn. The rest of the Pt was expanded through the addition of non-Mosaic matter. 'The Pt, writes Hoberg, is a result of a religious development in the people of the promise from Moses down to the time of the Babylonian exile on the basis laid down by Moses, which in space and significance forms the greatest part of the O.T. law-book'. It resembles the Breviary and the Missal which despite the many additions still bear the name of Pius V¹².

TOUZARD (1919) went further in his views; he restricted so much the literary activity of Moses that the Holy Office declared that his explanation *tuto tradi non potest*. J and E were written at the time of Moses and joined into JE in the ninth or eighth century B.C. The historical sections of the Pt betray the signs of a third document going back to Moses to which various sections were added by an inspired writer. Moses

¹¹ A. Schulz, 'Doppelberichte im Pentateuch', series *Biblische Studien* xiii, 1908.

¹² G. Hoberg, *Die Genesis*, Freiburg I, B² 1908, xii-cxiv.

wrote the Decalogue except for its amplifications in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the book of the Covenant (Ex 20, 22-23, 33), the renewal of the Covenant (Ex 34, 11-26) and the Priestly Code excepting additional matter of exilic or post-exilic times. There is a Mosaic nucleus in the Dt relating the renewal of the covenant and the reinculcation of the Law in the plains of Moab; the rest consists of post-Mosaic accretions of the times between Samuel and Josiah. This is a sort of an expansionist-documentary theory¹³.

NIKEL (1924) framed a form of documentary theory. Moses left behind him a nucleus of legislative and historical writings; this his successors took up and worked out into our actual Pt. Much material had been added by way of geography, history, archaeology and new enactments. There is a lot of historical accretions drawn out from well-founded traditions, oral or even written sources dating from Mosaic times. The law was based on the principles of Mosaic precepts¹⁴.

HEINISCH (1930) construed again a fragmentary hypothesis: He combined into one documentary theory the scribes' interference and the ever present enlargements. Moses utilized sources in certain sections of Gn and scribes in the other books. It is practically impossible to pick up what he himself had actually written, except for some fundamental laws and certain historical sections of special import. He rejects the opinion that all the history from Adam down to the wanderings in the desert was all written at a time and not gradually through the accessions of heterogeneous records from time to time. According to Heinisch the Pt is an inexplicable labyrinth; but we have to remark that the unity of the whole and of Gn in particular on which Heinisch worked does not lend support to this¹⁵.

H. JUNKER (1933)¹⁶ insists on the evolutionary character of the Law. Israel could have never lived with a static written law. Her law was in constant contact with prophetism, which exerted its own influence and was ever being adapted to new conditions throughout the centuries. Since however this law kept on evolving itself on the same fundamental principles on which it was based by Moses in its inception, it kept the name of its first legislator.

G. RICCIOTTI¹⁷ holds that there are two important stages in the history

¹³ J. Touzard, *Moïse et Josué* in DAFC, iii-4, Paris 1919, 737-755.

¹⁴ J. Nikel, *Grundriss der Ein. in das A. T.*, Munster, iv, 1924, 59-61.

¹⁵ P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis*, Bonn 1930, 43.

¹⁶ H. Junker, *Das Buch Deuteronomium*, Bonn 1933, 14-16; *Genesis* (Echter Bibel), Bonn 1952.

¹⁷ G. Ricciotti, *Storia d'Israele*, 2 vols, Torino 1947, 125-135; 271-273.

of the Pt. The legislation of D is substantially Mosaic and it was codified by the men of Ezechias after the fall of Samaria as a means to meet the disasters which had befallen the nation. During Manasseh's reign it fell into oblivion to be recovered and enforced again by Josiah (621). During the exile the scribes took upon themselves the arduous task of collecting and putting in order all the historical and juridical material handed down from the past orally or in a written form. To the traditional stories of the Patriarchs they attached later narratives forming thus a *corpus historicum*; the juridical collection formed the *corpus juridicum*. These two collections combined together, gave the Israelites in a single collection and in an orderly manner all the patrimony, historical and legal, of the past. Ricciotti, therefore, defending the antiquity of the sources, admits later elaborations of the same until the actual Pt came into being in Exilic times.

W. STÖDERL¹⁸ admits and takes for granted the literary conclusions generally held by critics. He dissociates himself, however, from their historical conclusions. The fundamental principles of the several documents go back to the times of Moses; these original documents went on evolving themselves in line with these principles so that they may rightly claim Mosaic authenticity.

A. ALLGEIER¹⁹ believes that the Pentateuch reflects the religious development of Israel since the days of Moses till post-exilic times.

A. VACCARI (1937) outlined a more far-reaching solution in a conference in the presence of his Holiness, which he later expanded. He marked out the weakness of the critics' analysis of the Pt into four documents JEDP and struck at their arbitrary dating²⁰.

Vaccari stated that in the Bible there is a kind of literary dualism parallel to the political dualism of Jewish history and perhaps connected with it. In the Psalter two series of David's psalms are extant, two collections of Solomon's reached us in the Prov., and a double version, one in Greek and one in Hebrew of Jer. exists. A parallel phenomenon may have happened in the case of Pt²¹. This theory is in some way related

¹⁸ W. Stöderl, *Das Gesetz Israels nach Inhalt und Ursprung*, 1933.

¹⁹ A. Allgeier, *Biblische Zeitgeschichte in den Grundlinien dargestellt*, Freiburg i, B 1937, 49-57.

²⁰ V.D. 17 (1937) 372.

²¹ A. Vaccari: Il pentateuco tutto composto da Mosè, parte su suoi ricordi, parte su documenti fornitigli dalla tradizione e dal ceto sacerdotale si propagò nella società ebraica e nella trasmissione, subendo modificazione di forma, punto insolite nella tradizione di opere letterarie, venne col tempo a ricevere in due punti diversi dell'area israelitica per esempio nel regno di Efraim e nel regno

to that formulated by Hummelauer in 1901.

This explanation is radical in attributing stylistic differences in certain sections of Pt to its peculiar transmissions. It is plausible with respect to the narrative parts; but what of the legislative parts? Lagrange objects to the view that a duality of versions of the work is a constant law of text-transmission and hence that it may explain the internal inconsistencies in the Pt; a redactor aiming at recovering the original text does not fuse into one two lines of tradition; few if any critics admit only two sources; it is unlikely that a single work developed itself into two apparently distinct writings and, finally, while multiplicity of sources is the point of departure for the Diatessaron with which Vaccari compares the history of the Pt, in our case unity of sources would have had resolved itself into multiplicity²². Lagrange rejects this theory as purely hypothetical and Vincent retains that it creates more difficulties than it solves²³.

LAGRANGE proposed a new solution which is nothing else but the classical documentary theory without its dates. He applied his principles to Genesis. He starts to define the limits within which the Catholic critic is free to move. On the one hand there is the substantial authenticity defended by the Commission, on the other there is the peculiar historiography of the Easterners as J. Guidi has shown²⁴. Their historians used to join together documents at times contradictory in spirit to one another. It is for the exegete then to identify each of these ingredients. Lagrange insists that he as far back as forty years before, had believed the documentary theory as framed by Wellhausen but for its system of dating as substantially proved. He has no reason whatever to retract that view. He tries to reconcile the sources hypothesis with tradition and is even ready to relegate P to post-exilic times²⁵. E is of a pre-Mosaic origin; J was written by Moses himself²⁶. Hence their chronological order is EJP.

