



P. P. Saydon

A decorative flourish or signature line consisting of a single, continuous, sweeping stroke that starts under the name and extends to the right.

# MELITA THEOLOGICA

---

Vol. XIII

1961

---

## THE BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP OF P.P. SAYDON

THE present issue of *Melita Theologica* purports to be no more than a modest attempt at commemorating the first Maltese translation (1929-59) of the entire Bible from the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek originals. It is, therefore, a *Festschrift* in honour of the translator and his work; but, if full justice is ever to be done to Monsignor Saydon, there remains yet to be published a commemorative volume of greater consequence — one that would embrace his own scholarly publications on matters biblical and oriental, for they all lie scattered in foreign works that are inaccessible, and therefore unknown, to the average Maltese reader.

To be sure, Professor Saydon's many distinguished friends here or abroad will welcome this humble but lasting tribute to his name. One article directly concerns itself with the Saydon Version of the Bible: it is the appreciation penned by Father Sant. In the following pages I have sought to delineate the trends of biblical and Semitic scholarship in Dr. Saydon's investigations, throwing into sharp relief the originality of his contributions. A full list of Professor Saydon's publications is appended.

### BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Professor the Very Rev. Mgr. Peter Paul Saydon was born at Żurrieq, Malta, on July 24, 1895. His secondary school studies at the Archbishop's Seminary were crowned with 'Second in Order of Merit' in the Malta Matriculation (June 1910). Ordained to the Priesthood on the 20th September, 1919, after graduating B.Litt., J.C.B., and D.D. at the University of Malta, he left for Rome in order to reap, as he admirably did, the benefits of the Government travelling scholarship awarded to him for placing First in all Faculty examinations. The Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome conferred upon him the degree of Licentiate in Holy Scripture (L.S.S.), whereupon in 1931 he was appointed professor of Holy Scripture, Hebrew and Biblical Greek at the Royal University of Malta, where he remains to this day — a great asset to the institution — and, in addition, he holds the appointment of University Librarian. He may be said to have won for himself friends as well as laurels at such

international congresses of biblical and oriental studies as were held in Rome (1932), Brussels (1938), Paris (1948), Rome (1952), Norfolk (1952), Copenhagen (1953), Cambridge (1954), Louvain (1954), Birmingham (1955), Strasbourg (1956), Munich (1957), Brussels (1958), Louvain (1959), Oxford (1959), Dublin (1961). In 1946 he was created Privy Chamberlain to His Holiness the Pope. At the age of 66, at the close of thirty years' professorship, the Malta University has on the 12th November, 1960, conferred on this great Maltese translator of the Bible an honorary D.Litt. in public recognition of the rare scholarship that is his.

#### LITERARY CRITICISM

No problem of origin and authorship, of structure and analysis, in the case of any book of the Bible eludes Professor Saydon's observation or even his inquiry. The book chronicles and book reviews, which have regularly appeared over his signature in this periodical ever since its first issue in March 1947, have done excellent service to succeeding generations of students as well as to the wider circle of reading public in Malta, acquainting one and all with the results achieved by present-day literary critics in both hemispheres. Such, too, was the purpose of the paper on *Recent Developments in O.T. Literary Criticism* (1950). His 1944 lecture on *Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch* evinces, no doubt, a rare sense of judgement: even more than in its being a full though terse review of the chequered history of a vexed problem, its value lies in its recommending 'a sounder interpretation of biblical texts, a deeper linguistic knowledge, a more intelligent application of the rules of textual criticism, a higher appreciation of the literary and psychological personality of the biblical writers' (page 74), and, above all, a fair estimate of all the constituent elements of a problem which is inevitably quite complex, as well as a fair estimate of all the literary features of the Pentateuch, which, as a book, is to be seen in its true historical perspective and in the light of its religious implications.

For scholars like P.P. Saydon, the prophetic writings — by far not the least difficult section of Holy Writ — seem to have the properties of magnets. The two *Melita Theologica* contributions (1951 and 1952) on *Cult and Prophecy in Israel*, a sound historico-theological inquiry based on a sound exegesis, couple themselves with such other exegetical matter relating to the prophetic literature as are his commentaries on Baruch, Daniel and Hosea in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London and Edinburgh, 1953). Problems of literary criticism are more than lightly touched upon in the introduction to each of those three commentaries. *The Literary Structure of Isaiah 40-55 and the Servant Songs*

(1953) is an independent investigation suggesting a division of these chapters into nine poems. As Father Robert North had done in a subsequent issue of *CBQ*, I am quoting Professor Saydon's conclusions word for word:

1. The several poems forming the two cycles Is. 40-48 and 49-55 are composed after a fixed pattern consisting of three different elements, namely, announcement of deliverance, assurance of deliverance, confirmation of promise in the first cycle, and the Servant's mission and its failure, promise of success and assurance of success in the other cycle.

2. The Servant songs are a constituent element and therefore an integral part of the contexts in which they stand.

3. The transposition of Is. 42, 1-43, 13 and its insertion at the beginning of the second group of poems would give us two perfectly symmetrical groups developing two aspects of the same fundamental theme, namely, the deliverance of Israel from the Babylonian captivity and the restoration of Sion as two successive stages in God's plan of eternal salvation.<sup>1</sup>

One other contribution — *Il libro di Geremia: struttura e composizione* (1957) — is equally revealing in that, on the strength of internal evidence, it tentatively presents a literary analysis of the whole book, which of itself betrays traces of its having been a collection of scrolls written on various occasions before it took its present shape of one composite work. Further reference to this article will be made further down.

Unpretentious as are his two contributions to N.T. criticism — *Dislocations in the Fourth Gospel with reference to a recent Theory* (1948) and *The Order of the Gospels* (1950) — they yet reveal him to be the good critic he is even when handling literary problems of the New Testament and (why leave it unsaid?) even when appraising theories proposed by others. It is characteristic of him to avoid all undue controversy in favour of setting forth the positive biblical data as well as all the external evidence available. The best and simplest solution of the difficulties inherent in the traditional order of the Fourth Gospel is that connected with the circumstances of the composition of the Gospel itself. It is generally agreed that St. John wrote the Gospel in his old age some fifty or sixty years after the events narrated. Though the recollection of Christ's discourses was, through prolonged meditation and preaching, still fresh in the Apostle's mind, we have not in the Fourth Gospel a verbatim report of Christ's discourses. The doctrine is Our Lord's, but the wording is, at least in many cases, St. John's. Besides condensing

<sup>1</sup> *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1953, p. 15.

Our Lord's speeches St. John has also, sometimes, added words and sentences which Christ had said on a different occasion. It is also possible that St. John has, occasionally, expanded in his own way Christ's words, without however changing Christ's doctrine. It is also probable that St. John, after completing his Gospel, has added some chapters inserting them in their chronological, though not in their logical, context.<sup>2</sup> In connexion with the problem of the order of the Gospels Saydon proves that the traditional order is upheld by internal no less than by external evidence and that it is a chronological order rather than a merely literary one. His investigation of the internal evidence ingeniously resolves itself into a comparison between all three Synoptic Gospels taken in pairs so as to establish the dependence between any two Gospels as well as the order of priority between them. His conclusions are: '... the order Matthew, Mark, Luke is supported by external evidence reaching into the second half of the second century. Internal criteria show that Luke is later than Mark and that Matt. Gr. is very probably later than Mark. The priority of Matt. cannot be proved with absolute certainty, but the priority of a Judaic Gospel over the other Gentile Gospels is more in conformity with the 'Jews first' principle followed by the Apostles and solemnly proclaimed by Paul. The decree of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, dated 19th June 1911, declaring the priority of Matthew's Gospel, is based on solid traditional grounds.'<sup>3</sup>

#### SCROLL THEORY

For years now, such expedients as Source Criticism and Form Criticism have been popular enough with scholars, but certain textual and literary problems can best be solved by appeal to the palaeographic argument. There are dislocations or transpositions in some of the O.T. books as surely as there are, say, in the Fourth Gospel; and, in some cases, there are divergences between the Hebrew M.T. and the Greek LXX as far as the length of the text is concerned. Professor Saydon ingeniously puts forward a theory calculated to reconcile the traditional views with the established data of literary criticism. At least the longer books of the O.T. were originally each written on a number of separate scrolls, more or less uniform in size, which were kept together in one jar; only many years later, towards the 2nd cent. B.C., was such a loose collection of small scrolls united into one larger scroll, after a number of additions, alterations, and adaptations had crept into the text. 'So long as books were in a state of loose collections of scrolls they were more liable to editorial changes, additions and adaptations to the chang-

<sup>2</sup> *Melita Theologica*, Vol. I, No. 3, 1948, p. 23f.

<sup>3</sup> *Scripture*, Vol. IV, No. 7, July 1950, p. 196.

ed conditions of the people. Still more important for literary criticism is the fact that the sacred authors writing on separate rolls and in different times and sometimes on different subjects could employ a different style and a different vocabulary. Hence literary difference between the component parts of a book are not necessarily marks of different authorship.<sup>4</sup> Saydon's 'Scroll Theory' provides a solution to the literary problem of Ezra-Nehemiah, Job, and Proverbs, as well as of Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, Daniel, Zechariah.<sup>5</sup>

#### THEORY OF 'AUTHOR' AND 'WRITER'

Professor Saydon instances Prov. 25, 1 (also 22, 17-21) to prove that the Hebrews actually distinguished between author and writer or editor. Mgr. E.J. Kissane had held, back in 1943, that Isaiah 40-66 were comparable with the Epistle to the Hebrews: just as this Epistle could be regarded as Paul's work because it contained his own ideas though perhaps written by a different hand, Isaiah 40-66 were to be attributed to the 8th-cent. prophet of that name because they contained his teaching even though this material may have been collected from oral tradition by some exilic compiler or editor (E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, II, Dublin, 1943, pp. 56-61). Mgr. Saydon had then accepted the comparison but not without this one important reserve: 'Paul must be considered as the author of *Hebrews* because the letter, if not actually written by him, was certainly conceived by him, written under his direction and finally approved by him. The case is different with Is. xl-lxvi. According to Kissane's theory these chapters contain Isaiah's teaching but were neither written under his direction nor with his approval. Isaiah, therefore, can hardly be considered to be the author of chapters xl-lxvi.'<sup>6</sup> What Saydon understands to have been the concepts of author

<sup>4</sup>Literary Criticism of the Old Testament. Old Problems and New Ways of Solution', in *Sacra Pagina* (Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica, edd. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, E. Massaux), I, Paris and Gembloux, 1959, p. 322.

<sup>5</sup>See: 'Paleography of the O.T. and its bearing upon Textual and Literary Criticism of the O.T.', in *Melita Theologica* 3 (1950) 5-22; 'Are we to take Daniel V, 30-1 as historical and, if so, to what does it refer?', in *Scripture* 4 (1951) 363; 'The Authorship of the Book of Isaiah', in *Scripture* 5 (1952) 58f.; 'Il libro di Geremia: struttura e composizione', in *Rivista Biblica Italiana* 5 (1957) 142-4; 'Literary Criticism of the O.T.: Old Problems and New Ways of Solution', in *Sacra Pagina*, I, Paris & Gembloux, 1959, pp. 319-24; ast. 'Libros Hebreos, Forma original de los', in *Enciclopedia de la Biblia*, Barcelona (in preparation).

<sup>6</sup>'The Authorship of the Book of Isaiah', in *Scripture* 5 (1952) 56. Prof. Saydon points out that the Isaian authorship of the whole book must not necessarily be extended to every single sentence or even to every single chapter. With the help of his 'Scroll Theory' Saydon explains such editorial alterations and ad-

and writer according to Hebrew mentality is found in the paper he read out before the scholars of the Brussels congress in 1958: 'author is the person from whom the contents of a book or at least their substance derive; writer or editor is the person who puts into writing the author's thoughts either in his own words or in the author's own words.'<sup>7</sup> Admittedly, the writer was not necessarily one who wrote under dictation, and he may have gleaned his material from oral tradition, moulding it as he thought best to suit the historical conditions of his own time. It is easy to understand why the editor's or compiler's name, excepting that of Baruch, should be completely forgotten, when obviously the right of authorship rested with the author, not with the compiler.

#### EXEGESIS

Of the exegetical contributions *Sin-Offering and Trespass-Offering* (1946) is, perhaps, the most rewarding. Little wonder that it ranks foremost among the opinions reviewed by Father L. Moraldi in his doctoral thesis on *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'Antico Testamento* (Roma, P.I.B., 1956, p. 163). Dr. Saydon distinguishes for the verb  $\text{נָסַח}$  a legal sense, namely 'to incur the obligation of making good the damage caused to a person', and a liturgical meaning (which is, in fact, the fundamental meaning of  $\text{נָסַח}$ ), namely 'to be responsible in spite of ignorance'. According to Professor Saydon, Hebrew theology made no distinction between material and formal sin; both were imputable. For an understanding of the O.T. theology of the Redemption from the Hebrew viewpoint, we are to bear in mind, as we read Is. 53, 10ff. (an  $\text{נָסַח}$  passage), that the responsibility of the Servant of Yahweh does involve an involuntary, though not a personal, transgression of the law. It is in this sense that the Messiah actually atoned for man's sin, namely, in so far as our sins were laid upon him. We are indebted to Saydon's original investigation for these conclusions: 'Therefore, Hebrew theology distinguishes three classes of sins with regard to their expiation:

1. Sins committed with a high hand, consciously and wilfully; sins involving disregard and contempt of the Law. These could not be atoned for by any sacrifice (Num. 15, 30).

2. Ordinary sins committed with a greater or lesser degree of consciousness and wilfulness, but which are due to human frailty rather than to

ditions as had found their way into the text in course of time. 'If these changes and additions do not affect the substance of the book, Isaiah will still be regarded as the author of the latest, revised and enlarged, edition of his work as much as of the original one' — loc. cit., p. 58.

<sup>7</sup> *Sacra Pagina*, I, p. 318.

any disregard of the Law. These are atoned for by a sin-offering (*sacrificium pro peccato* - אֲשַׁמֵּן).

3. Sins of ignorance or unintentional sins. These are atoned for by an offering (*sacrificium pro delicto* - אֲשַׁמֵּן). (page. 398).