Lagrange takes the Revelation of God's name YAHWEH in Ex 2, 13-15 and 6, 2 as the point of departure²⁷. Since a J narrative before this

di Giuda, due forme alquanto differenti; in una di esse, tra l'altro, al primitivo Jahweh fu sostituito Elohim. Più tardi quando (sotto Ezechia o Giosia) si sentì la necessità o l'opportunità di unificare le due recensionì, un redattore le fuse insieme prendendo ora da questa ora da quella, talora contentandosi di giustaporle senza alterare le fattezze proprie di ognuna. *La Sacra Bibbia*, Roma 1942, 5-8; Cfr VD 17 (1937), 372.

²² RB (1938), 173f.

²³ Vincent, in *Vivre et Penser*, 1945, 160.

²⁴ RB (1906), 509-519.

²⁵ RB (1938), 179.

²⁶ Ibid. 178.

²⁷ Ibid. 174.

Revelation is inadmissible, we have here a chronological datum of great importance and a strong argument for the separation of E from J. Lagrange at this point accentuates P's insistence on the transcendency of God as master of all peoples. Immediately after this Revelation it was but natural that history would be written under the patronage of Yahweh. Moses utilized E, either he himself or one of his co-workers inspired by him²⁸. If Moses is the author of J and E of which P is only a resumé, Moses is indeed the author of Gn, making allowance for additions here and there which by no means impair their historical value. The enquiry is not extended to the whole Pt, but Lagrange does not leave it obscure that P is post-exilic in date.

Lagrange rejects the unity of E and J taken together because this would require a change in the history of the religious development; in other words history itself as it is expounded in the Scriptures goes against it. The anthropomorphism of J does not necessarily argue its antiquity. It might be the result of two simultaneous tendencies within Israel itself; the fact is not improbable when one considers the unabating battle that the leaders of Israel had to fight against the worship of alien gods throughout her history. E, which paints a golden past in contrast with the gloomy one of J, cannot be attributed to the same writer. The familiarity between God and man so prominent in J is explained by Israel's consideration of God as their peace-time friend and their war-time chief; E on the other hand insists on the universality of God. Neither was it likely for Moses to change the *EL* of the earlier document into Yahweh²⁹. It would be exactly against his purpose and too mechanical a process. In accepting E and joining it with J, Moses proved to the Hebrews that the God who befriended their forefathers in the past was then leading them into the rich land of Canaan. But is it likely that once E was extant Moses would have written a second account not divergent in substance from the first, and then amputate it to make place for E? It is much more easy to understand how Moses compiled Gn if J and E were existing separately. 'Mais, les deux ouvrages existant, on comprend

²⁸ 'Au moment où la promesse faite à Abraham allait être remplie par l'entrée en Canaan Moïse faisait entrevoir pour Israël un rôle plus glorieux qui s'étendrait à toutes les nations. Lui, le grand législateur, aurait fixé ainsi les deux pôles de l'existence d'Israël, la Loi et le Messianisme. Il est le seul, connu de nous auquel on puisse attribuer cette vue profonde dans le dessein de Dieu. Et si par impossible, il n'a pas rédigé ou même approuvé E et J, il aurait encore sûrement posé les deux fondements de la foi, dont le souvenir pleusant recueilli aurait abouti à la rédaction du Pt. Mais nous ne voyons pas d'obstacle au fait que Moïse ait été vraiment de son vivant l'instigateur et ainsi l'auteur des récits de la Genèse, qu'il aurait ensuite approuvés.' Ibid, 175.

²⁹ Ibid., 179.

tres bien que Moïse se soit fait l'arbitre entre eux en les fondant dans une même tout, ce qui réalisait au mieux son but de changer le nom de Dieu pour l'usage national, sans abolir tout à fait, et de manière à rendre son unité très sensible: une seule foi dans le passé, une même espérance pour l'avenir³⁰.

In 1943 five years after these clear statements of Fr Lagrange Pope Pius XII issued an Encyclical Letter *De Sacrorum Bibliorum Studiis Provehendis*³¹, in which he summed up the progress realized in the fifty years since the publication of the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus* in 1893 by Pope Leo XIII, and he laid down principles of fundamental importance for future biblical studies. This pontifical document is characterized by a tone of satisfaction with what had been done and of optimism for the future. It is remarkable for its confidence in modern methods and for the liberty conceded to the Catholic exegete; indeed it opened the door for more intensive studies in all branches of Biblical learning.

The Pope did not deal with any question in particular except perhaps for the authenticity of the Vulgate; still less did he deal with the Pentateuchal question. In his statements however we find much that concerns us. Without in any way condemning literary criticism as such, he insists on the importance of studying well the structure of the several books against the background of the ancient oriental method of writing and ways of expression. . . *Antiquorum denique modus loquendi narrandi scribendique innumeris exemplis illustratur. Haec omnia quae non sine providentiae Dei consilio aetas haec nostra consecuta est, sacrarum litterarum quodammodo invitant atque admonent, ut ad divina Eloquia penitus perscrutanda, illustranda clarius, lucidiusque proponenda, tanta haec luce data alacriter utantur.* The Sacred writer was an instrument, indeed a rational instrument in the hands of God, and hence he had his own part to play in the writing or compilation of his book. This action exercised by the human instrument must be taken into consideration. It is very important then to study the personality of the human author and the method used by him in mediating to us divine revelation, otherwise we would never arrive at an adequate and a full understanding of the divine message: *Cognitis igitur accurateque aestimatis antiquorum loquendi scribendique modis et artibus multa dissolvi poterunt quae contra Divinarum Litterarum veritatem fidemque historicam opponuntur; neque minus apte eiusmodi studium ad Sacri Auctoris mentem plenius*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 181; Cfr R.T. Murphy, 'Père Lagrange and the Scriptures', in *CBQ*, 11 (1949) 176ff.

³¹ *Lit. Encycl.*, *Divino Affante Spiritu* AAS 35 (1943) 297-326; Cfr *Biblica* (1943) 313; *Rev. nouv. Theol.* 68 (1946) 648-670; 766-798.

illustriusque perspiciendam conducet.

No one would fail to see how Pentateuchal literary criticism which deals with the origin of the Mosaic work enters into this programme of studies proposed by the Supreme Pontiff. He himself states that historical writing among the Orientals was not based on the same principles and method of the Greeks or Romans, or of modern historiography. Therefore it is legitimate to enquire into the constitution of the Pt to see how it came into being, and by doing so one may apply certain principles and methods which are not applicable to European narrative. This would in no way detract from the authority of the Sacred books, provided that it does not lead to conclusions against the sanctity and infallibility of God (p. 315). The author of the Pt wrote in the East making use of ordinary methods used by his contemporaries.

All this has been confirmed five years later when the Pont. Bibl. Commission addressed a letter to Cardinal Suhard of Paris in 1948³² under the heading *De tempore Documentorum Pentateuchi et de Genere Litterario undecim priorum capitum Geneseos*. The Commission unequivocally stated that the Church allows full liberty to her exegetes within the limit of traditional teaching (p. 45) and that the pontifical decrees of the years 1905, 1906, 1909 relating to Pentateuchal literary and historical problems do not preclude or hinder further research (p. 46). Having made these general remarks the Commission tackles our problem directly, unequivocally stating that no one to-day dares to deny the existence of documents in the Pt or the progressive growth of the Mosaic legislation: *Il n'est plus personne aujourd'hui qui mette en doute l'existence de ces sources et n'admette accroissement progressive des lois mosaïques du aux conditions sociales et religieuses de temps postérieures, progression qui se manifeste aussi dans les recits historiques.* (p. 46). Not only the possibility of documents is here admitted but also the fact itself. There is no agreement however within the critics' circles as to the nature, number, denomination and date of these documents or sources. Various methods have been applied and experimented upon to find a way out of this confusion. P. Vosté concludes this first part of his letter with an earnest appeal to Catholic exegetes to tackle these problems with all seriousness: *C'est pourquoi nous invitons les savants catholiques à étudier ces problèmes sans parti – pris, à la lumière d'une saine critique et des résultats des autres sciences intéressées dans ces matières et une telle étude établira sans doute la grande part et la profonde influence de Moïse comme auteur et comme législateur.*

³² AAS 40 (1948) 45-48; Cfr Bea, 'Il Problema del Pentateuco e della storia primordiale', in *Civ. Catt.* 99 (1949) 116ff. J.M. Vosté, *Anglicum* 25 (1948) 153-164.

One cannot pass unnoticed the intimate connexion between the Encyclical and this letter. The former laid down the principles on which Biblical studies should be based; the latter applied them in particular to the literary criticism of the Pt and the exegesis of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, which do not concern us here. No less than the Encyclical, the letter is inspired by a tone of optimism and confidence for the future. Commenting on this letter Vosté, under whose signature it has been issued, maintains that Catholics are free to hold that there are documents in the Pt, provided that they reject the low datings of the Wellhausen school and others, and that they would keep to the substantial Mosaic authenticity. Bea explaining the same letter to the readers of *Civiltà Cattolica* insists on the great part played by Moses in the *origine* of the Pt; this however does not exclude his use of documents nor the usual redactional procedures. Later legislation was based on much older Mosaic laws; therefore neither these escape from Mosaic influence.

One may conclude, after thorough perusal of these Pontifical documents, that Ecclesiastical authorities, far from condemning critical studies as such, encourage Catholic scholars to take them up in all earnestness. It is not only an advice in general but it has a special reference to the Pt problem.

In the revised edition of the Höpfl manual in 1946³³ the reviser holds that Moses wrote the greater part (*permagnam partem*) of the Pt in the legislative sections, and that some slight additions and modifications had been introduced to meet new situations. The Pt may have been written from sources, oral or written, combined into one whole, either by Moses himself or by some other writer later than Moses; in the latter case the sources go back to Moses in their greater part. It is impossible however to go beyond a general analysis to the single words.

A. CLAMER³⁴, upholding Mosaic authorship of these books and the whole Pt in the terms of the Biblical Commission, admits the insertion of new laws and the adaptation of the older ones to the new conditions. He follows the steps of modern Catholic interpreters such as Goettsberger, Heinisch, Junker without presenting any theory of his own.

H. CAZELLES³⁵ defends the Mosaic authorship of the Covenant Code.

Th. C. VRIEZEN³⁶ states that the JEDP theory is no more than a working

³³ P. Höpfl, *Introductio Specialis in Vetus Testamentum*, Rome 1946, 110.

³⁴ A. Clamer, *La Sainte Bible*, Tome II, *Les Nombres-Deutéronome*, Paris 1946.

³⁵ H. Cazelle, *Etudes sur le code de l'Alliance*, Paris 1946; 'A Propos du Pt', in *Bib.* 35 (1954) 279ff. *Le Levitique*, Paris 1951; *Les Nombres*, Paris 1952; *Le Deutéronome*, Paris 1950.

³⁶ Th. C. Vriezen, 'Oudisraëlitische Geschriftten', in *Miscellanea XVIII a XXIII*

hypothesis. The formation of the Biblical literature was not simply due to a mechanic combination of written documents but the result of a slow evolution in which oral tradition, successive redactors, amplifications and additions played their own special part.

J. RENIE³⁷ admits legislative evolution and also that the narrative in the Pt is historical in its main outlines but not necessarily in all its details.

DE VAUX³⁸ himself outlines his own theory in one of his latest publications. The Pentateuch is the resultant of a combination of no less than four lines of *traditions*, and not written *documents*, which are identifiable by the recurring fixed 'constants'. The several traditions correspond to JEDP because the same criteria are used for their separation, but one should not speak of *documents* but of a *Jahwistic* or *Elohistic* or *Priestly* tradition. For the dating of the several traditions one should speak of epochs. Deuteronomy belonging to Josiah's reign, but of much older origin, affords us a fixed point on which to build the chronological order of the four traditions. Jahwistic and Elohist traditions are much older. The priestly tradition is exilic. The Jahwistic is of Judean while the Elohist is of northern origin. The Deuteronomic code neglects the Northern atmosphere, and the priestly tradition belongs to the Jerusalem priesthood. These traditions started in the various shrines where the events of olden days were recited from time to time; laws were promulgated to meet recurring needs. All these traditions, which betray an ancient common background go back to Mosaic times; indeed ancient traditions of ancient peoples, neighbours of Israel, such as the Ugaritic texts, show that even before Moses literary activity far from being something rare, was much valued and resorted to keep alive the various traditional beliefs and culture of the nation. In the Pentateuch we have the history of the promise and its partial fulfilment on which were based all the hopes of Israel.

CHAINED³⁹ upholds the existence of documents identical with those of Wellhausen. He goes so far as to distinguish them in the text itself. He rejects the later datings of the independent critics without however going back to the Mosaic age, in all cases following Lagrange: P is not Mosaic; J and E would suffice by themselves to save Mosaic authenticity

(*Analecta Lovaniensa Biblica et Orientalia* II, 8) ed. by J. Coppens, Gembloux, Duculot 1948.

³⁷ J. Renie, *Manuel d'écriture Sainte*, Tome I: *Introduction Générale à l'Ancien Testament et Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1949.

³⁸ De Vaux, *La Génèse*, Paris 1951. Cfr RB 56 (1949), 455.

³⁹ Chaine, *Livre de la Génèse*, Paris 1949.

and even if one would not assign J and E to Moses he would have to admit that they are based on Mosaic material, because J betrays the inclusion of much earlier narratives. P, written after D, represents the final development of Hebrew legislation; P idealized the past in its narrative sections which form a literary genus having nothing to do with modern historiography just as Ezechiel idealized the future when he depicted the restoration to be effected after the exile. Besides these three main strands, JEP, there are other fragmentary sources such as ch. 14 as the ancient names clearly indicate, the list of the Edomite Kings 36, 31-39, Jacob's poem 49, belonging to the times of the Judges and introduced in Gn by the redactor of JEP.

The history of Genesis may be reconstructed thus: JE were first dovetailed together by a redactor by a process of compilation inserting redactional elements to harmonize the narratives. A later redactor taking P for his framework combined JE with P.

Criticising its lack of emphasis on the literary beauty of the Book and its doctrine, De Vaux hails the work as a step forward in literary criticism within Catholic circles⁴⁰.