### SEMITIC PHILOLOGY

It was Father Alberto Vaccari, S.J., who once described Mgr. Saydon, his student of former days, as a 'profondo conoscitore' (one imbued with a thorough knowledge) of both Hebrew and Maltese.<sup>8</sup> Articles like *The Pre-Arabic Latin Element in Maltese Toponymy* (1956) and *The Vocalization of the Verb in Maltese* (1958) will by now have undoubtedly been acclaimed by a Vaccari, a Rychmans, an Arbez, or a Seele. I am limiting myself to a review of those of Saydon's contributions that must have appealed to the wider circle of Hebraists.

The assonant expression אֲשַׁמֵּן אֲשַׁמֵּן presents difficulty. Saydon<sup>9</sup> rejects the antithetical meanings generally adopted by modern interpreters, 'bond and free' or 'under age and over age', in favour of the synonymic meaning 'a helpless and worthless person'. There are texts, e.g., Deut. 32, 36 and 2 Kings 14, 26, where the sense clearly supports this interpretation. The assonance expresses with greater emphasis the meaning already conveyed and forcibly enough by the synonymous phrase. Saydon, therefore, takes אֲשַׁמֵּן אֲשַׁמֵּן to have been a proverbial saying which originally denoted a universality from which not even the most miserable of the people are excluded, but it then came to denote an unlimited universality, very often (as in 1 Kings 14, 10) 'all males, no one excepted'.

The aesthetical and psychological relation of assonance to style had been brought out by Eduard König in his *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik...* (Leipzig, 1900, pp. 290ff.). Saydon has contributed on the subject thirty-three pages of *Biblica*,<sup>10</sup> limiting himself to investigating those cases where assonance is intended to express emphasis, not those others where assonance is intended to produce a purely aesthetic effect. Mgr. Saydon distinguishes three groups of assonant expressions: emphatic assonance may be produced by (a) the combination of two identical words, the second one being the feminine of the other; (b) the combination of two

<sup>8</sup> *Biblica*, Vol. XX, 1939, p. 435: 'la traduzione di quel profondo conoscitore delle due lingue, che è l'esimio Professore di Malta, può interessare anche il filologo.'

<sup>9</sup> *The Meaning of the Expression 'asur we'azubb*, in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. II, 1953, pp. 371-4; 'Assonance in Hebrew as a means of expressing Emphasis', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXVI, 1955, 299-303.

<sup>10</sup> 'Assonance in Hebrew as a means of expressing Emphasis', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXVI, 1955, pp. 36-50, 287-304.



words derived from the same stem; (c) the combination of two words of a different stem but with a similar meaning. Well over eighty assonant phrases come for separate treatment in this investigation.

The Hebrew tenses express temporal relations — Present, Past, Future — as well as 'kinds of action' — instantaneous, durative, iterative. In *Biblica*<sup>11</sup> Saydon draws our attention to a fourth 'kind of action' or action-form, namely inceptive action, which we must take into consideration on account of its syntactical implications. Whereas S.R. Driver had held that the simple *yiqtol* is sometimes used with an inceptive meaning, P.P. Saydon has submitted a number of examples which show that there are *wayyiqtol*, not *yiqtol*, forms which are best explained in an inceptive sense. The second half of his article inquires into the relation between the verb  $\begin{matrix} \text{ה} \\ \text{י} \\ \text{ב} \\ \text{י} \\ \text{נ} \end{matrix}$  ('to begin') and the inceptive *wayyiqtol*.

There is yet another *Biblica* article, of recent publication, which concerns itself with the Hebrew verbal system and its syntactical connotations.<sup>12</sup> Saydon, in the wake of G.R. Driver, has there set himself the task of improving upon the investigations of Ludwig Köhler (*Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht*, BZAW, 1923), who had stopped at remarking that *qatal* and *yiqtol* could equally be translated 'he kills, he killed, he will kill'. In Deutero-Isaiah Saydon finds traces of an older pre-Massoretic pronunciation pointing to two *qatál* and two *yiqtol* forms: *qátál* denoted a present-future tense and *qatal* denoted a past action; while *yiqtol* was originally both *yaqtúl* with a present-future meaning and *yáqtul* with the meaning of a past. Instances of an originally past *qatál* survive in the *weqatálti* forms of Is. 43, 12 and 44, 8. The *yiqtol* form in 40, 3, for example, is a remnant of the old preterite *yáqtul*.

These are the main trends of the biblical scholarship of P.P. Saydon. Students of the Bible await his further contributions.

J. SCHEMBRI

<sup>11</sup> 'The Inceptive Imperfect in Hebrew and the Verb hehel "to begin"', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXV, 1954, pp. 43-50.

<sup>12</sup> 'The Use of Tenses in Deutero-Isaiah', in *Biblica*, Vol. XL, 1959, pp. 290-301; also in *Analecta Biblica* 10, Roma, 1959, pp. 156-67.

**A CHRONOLOGICAL LIST  
OF PROFESSOR P.P. SAYDON'S CONTRIBUTIONS**

- 1925 - 'L'arte di scrivere nei tempi antichi', in *L'amico dei giovani*, Anno III, N. 3, pag. 22-7.
- 1929 - (1929-1959) *Il-Kotba Mqaddsa maqlubin bil-Malti*, Malta, Empire Press. (Maltese translation of the Bible).  
 - *Il-Malti u l-ilsna semin*, Malta, pp. 35  
 - *The development of Maltese... and its semitic affinities*, Malta, pp. 13-22.
- 1932 - *Taġħlim il-Malti fl-imġhoddi u illum* (writer's name withheld), Malta, pp. 24
- 1933 - 'L'anno della morte di Gesù Cristo', in *Annuario della Diocesi di Malta*, Anno I, pp. 249-56.
- 1936 - *Ward ta' Qari Malti* (an anthology of Maltese prose and verse), jointly with J. Aquilina, Vol. I, pp. xxi + 219.  
 - 'Adnotationes exegeticae in Gen. 1, 1-2, 4', in *Scientia*, Vol. II, pp. 3-16, 197-214.  
 - *Tifkira tar-Rebħa* (a commemorative speech of the 8th September 1565 victory over the Turks), pp. 18.
- 1937 - *De gloria immortalis consequenda* (an oration delivered on the occasion of the conferment of academical degrees), pp. 4  
 - 'The Earliest Translation of the Bible from Hebrew into Maltese', in *The Journal of the Malta University Literary Society*, Vol. II, October, pp. 11  
 - *Ward ta' Qari Malti*, jointly with J. Aquilina, Vol. II, pp. x + 296.
- 1939 - 'The Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks', in *Scientia*, Vol. V, pp. 113-27.
- 1940 - *Ward ta' Qari Malti*, jointly with J. Aquilina, Vol. III, pp. ix + 482.
- 1942 - 'Ancient Oriental History and the History of Israel', in *Scientia*, Vol. VIII, pp. 161-73; Vol. IX, pp. 13-22.
- 1943 - 'Systems of Studies and Academical Degrees in the Royal University of Malta', in *The Sundial*, Vol. III, Nos. 9-12, pp. 208-15.
- 1944 - 'Ecclesiastical History in Malta', in *The Sundial*, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 28-32.  
 - 'Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch', in *Domine ut videam* (a collection of essays by Professors of the Royal University of

Malta, published by the R. Univ. Students' Catholic Guild), pp. 55-82.

- 1945 — *Ward ta' Qari Malti*, II, 2nd edition.
- 1946 — 'Sin-offering and Trespass-offering', in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, pp. 393-8.  
 — *Maltese Literature and its Future*, pp. 20.  
 — 'The contribution of our University to learning', in *The Sundial*, Vol. IV, No. 6, pp. 4-5.
- 1947 — *The Social System of the Israelites according to the Mosaic Law*, (a lecture), Malta, pp. 30  
 — *Notes on General Methodology* (for private use of students).  
 — 'The New Latin Translation of the Psalter', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 13-32.  
 — 'The Origin of Maltese according to a Recent Theory', in *The Sundial*, Vol. IV, No. V, pp. 19-20.
- 1948 — 'The First Maltese Translation of the New Testament' (1847), in *The Sundial*, Vol. IV, No. 8, pp. 10-3.  
 — 'The Divine Sonship of Christ in Ps. 2,' in *Scripture*, Vol. III, pp. 32-5.  
 — 'Dislocations in the Fourth Gospel, with reference to a Recent Theory', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. I, No. 3, pp. 16-24.  
 — A critical introduction to the collection of Maltese essays *Il-Polz ta' Malta* by Prof. J. Aquilina, pp. vii-xxxv.  
 — Commemorative speech on the occasion of the Foundation Day Celebrations, pp. 6.  
 — 'Some Recent Commentaries on the Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 62-5.
- 1949 — 'Some Recent Commentaries on the Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 70-2.
- 1950 — 'Recent Developments in Old Testament Literary Criticism', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 79-96.  
 — 'The Origin of the 'Polyglot' Arabic Psalms', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 226-36.  
 — 'Paleography of the Old Testament and its Bearing upon Textual and Literary Criticism of the O.T.', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 5-22.  
 — 'The Crossing of the Jordan: Joshua Chaps. 3 and 4', in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XII, pp. 194-207.  
 — 'The Order of the Gospels', in *Scripture*, Vol. IV, pp. 190-6.

- 'A Note on "Lips-Choros" in Acts 27, 12', in *Scripture*, Vol. IV, pp. 212-3.
- 1951 - 'Old Testament Prophecy and Messias Prophecies', in *Scripture*, Vol. IV, pp. 335-9.
- 'Are we to take Daniel V, 30-31 as historical - and, if so, to what does it refer?', in *Scripture*, Vol. IV, pp. 362-3.
- 'Some Recent Commentaries on the Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 51-4.
- 'Cult and Prophecy in Ancient Israel', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 75-88.
- 1952 - 'Cult and Prophecy in Ancient Israel (cont.)', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 7-16.
- 'The Meaning of the Expression  $\text{לְעֵינַיִךְ} \text{לְעֵינַיִךְ}$ ', in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. II, pp. 371-4.
- 'Some Mistranslations in the Codex Sinaiticus of the Book of Tobit', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 363-5.
- 'The Authorship of the Book of Isaiah', in *Scripture*, Vol. V, pp. 111-5.
- 'Some Recent Commentaries on the Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 111-5.
- 1953 - 'Bibliographical Aids to the Study of Maltese', in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. XII, pp. 20-30, 124-33.
- 'The Books of *Leviticus, Numbers, Canticles, Daniel, Baruch, and Osee*', in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, London and Edinburgh.
- 'The Literary Structure of Isaias 40-55 and the Servant Songs', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- 'The Psalm *Miserere*', in *Scripture*, Vol. VI, pp. 37-41.
- 'Lo stato attuale degli studi ecclesiastici a Malta', in *Lucerna*, Anno I (N.S.), No. 2, pp. 27-8.
- 'L'apostolato della S. Scrittura a Malta', in *Lucerna*, Anno I (N.S.), No. 4, pp. 63-7.
- 'The International Congress of Old Testament Scholars at Copenhagen', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VI, No. 2, pp. 119-26.
- 'A Copy of J. Benoit's Edition of the Latin Vulgate in the Library at the Royal Malta University', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VI, No. 2, pp. 132-4.
- 1954 - 'The Inceptive Imperfect in Hebrew and the Verb  $\text{לְהַחֲלִיף}$  'to begin'', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 43-50.
- 'Some unusual ways of expressing the Superlative in Hebrew and

- Maltese', in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. IV, pp. 432-3.
- 'Traces of the Byzantine Rite in the Church of Malta', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 47-8.
  - 'Some Recent Commentaries on the Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 51-6.
  - 'Gen. 3, 15 in the light of Recent Discussions', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. VII, No. 2, pp. 69-92.
- 1955 - 'Assonance in Hebrew as a means of expressing Emphasis', in *Biblica*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 36-50, 287-304.
- 'Versio Melitensis S. Scripturae', in *Verbum Domini*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 346-7.
- 1956 - 'The Pre-Arabic Latin Element in Maltese Toponymy', in *Orbis*, Vol. V, pp. 191-7.
- 'The Second International Congress of Old Testament Scholars', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. IX, No. 2, pp. 72-81.
- 1957 - 'Il libro di Geremia: struttura e composizione', in *Rivista Biblica Italiana*, Vol. V, pp. 141-62.
- 'History of the Maltese Bible', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- 1958 - 'The Vocalization of the Verb in Maltese', in *Orbis*, Vol. VII, pp. 168-82.
- 'St. Thomas Aquinas' Biblical Commentaries', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. X, No. 2, pp. 37-46.
- 1959 - 'Domenicus Magri and his *Apparentes S. Scripturae Contradictiones*', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. XI, pp. 14-17.
- 'The Use of Tenses in Deutero-Isaiah', in *Biblica*, Vol. XL, pp. 290-301; also in *Studia Biblica et Orientalia*, Vol. I; *Vetus Testamentum* (Analecta Biblica 10), Pont. Istituto Biblico, Roma, pp. 156-67.
  - 'Literary Criticism of the Old Testament: Old Problems and New Ways of Solution', in *Sacra Pagina* (Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholice Re Biblica, edd. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, E. Massaux), Vol. I, Paris and Gembloux, pp. 316-24.
- 1960 - 'A Fragment of a Lectionary in the Royal Malta University Library', in *Melita Theologica*, Vol. XII, p. 1-4.
- 1961 - 'Linguistic and Textual Notes to the Maltese Translation of the Bible', in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, pp. 249-57.
- 'Libros Hebreos, Forma original de los', art. in *Enciclopedia de la Biblia*, Barcelona (in preparation).
  - 'The Conative Imperfect in Hebrew', in *Vetus Testamentum* (in preparation).

## THE MERITS OF THE MALTESE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE BY PROF. P.P. SAYDON

THE readers of this review are quite familiar with the Maltese translation of the Bible by the Right Rev. Mgr. Prof. P.P. Saydon. The editor was kind enough to give notice of each book as it came out of the press. In this short note we propose to sum up its merits from the literary and scientific aspects.

Prof. Saydon's translation is really a literary monument and we are of opinion that it will surely exercise a deep influence on Maltese prose for many years to come; fortunately it has been completed at a time when our language is undergoing a profound change under the powerful hammering of foreign languages, such as English, which are poles apart from it as to vocabulary, grammar and syntax. Prof. Saydon has set himself firmly against the strong current tending to undermine the Semitic structure of the language with a consequent loss of vitality of expression and beauty.