The above survey leads to this conclusion: Catholic works on this problem are relatively small in number, and even these are divided into two main classes; those tending to defend strict Mosaic authorship without providing reasonable explanation of the inherent difficulties in the Pt; and the others, taking into full account the arguments of the independent critics and realizing that somehow or other the objections raised against the authority of the Holy Scriptures must be met, propose new methods of approach. In these works the substantial Mosaic authenticity of the work and posterior redactions are admitted. Can one say, however, that so far an adequate solution of the whole problem has been framed? Brucker, Hummelauer, Touzard and Heinisch defend expansionism, which, we believe, is in contrast to the unity of purpose of the whole Pentateuch and of Genesis in particular. Lagrange and Vaccari are more radical, but they stopped with outlining fundamental principles, without applying them in detail; Chaine went further by applying the source theory to the whole of Genesis as also did De Vaux and the other translators of the Jerusalem Bible. Catholics to-day are taking a more positive approach to solve this highly complicated and important problem.

C. SANT

⁴⁰ RB 56 (1949) 455 f.

CASUS MORALIS

DE PARTU SINE DOLORE ET DE USU NARCOTICORUM

Lucia, quotiescumque ad parturiendum pervenit, maximos atque diuturnos dolores patitur. Medicus, tamquam minus malum, Luciae suadet ut deinceps rem male cum viro suo habeat eique analgesim¹ administret, quod idem saepe facit cum moribundis et cum aegrotis in periculo mortis, ut dolores naturales supprimat.

Cajus, infirmorum confessarius, innixus textu S. Scripturae 'In dolore paries filios', medicum, ob suum modum agendi cum Lucia suaviter reprehendit et usum narcoticorum omnino ei prohibet, quia ita aegroti saepius inconscii moriuntur et aliquando eorum vita abbreviatur. Coeterum et Christus agonizans in cruce vinum felle mixtum respuit ne dolores ejus minuerentur.

QUAERITUR

- I. Utrum semper licitum sit suadere minus malum ad vitandum majus?
- II. Utrum mater teneatur acceptare dolores partus?
- III. Utrum illicitus sit usus narcoticorum cum aegrotis?
- IV. Quid de modo agendi Caji confessarii dicendum?

SOLUTIO

Ad I. Cum fusius iam alia occasione de hoc tractatum sit in hac ephemeride², breviter tantum hic respondetur. Si malum inferens iam determinatus sit ad malum inferendum vel ab illo inferendo averti non possit, et eodem tempore, agatur de minori malo *ejusdem* speciei, omnes auctores liceitatem suasionis admittunt. Sed si malum hoc esset diversae speciei, auctores discrepant. Pater FABREGAS S.J., innixus doctrinae antiquorum auctorum expresse liceitatem admittit. Praecipuum ejus argumentum est hoc: Minus malum quod suadetur ad impediendum majus, quamvis sit *ejusdem* speciei, in se consideratum, remanet semper malum; et si hoc non imputatur suadenti, hoc fit quia imminutio est mali majoris. Ergo etiam a pari, minus malum quod non est *ejusdem* speciei non debet imputari consulenti quia imminutio est mali majoris.

¹ *Analgesicum*, a Graeco ἀλγός, est remedium quod tollit dolores physicos.

Narcoticum est quolibet medicamentum producens *narcosim*; (a Graeco νάρκη) i.e. statum torporis cum amissione sensibilitatis et conscientiae, qui torpor artificialiter obtinetur mediis narcoticis;

Anestheticum, a Graeco ἀνασθητικός, est remedium quod tollit sensibilitatem. Cfr Ferrio L., *Terminologia clinica*, Torino, 1899.

² Cfr P. Tabone, *Melita Theologica*, Vol. iiii, No. 2, July-Dec. 1950, 99 ad I.

Idem docet JORIO quia, ut ipse ait, 'Quod a suadente enim intenditur est imminutio mali, quod per se bonum est'. NODLIN aliique negant.

Ad II. Circa hanc quaestionem Romanus Pontifex, Pius XII, quem Deus diu sospitem et incolumem servet, die 8 Januarii 1956, allocutionem habuit coram multis honorabilibus medicis in qua praecise loquitur de partu sine dolore³. Attamen Augustus Pontifex in hac sua allocutione loquitur principaliter de aliqua nova methodo juxta quam nullum medium artificiale adhibetur ad tollendos partus dolores, sed mater relinquitur in tota sua conscientia a principio usque ad finem partus. Nil tollitur ex matris intelligentia, voluntate et affectu materno, sed mens et voluntas matris ita diriguntur ut dolores, tempore partus, in ea oriri non sinantur. Mater insuper educatur circa dignitatem suam maternam necnon circa aliqua exercitia practica quae partum faciunt. Methodus haec, dicit R. Pontifex in sua constitutione, nihil immoralitatis continet, imo si per eam dolores et timor partus evitantur, etiam diversi actus immorales in usu matrimonii diminuentur. Ergo mater hac methodo mediante poterit dolores partus vitare. Sed quid dicendum si haec methodus, quae *psycho-prophylactica* vocatur, non evadit sufficiens et opus erit mediis artificialibus, analgesicis vel narcoticis, ad dolores auferendos? Ad hanc difficultatem solvendam iterum recurendum est ad aliam allocutionem quam idem Pontifex, die 30 Septembris 1949, habuit ad participantes ad IV Congressum Internationale Medicorum Catholicorum⁴. Pius XII incipit hanc allocutionem dicendo quod medici est omnibus remediis uti ad dolores humanos tollendos aut saltem minuendos; iterum chirurgi est media applicare ad operationes necessarias leniores reddendas, dum ginecologi est dolores partus minuere dummodo hoc fiat sine periculo matris et infantis et sine offendiculo amoris materni.

R. Pontifex consulto utitur verbo 'minuere' quia, saltem juxta aliquos medicos, numquam dolores partus penitus supprimi possunt, quin mater, mediantibus prolongatis narcoticis, ponatur in profunda hypnosi. Attamen in hac methodo haberetur periculum indifferentiae amoris materni erga prolem. Ergo mater tenetur acceptare dolores partus si nulla via adest praeter hypnosim narcoticis prolongatam.

Ex hoc sequitur etiam quod mater potest dolores partus non acceptare, etiam analgesicis mediis adhibitis, si periculum hypnoseos non habetur. Et ad hoc confirmandum atque roborandum idem Pius XII aliam allocutionem habuit ad medicos die 24 Februarii 1957⁵, in qua ipse magna

³ Cfr hanc allocutionem, in lingua gallica recitatam, in AAS LXVIII (1956), 82-93 et in lingua italica in *Perfice Munus!* XXXI, (1956), 129.

⁴ Cfr *Atti e Discorsi di Pio XII*, Ed. Paoline, XI, (1949), 242-8

⁵ Cfr AAS LXIX (1957), 129-147, gallice, et *Perfice Munus!* XXXII (1957), 393-409, italice.

dexteritate respondit ad tres quaestiones ei prius positas a IX Congressu nationali Societatis Italicae Anestescologiae, Romae habito, diebus 15, 16, 17 Octobris 1956. Et praecise prima quaestio fuit haec: Utrum existat praescriptio moralis rejiciendi anesthesiam et acceptandi dolorem physicum cum spiritu fidei. Augustus Pontifex respondit quod si infirmus desiderat evitare aut minuere dolorem physicum, potest, tuta conscientia, uti mediis a scientia inventis modo in se ipsis immoralia non sint. Imo, idem Pontifex, allocutionem diei 8 Januarii 1956 prae oculis revocat et repetit quod mater non tenetur acceptare omnes dolores partus rejiciendo omne auxilium analgesicum sive naturale sive artificiale.

Ad III. Haec est praecise tertia quaestio Augusto Pontifici posita a IX Congressu de quo supra⁶. Huic quaestioni Pius XII respondit probari non posse, neque a natura rerum neque a fontibus revelationis, moribundos obligationem moralem habere acceptandi dolorem et rejiciendi quodlibet lenimentum. Attamen si ipse moribundus vult acceptare dolores uti medium expiationis et fontem meritorum ad progrediendum in amore Dei et in abnegatione propriae voluntatis, media narcotica administranda non sunt⁷. Neque administranda nisi ad tollendos dolores, imo moribundi saepius desiderant apud se praesentiam suorum, amicorum, sacerdotum qui illos adjuvant ad bene moriendum. Non semel moribundi manifestant sua desideria, disponunt de rebus suis et dant ultima consilia. Privare moribundos consolationibus istis, prosequitur R.P., repugnat cuilibet homini praesertim Christiano. Ergo usus narcoticorum quae administrantur in hora mortis simpliciter ad tollendam ab infirmo conscientiam ejus finis, est omnino illicitus et reprobabilis; imo si moribundas per narcosis redditur incapax satisfaciendi suis gravibus obligationibus, uti conficiendi testamentum, confitendi peccata sua gravia etc., usus narcoticorum redditur illicitus sive ex parte infirmi sive ex parte medici. Coeterum, ut rectum iudicium efformari possit circa narcoticorum liceitatem, videri

⁶ Secunda quaestio de qua in allocutione diei 24 Februarii 1957 erat haec: Utrum effectus a narcoticis producti, i.e. privatio conscientiae et torpor facultatum superiorum animae compatibles sint cum Evangelio. R. Pontifex respondens huic quaestioni ita concludit: Intra limites indicatos (ab ipso Pontifice) et servatis conditionibus requisitis, narcosis quae affert diminutionem conscientiae aut suppressionem ejusdem, permittitur a morali naturali et compatibilis est cum spiritu Evangelii. Limites indicati sunt vera necessitas et subministratio a medico ob finem clinicum adhibitisque cautelis sive a medico sive ab infirmo.

⁷ Scito tamen quod dantur aliqua narcotica quae praeter effectum narcoticum continent etiam in se aliam actionem therapeuticam. Si actio haec evaderet necessaria, medicus, ni fallor, poterit hac narcosis uti etiam praeter voluntatem infirmi qui vult dolores physicos pati. Ratio est quia narcotici hoc in casu non administrantur directe ad tollendos dolores, sed ad alium finem therapeuticum indicatum.

oportet utrum narcosis duret per breve tempus, unam horam, vel per longius tempus, totam noctem vel diem, utrum continua vel interrupta, utrum usus facultatum superiorum redeat saltem per aliquot temporis spatium ut moribundus satisfacere possit obligationibus suis. Sed non obstantibus istis obligationibus, si moribundus, propter graves rationes, perseverat in petendo narcosim, postquam aliquis illum invitat ad satisfaciendum obligationibus suis, medicus poterit administrare ei narcosim quin formalis cooperatores evadat in peccato commisso. Hoc enim non penderet a narcosi sed a mala voluntate infirmi.

Istis distinctionibus factis, Pius XII statim transit ad sequentem quaestionem. Quid dicendum si per usum narcoticorum vita abbreviatur? Paucis verbis ita respondit: Quaelibet forma euthanasiae directae est illicita, quia homo non est dominus vitae suae. Si indirecta, h.e. administrata juxta principia duplicis effectus, usus narcoticorum evaderet licitus⁸.

Ad IV. Cajus, infirmorum confessarius, certe totaliter culpandus non est in suo modo agendi. Verum est quod quis sequi potest sententiam eorum qui tenent licitum esse suadere minus malum ad vitandum majus etsi in diversa specie. Sed quando medicus suavitatis suavitatis Luciam et rem male habeat cum viro ne dolores partus iterum patiat, ipse suggerere intendebat onanismum sive naturale sive forsitan artificiale. Onanismus vero non solum non est res minus mala relate ad Luciam, sed est res intrinsece graviter mala. Atqui nunquam faciendae sunt mala ut eveniant bona. Ergo Cajus bene fecit si medicum suaviter reprehendit ne hanc suasionem aliis repetat.

Sed male fecit Cajus si eidem medico omnino, exclusis nempe omnibus casibus, usum narcoticorum, sive cum matre praegnante sive cum aliis infirmis, prohibuit. Etenim si mater vult acceptare omnes dolores partus, bene facit et medicus non potest ei administrare media analgesica; sed si ipsa mediantibus mediis analgesicis, dolores ferre nolit, et hoc facere potest sine ullo conscientiae scrupulo.

Argumentum Caji desumptum ex S. Scripture 'In dolore paries filios' obligationem accipiendi omnes dolores partus non demonstrat. Etenim ex eadem allocutione Pii XII colligere possumus quod poena a Deo lata in paradiso terrestri matri nostrae Hevae et omnibus mulieribus ab ea descendentes non prohibet quominus homo quaerat in res creatas ut ex his beneficia pro vita meliori ducenda sumat. Omnia enim in utilitatem hominis creata sunt in mundo, imo et tota terra subjecta remanet potestati hominis⁹. Insuper Deus hanc poenam parturientibus infigit, non

⁸ Cfr etiam P. Tabone, *Ethics of Euthanasia*, Malta, 1950.

⁹ Gen. I, 28 ss.

prohibuit neque prohibet eas uti mediis quae partum faciunt atque minus dolorosum reddant.

Idem dicendum est quoad alios infirmos. Si medicus recte utitur methodo technica juxta dicta ad III, non contradicetur neque ordini morali neque spiritui Christiano. Iam diximus quod obligatio acceptandi dolores physicos demonstrari non potest. Neque valet argumentum Caji quod Christus agonizans in cruce respuit vinum felle mixtum ne dolores minuerentur in ipso. Verba Evangelii non significant Deum exigere a quolibet homine et in omni tempore quod Christus fecit in cruce, neque umquam Mater Ecclesia hanc interpretationem dedit. Dolores Christi in cruce sunt fons consolationis, imitationis et fortitudinis pro aegrotis, sed nequaquam obligatio. Fides non minueretur in infirmo si dolores physici non acceptantur, per media licita. Igitur si moribundus omnibus obligationibus suis iam satisfecit, si ultima sacramenta iam recepit, si vera ratio habetur ut ei administretur auxilium narcoticum, si medium hoc accurate quoad quantitatem et durationem iuxta praedicta administratur, si ipse moribundus non contradicit, nil prohibet quominus medicus licite agat, etsi etiam aliqua abbreviatio vitae forsitan praevideatur¹⁰.

A. TABONE

¹⁰ Ex dictis clare liquet quod male faciunt illi confessarii qui contenti sint lectura textuum scholae Theologiae Moralis. Dato mirifico atque accelerato progressu scientiarum naturalium, scientia moralis non est inquirenda tantum in dictis textibus, sed et in ephemeridibus et in allocutionibus RR. Pontificum et praesertim regnantis R. Pontificis qui singularis moralista est nostrorum temporum. Si hae ephemerides et alii libri ex professo tractantes circa quaestiones sociales hodiernas prae manibus non habentur, confessarii praedicti minus digni ministri evadant ad opus ad quod misit illos Deus.