With respect to vocabulary he did not think it twice to call back to life obsolete words or to give their original Semitic meaning to living words: v.g. *ġebel*, 'mountain', not 'stone'; *leħħ*, 'to insist', not 'to flash'; *għelm* is used in the sense of 'knowledge, science', besides its ordinary meaning of 'sign'. New forms are coined from already existing roots: *siefel* and *saffel*, 'lowly, humble' and 'to humiliate' respectively from *isfel*, 'down'; *qarreb*, 'to bring near, to offer' from *qrib*, 'near'; *xiehed*, 'witness', the plural form *xhud* being used in the spoken language in a singular and plural sense; *waqqat*, 'to fix a date', from *waqt*, 'moment'; from the participle-adjective *imbikkem*, 'made dumb', we have the adjective singular *ibkem* and the plural *bokom* after Arabic patterns; from the noun *għawġ*, 'obstacle', we have the adjective *għawġi*, 'perverse', and others.

Grammar, that is, syntax, is, as far as possible, Semitic avoiding all Romance influence so conspicuous in other writers. The verb generally precedes the subject; the adjective qualifying a determinate noun invariably takes the article; the construct case takes the place of the colloquial *ta'*-construction; the *ġie*-passive construction, a bad Italianism, is constantly and rigorously avoided. This method gives the translation a strong Semitic colour, capturing the beauty, strength and rhythm of the original Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Semiticised Greek of the New.

It is this characteristic that differentiates Prof. Saydon's translation from any other. One notices, for example, that the translator is dead set against paraphrastic renderings of which he makes use only in desperate cases. He avoids the combination of a noun, an adjective or a verb with a paraphrastic expression, such as *'sabiħ u jingħo ġob* or *'sabiħ u ta' min iħobbu*. He is at a loss to render the numerous abstract nouns and negative concepts so common in St. Paul's writings and for which there is no one-word equivalent in Maltese; thus 'invisible' is *dak li ma jidberx*, Rom. 1, 20; 'immortality' is *ħaris mill-mewt*, Rom. 2, 7; 'weakness' is *nuqqas ta' qawwa*, 1 Cor. 2, 3; 'unknown' is *nies ma jaf bibom ħadd*, 2 Cor. 6, 9. These paraphrastic renderings are so well integrated with the context that they are hardly felt at all. It must be acknowledged that Prof. Saydon had to give up his effort for linguistic purity in case of such concepts as *rivelazzjoni*, *profezija*, *ġustifikazzjoni*, *sentenza*, *ġudizzju*, *natura*, *grazzja*, *spiritwali*, *kundanna*, *salvazzjoni*, *persekuzzjoni*, *kuxjenza*; non-Semitic terms are unavoidable in Maltese. A paraphrase would render the style cumbersome and vague.

Sound biblical scholarship is the basis of Prof. Saydon's translation. Any good translation must necessarily be based on a critically reconstructed text. The Hebrew text contains some errors of transcription which may be corrected with the help of the old versions. Sometimes the text is so corrupt that conjectural emendation is the only way to have any meaning at all. Prof. Saydon does not follow blindly the Hebrew text; sometimes he departs from it to follow the LXX or to propose his own conjecture. Unfortunately such departures are not indicated in the footnotes or in an appendix, perhaps because they are of no use to the average Maltese reader. Thus in Gen. 9, 26 Prof. Saydon accepts the emendation proposed long ago by Graetz and accepted by Kittel in the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* and translates 'Bless, O Yahweh, the tents of Sem' instead of the Massoretic reading 'Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Sem'. The emendation was also accepted by A. Vaccari in the first edition of his Italian translation of the Pentateuch (1923), while in the second edition (1942) another emendation is proposed: 'Blessed be Sem by Yahweh my God', already proposed by Budde. Gen. 46, 13 'Jasub' with LXX against 'Job' of Mass. and Vulg.; Ex. 14, 20 'passed' with LXX against MT 'illuminated'; Ex. 23, 2 'justice' LXX is omitted by MT; Num. 21, 24 'Jazer' with LXX against MT 'strength'; Num. 26, 3 'they numbered' according to the context against MT and versions 'and he spoke'; Josh. 3, 12 is out of place and the translator informs us in a note that it had better been omitted; Josh. 15, 32 *Għajn Rimmon* as one city against MT *Għajn* and *Rimmon*, two cities; Judges 5, 13 'Israel' for MT 'survivor'; Judges 8, 16 *u tertaq* with LXX and ancient versions

against MT 'and he made known'; I Sam. 1, 5, *għalkemm* with LXX, Heb. uncertain; I Sam. 8, 16 *baqar tagħkom* with LXX against MT 'your young men'; I Sam. 9, 25 *u frxu lil Saul fuq is-setaħ u raqad* with LXX against MT 'and he spoke to Saul on the terrace. And they rose up'; I Sam. 11, 1 *Wara* with LXX against MT 'as dumb' and joining with 10, 27; I Sam. 12, 11 *Baraq* with LXX against MT *Bedan*; I Sam. 13, 5 *tlett elef* with LXX against MT 'thirty thousand'; I Sam. 14, 33 *lil bawn* with LXX against MT 'to-day', confusion between  $\square\text{ל}\eta\eta$  and  $\square\text{ל}\eta$ ; I Sam. 17, 52 'Gatt' with LXX against MT 'valley', confusion between  $\eta\eta$  and  $\text{N}\eta$ ; I Sam. 18, 28 *Israel kollu kien iħobb* with LXX against MT 'Mikol, Saul's daughter, loved him'; I Sam. 24, 20 *ħajti* with LXX against MT 'a flea'; 2 Sam. 2, 9 *Aserin* with Targum against MT *Assur*; 2 Sam. 2, 24 *wied* with LXX and Vulg. against MT *Gijab*; 2 Sam. 6, 5 *b'kemm għandbom saħħa u bil-għana* with Chr. 13, 8 against MT 'with all wood instruments of pine'; 2 Sam. 15, 7 *erba' smin* with many mss of LXX and (crit. ed. of) Vulg. against MT 'forty years'.

In other cases the MT is hopelessly corrupt and the LXX itself is based on a corrupt Hebrew text. In these cases Prof. Saydon resorted to conjectural emendations. Thus Is. 53.9b the word  $\text{י}\eta\text{מ}\eta\text{ד}\eta$  'in his death' is generally taken to refer to Christ condemned to death and therefore buried with guilty men; but in fact his tomb was with the rich, or with the evildoers. Thus P. Auvray and Steinmann translate *On lui dévolut sa sépulture au milieu des impies et a sa mort il est avec les mafaiturs* (Bible de Jérusalem 1951). Prof. Saydon emends  $\text{י}\eta\text{מ}\eta\text{ד}\eta$  into  $\text{י}\eta\text{מ}\eta\text{ד}\eta$  and translates *difna*, 'tomb, burying place, funerary installation': an emendation confirmed by the Dead Sea MS of Is. Saydon's work was finished in 1950; hence his emendation is independent of DIsa. The reading has been subsequently accepted by most translators.

In Is. 4, 5.6 the two words  $\text{י}\eta\text{מ}\eta\text{ד}\eta$  are joined together so as to form one assonant expression. Is. 10, 26 'his rod over the sea and he will lift it' is emended so as to read 'he will lift his rod against his (Assur) multitude'. The emendation involves only a slightly different division of the consonants. Is. 15, 9 'for the escaped of Moab a lion and for the remnant of the land' which makes poor sense, is emended 'I will destroy the escaped of Moab and their remnant I will annihilate'. Is. 17, 5.6 the text is confused and apparently mutilated. There are three similes one of which has disappeared: 'the harvester, the vintager and the olive-gatherer'. Saydon conjecturally supplies the missing simile and translates *U jkun bħal meta l-ħassad... f'tarf ta' fergħa...* Sometimes however the translator seems to lack the courage to introduce into the text an emendation which he considers to be probable. Thus in Apc. 19, 16 he accepts the traditional reading 'on his thigh', but in the note he



makes reference to an alternate reading 'on his banner' which has been suggested by C.C. Torrey in ZAW 1953, p. 235.

Excellent readings exist in those books of the OT, which, though existing in Greek, were originally written in Hebrew, as Tobit and 1 Macchabees. In these books Prof. Saydon goes back to the underlying Hebrew text and produces a translation which is by far superior to the existing Greek. Thus Tob. 5, 16 and 7, 11 the  $\sigma\tau\iota$  is not translated as it corresponds to the asseverative Heb. particle  $\text{וְ}$ . In 3, 6 and 6, 5 the preposition  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ , with, is translated *għand* according to Heb.  $\text{בְּ}$ . In 7, 13 the particle  $\omega\varsigma$  corresponds to Heb.  $\text{כִּי}$  and is translated *u bekk* not *kif*. 7, 16 the Greek reads 'and she wept for her' where it does not appear who wept and for whom he or she wept. Pautrel translates equivocally *elle pleure sur elle* (Bible de Jérusalem). But the Greek preposition  $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda$  sometimes reproduces the Heb. prep.  $\text{עַל}$  which means 'upon' and therefore Saydon translates *U bdiet tibki (mixħuta) fuqha, u qabdet (ommba) twaqqaħba mill-biki*. 12, 6 is confused. Saydon translates it into Hebrew and then re-translates into Maltese *Bierku 'l Allau fahħrub quddiem il-ħajjin kollha għal kull ma għamel magħkom. Tajjed li wieħed ibierek*. . . (See P.P. Saydon, 'Some Mistranslations in the Codex Sinaiticus of the Book of Tobit', *Biblica* 33 [1952]363-5). 1 Macc. 1, 1 offers an awkward construction in Greek and Latin, but the Maltese translation based on the underlying Hebrew text is smooth and clear. 1 Macc. 1, 16 the Greek  $\eta\pi\omicron\tau\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta$ , 'was prepared', is rendered *u twettqet* according to Heb.  $\text{כִּי}$  to prepare and to consolidate'. 8, 30 Greek 'these and these' corresponds to Heb.  $\text{וְאֵלֶּם}$  where the conjunction  $\text{וְ}$  has the meaning of 'or not' and hence Saydon translates *wieħed jew l-iħor not les uns et les autres* (Abel).

Another feature showing how Prof. Saydon's translation keeps abreast of modern linguistic studies is its conformity with modern translations and Hebrew lexical studies. Modern tendency, represented by G.R. Driver, is to avoid as much as possible any arbitrary manipulation of the text on grounds of a difficult translation of hapaxlegomena. The text should be preserved and studied in the light of cognate languages especially Accadian and Arabic. In this way many new meanings have come to light, the sense has become clearer and the correctness of the traditional text vindicated. Just a few examples: The Hebrew word  $\text{נֶפֶשׁ}$  is generally translated 'soul', which is its ordinary meaning; but in certain occurrences this meaning is utterly unsuitable. Thus Ps. 68(69) 'the waters are come in even unto my soul' and Is. 5, 14 'hell hath enlarged her soul' make no sense whatever. But it has now been established that in Accadian the word meant also 'neck, throat' and it is very likely that this meaning was known also in Hebrew. The sense would

be 'the waters have reached up to my neck' and 'hell has opened wide its throat'. Is. 5, 28 the word  $\text{רָצַף}$  which is generally translated 'flint', is here rendered *xrar*, 'flash' (G.R. Driver, 'Difficult word in the Hebrew Prophets', p. 55 in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, T & T Clark, 1950). In Is. 18, 1  $\text{גִּפְיֵן בִּיל-גְּוִיֵּנָאִם}$  is *gfen bil-gvienāb*, 'winged ships' with LXX supported by Accadian, Arabic and Ethiopic meanings (G.R. Driver, o. c. p. 56) against the usual rendering *cymbalo alarum* (Vulg.), *où susurrent des ailes* (Bible de Jer.). Is. 44, 9  $\text{עֲדָוָתָם יְהוָה}$  'their witnesses', makes no sense. The Bible de Jer. reads 'their servants' by the addition of one consonant. Here again Prof. Saydon adopts the meaning proposed by Driver (o. c. p. 57) 'they that resort to them': *dawk li jmorru għandhom*. A. Vaccari in *La Sacra Bibbia traduce loro devoti*, which makes very good sense. Is. 41, 14  $\text{יְהוָה יִמְוֵתָם מֵיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  apparently means 'the dead ones of Israel', *qui mortui estis ex Israel*. But this meaning has no parallelism with 'worm' in the same verse. Hence the word is linked up with Accadian *mutu*, 'louse', a good parallel with worm. Translators and commentators generally read  $\text{חֲמִיל}$  insect. Prof. Saydon translates *dwejda* diminutive of *duda*, 'a worm', seemingly not accepting the emendation  $\text{חֲמִיל}$ , which is not the case for he himself informs the present writer that he used *dwejda* to avoid the Maltese word, *qamla*, 'lice', which does not belong to the polite language. In Hos. 5, 12 the word  $\text{פִּשׁ}$  is regularly translated 'moth, tineā' (Vulg.) not a good parallel with rotteness of the same stich. Prof. Saydon accepts Driver's rendering 'pus' (o. c. p. 56) and translates *tidnija*, 'infection'. Is. 57, 13 the word  $\text{צִבְעֹתָם}$  is translated *congregati* (Vulg.), *collection of idols* (Revised St. Version, where the word *idols* has been added to make sense), *idoles abominabiles* (Bible de Jer.). But  $\text{צִבְעֹתָם}$  is obviously an Aramaism meaning 'statue'. Hence Prof. Saydon translates *statwi*. King Jareb in Hos. 5, 13 is simply *is-sultān il-kbir*, the great king. Hos. 7, 15 the words *erudivi ... confortavi* (Vulg.) are rendered by one verb *qawwejt*, the one being a Hebrew gloss of an Aramaic verb. Is. 47, 15 the word  $\text{סֹרְסֵרִים}$  is not 'thy traffickers' as generally understood, but 'thy sorcerers', *is-sahhāra tiegħek*. Is. 51, 14  $\text{לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים}$  'his bread' is read  $\text{כֹּחַ אֱלֹהִים}$  'his force', *sahħtu* (G.R. Driver in *Jour. Th. St.* 36[1935]402). Is. 53, 8 the difficult *generationem eius quis enarrabit* is translated with some paraphrasis *min qagħad jahseb x'kien?* where the Heb.  $\text{דֹּר}$  'generation' is referred to Accadian *duru* 'state, condition'.