SHORT NOTE

UN GIUDIZIO MORALE DI S.S. PIO XII SULL'USO DEGLI ARMAMENTI BELLICI MODERNI

Le norme del diritto internazionale vietano in modo generale l'uso di armi, proiettili o materie inutilmente dolorose o atte a causare mali e danni superflui¹. L'interpretazione di questa norma di diritto internazionale ha suscitato numerosissime discussioni, specialmente in questi ultimi tempi, per quanto riguarda alcuni nuovi mezzi di guerra, quali sono le armi atomiche e nucleari, biologiche e chimiche, sviluppate durante e dopo il secondo conflitto mondiale.

Considerando il problema soltanto dal lato politico e giuridico, le scuole politiche moderne non esitano ad affermare, senza distinzioni di sorta, la legittimità dei nuovi strumenti bellici. Infatti, il fenomeno più pauroso e preoccupante della nostra epoca è la sfrenata corsa agli armamenti nucleari da parte delle grandi potenze, le quali, in virtù della loro posizione politica e del loro prestigio nel campo internazionale, hanno piuttosto il dovere di stabilire e mantenere l'equilibrio mondiale nell'ordine internazionale. Al contrario, come osserva S.S. Pio XII, lo squilibrio tra una esagerata potenza bellica degli Stati maggiori e il deficiente armamento degli Stati deboli costituisce un pericolo per la conservazione dell'ordine, della tranquillità e della pace dei popoli². Perciò il Papa considera con ansia tremenda e con grande sgomento la possibilità di un terzo conflitto mondiale, svolto con le nuove armi distruttrici e di inaudita violenza, — armi, come le descrive il Santo Padre, «atte a provocare per l'intero nostro pianeta una pericolosa catastrofe, a portare il totale sterminio di ogni vita animale e vegetale e di tutte le opere umane su regioni sempre più vaste e capaci ormai, con isotopi artificiali radio-attivi di lunga vita media, d'inquinare in modo duraturo l'atmosfera, il terreno, gli oceani stessi, anche assai lungi dalle zone direttamente colpite e contaminate dalle esplosioni nucleari»³. Ne segue con limpida chiarezza che la questione degli armamenti bellici non è una questione meramente politica e giuridica, ma anche e soprattutto una questione morale. L'aspetto morale della questione è di esclusiva competenza della Chiesa di Cristo, quale autentica ed infallibile interprete della legge morale universale.

¹ Cf. Convenzioni dell'Aia, art. 23.

² Cf. Radiomessaggio Natalizio (1941); Atti e Discorsi di Pio XII (Edizioni Paolina), III, 363.

³ Cf. Radiomessaggio di Pasqua (1954); O. cit. XVI, 105.

Considerando il problema degli armamenti bellici sotto la luce della morale, il Santo Padre risponde alla domanda se la guerra totale A.B.C., come viene chiamata oggi la guerra atomica, biologica, chimica, sia per principio permessa, iterando la dottrina morale che tale guerra, a causa degli orrori e delle immense sofferenze che essa reca all'umanità, costituisce un 'delitto' degno di severissime sanzioni nazionali ed internazionali, fourchè nei riguardi di coloro sui quali essa viene 'imposta da una ingiustizia evidente ed estremamente grave, in nessun modo evitabile'⁴. Fuori di questa ipotesi, in cui la guerra A.B.C. è oggettivamente giudicata indispensabile per la propria difesa e nelle condizioni indicate dal Papa, la illiceità dell'uso degli armamenti suddetti è fuori dubbio. Ma anche nella verificata ipotesi di una ingiustizia evidente ed estremamente grave, in nessun modo evitabile, resta allo Stato gravato l'obbligo grave di ricorrere a tutti i mezzi leciti ed atti ad evitare la guerra A.B.C. e persino di rinunciare all'uso dei micidiali armamenti che essa comporta, se si prevede che il loro effetto sarà così disastroso da sfuggire al controllo umano. Ecco le parole testuali del Papa su questo grave ed attualissimo argomento:

Però anche allora si deve tentare con tutti i mezzi di evitarla, mediante intese internazionali, oppure ponendo alla sua utilizzazione limiti molto chiari e stretti affinché i suoi effetti possano rimanere limitati alle esigenze rigorose della difesa. Quando, tuttavia, la messa in opera di questo mezzo cagiona una estensione tale del male che esso sfugge interamente al controllo dell'uomo, la sua utilizzazione deve essere rigettata come immorale. Qui non si tratterebbe più di 'difesa' contro l'ingiustizia e di 'salvaguardia' necessaria di possessi legittimi, bensì dell'annichilamento puro e semplice di tutta la vita umana entro il raggio di azione. Questo non è permesso a nessun titolo⁵.

Per evitare l'annientamento di tutto ciò che di bello, di buono e di santo ha prodotto il genio umano per opera di armi micidiali ed inumane, destinate a sterminare non soltanto gli eserciti e le flotte, ma anche i tesori della religione, dell'arte e della cultura e persino fanciulli innocenti e donne, ammalati e vecchi indifesi⁶, S.S. Pio XII ha lanciato ai popoli del mondo ripetuti appelli per un serio e onesto disarmo e per un effettivo generale controllo internazionale degli armamenti nucleari.

⁴ Cf. Discorso ai Partecipanti all'VIII Assemblea della Associazione Medica Mondiale, XVI, 284; e Discorso alla XVI Sezione dell'Ufficio Internazionale di documentazione di Medicina Militare, XV, 468.

⁵ Discorso ai Partecipanti all'VIII Assemblea della Associazione Medica Mondiale, XVI, 284.

⁶ Cf. Lettera Enciclica 'Summi Moeroris', XII, 157.

Nel campo di un nuovo ordinamento fondato sui principi morali... — ha detto il Papa — è necessario che con serietà e onestà si procede a una limitazione progressiva e adeguata degli armamenti⁷.

Qui non si tratta di una mera esortazione ma di una chiara esposizione di un obbligo morale, di un dovere di coscienza dei popoli e dei loro governanti⁸. La vera funzione delle forze armate dovrebbe essere quella di proteggere e di difendere i diritti concessi all'uomo da Dio e da una legge giusta, e non di sminuirli o annientarli⁹. Il Santo Padre rileva che via più sicura per poter arrivare al fatto di un disarmo generale e di una rinuncia alla produzione e all'impiego di armi inumane e per tramutare un simile impegno in uno stretto obbligo di diritto internazionale, vincolante i singoli Stati, è quella della Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite (ONU), la quale al momento presente è sola in grado di stabilire tale obbligo giuridico, di esigerne l'osservanza e di assumere l'effettivo controllo degli armamenti di tutti gli Stati, senza esclusione di alcuni¹⁰.

C. MUSCAT

⁷ Radiomessaggio Natalizio (1941), III, 363.

⁸ Cf. Radiomessaggio Natalizio (1955), XVII, 462-4.

⁹ Cf. Discorso ad un gruppo di Senatori degli U.S.A. (17/11/49), XI (ediz. 3a), 284.

¹⁰ Cf. Radiomessaggio Natalizio (1956), AAS, XXXIX, 21.

BOOK CHRONICLE

RECENT BOOKS ON THE LITURGY

The Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites *De Liturgici Hebdomadae Sanctae Ordinis Instauratione* (16th November 1955) has been the occasion for the publication of a large number of books and of hundreds of articles, a list of which (over 900) collected by Dom Placid Bruylants O.S.B. of the Abbey of Mont Cesar, is found in *Hermanus A.P. Schmidt S.J. HEBDOMADA SANCTA*, three volumes, (Herder, 1956, 1957). The three volumes undoubtedly are among the best books on the restored Holy Week Rite from an academic point of view. The first volume puts before the reader a clear picture of the manner in which the Holy Week Rites have been restored by a detailed comparison of the various contemporary liturgical texts. The second volume, in two sections, contains a collection of all the known ancient Holy Week liturgical texts (first section), together with a brief but learned historical commentary on them (second section); the commentary is followed by two short dissertations, one on the order of the psalms in the Triduum Sacrum due to Dom Klesser O. Praem., and the second on Gregorian Chant by Helmut Hucke.