The N.T. provides us with no less important examples of the same procedure. The difficult word  $\text{πορνεία}$  in Mt. 5, 32; 19, 19 generally translated 'fornication' is *rabta ħażina*, that is, 'unlawful marriage' which gives right to dissolution or separation. Mt. 1, 25 'and he knew her not

till she brought forth her first born son' is rendered *u mingħajr ma għarafha, wildet iben*, a rendering which is adopted by all modern translators. In Matthew 6, 27 ἡλικία is 'age' rather than 'stature' (Vulg.). Mt. 8, 26 the verb ἐπιτιμᾶν is not 'to rebuke', (Vulg.) but 'to command with force', hence *amar bil-qawwa*. Mt. 10, 41 εἰς ὄνομα is not 'in the name', (Vulg.) but 'for the reason of' as in Hebrew and Aramaic. The same rendering should have been adopted in Mt. 18, 20. Mt. 20, 11 the verb ποιεῖω 'to do' is translated *ħadmu*, 'they worked', as the Hebrew עָבַד, 'to do, to work'. Lk. 18, 14 some modern translators render 'he went home more justified than the other' while the real sense is that given by Prof. Saydon: 'he went home justified, not the other'.

In Acts the translator declares that he does not follow blindly either form of text but in point of fact he almost always stands with the text represented by the great uncials. The letters of St. Paul are the most difficult parts of the Bible to translate into any language, and still more into Maltese, which is very deficient in words expressing abstract and negative ideas occurring frequently in these writings. Still the translation maintains its high scholarly standard with a smooth and dignified style as the rendering of Rom. 5, 1-6 amply shows: *Wara li qlajna l-ġustifikazzjoni bil-fidi, għandna s-sliem ma' Alla permezz ta' Ġesù Kristu, Sidna, li tana d-dħul bil-fidi għal din il-grazzja li siba qegħdin u niġiabrub bit-tama fis-sebħ ta' Alla*. The same is applicable to the translation of the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, which both have a strong Semitic colour full as it is with Old Testament reminiscences.

These are the merits of this monumental translation of the whole Bible by one man into an idiom that is still in its formative stage as a literary language. It is a landmark in the history of Maltese literature and linguistic studies; it is of an immense help for the Church's pastoral work, especially to-day that there is a strong current — due in no small degree to the work of Prof. Saydon at the University and of his one time students — towards biblical spirituality; it is a remarkable monument to biblical scholarship in Malta, worthily represented by Prof. Saydon, a man exclusively dedicated to research. We who have attended his lectures, followed his advice and worked with him know well enough with what care and diligence he went about his work to give a translation worthy of the Island of St. Paul, himself a great biblical scholar and writer.

## THE MASTER-IDEA OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is the most elusive of the writings of the New Testament, disguising as it does under a magnificent array of scriptural arguments and rhetorical devices its real object and purpose. Interpreters of all ages have been misled by the fallacious appearances and have consequently misrepresented the writer's mind and the logical nexus and development of his ideas. Even those who came nearer to the writer's mind have left some points in complete darkness. It is universally agreed that the most salient doctrine of the Epistle is the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, hence this is considered to be the object of the Epistle. But before bringing out the master-idea of the writer of the Epistle, it will be worth while to trace the tendencies and main lines of argument followed by modern interpreters.

St. Thomas, though he is not one of the moderns, after having said in the Prologue that the writer's aim is to demonstrate Christ's pre-eminence, begins to explain the first chapter by stating that the writer intends to demonstrate the superiority of the N. over the O.T. by means of the pre-eminence of Christ in relation to the angels, to Moses and to Aaron as representing the O.T. priesthood. But St. Thomas fails to explain the reason why the doctrine of Christ as the high priest of the N.T. occupies such a prominent place in the Epistle nor does he bring out the historical relation between the dogmatic and the practical or parenetical element of the Epistle. In the second part 10, 19-13, 17 the writer, according to St. Thomas, exhorts the Christians to keep themselves united to Christ's priesthood. The 'verbum solatii' in 13, 22 is, according to all Latin interpreters, a word of consolation, the Letter being intended as a consolation rather than as a reproach to those Judaeo-Christians who were in danger of relapsing into Judaism.

This is also the teaching of Estius, St. Thomas's follower and the greatest of Paul's interpreters. The writer of this Letter, he says, intends partly to expound the dignity of Christ's priesthood in relation to that of the O.T. and partly to exhort the Christians to hold fast to Christ, their high priest, if they wish to avoid the danger of eternal punishment.

Among more recent interpreters R. Cornely (*Historica et Critica Introductio in U.T. Libros Sacros*, Vol. III, 1897, pp. 544-6) investigates the historical background of the Letter. Times were not very encouraging and the Judaeo-Christians were in great danger of falling back to their

former religion. Paul writes to them this Letter not so much to console them as to exhort them to hold fast by their Christian faith by demonstrating to them the superiority of their Christian religion to their former Jewish religion. But Cornely follows the ordinary way of dividing the Letter into two parts, a dogmatic part, 1, 10-10, 18 and a parenetic part 10, 19-13, 21, although he recognizes parenetic elements in the dogmatic section.

H. Höpfl, both in the earlier editions (1926) and in the latest edition (1949) of his *Manual* believes that the writer of the Letter intends to show the superiority of the N. over the O.T. and for this reason he considers the person of the founder of the N.T. religion, his dignity and his priesthood. But, again, the historical relation between faith and exhortation is not clearly brought out.

One of the best analyses of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that carried out by F. Thien ('Analyse de l'Épître aux Hébreux' in *Revue biblique* 1902, 74-86). Thien begins by rejecting the usual division of the Letter into a dogmatic (1, 1-10, 18) and a parenetic part (10, 19-13, 17). The Letter, he says, is an hortatory discourse meant to encourage the Judaeo-Christians amidst their persecutions and to exhort them to hold fast by their religion.

L. Vaganay ('Le plan de l'Épître aux Hébreux' in *Mémorial Lagrange*, 1940, pp. 269-77) believes the Epistle to be made up of themes divided into sections connected by means of certain words or expressions which he calls 'mots-crochet', occurring at the end of a section and at the beginning of the next one. He analyses the whole Epistle according to this plan and sets forth his conclusions very moderately. But his main interest is the plan of the Letter rather than its subject-matter and purpose.

W. Leonard in his commentary on Hebrews in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953) holds the superiority of the N. over the O.T. to be really the lesson taught by the author's insistence on the super-excellence of Christ from every point of view. In a previous work on the same Letter *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, (Rome, 1939) he regards the argument of the Letter as 'a great dogmatic theme in the function not of intellectual instruction only but of the encouragement which the theme is calculated to inspire in the face of a crisis' (p. 24). But the relation between doctrine and exhortation is obscured by the analysis of the several sections.

J. Bonsirven in his excellent commentary on Hebrews ('Épître aux Hébreux' in *Verbum Salutis*, 1943) considers the Epistle as an hortatory discourse with doctrinal and practical elements intermixed. This is quite correct. But what is the dogmatic element which serves as a basis for the practical exhortations? Bonsirven thinks it to be Jesus Christ as the

high priest of the New Covenant. No, it is rather the superiority of the Christian religion demonstrated by the superiority of Christ, the mediator of the N.T. religion.

A. Wikenhauser (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Freiburg i. B., 1956, p. 325) enounces the main theme of the Epistle thus: Christ is the high priest of the New Covenant. Here again we have the same confusion between the main doctrine of the Epistle and the purpose of the Epistle which are quite different.

But the best exposition of the purpose of the Epistle is that given by C. Spicq (*L'Épître aux Hébreux*, Paris, 1952, I, 4ff). The writer of the Letter, says Spicq, intended to ward off the danger of apostasy by showing to the Judaeo-Christians that Christ was greater than the angels, than Moses and greater than the Aaronitic high priest. This is well said, but it would have been better said if Spicq had based the admonition of the writer of the Letter not upon the superiority of Christ, but upon the superiority of the Christian religion as demonstrated by the superiority of Christ.

From this brief survey of modern opinions about the main argument and purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews it appears quite clearly that there is no general agreement between interpreters about the main argument and purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews. While the majority agree in holding the superiority of the N. over the O.T. or the superiority of Christ's priesthood over the Aaronitic priesthood to be the main argument, they fail to go deep into the mind of the writer and try to discover the nexus of ideas and the logical development of his thought. It is the purpose of this paper to try to determine the master-idea of the Epistle by the exclusive means of a careful analysis of the Epistle itself.

The Epistle is called by its writer λόγος παραωλήσεως 'a word of exhortation' (13, 22), not 'a word of consolation' as the Vulgate translates. Therefore the general character of the Letter is hortatory. And in fact exhortation holds an important place in the whole Letter. Not only is the latter part of the Letter (10, 19-13, 17) an exhortation throughout, but even the first part (1, 1-10, 18), which is mainly dogmatic, is all interspersed with exhortations closely connected with the doctrine. The object of all these exhortations is the perseverance in the Christian faith. This is apparent from the very beginning. Thus the Christians are exhorted to hold fast by the faith taught by Christ more earnestly than the Jews held fast by the Law of Moses, because Christ, through whom we received the faith, is above the angels through whose agency the Law was given to the Israelites (2, 1-4). They are again exhorted to give heed to Christ, the Apostle and High Priest of our Christian religion, who is as much above Moses as a son is above a servant (3, 1-6). And

still in the same context the writer exhorts the Christians: 'Since we have such a great high priest, let us hold fast by the faith we profess' (4, 14). Eternal salvation will be the reward of those who remain faithful to their Christian religion, and eternal damnation will be the just punishment of the apostates. This hortatory note rings through the whole Letter and fully justifies its appellation as a word of exhortation.

The hortatory tone of the Letter will be more clearly perceived if we can set the Letter in its real historical background. It appears that the Christians, to whom the Letter is addressed, were having hard times. They were Jews who had passed from Judaism to Christianity, who had changed the temple with its gorgeous ceremonies for the simple and unimpressive meetings of the Christians. They felt isolated from the other Jews and suffered of a state of inferiority. They were persecuted; they had been held up to public derision, accused of crime, suspected and denounced. They had their property confiscated or plundered; some were even imprisoned. Although at first they bravely stood all these trials, later they became disheartened and discouraged and were in great danger of reverting to their former faith. They needed further instruction and encouragement; their failing faith had to be supported by a clear exposition of its excellence as well as by the promise of reward for those who profess it and the threat of punishment for those who desert it.

It is against this historical background that the Epistle to the Hebrews must be read. Paul says: Do not revert to your former religion, because the Christian religion is by far superior to the Jewish religion, and a severe punishment is meted out on those who, after having believed, reject their faith. Paul bases his exhortation upon the dogmatic truth of the superiority of the Christian religion and on the certainty of punishment. This he does by showing that Christ, the mediator of the N.T. religion, is by far superior to the angels through whose ministry the Law or the O.T. religion was believed to have come into the world (Acts 7, 53). This is a dogmatic truth which is followed up by its appropriate exhortation. Therefore, he says, more firmly must we hold by the truths which we have learnt. For if the Old Law, which had been given to us through the angels, was none the less valid, and every transgression of it, every refusal to listen to it, incurred just retribution, what excuse shall we have, if we pay no heed to such a message of salvation as has been given to us? Here Paul anticipates an objection: Christ appeared as a man, and man is lower than angels. But Christ, answers Paul, took the form of man in order to be able to sympathize with man's weaknesses, to suffer and atone for his sins and to help him in all his painful experiences in life, especially in the hardships through which the Christian

has to go in order to persevere in his faith. Naturally the idea of atonement calls up that of high priest whose duty it was to atone for man's sins by sacrifice. And this idea of Christ as the true high priest serves as a transition to another section, which begins with these words: 'Think of Jesus as the apostle and the high priest of the faith which we profess' (3, 1). And he goes on: 'who was loyal to God who had so appointed him'. Now every Jew could retort: 'But Moses too was loyal to God. Therefore Moses is as great as Christ, and there is no reason why we should not obey him and keep his law'. Paul is far from denying Moses's loyalty to God, but, he adds, Moses's loyalty was that of a servant in his master's house, while Christ's loyalty was that of a son in his father's house. Christ is the founder of God's household, Moses was only a servant or a part of it. Christ's household are the Christians if they firmly keep their confidence and their hope.

Once more the dogmatic truth of Christ's superiority over Moses is followed up by an hortatory appeal. As the Israelites in the wilderness refused to obey God's word and were punished by being excluded from the Promised Land, so must the Christian beware lest he should be excluded from the eternal rest in heaven by his disobedience. The Christians must not walk into the footsteps of the Israelites' unbelief; on the contrary they must strive with all their power to enter into that rest in order to avoid any possible danger of apostasizing from God. The conclusion reverts to the introduction where Christ is called the high priest of our religion, and the necessity of holding fast to him is strongly emphasized. 'Think of Jesus, the high priest of our Christian faith' he had said in the opening verses of this section, which he now closes with the same warning: 'Having such a great high priest, let us hold fast by the faith we profess'.

This appeal to fidelity to Christ, our high priest, who, having passed through all sort of painful experiences with the exception of sin, is ever ready to sympathize with our human weaknesses and to help us in all our needs, besides binding up the whole section into a compact unit, prepares the way for the next section which deals with Christ's pre-eminence as high priest.

Christ was really high priest because he was called to this dignity by God himself by the words: 'Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedek' (Ps. 110, 4). But before developing the theme of Christ's priesthood, which forms the central part of the Letter, Paul calls the attention of the readers to the difficulty of the subject and warns them reproachfully of their immaturity and backwardness. Instead of advancing in knowledge they had become like children needing the most elementary instruction. Paul however is not willing to impart this rudimentary



mentary instruction. In spite of their unpreparedness and immaturity, he intends to pursue his subject further and feels confident that they will listen to his instruction. Here Paul introduces a new element in his teaching. In order to strengthen his exhortations, he now warns them that the sin of apostasy will never be forgiven. 'Those who will fall away from the Christian faith cannot attain repentance through a second renewal' (6, 6). But those who hold fast by their faith will attain the reward promised by God to Abraham and to all those who, like him, believe in God's promises. He concludes this introductory exhortation by a reference to Christ's entrance into heaven where we shall follow him as our high priest according to the order of Melchisedek.

Now Paul enters into the heart of his subject, the superiority of Christ's priesthood. The position of the priesthood in religion, though not expressly stated, is implied. The function and purpose of priesthood is to bring man nearer to God; therefore the higher is a priesthood, the nearer it brings man to God; and the nearer does a priesthood bring men to God, the more perfect is the religion in which that priesthood functions. Now it clearly emerges from all the discussion of Christ's priesthood that there is no other priesthood and there can be no other priesthood that so brings man near to God as Christ's priesthood, which is still exercised in heaven and perpetuated on earth through his ministers. This Paul does not explicitly say, but he proves his thesis of the superiority of Christ's priesthood by a series of contrasts between Christ's priesthood and the Aaronitic priesthood. We need not go through the whole demonstration which, I suppose, is well known to all. I only wish to repeat Paul's concluding words on the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice: 'Christ sits for ever at the right hand of God, offering for our sins a sacrifice that is never repeated, waiting for the rest, until his enemies have been made a footstool under his feet. For by a single offering he has completed for ever his work in those whom he sanctifies. The Holy Spirit also testifies. For after having said: This is the covenant which I will set up with them after those days, the Lord says, I will put my laws upon their hearts and I will write them upon their mind and I will remember no more their sins and their transgressions. Now where there is remission of sins, there is no longer any room for a sin-offering' (10, 12-8).

This doctrinal section is again followed up by its appropriate exhortation. Since Christ, our high priest, has opened to us a way to the heavenly sanctuary, let us turn to God full of faith, hope and charity. But if one sins wilfully, that is, if one apostasizes from God after having been granted the full knowledge of the truth, one has no further sacrifice for sin to look forward to; nothing but a terrible expectation of judgement, a fire that will eagerly consume the rebellious. And Paul bases this terrible

threat on the law of Moses itself. If a man is convicted of a breach of certain prescriptions of the Mosaic law, he is mercilessly put to death. What of the man who has trampled the Son of God under foot, who has reckoned the blood of the covenant, that blood which sanctified him, as a thing unclean, mocked at the Spirit that brought him grace? Will not he incur a punishment much more severe? It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God (10, 26-31). From this austere warning Paul turns to encouragement. He reminds his readers of their past hardships and trials and of the way they have endured them. Do not lose courage. The reward will soon come. Eternal salvation will bring an end to your sufferings. So we see that Paul has always in mind the same object: necessity of holding fast by the Christian faith, assurance of reward and threat of punishment.

So far the writer has demonstrated the necessity of persevering in the Christian faith by showing the superiority of Christ, the mediator of the Christian religion, over all the other mediators of the O.T. religion. He now goes on to illustrate and to corroborate his thesis by a series of historical examples of O.T. heroes of faith from Abel to the Maccabean martyrs. All these, Paul says, have firmly believed in God's promises, although they did not live to see those promises fulfilled. It was reserved to us, according to the plans of God's providence, to see the fulfilment of those promises and to share in the Messianic blessings provided we have the same heroic faith which they had.

The writer concludes with a vibrating appeal to the Christians to persevere in their faith by following in the footsteps of those heroes of faith and, above all, by fixing their eyes on Jesus Christ, the author of their faith, who remained true to his mission and suffered worse than anything they had suffered before being raised to sit at the right hand of his Father. If those of earlier generations and Christ himself have suffered so much in loyalty to their faith, why should the Christians of today be so faint-hearted as to lose courage and give way under a lesser strain than theirs? God has not yet asked from them the supreme sacrifice of their lives; He is simply training them by means of temporary sufferings as a loving father trains his sons. No father loves his son unless he punishes him, and God punishes us, not out of vindictiveness, but out of his tender love for us. Let us therefore endure courageously all trials and hardships and hold out in the midst of temptations and persecutions and walk straight to our ultimate destination.

The writer closes up his Letter by a few practical exhortations on the sanctity of Christian life. 'Your aim' he writes 'must be peace with all men, and that holiness without which no one will ever see God. Beware of excusing yourselves from listening to him who is speaking to you.

There was no escape for those others who tried to excuse themselves when God uttered his warnings on earth; still less for us, if we turn away when he speaks from heaven' (12, 1-14).

From this brief analysis it appears clearly that the master-idea of the Epistle is perseverance in faith. All sections are subordinated to this end. The exhortation is based on the dogmatic fact of the pre-eminence of the Christian religion over the Jewish religion and corroborated by the promise of reward to those who remain loyal to their Christian faith and by the threat of punishment to the apostates.

P.P. SAYDON

## SCRIPTURE READINGS DURING HOLY WEEK IN THE WEST

IN THE early centuries Scripture readings in the Liturgy was a *lectio continua*,<sup>1</sup> the various books of Holy Scripture were read right through, though from a very early period particular books of the Bible were read during stated periods of the year.<sup>2</sup> The continuous reading of certain books of the Scripture has remained the normal procedure even nowadays in the Nestorian and Jacobite liturgies.<sup>3</sup> The first instance we find of

<sup>1</sup> This is easily proved from the voluminous commentaries of whole books of the Scriptures by the Fathers, commentaries which are nothing more than the homilies which those Fathers held after the Scripture readings of the Mass.

<sup>2</sup> A. Baumstark (*Liturgie Comparée*, 3rd ed. revised by Dom B. Botte O.S.B., editions de Chevetogne, 1953, p. 136) says that one must distinguish two types of *lectio continua*, i.e. (i) the reading of a book of the Scriptures during the whole year, or (ii) the reading of it only during a certain period of the liturgical year. As an example of the first type he mentions a Jacobite manuscript of the Syrian text of the Hexapla at the British Museum (c. A.D. 687) which divides the whole of the Exodus among all the liturgical days of the year. The second type of *lectio continua* is more common and several references to it are found in the writings of the Fathers. St. Ambrose, for example, mentions that Genesis and Proverbs were read during Lent at Milan (*De moralibus quotidianum sermonem habuimus cum vel patriarcharum vel proverbiorum legerentur praecepta — De Mysteriis 1, 1*) and that the books of Job and Jonas were read during Holy Week (*Audistis librum Job legi qui solemniter est decursus et tempore... Sequenti die lectus est de more liber Jonae. Erat autem dies quo sese Dominus pro nobis dedit quo in Ecclesia poenitentia relaxatur — Ep. XX ad Marcellinum*) And St. Augustine mentions that the Acts of the Apostles were read during Eastertide (*Ipsae libri Actuum Apostolorum incipit a Dominico pascha, sicut se consuetudo habet ecclesiae — Sermo 315, 1*). St. John Chrysostom mentions that the Acts and the Apocalypse were read at Constantinople during Eastertide and Genesis during Lent (*In Act. Apos. sermo IV, 5; Hom. VII ad pop. Antioch.*)

Baumstark mentions another type of *lectio continua*, i.e. a series of pericopes taken in order from a particular book of the Scriptures but showing no continuity. This type of *lectio continua* is still in use in our office and can also be noticed in the Roman Missal for certain periods of the year v.g. the pericopes from St. John's Gospel during the last weeks of Lent (see note no. 16) and those of St. Paul's Epistles for the Sundays after Pentecost; these still form a series of pericopes in which the Letters of St. Paul are covered with almost no disturbance of the order of the Scripture Canon. (Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, Benziger, 1950, vol. 1, p. 399).

<sup>3</sup> Baumstark mentions (*loc. cit.*, p. 137) that the Acts are read in order but with no continuity in the first four days of Easter Week and during the Sundays following up to Pentecost in the Nestorian rite.

special readings from the Scriptures which are 'aptae diei' is in the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*: Aetheria is continually stressing the fact that at Jerusalem, contrary to what she was accustomed to, the readings, psalms, and antiphons on Epiphany, during Holy Week and at Easter, are all 'aptae diei'.<sup>4</sup> Towards the end of the fifth century we find the existence of special readings for particular days in the Gallican Church.<sup>5</sup> By the seventh century the *lectio continua* had come to an end and had been substituted by a system of pericopes; this natural evolution was brought about by the development of the liturgical cycle: as the main periods of the liturgical year (Advent, Christmastide, Lent, Eastertide, the feasts of the Saints) gradually took their place in the liturgical cycle, automatically, so to say, the readings proper to these special celebrations became definitely fixed.<sup>6</sup>

If we were to compare the Scripture readings in the Eastern churches with those of the West we shall find that there is very little in common, though one cannot deny the existence of an Eastern influence of a general character on the West from very early times.<sup>7</sup> As to the West itself, while

<sup>4</sup> *Itinerarium Aetheriae: dicuntur... similiter et lectiones aptae diei quaecumque leguntur* (c. 29); *dicuntur hymni et antiphonae aptae diei ipsi vel loco, lectiones etiam similiter* (c. 31); *et ibi denuo similiter lectiones et hymni et antiphonae aptae diei dicuntur* (c. 35); etc.

<sup>5</sup> G. Godu in *D. A. C. L.* ('*Épîtres*', V, 249) quotes Sidonius Apollonaris who says that Claudianus, brother of Claudianus Mamertus, bishop of Vienne (c. 450) *solemnibus annis paravit quae quo tempore lecta conveniret*. He also mentions Gennadius of Marseilles (+435) who tells of 'Musaeus, Massiliensis ecclesiae presbyter', who *hortatu sancti Venerii (+452) episcopi: excerptis ex sacris Scripturis lectiones totius anni festivis aptis diebus*.

St. John Chrysostom, in one of his homilies on Genesis (*In Cap. XIII Gen. hom. XXXIII*) says that he had interrupted the homilies (which he had begun with the opening of the Lenten sermons) with the approach of Holy Week and Eastertide as *quando venit diem traditionis... in proditorem linguam laxavimus; deinde de Cruce aliqua in medium protulimus. Postea illucescente resurrectionis die necessarium erat ut de resurrectione Domine charitatem vestram doceremus...* The homilies were on the readings of the Liturgy, and what Chrysostom says shows clearly that the *lectio continua* was broken into, as might have been expected, first of all, on the greater feasts so as to have readings *aptae diei*.

<sup>6</sup> *D. A. C. L.*, 251. Fr. E. Beisel S. J. tried to find out the principle which underlies the order of the readings in his book *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* comparing all manner of *Comites* both Eastern and Western but chiefly Western. His conclusions briefly are: The root of the order is the selection of appropriate Gospels for the chief feasts and seasons of the year; for these, the account which seemed most complete was chosen without regard to the particular evangelist. The intervals were then filled up so as to complete the picture of Our Lord's life but without chronological order... much of the arrangement is accidental. (*Cath. Encyclopaedia*, V, p. 660).

<sup>7</sup> Baumstark (*Liturgie comparée*, p. 140) mentions several instances of agreement

all the lectionaries extant agree with each other in their general character and arrangements, they present considerable differences in detail.<sup>8</sup> This is quite evident with regard to the Scripture readings during Holy Week. From the sermons of Pope Leo the Great we know that in Rome on Palm Sunday and on the following Wednesday the Passion according to St. Matthew was read,<sup>9</sup> and on Good Friday that according to St. John. Later on, some time during the fifth or sixth century, the Passion according to St. Matthew was assigned to Palm Sunday, that according to St. Luke to Wednesday in Holy Week, and that according to St. John remained assigned for Good Friday. The Passion according to St. Mark was later on introduced in the Liturgy during the tenth century.<sup>10</sup> The custom outside Rome was different. We know from St. Augustine that in Africa only

between East and West with regard to books of the Scriptures read during particular times of the liturgical year and is of the opinion that there must have been a general influence on the West from the East from earliest times, though he does not distinguish what is primitive and what is more recent in these influences.

<sup>8</sup> Smith-Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, John Murray, London 1908 — Lectionary, vol. II, p. 962.

<sup>9</sup>... *haec hodie... sufficient... quae autem desunt plenitudini; quarta feria auxiliante Domino reddenda promittimus* (Sermo LII De Passione Domini I)

... *in quartam feriam, qua lectio Dominicus Passionis iterabitur, residua differantur* (Sermo LIV De Passione Domini III)

... *caetera in quartam feriam differentur...* (Sermo LVI De Passione Domini V)

<sup>10</sup>This is quite evident from an examination of the various historical sources still extant: The *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romanum A* (c.A.D. 645), the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romanum B* (c.A.D. 700), the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romanum C* (c.A.D. 755), the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romano-Gallicanum* (c.A.D. 750) indicate as Gospel reading for Palm Sunday the Passion according to St. Matthew (Mt. 26, 2-27, 66), for Wednesday the Passion according to St. Luke (Lk. 22, 1-23, 53) and for Good Friday the Passion according to St. John (Jo. 18, 1-19, 42). For Tuesday the Gospel reading is Jo. 13, 1-32. The same thing is evident in the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Burchardi* (A.D. 741-53), in the *Comes* of Murbach (8th cent.) and in the *Comes Theotincbi* (c.A.D. 800), but in these last two sources the Gospel reading for Tuesday is given as Jo. 12, 24-43 (com.Mur.) and 12, 24-44 (Com.Th.). This shows the uncertainty caused by the assignment of the didactic part to the Mass on Maundy Thursday (see note 19). The *Evangeliorum Capitulare Salisburgense* (9th cent.) gives Jo. 13, 1-32 as the Gospel reading for Tuesday, but a later hand indicates the Passion according to St. Mark; this shows that St. Mark's Passion must have been introduced not before the tenth century, perhaps later, for the *Missale Lateranense* (c.A.D. 1230) still gives Jo. 13, 16-32 as the Gospel reading for Tuesday in Holy Week.

The *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae instauratus* has shortened the readings of the Passion; in the restored rite the readings are as follows: Mt. 26, 36-27, 54 instead of 26, 2-27, 66; Mk. 14, 32-15, 46 instead of 14, 1-15, 46; Lk. 22, 39-23, 53 instead of 22, 1-23, 53; while John's Passion has remained unchanged. (Cfr. *Conspectus* and description of sources in Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, Herder 1957, vol. II, 303-36, 674).

the Passion according to St. Matthew was read, and when the saint tried to introduce the reading of an account of the Passion compiled from the four evangelists he was faced by the opposition of the congregation who objected to such a novelty being imposed upon them.<sup>11</sup> What Augustine tried to introduce in Africa seems to have been the custom of the Gallican rite,<sup>12</sup> while in the Mozarabic rite the Passion of St. Matthew was read,<sup>13</sup> though later on there seems to have been a change and a Passion compiled from the four evangelists was read both on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday.<sup>14</sup> In the Ambrosian rite the first part of the Passion according to St. Matthew was read and is still read on Maundy Thursday, while the second part is read on Good Friday. The Passions according to St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John are read on Good Friday after the Second Nocturn of Matins.<sup>15</sup>

If we now turn our attention to the other Gospel readings of Holy Week we can easily notice that at Rome the extracts read are from St. John: in fact from the fourth Sunday in Lent the Gospel of St. John is read; when the *lectio continua* had given place to a system of pericopes Mondays and Tuesdays were already liturgical days, and on Palm Sunday and Wednesday the Passion was read.<sup>16</sup> Thursdays in Lent became liturgical

<sup>11</sup> *Volueram aliquando, ut per singulos annos secundum omnes evangelistas etiam passio legeretur: factum est; non audierunt homines quod consueverant et perturbati sunt* (Sermo 232, 1, 1).