The author's intention has been the publication of a *liber exercitationis* and not a *liber lectionis*. Many commentaries on the Restored Rite, he says in the introduction, may be called libri lectionis for the reader remains passive by receiving the doctrine which the authors try to give him with all the eloquence, persuasion and authority they can master. His book is quite different; he wants to put before his readers all the documents necessary (with brief comments on their importance) so that one may be able to make a personal scientific study of the restored Rite. Fr Schmidt, who is the professor of Liturgy in the Gregorian University, has in mind those students who take up as a subject for their practical exercitations the Holy Week Rites; the book gives them all the material they need for such exercitations.

Two publications by Herder have made available to scholars the texts of the Sacramentarium Veronense and the Missale Francorum (L. Cuniberti Mohlberg O.S.B. — Leo Eizenhoefer O.S.B. — Petrus Siffrin O.S.B., *Sacramentarium Veronense (Leonianum), textus, glossarium, introductio, indices, tabulae cvii et 453pp.*, 1956; Leo Eizenhoefer O.S.B. — Petrus Siffrin O.S.B., *Missale Francorum, textus, glossarium, introductio, indices, tabulae xxvi et 107pp.*, 1957) in the Collection *Rerum Ecclesiarum Documenta cura Pontificii Athenaei Sancti Anselmi de Urbe*

edita, moderante L.C. Mohlberg. — *Series Major: Fontes.* The text of the *Sacramentarium Veronense* is preceded by a long introduction in German describing the MS in detail, discussing the peculiarities of the language, the contents and character of the book, the date of its contents, and its relation to the other sacramentaries (pp. i-cxv). The text is followed by seven monographies (pp. 173-203) and four indexes and six plates. The edition of the *Missale Francorum* is planned on the same lines: a long introduction describing the manuscript and discussing its language, place of origin and date (pp. i-xxxiii), six short monographies indispensable for a scientific study of the book (pp. 55-88), followed by two indexes (pp. 89-107), and six plates.

The Henry Bradshaw Society, founded in 1890 for the editing of rare liturgical texts, after a lapse of six years has issued to its members their 1954 and 1955 volumes: they are volumes I and II of *The Ordinale of the Abbey of St Vaast*, edited with introduction, notes and indexes by Dom Louis Brou O.S.B., 1957 (vol. I: xiv-208pp.; vol. II: pp. 209-232). The H.B.S. has already published various Ordinaries and Customaries of English Abbeys, but never yet any foreign Ordinary or Customary, though the Society has published the *Missale Romanum* of 1474 (vols 17 and 33 of the series), the *Quignon Breviary* (vols 35 and 42), *North Italian Services of the XIth century* (vol. 67) etc. The present edition is the first the Society is publishing of a French Monastic Ordinary, that of *St Vedast's or Vaast's Abbey, at Arras*. The MS is found in the *Bibliothèque Municipale* of Arras and numbered 230 (907) and it belongs to the beginning of the fourteenth century. The introduction has a brief account of the history of the Abbey, a description of the MS and its comparison with another MS of the same Ordinary (*Codex Arras 210 (1001)*), a brief account of the various churches depending on the monastery of St Vaast in the fourteenth century, and a critical study of the contents of the Ordinary. The first volume of the edition, besides the introduction, contains the five preliminary folios (unnumbered) with the *Calendar and Computation tables*, and the *Ordinarium (temporale)*; the second volume has the *Sanctorale*, the *intonationes responsorium et hymnorum*, the *Ordo Missae* and an *Ordo in lingua vernacula* followed by a general index.

Since my last Book Chronicle, Longmans have published the two remaining books of Archdale A. King's *Rites of Western Christendom*. The first of these two volumes to be published is *the Rites of the Primatial Sees*. It follows the same pattern as the author's other book *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, and covers the rites of Lyons, Braga, Milan and Toledo. Mr King gives a brief historical outline of each rite,

a description of the liturgical cycles, church furniture and vestments of each rite, and finally a somewhat detailed account of both solemn and low mass. A bibliography is given after each chapter and a general bibliography at the end of the book. To the first two chapters, which discuss the rites of Lyons and Braga, an appendix is added. The last of the volumes to be published is *The Liturgy of the Roman Church*. This volume is divided into three parts: a short historical survey, followed by the discussion of a number of different topics all in one way or another connected with 'Roman Liturgy', and finally a description of the 'Mass of the Roman Rite' with a prayer-by-prayer analysis and history which is much too short. The two books are 'masterpieces of patient research and scholarship'. The detailed information given makes both of them very useful as reference books, which make interesting reading though it is sometimes rather difficult to get a clear idea of the present state of each particular rite unless one is familiar with it.

The question of the vernacular in the Liturgy is well-treated from different points of view in *English in the Liturgy: A Symposium*, edited and introduced by Charles R.A. Cunliffe and published by Burns and Oates (London, 1956). The editor writes an introductory historical essay mentioning various occasions when the Holy See permitted a vernacular language for the liturgy of the Roman rite. J. McDonald, professor of Dogma at Ushaw, discusses the theological aspect of the whole problem, while Fr Clifford S.J., and Rev. J.J. Coyne of Catholic Missionary Society and late professor of Fundamental Theology at Oscott argue in favour and against the use of the vernacular in the liturgy. Mr H.P.R. Binberg discusses the problem of style in an English Liturgy and Mr A. Milner discusses Music in a vernacular Liturgy. The concluding essay is by Dom Oswald Sumner of Downside and discusses how more English in the Liturgy would aid the conversion of England.

A very recent publication of the English translation of Fr Jungmann's *Der Gottesdienst der Kirche* by Fr Clifford Howell: J.A. Jungmann S.J., *Public Worship*, Challoner Publications, London, has succeeded in tracing the main outlines of the development of Christian worship, bringing into prominence those aspects which seem to be of greater use for a proper understanding of it. The book is a compendium of the most important elements of the lectures he had delivered to theological students in these last thirty years. It will certainly be a very useful text-book for theology students, for it gives them a clear and proper view of liturgy and may serve them as an introduction which will lead them to a deeper study in the spirit of the liturgy. Even priests, teachers and laymen will find it very useful if they wish to have a clear idea of what Liturgy is.

Before concluding I would like to make a reference to three other publications: (i) *Liturgica l. Card. I. A. Schuster in memoriam (Scripta et documenta 7)*, In Abbatia Montiserrati (Barcinone), 1956, which consists of ten dissertations in Catalan on various liturgical questions published on the anniversary of the death of Cardinal Schuster by the monks of the Abbey of Montserrat *in grati et devoti animi pignus*; (ii) *Studia Patristica*, Papers presented to the Second International Conference of Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1955, edited by Kurth Aland and F.L. Cross, 1957, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 2 volumes. The publication has been noted here for a number of liturgical dissertations, twelve in all, which are found in the beginning of the second volume. (iii) *La Restaurazione liturgica nell'opera di Pio XII*, Atti del Primo Congresso Internazionale di Liturgia Pastorale. Assisi-Roma 18-22 Settembre 1956, Centro di Azione Liturgica, pp. xxiii-267. This is the Italian edition of the Acts of the Liturgical Congress of Assisi and has been published by the Centro di Azione Liturgica whose president, Mgr Carlo Rossi, bishop of Biella was a member of the organizing Committee of the Congress.