<sup>12</sup> In the Lectionary of Luxeuil (critical edition by P. Salmon, *Le Lectionaire de Luxeuil*, Rome 1944) the *legenda in Parasceven ad matutinos, ad secunda* (instead of Prime through celtic influences), *ad tercia*, and *ad sexta* consists of passages from the Prophets and from the *Evangelium Matthaei* though actually the Gospel readings are a harmony of the four Gospels (Salmon, pp. 88-96). According to Dom Salmon this must have been a general custom as one finds such a harmony in several lectionaries (Salmon, *Le Lectionaire de Luxeuil*, II, étude paleographique, Rome 1953, p. 44).

<sup>13</sup> The *Comes Mozarabicus* (c.A.D. 650) has *legendum in Parasceven ad VIII. . . Passio Domini nostri Jesu Christi secundum Matthaeum. In illo tempore; Consilium inierunt omnes principes usq. signantes lapidem, cum custodibus* (Mt. 26, 1-27, 66) (Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, p. 477).

<sup>14</sup> The *Missale mixtum secundum regulam beati Isidori dictum Mozarabes* (printed by order of Card. Cisneros in 1500) for Holy Thursday gives a Mass in which the Gospel although purporting to be according to St. Luke, is in fact a cento of the Passion taken from all four evangelists. . . . Good Friday was originally a day of mourning with no service whatsoever. Then later a Passion came to be read in a sort of Diatesseron, as on Holy Thursday (A.A. King, *Liturgies of the Primate Sees*, Longmans 1957, Rite of Toledo, pp. 541-2).

<sup>15</sup> A.A. King, *Liturgies of the Primate Sees*, Rite of Milan, p. 350; Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, vol. II, Excursus II, 'L'anno liturgico ambrosiano del Rev.mo Can. Pietro Borella', p. 390: the third Passio (that of John) is chanted by the Archbishop *cum rubea planeta indutus habens mytram in capite*.

<sup>16</sup> Fr. Hermann A.P. Schmidt (*Introductio in Liturgiam Occidentalem*, Herder 1960,

days only at the time of Pope Gregory II (715-31) and although Maundy Thursday, on account of the special character of the day, had a celebration of the Liturgy from early times,<sup>17</sup> yet its Mass lacked a didactic part up till the eighth century,<sup>18</sup> when the Thursdays in Lent received their formularies compiled from formularies assigned to other days; this is also true of the fore-Mass of Maundy Thursday where the Gospel assigned was the same as that on the preceding Tuesday.<sup>19</sup> This repetition of the

p. 516-7) admits that the Gospel of St. John enjoys a privileged position during Lent and Eastertide, especially during the last three weeks of Lent. But he rejects the opinion holding that these last three weeks are the old Roman Lent, the *jejunium trium hebdomadarum*, an opinion which is proved by the fact that the pericopes from St. John's Gospel are a vestige of the *lectio continua*. He rejects this opinion basing himself on the following historical facts: (i) the privileged position enjoyed by St. John's Gospel in Lent and Eastertide is due to its special characteristics; (ii) at the time when the liturgy was celebrated on Sundays only St. John's Gospel is met with on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th Sundays: the order of the chapters read (i. e. 4, 8, 9, 11) are probably vestiges of the *lectio continua*; (iii) with a change in the discipline of the Baptismal scrutinies the original order of the chapters was disturbed; (iv) when Wednesdays and Fridays became Mass days, St. John's Gospel was chosen for reading: one cannot help noticing the mutual influence between these days and the discipline of the scrutinies; (v) when Mondays, Tuesdays, and Saturdays became Mass days, before Mass was also assigned to Thursdays, even these days had readings from St. John's Gospel (in fact the readings from this Gospel were purposely chosen) but the order of the chapters was imperfect on account of the order already existing; (vi) finally, the Saturday preceding Palm Sunday had assigned to it the Gospel of Monday in Holy Week, and Maundy Thursday that of Tuesday in Holy Week.

<sup>17</sup> The letter of St. Jerome to Oceanus about the death of Fabiola (c. 399 A.D.); the letter of Pope Innocent I (401-17) to the bishop of Gubbio, Decentius; the letter of St. Augustine to Januarius (first half of the 5th cent.) and the *Vita Sylvestri* (second half of the 5th cent.) all witness the celebration of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday (Cfr. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, pp. 710-5).

<sup>18</sup> That the Maundy Thursday Mass originally lacked its didactic part is evident from the Pontificale Egberti (A.D. 732-66) whose Ordo for Maundy Thursday gives us the Gregorian liturgy introduced by St. Augustine in Britain in A.D. 596. This is confirmed by Ordo 16 (8th cent.), which says: *Quinta vero feria ante pascha, id est cena Domini, ad Missam antephona ad introitum non salletur; apostolum nec evangelium non legitur, nec responsorium cantatur, nec salutatio presbyter, id est non dicit Dominus Vobiscum, nec pacem faciunt usque in sabaio sancto, sed cum silentio ad missam ingrediuntur*, (Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age*, III, Louvain, 1951, p. 151). Ordo 17, which is dependant on Ordo 16, has the same thing (Andrieu, *l. c.* p. 188) (Cfr. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, pp. 736-47).

<sup>19</sup> The *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romanum B* and the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romanum C* give Jo. 13, 1-15 as the Gospel for Maundy Thursday, i. e. only the first part of the Tuesday Gospel; while the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Romano-Gallicanum* and the *Evangeliorum Capitulare Salisburgense* give Jo. 13, 1-32 as the Gospel for Maundy Thursday, i. e. the same Gospel as Tuesday in Holy Week. The *Comes* of Murbach and the *Comes Theotinchi* give Jo. 13, 1-32 as Gospel for Maundy Thursday, but assign a different pericope from St. John for Tuesday. The *Missale*



Tuesday Gospel on Maundy Thursday lasted till the tenth century or even later, until the Passion of St. Mark was assigned to Tuesday in Holy Week.<sup>20</sup> The Gospel of the Mass following the Easter vigil is taken from St. Matthew, and with regard to this, all the Western liturgies are in agreement.<sup>21</sup> The same thing cannot be said of the Gospel readings for the other days: a different system was in use though readings from St. John's Gospel predominate.<sup>22</sup>

No vestige of progressive reading can be detected in the epistles and lessons during Holy Week; the epistle and lesson pericopes for those days are all pertinent to the mysteries being celebrated and must have been selected for the purpose.<sup>23</sup> Thus the Epistle on Palm Sunday (Phil. 2, 5-11) is a perfect parallel to the Passion of St. Matthew; it shows the supreme humiliation of the Messiah followed by His glorification. Monday's lessons speak of the sufferances of the Messiah (Is. 50, 5-10) and of the betrayal of Judas (Zach. 11, 12-13, 9) while Tuesday's lessons (Jer. 11, 18-20 and Wisd. 2, 12-22) are prefigurations of Christ. Since the ninth century the second lesson on each of these two days has been dropped.<sup>24</sup> Wednesday's readings from Isaias are in themselves a recital of the Passion: the first (62, 11-63, 7) presents Christ as the conqueror of the

*Lateranense* assigns Jo. 13, 1-15 to Maundy Thursday, and Jo. 13, 16-32 to Tuesday.

<sup>20</sup> See note 10.

<sup>21</sup> St. Augustine (Sermo 232, 1, 1): *Resurrectio Domini nostri Jesu Christi et hodie recitata est, sed de altero libro evangelii, qui est secundum Lucam. Prima enim lecta est secundum Matthaeum, hesterno autem die secundum Marcum, hodie secundum Lucam; sic habet ordo evangelistarum.*

All Roman sources assign Mt. 28, 1-7 to the Mass following the Easter vigil; the same thing results from an examination of Mozarabic, Ambrosian and Gallican sources (Cfr. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, pp. 455-79).

<sup>22</sup> A few examples are enough: Gallican rite: the Luxeuil lectionary gives Jo. 12, 1-25 for the Mass *in symboli traditione* (Palm Sunday); the Bobbio Missal gives Jo. 12, 1-16 *in tradicionem symboli* and Mt. 26, 20-35 *in cena dni*; the Treves Gospel with marginal notes (8th cent.) gives Jo. 12, 1-50 *in symboli traditione missa prima legenda* and Jo. 17, 1-25 *in symboli traditione, ante una die de cena dni* Lc. 13, 32 and *in cena dni ad missa secunda* Mt. 26, 1-36.

Ambrosian rite: Palm Sunday Jo. 11, 55-12, 11; Monday 'in authentica' Lk. 21, 34-6; Tuesday 'in authentica' Jo. 11, 47-54; Wednesday 'in authentica' Mt. 26, 1-5; Maundy Thursday at the Catechesis preceding the Mass (in which the first part of the Passion according to Matthew is read) Mt. 26, 1-16 — this is the present day use, which agrees more or less with the mss extant from the early Middle Ages.

Mozarabic rite: *Comes Mozarabicus* (c. A.D. 650) has Jo. 11, 55-12, 13 *legendum in ramos palmarum ad missam* (Cfr. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, pp. 467-9).

<sup>23</sup> See note 6.

<sup>24</sup> The *Comes Theotinchii* (c. A.D. 800) still has two lessons for Monday and Tuesday in Holy Week.

world, under the figure of a warrior covered with blood, bringing blessings and justice to his own; while the second (53, 1-12) is the famous passage on the sufferings, death and reward of the Messias. Maundy Thursday's epistle (I Cor. 11, 20-32) has quite evidently been chosen with reference to the day's celebration. Good Friday's first lesson (Os. 6, 1-6) is an appeal for a return to God and a threat of divine chastisement for the hard-hearted, while the second one (Ex. 12, 1-11) tells of the Paschal Lamb, which is a figure of Christ. The epistle for the Mass following the Easter vigil (Col. 3, 1-4) marks the passage from Holy Week to Easter Week: it echoes the collect of the Mass with its clear reference to the newly baptized.<sup>25</sup>

The Epistle and lesson readings of the other Western rites are different from those at Rome, though all are pertinent to the time;<sup>26</sup> but one cannot help noting that the Ambrosian rite shows signs of Roman influence.<sup>27</sup>

The lessons of the Easter vigil as those of the office need a special

<sup>25</sup> D. A. C. L., V, 330.

<sup>26</sup> A few examples are enough: Gallican rite — Luxeuil lectionary *in symboli traditione* Jer. 31, 34 and Heb. 11, 3-34; Bobbio missal *in tradicionem symboli* Is. 57, 1-4, 13 and 1 Pet. 2, 21-5; *in cena dni* 1 Cor. 11, 20-6.

Mozarabic rite — *Comes Mozarabicus, legendum in ramos palmarum ad missam lectio libri Exodi* (Ex. 19, 4-5; Deut. 5, 32-3; 6, 2-3; 12-8; 4, 20, 2-4; Lo. 17-21; 11, 16-22; 30, 3-5; 28, 10-1) and *epistola Johannis apostoli ad gentes* (1 Jo. 2, 9-17).

<sup>27</sup> In the Ambrosian rite the readings are:

Palm Sunday: Is. 53, 1-12 (which is the 2nd lesson for Wednesday in the Roman rite), Thes. 2, 14-6; 3, 7-5 and Jo. 11, 55-12, 11 (cfr. the Gospel reading for Monday in the Roman rite according to the various sources).

Monday 'in authentica': Is. 50, 5-10 (the same as in the Roman rite) and Lk. 21, 34-6.

Tuesday 'in authentica': Jer. 11, 18-20 (the same as in the Roman rite) and Jo. 11, 47-54 (The Gospel of Friday in Passion Week in the Roman rite).

Wednesday 'in authentica': Is. 62, 11; 63, 1-7 (the same as the first lesson for Wednesday in the Roman rite) and Mt. 26, 1-5.

Maundy Thursday (At Mass): 1 Cor 11, 20-34 (while in the Roman rite the lesson is 1 Cor 11, 20-32).

The Maundy Thursday Mass is preceded by a catechesis after Terce; three deacons vested in red dalmatics chant Dan. 13, 1-64 and Wisd. 2, 12-3, 8 solemnly in the Gospel tone and Mt. 26, 14-6 in ferial tone (for this Gospel reading the deacon is accompanied by the subdeacon but no lights or incense are used). After Solemn Vespers Jon. 1, 2-34 is chanted by a lector (cfr. note 2) after which the Maundy Thursday Mass begins (this Mass has a *Canon Missae* proper to it). After Mass the blessed Sacrament is carried to the 'sepulchre' where it remains till Holy Saturday, and then after the epilogue of Vespers, the Mandatum is performed (cfr. A. King, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*, pp. 351-5).

On Good Friday the liturgy is similar in plan to the Roman but the choice of readings is different: the lessons read are Is. 49, 21-50 and Is. 53, 1-12 (the same as for Palm Sunday at Mass and corresponding to the second lesson for Wednesday in the Roman rite).

study which will lengthen this article considerably, and so are being left for consideration in another article. We shall therefore conclude the present article with a short reference to the liturgical setting of the readings discussed in this article.

The reading of the Epistles and lessons in the Roman rite has been always marked with a character of the utmost simplicity; there is no address to the people and no reply on their part, no blessing of the reader and no prayer by the reader for purification, no solemn escort to the ambo; the only elaboration accorded to the Epistle and lesson is the title and the *Deo gratias* at the end. This sobriety, however, is not so pronounced as at the readings which bear the stamp of greatest antiquity, those of Good Friday and Holy Saturday, which are read *sine titulo, Deo gratias* is not said at the end, and no blessing given to the reader.<sup>28</sup>

In contrast to the sobriety of the liturgical setting of the Epistle we have in the liturgy itself from the earliest times an effort to enhance and stress the Gospel readings as much as possible. It seems that in the earlier centuries there was no difference in the liturgical setting for the reading of the Passion and the reading of the Gospel on other days: it was only in the eighth century that the reading of the Passion was announced as *Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi secundum...* and at first the deacon addressed the people and they replied. Later on the *Dominus Vobiscum* and *Gloria Tibi Domine* were omitted, first on Good Friday and later on the other days when the Passion was read.<sup>29</sup> The carrying of lights before the Gospel tallies with an ancient Christian practice that must have been common to all the liturgies.<sup>30</sup> At Rome, at least from the early Middle Ages, no lights were carried at the reading of the Passion, and later on, in imitation of the Good Friday custom, the same thing was done for the Passion on the other days of Holy Week.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman rite*, Benziger, 1950, vol. I, p. 420.

<sup>29</sup> Ordo 16 n. 32 has *legitur passio domini secundum Johannem*. Ordo 28 (c. A. D. 300) gives the title of the reading: *pronuntiat diaconus ita: Passio domini nostri Jesu Christi secundum Johannem et incipit legere*. Ordo 29 (c. A. D. 870-90) says that the greeting is omitted: *legitur passio domini secundum Johannem. Et diaconus non dicat Dominus vobiscum sed pronuntiat: Passio domini nostri secundum Johannem*. Ordo 31 (850-900) repeats the same thing and adds that no answer is given after the title is read: *non dicatur Dominus vobiscum, sed mox dicat diaconus: Passio domini nostri Jesu Christi secundum Johannem, et nemine quicquam respondente, legat passionem*. (Cf. M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age*, III, pp. 151, 399, 442, 497; Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, p. 683).

<sup>30</sup> Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, I, p. 444.

<sup>31</sup> Ordo 33 (11th cent.) mentions that no incense or lights are carried: *neclumen, nec incensum ante passionem non portant*. (Andrieu, *loc. cit.*, p. 531).

The custom of having no lights on Good Friday is mentioned by *Amalarius* in

All this is in marked contrast to the Ambrosian rite where even on Good Friday both lessons and Gospel are announced in a very solemn setting.<sup>32</sup>

J. LUPI

his *Liber de ordine antiphonarii: nullum lumen habeatur lampadum sive cereorum in ecclesia in Hierusalem quamdiu dominus apostolicus ibi orationes facit, aut quamdiu lux salutatur...* But some of the Ordines mention lights on Good Friday — the whole question is very complicated and is connected with the rite of the new fire on the Easter vigil: it needs a separate study for itself. (Cfr. Schmidt, *Hebdomada Sancta*, II, pp. 683, 809-24).

<sup>32</sup>The present day rubric for chanting the Passion on Good Friday says that the deacon vested in red puts the missal on the altar, and kneeling on the predella recites the *Munda*. Then preceded by the subdeacon, and acolytes with incense and lights, he goes to the pulpit and solemnly chants the Passion, without omitting the usual signs of the Cross on the book and on his forehead, asking for and receiving the celebrant's blessing, and incensing the book. At the words *emisit spiritum* all genuflect and two subdeacons vested in albs strip the altars. The bells ring the Ave Maria and then are silent till Easter Saturday. When this is done all rise, and the deacon chants the remaining verses of the Passion in ferial tone with the lights extinguished.

AN EXPOSITION OF  
AND CRITICAL NOTE ON  
DR. RHINE'S THEORY OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY

PRESENTATION

TO MANY perhaps the subject matter of this paper will sound altogether new. Indeed, nobody should be dismayed for it has been the same with us, and we did not come to know about its existence except from sheer curiosity and chance. It so happened that we came across the word 'parapsychology' through one of the several Journals of Psychology, which led us, through further investigation, to trace the chief exponent of such a novel theory in Dr. J. Rhine, who has written quite a deal on the matter both by himself and in collaboration with others\*.

Out of all these publications we have chosen as a source of the present study the book which runs by the title *Parapsychology - Frontier Science of the Mind* (Ch. Thomas, Illinois, 1957), written by Dr. J. Rhine himself, who is actually professor of Parapsychology at Duke University of Durham, North Carolina, U.S.A., and by his assistant in the running of the Laboratory at the same University, Mr. J.G. Pratt.

The reason for such a choice on our part is very simple to understand: it is the author's last publication in this field of investigation, and the best documented treatment as far as experiments go.

In the book the authors presume to have set on sound scientific footing facts about ESP and PK, which formerly had been believed on a merely popular level. But the aim in writing the book was mainly to

\* For any as would feel inclined to read the works of Dr. J. Rhine, we are giving a list of the main and best known titles: Rhine J.B., *Extrasensory Perception*, Boston, Bruce Humphries, 1934; Rhine J.B., Pratt J.G., Stuart C.E., Smith B.M., & Greenwood J.A., *Extrasensory Perception after Sixty Years*, N.Y. Holt, 1940; *The Reach of the Mind* N.Y. Wm. Sloane, 1947.

Besides these books, ever since the foundation of *The Journal of Parapsychology*, under the aegis of the Duke University Press, Dr. Rhine has been a constant contributor of articles in the same Journal. Generally new experiments are brought to the knowledge of readers interested in this field of science.

N.B. All numbers of pages given in brackets from sections 1 to 6 inclusively refer to *Parapsychology - Frontier Science of the Mind* by J.B. Rhine & J.G. Pratt. Other similar indications contain the surname of the author we are quoting in the work just previously mentioned in each respective section. Where only the page is given, it is only too clear to which work we are making reference.

serve as a manual for professional people, who in it find 'a concise statement of the known facts of this new field of science, just how the researches are carried on and what general advance has been made in relating the new findings to the older branches of knowledge' (p. v); and for teachers and students alike (*ibid.*) who are introduced into the field of parapsychology, finding therein definitions of terms, description of methods and a summary of the main facts accumulated to date. In brief, it is presumably the clearest and most far-reaching work on the subject ever written.

### DEFINITIONS OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY

But then what is 'parapsychology'? Let us note from the outset that several psychologists do not give the definition of parapsychology itself, but are wont to include it under one of the branches of Psychic or Psychical Research, due perhaps to their non-acceptance of parapsychology as a science in itself. Just to quote one example, the *Enciclopedia Italiana* mentions parapsychology only under the heading 'ricerca psichica', and then the author of the article goes on to explain the Rhine Theory.<sup>1</sup> Or rather because it is the fruit of older psychic research, and hence some would still prefer to call it by its older name — as Dr. Rhine himself would admit (p. 209).

Dr. Rhine's definition is the following: 'A division of psychology dealing with behavioural or personal effects that are demonstrably non-physical (that is, which do not fall within the scope of physical principles)' (p. 208). The object, therefore, of this science is — as he asserts — 'to illustrate the direct influence of human volition on a moving object without the use of any kind of physical energy to achieve the effect' (p. 6).

Other definitions vary substantially even in such as would admit to treat of parapsychology rather than of psychic research.

In *Chamber's Encyclopaedia* parapsychology is defined as 'a term given to that branch of psychology which is concerned with such matters as telepathy, apparent clairvoyance and other non-normal modes of acquiring knowledge and like topics. It is used especially in connexion with experimental work on these subjects'.<sup>2</sup>

According to *Everyman's Encyclopaedia* 'Psychical research or para-

<sup>1</sup> *Enciclopedia Italiana* (Rome, 1949) appendix II, p. 626. Cfr. also *Everyman's Encyclopaedia* (London, 1958) vol. II, p. 284; *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (U.S.A., 1947) vol. 18, p. 668; *Dizionario Enciclopedico Italiano* (Rome, 1938) vol. 9, p. 36).

<sup>2</sup> *Chamber's Encyclopaedia* (London, 1955) vol. 10, p. 425.

psychology is the scientific study of the facts and causes of mediumistic and other alleged supernormal phenomena beyond consciousness'.<sup>3</sup>

In connexion with *Chamber's Encyclopaedia's* definition we should like to note:

(i) that parapsychology is normal and supposes normal subjects who yield extra chance results (Rhine: pp. 80-1). Good subjects, as Rhine says, are made not born (*ibid.* p. 133). Hence if by non-normal is meant a privilege of the few, the definition does not apply to our field (p. 83);

(ii) that favourable psychological conditions from the part of the subject and the experimenter should be procured – though these would in no way overturn the balance of one's normality and make one non-normally sensible (pp. 133-6).

The other definition in *Everyman's Encyclopaedia* still opens a wider chasm in that besides non-normality – seemingly the equivalent of 'supernormal', – it adds another point of difference by admitting 'mediumistic' phenomena. But this again runs counter to Dr. Rhine's experiments, from which he came to the conclusion that approximately all score the same average number of runs without showing any superior *psi* powers. This is what he says:

'Groups of blind children have yielded results that compared with those of seeing children of the same age, and a few at least of the practitioners of the occult, such as mediums, astrologers, palmists, yogis, and dowzers have been tried. While no group of any size has been found completely devoid of capacity to demonstrate ESP, at the same time no subdivision of the human species has been found to stand out in any really distinctive way as either possessing superior *psi* powers or superior control over them' (p. 83).

#### FURTHER DEFINITIONS AND SUBDIVISIONS

Parapsychology is divided into two main branches, namely 'extra-sensory perception', abbreviated into ESP; and psychokinesis, abbreviated into PK.

*Extra-sensory perception* is a parapsychical phenomenon whereby 'knowledge is acquired in a special way – by a mode of perception that is independent of the senses' (p. 7).

*Psychokinesis* is 'the direct influence exerted on a physical system by a subject without any known intermediate physical energy or instrumentation' (p. 209); or simpler still: 'the direct action of mind upon matter' (p. 13).

<sup>3</sup> Cfr. article *Psychical Research or Parapsychology*, vol. 10, p. 284.

ESP is again subdivided into telepathy, clairvoyance and precognition.

*Telepathy* is 'the extra-sensory perception of the mental activities of another person'. It does not include the clairvoyant perception of objective events (p. 210).

*Clairvoyance* is defined as the extra-sensory perception of objects or objective events, as distinguished from the mental states of another person (p. 9).

*Precognition* is simply the perception of a future event by means of ESP (p. 10); i.e. that could not be known through rational interference (p. 209). (To qualify as a genuine instance of precognition, Dr. Rhine enumerates three important points. Such an experience: (i) must refer to a coming event that is more than merely accidental; (ii) it must identify a future happening that could not have been inferred as about to occur; and (iii) finally, it must refer to an event that could not have been brought about as a consequence of the perception (p. 10).

#### EXPERIMENTS AND PROOF OF THE SYSTEM

To prove his theory, Dr. Rhine submits his findings to very strict and scientific experiments and to mathematical calculations. Before proceeding to discuss such a scientific treatment, it is worthwhile investigating the experiments themselves. These are to be roughly classified into two groups, and they have been applied to all and sundry with, according to the author, very favourable results, such as to exclude chance.

#### The ESP Experiment Explained

A. For testing ESP he uses a set of five cards in a pack of twenty-five, normally with five of each of the five geometric designs: star, circle, square, cross and waves. The cards can either be arranged in an even distribution, and then called a *closed* pack, or arranged in a random order, regardless of whether the numbers of symbols are equal, being thus called an *open* pack.

To provide safeguards against sensory cues, he procured cards free from any identifying marks, which he kept out of sight of the person under test. For this reason experiments were tried with people not only behind an opaque screen, but also in different rooms from that of the experimenter to render the pack completely invisible to the subject. The cards were always kept by the experimenter until the run through the pack was finished. Then the calls or 'guesses' were recorded by the experimenter or even by both experimenter and subject. He suggests beginning with a 4-run test totalling 100 trials, safe enough for reasonable



testing, although he would demand a 20-run or 500-trial minimum to test an individual's psychical capacity (simply called *psi*), or to explore a new claim or hypothesis.

B. *Clairvoyance* was also submitted to the same type of test (pp. 146 ff), but for a few changes. In the test the subject tried to identify the cards as, one by one, the experimenter took the top card from the inverted and shuffled pack, and held it in a designated position against the opaque screen. Sometimes the subject had to match each of the cards lying in a row in front of him face up or face down. Precautions were also taken lest the subject should try to lay the cards in even piles, or to fall into a rhythm or pattern of distribution. Besides, machines were introduced to record only the total number of trials and the total number of successes, as soon as the alternative of precognitive telepathy cropped up as a defect in the case for clairvoyance.<sup>4</sup>

As a better controlled procedure, the 'blind matching test' (p. 149) is also suggested in which the five key cards, one of each symbol, are kept unseen by the subject and put in opaque envelopes; and the five envelopes, after being shuffled so that the order is not known, are laid out in a row on the table. The subject proceeds with the shuffled pack of cards held face down in the same way as in the open matching test. In this case he is matching the inverted card in the pack against the concealed card in the envelope, with no sensory contact with either of the two symbols he is trying to match against each other.

There is also another experiment called the 'screened touch-matching' technique which has yielded the most satisfactory results. From under the screen, which has the five cards fixed to its side facing the subject, the shuffled cards were passed face down through a slot to the subject, who, without turning them face up, matched them with their corresponding cards in front of him.

C. *Precognition* tests (p. 151) were also provided to prove the possibility of ESP's reach into the future. The subject was instructed to predict and record what he thought was the order of a given pack of cards, when it was next shuffled and cut. The shuffling and cutting was also tried by a third independent party, who was unaware of the experiment being carried out at that time.

D. This same test was applied to *psychokinesis* in the dice experiment, where a sort of ESP and PK combined was obtained. We shall first explain the PK experiment by itself, and then in conjunction with ESP.

The experiment called 'placement method' (pp. 153 ff) is mainly based

<sup>4</sup> Cfr. Rhine, *op.cit.*, p. 54; Tyrrell G.N.M., 'The Tyrrell apparatus for testing extrasensory perception' in *Journal of Parapsychology*, 5(1941) 267-92, reported by giving significant evidence of clairvoyance.

on precognition which influences the position of the throw of dice. The subject is told first to select a target face of a pair of dice of the inlaid variety, with no cavities where the spots are marked, which were thrown from a cup with a roughened interior, in a series of twenty-four die throws. Then the number of dice was increased to six or even ten, and so also the corresponding number of targets.

To avoid chance, Dr. Rhine suggests disregarding any lucky throw right at the beginning of the experiment, by saying in advance when the next release will be recorded. Besides, all dice rolling off the table or landing in a cocked position against the sidewall should be ignored and the throw repeated with all the dice. The top of the table, too, is to be blanketed to avoid the dice sliding on a polished surface.

Since the activation of the dice is highly advantageous (both from the side of the experimenter and of the subject)<sup>7</sup> a mechanical method of release was set up to ensure against subject and experimenter telepathy. In tests with faces as targets, rotating (motor-driven) transparent cages were used (see illustration p. 105) with an electrically operated release box. The subject in the meantime sat down with eyes fixed on the rotating transparent cage until the dice were released.