J. LUPI

BOOK REVIEWS

QUMRAN LITERATURE

- J.M. ALLEGRO, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1956.
- G. GRAYSTONE, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*, Sheed and Ward, London 1956.
- R.E. MURPHY, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, The Newman Press, Maryland Westminster, Maryland 1956.
- M. BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Secker and Warburg, London 1956.
- J.T. MILIK, *Dieci anni di scoperte nel Deserto di Giuda*, Marietti, Torino 1957.
- T. GASTER, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect in English Translation*, Secker and Warburg, London 1957.

It is practically impossible to keep pace with the speed with which books, articles and notes are being published at all levels. One must make a choice of what really is worth reading and what is not. Here we have chosen five books which taken together may give one a fairly general picture of the whole literature of and about the Qumran Sect or Community, which lived around the North-West shores of the Dead Sea.

Two of these books give us the translation of the texts so far published, plus some interpretation and comparative study. The others describe the MSS and make an attempt at an interpretation, especially with reference to Christianity.

Prof. BURROWS, one of the first men to handle the MSS, gives a complete history of the finds, beginning with the first discovery, itself partially shrouded in mystery; a description of the MSS follows to which is added a study on the datings of the MSS, which range from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D. The doctrines and the organization of the Qumran Community are accounted for in part three. Prof. Burrows then writes on the importance of the Scrolls for the study of Judaism and Christianity. 'They help us to visualise better the world in which Our Lord and the first Christians moved; in no way do they discredit Christianity. And knowing more fully the world into which the Gospel came, its deep devotion and high hopes as well as its pathetic aberrations, we can better realize what the Gospel brought to the world. Perhaps the best thing the Dead Sea Scrolls can do for us is to make us appreciate our Bible all the more by contrast'. A translation of the main texts ends the book.

THEODORE GASTER provides us with a complete translation of the texts published up to the date of the publication. They are classified according to their main subject matter. Each section is followed by short notes on the text. In the Introduction the writer rejects as unfortunate the attempt to Christianize or to historicize the texts. All that is said to be common with Christianity can be paralleled with perfect ease with the Old Testament or the Apocrypha. For him the Qumranites represent an experience which has been repeated often enough in history — the experience of the typical non-conformist who combines, by strange and wonderful alchemy, an inner quietude with an outer fanaticism, and whose sense of God is a sense of burning fire as well as radiant light (p. 37).

S.M. ALLEGRO, a member of the International Editing Commission, gives the history of the finds; he goes all over the material examining it from all points of view. The Community and its doctrines are minutely described and placed in their cultural and historical background. Allegro is over-enthusiastic about the contribution of these documents to the study of the origin of Christianity. From his book one would conclude that Christianity was born in Qumran rather than in Nazareth or Bethlehem. The factual information is valuable while the interpretation of the texts leaves much to be desired.

MURPHY'S book is a brief description of the Scrolls meant to introduce them to the general reader. Information is given about the story of the finds which is followed by a comparative study with the New Testament. The conclusion is: The most conspicuous affinity is found in the writings of St John, next in certain epistles of St Paul (Ephesians, Corinthians, Colossians), then in St Matthew and St Luke. Across the New Testament the voice of Qumran resembles the 'still small voice that Elias heard. We can be grateful that archaeology has enabled this voice to be heard, because far from levelling the Christian Gospel it will by contrast show forth the incomparably richer message that is Christ' (p. 108). This view is shared by J. Coppens.

GRAYSTONE'S work consists of a number of articles which appeared in *The Tablet*. Its aim is manifestly apologetic; it is a reaction against the journalistic work of Edmund Wilson *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, a popular work which had four impressions besides the first edition within two years and which has poisoned the whole atmosphere of the Qumran study. Graystone however suffers from the very nature of his work, namely that due to the apologetic aim of the whole work he tends consciously or not to belittle the contribution of the new MSS for the study of the New Testament. It is true that many other Catholic and non-Catholic writers besides the above mentioned hold that the originality of

Christianity is not impaired by the discovery, but it is no less true that these MSS are playing and will continue to play a large and important part in the elucidation of the New Testament writings. Graystone does not however deny this contribution; he admits it but his work gives one the impression that he is soft pedaling it.

The last book for our consideration is again by a member of the editing commission, Fr MILIK who is working hard at the Palestine Museum deciphering the non-biblical material. This work was meant for Italian speaking readers but it has already been translated into French. It consists of five chapters plus an appendix on the history of the Essenes against the background of the general history of the Jews. Chapter one deals with the history of the finds in no less than eleven caves over an area of 134 square miles; the next chapter gives us an inventory of the MSS; the third takes up the history of the Essenes making full use of the new literature; chapter four describes the doctrine, organization, practice and the spirituality of the Qumranites, whom Milik strongly believes to be the Essenes. In the fifth chapter Milik evaluates the importance of this new literature: we have documents two thousand years old which are of immense value from philological, palaeographic, historical, juridical, literary and doctrinal point of view. With respect to the possible influence of this movement on Christianity Milik writes: 'Se dunque nell'essenismo non mancano gli elementi che in vario modo hanno fertilizzato il terreno in cui è germogliato il cristianesimo è assolutamente necessario sottolineare la novità totale e la trascendenza di quest'ultimo, che trovano un'unica spiegazione nel fatto della Persona di Cristo Gesù'. The writer is further of the opinion — and few can state it with the same authority as he — that the Qumran literature will provide scholars with materials for their elucubrations for a good number of decades to come.

From this brief survey of Qumran studies, which covers only a fraction of what has been and is still being written, one may get some idea of the importance of these discoveries and understand how immature certain conclusions still are. After the first wave of enthusiastic reception and hasty conclusions not always favourable to the Christian faith, scholars are now examining the evidence with calmer minds and less urgency. Surely it can be stated with certainty that apart from any possible contact between Christianity and Qumran, these two movements draw on the same source, namely the Old Testament; hence any possible resemblance between the two may be due to this common background influence.

C. SANT

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- Australasian Biblical Review* – Vol. V, nos. 3,4
Australasian (The) Catholic Record – Vol. XXXIV, nos. 3,4
Carmelus – Vol. 4, no. 2
Catholic (The) Biblical Quarterly – Vol. XIX, no. 4; Vol. XX, no. 1
Cistercium – nos. 53-56
Ephemerides Carmeliticae – Annus VIII, fasc. 2
Lucerna – Vol. III, no. 6
Manuscripta – Vol. I, no. 3
Pier Lombardo – Anno 1^o, no. 3
Relations – nos. 204-208
Rivista (La) del Clero Italiano – Anno 39^o, fasc. 1-2
Salesianum – Anno XIX, no. 3
Sal Terrae – Vol. XLV, nos. 11-12; XLVI, nos. 1-5
Science Ecclésiastiques – Vol. IX, nos. 3,4
Scientia – Vol. XXIII, no. 4
Scuola (La) Cattolica – Anno LXXXV, fasc. 4; LXXXVI, fasc. 1,2
Theology Digest – Vol. V, nos. 3,4
Unitas – Vol. IX, nos. 3,4