The experiment for ESP and PK combined in precognition is called 'randomizing procedure' (p. 151). It works out in the following way. A pair of dice is thrown twice and the faces recorded. The die is marked in advance as giving the left digit and the other the right digit of a number. Then, using the telephone directory, the first pair of numbers are made to indicate the page (Rhine suggests between 11 and 66) and the second pair the number of names to count off before beginning on that page. Then, with the beginning point indicated, the rule would be to choose the second column of numbers from the right. Also it should be agreed that numbers 1 and 6 will be circle, 2 and 7 cross, 3 and 8 waves, 4 and 9 square, 5 and 0 star. Then by going down the column and taking the first twenty-five numbers and converting them to symbols, the target would be obtained for the first run. Going on to the next twenty-five would give the target order for the second run and so on.

#### PSYCHOLOGICAL AIDS IN TESTING

Since we are in the field of psychology it stands quite clear to reason that the experimenter and subject, in so far as they are persons, exert in a way or another influence on conditions for the success or otherwise of the experiments. Still one should note that we exclude in these conditions all sorts of telepathy or similar agencies in thought communication, such as one is wont to encounter in seances and psychical situa-

tions. In similar cases the target perceived is always subjective, while in parapsychology it is objective. This difference is well pointed out by Rhine himself who distinguishes distinctly from their effects telepathy and clairvoyance, although he still seems unable to find any noteworthy, fundamental differences between the two processes, which have basic similarities.

'As the science of parapsychology has advanced, the basic similarity of the processes of telepathy and clairvoyance has become more and more apparent. It now seems doubtful whether they are two different processes after all. At any rate, it would be difficult to offer any specific fundamental difference between the two types of manifestation of ESP, except of course, in the targets perceived - the one subjective, the other objective' (p. 9; pp. 54-6).

It is only those natural psychological aids which each and everyone can exert that we are dealing with. These may roughly be considered under three aspects, namely: (A) subject-experimenter relationship, (B) fit psychological conditions for the subject, and (C) similar conditions for the experimenter, in so far as he is dealing with the subject in the course of experiments.

A. (i) The subject should be prepared: 'it is important that the subject not only understand what the test is for and what his part in it is to be, but he needs to be familiarized with the procedure in order that its novelty will not distract him' (p. 145). Hence the subject should be allowed to see the cards, make a few informal off-the-record trials lest the numbers or signs should distract him later or be recalled with any effort.

(ii) This helps also to familiarize the subject with the experimenter who should win confidence throughout the experiments, and to procure the most normal conditions possible while the subject is undergoing the test. Although to a certain extent the individual qualities of subject and experimenter are independent, yet there is always a mutual effect of the one upon the other. This hint helps to keep one on guard because a decline in scores has been noted by Rhine in similar cases, where a drop not only to chance average but even to a negative deviation was obtained.

'It is not known that the sign of the deviation may be affected by this personal relation. The subject may be highly motivated in the test even if he does not like the experimenter, but the chances are good that dislike will produce a drop in his scoring not merely to a chance average but even to a negative deviation (from the chance mean). But unless the experiment is one in which a negative deviation is anticipated and prepared for, such combinations are, of course, to be

avoided' (p. 136).

As a proof of this assertion Rhine quotes VAN BUSSCHEACH's (of Amsterdam) successful experiment with his pupils in the so-called 'social stratum'.

(iii) Experiments should be brief to avoid taxing the nerves of the subject and experimenter, which else make them lose all the lively interest with which they set out at the beginning. Hence brevity, variety and novelty are needed too.

'Generally speaking the shorter an experimental series can be made and still meet its requirements, the better for both experimenter and subject. The shorter a given contribution by a given subject can be made, the better, for in long-drawn-out sessions and experimental series some important element is used up or lost. The spontaneous interest with which the subject approaches the test may decline considerably... in the course of a single run... One way to help this is to make the procedure as brief, varied and novel as the design of the experiment will allow' (p. 135).

B. (i) The subject, as everyone might easily understand, is the one most interested in the test, and therefore also the one requiring most attention with regard to suitable psychological conditions. The simplicity of tests, which we have stressed earlier, has been found to play a very important part in the satisfactory carrying out of experiments. As a matter of fact, there are many states of mind which, in the subject, can upset psi-hitting, and which, when coupled to a variety of conditions, bring along disastrous results in ESP and PK experiments, notwithstanding the fact that such unfavourable conditions have been of the subject's free choice. It is up to the experimenter to consider these un-stabilising influences in the design of his experiments, in the exploratory or pilot-testing stage; and in the selection of subjects who should as a rule be of the extraverted, self-confident, enthusiastic and non-sceptical type (pp. 97-8).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cfr. also S.G. Soal & F. Bateman, *Modern Experiments in Telepathy* (London, 1953) p. 351: 'With increasing consistency it is coming to light that the above-chance deviations are to a large extent produced by the socially adjusted, extravert types of personality, and the below-chance scores by the introvert, mal-adjusted types.'

Each person was made to guess through 16 packs of ESP cards, and it was noted that those lacking self-confidence began by scoring as well as those who were confident, but whereas the latter group continued to score at a consistent above-chance level, the success of the former was short-lived, and declined rapidly to a below-chance average.

Above-chance scoring was also found to be associated very significantly with emotional stability'.

(ii) The subject should be convinced that the capacity which is being tested, is not a quality of the selected few, but inherent to each and everyone. If therefore some show no evidence of psi-capacity at the beginning under the conditions of the test, they may later prove successful under different circumstances. So, too, the opposite effect was obtained when a good subject had been investigated long and continuously. 'This', Rhine says, 'is in reality a variation of the formula that good subjects are not born but made, for it shows that good subjects can be *unmade* too' (p. 133).

C. Most conspicuous, perhaps, among failures in psi-testing is the fact that some experimenters have found themselves unable to conduct successful psi-experiments; that is, when they have gone through the standard testing routines with their subjects they obtained only chance results. The main fault here, as in the case of deteriorating effect in psi-hitting, is very often due to the experimenters. In such instances either the subjects' psychological conditions were altogether neglected, or something has been apparently lost that was once a potent factor. To account for all this Rhine points out three main defects: (a) prolonged testing, which wears out completely the majority of subjects; (b) no contagious or communicable interest as would help create favourable test environment for subjects; (c) infectious enthusiasm that accompanies the initial discoveries of the research worker (p. 132).

#### EVALUATION OF A TOTAL SCORE

After considering the system in itself, Rhine finally comes to assess the value of the results obtained. Since, as he willingly admits, chance plays its part in the game, its significance should figure anywhere in tabulating the results, if we are to have an accurate evaluation. The complete method based on the *binomial formula* works out in the following way.<sup>6</sup>

*Mean chance expectation* (MCE) =  $np$  ( $n$  = number of trials;  $p$  = probability of a hit in each one)

*Deviation* = *observed score* - MCE

*Variance* =  $npq$ , or  $np(1-p)$

{ general formula for binomial distribution  
 {  $n + p$ , as before;  $q = 1 - p$ , or probability of scoring  
 { a miss on any given call.

<sup>6</sup> Cfr. also S.G. Soal & F. Bateman, *op.cit.*, pp. 370-8, where the same formulae are accepted wholesale and explained.

*Standard deviation* = square root of variance, or  $\sqrt{npq}$

*Critical ratio (CR)* =  $\frac{\text{observed deviation}}{\text{standard deviation}}$

From these mathematical considerations Rhine states that the *probability* (P) of scoring hits follows in a more or less fixed pattern by consulting specially prepared tables (pp. 191-7) for the conversion of CR values to P values.

For example: in an ESP series of 25 runs (625 trials) with a total of 160 hits, the P value associated with a CR of 3.5, is .0005. This means that only about 5 times in 10,000 would a score in a 25-run series deviate from MCE by as much as the observed score through mere chance coincidence. In other words, the fact that the score does not fall between 90 and 160 is very unlikely – so unlikely that the chance hypothesis is not a reasonable explanation of the results. The score of 160 hits on 25 runs is therefore statistically significant (pp. 172-3).

The same formulae hold good for PK in target faces and displacement tests.

It is from this last probability theory that Rhine pins so much faith to parapsychology, and thinks to have set it on sound scientific footing. But not all psychologists would agree on the validity of the binomial formula in similar experiments, where no hard and fast rules can tell how much guessing or hitting has been actually done. It seems very difficult to conclude when a hit has been also guessed by chance or really scored by means of a psi-phenomenon. Some would therefore attack the Rhine hypothesis on the selfsame mathematical grounds which seem to establish parapsychology as a working hypothesis.

We shall now concentrate on this thorny problem and discuss the pros and cons of the theory. To be fair with Dr. Rhine we shall conduct our critical investigation of the system on the authority and by the help of other psychologists. One of these is in favour of the Rhine theory, Mr. S.G. Soal of London University, and another against it, Mr. R.J. Hirst, a lecturer in Logic in Glasgow University.

#### A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

A. Mr. S.G. SOAL, the first Fulbright Scholar to receive a travel grant in parapsychology in 1949 for research work in Duke University (Rhine, p. 203), in his book on *Modern Experiments in Telepathy* rejects a lot of inept criticism against Rhine. However, he starts by denying 'a priori':

- (i) errors in recording the lists of guesses or card-symbols;
- (ii) guessing through defective and recognisable cards;

(iii) and confirms the use of the binomial formula to assess results and the standard deviation.<sup>7</sup>

The first two points do not seem worth discussing, since it is hardly possible to give the theory of fraud in experiments a moment's thought, when Rhine worked out every possible and imaginable method to ensure the maximum possibility of correctness.

Yet the use of the formula has been the bone of contention ever since its introduction into the field of parapsychology, because some cannot admit that psychological results, more irregular than fixed, could be subjected to the stability of an unchangeable mathematical formula. But such criticism seems to crumble before the authority of able mathematicians who are in perfect agreement with the valid application of the formula, even given the irregular behaviour of the psyche; and hence criticism should be more sanely directed towards the experiments themselves. But these, again, do not betray any sign of defect, and therefore cannot be dismissed as insufficient or false.

'All doubts as to the essential validity of the mathematical method of evaluation employed were dispelled when Sir Ronald Fisher, the English authority on statistics, announced in 1935 that if the records reported were correctly observed, and published without selection, the departure from expectation could not be ascribed to chance. He went on to suggest that criticisms should be directed towards the conduct of the experiments rather than to the handling of the data'.<sup>8</sup>

In the last section of this book entitled *Science and ESP Research* (pp. 346 ff), Mr. Soal proceeds to establish the theory of parapsychology as a working hypothesis, and refutes much inept criticism as due to prejudice. His arguments appear sound enough to win conviction from the sober reader because the flaws he notes in critics are true. They very often set out from preconceived assumptions which underlie so often much opposition of scientific men to the facts of extra-sensory perception.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 44-5; 49; 53; 37-8.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 39. Cfr. also M. Brierley, *Trends in Psycho-analysis* (London, 1951) pp. 240-1: '... there can be no doubt of the sincerity of Rhine's conviction that experimental proof of the existence of Psi processes is now adequate, and their general acceptance a matter of time and overcoming of various emotional resistances. Indeed, the statistical methods employed have been examined by competent mathematicians, e.g. the opinion of the American Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1937: "If the Rhine investigation is to be fairly attacked, it must be on other than mathematical grounds". The account of the experiments given, though naturally condensed, seems to indicate that every possible error that was thought of was adequately controlled. In short, the evidence demands very serious consideration and cannot lightly be dismissed as "nonsense" or "incredible".'

1. Several scientific men presume to subject everything to the laws of physics, and only phenomena falling within their limits can possibly be true. But a moment's reflection would show the absurdity of this contention, since not everything worth knowing about the universe has already been discovered; so that now it is not merely a question of the filling in of the details. Hence 'it is true that very great progress has been made in the physical sciences, but we remain in the deepest ignorance concerning the probable relation between cerebral and mental phenomena'.

2. Mis-reports and mis-statements frequently play their part too in criticism. A case in point is that of Prof. Skinner, a psychologist now at Harvard University, and Prof. Evelyn Hutchinson, of whom the latter had written a long and careful account of the Shackleton experiments for the *American Scientist*. In a later issue of the same Journal, Skinner wrote a letter attacking card-guessing experiments in general, and the Shackleton experiments in particular. 'The letter contained so many mis-statements and errors of fact that it was clear both to Evelyn Hutchinson and to S.G.S. that Skinner had not read the Shackleton report at first hand. For instance, he spoke of packs of cards shuffled by hand whereas no such packs were used in our experiments. He also hinted that recording errors might afford a possible explanation of the results, whereas separate records were kept of card lists prepared before the experiment and of Shackleton's own guesses recorded by himself and these independent records could be re-checked at any future time'.

It is therefore likely that, since nowadays there is very little criticism of the experimental evidence that need be taken seriously, more often than not the would-be critic betrays the fact that he has not even taken the trouble to make himself conversant with the published reports which he presumes to criticise.

3. So far no critic has succeeded in proving that the best experiments are faulty. 'It will not do for him to find errors in, say, the early work of Rhine and then conclude that later experiments based upon an incomparably more rigorous technique are equally invalid. On the same ground we should have to reject most of the present-day physics because the pioneers often did not refine their methods at the first approach... Moreover, the later series of successful experiments in ESP provide confirmation of the findings of previous workers. We are no longer dealing with an occasional isolated success but now with a whole series of well-conducted and highly significant experiments carried out under stringent conditions'<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Soal refutes D.H. Rawcliffe, *The Psychology of the Occult* (London, 1952) who attempts to show that successful experiments in parapsychology are, without exception, based on methodological errors.



Mr. Soal then goes on to discuss whether ESP is a *statistical artifact*, after having established the validity of experiments on methodological grounds. Mr. Spencer-Brown, in an article entitled 'Statistical Significance in Psychical Research', published in *Nature*, 25th July 1953, suggests that the so-called random distributions to be found in certain well known tables of random numbers do not always behave in practice as we should expect them, according to accepted probability theory. He therefore accepts the validity of the formulae in card-guessing, but attacks the fundamental concept of randomness itself, on which the formulae are based.

The answer to this contention, namely that ESP phenomena are merely examples of hitherto unnoticed defect in accepted probability theory is based on three considerations:

- (i) persistent scoring above chance expectation under first class experimental conditions;
- (ii) in many series, changes in the experimental conditions or in the agents, produce consistent and highly characteristic changes in the nature of the results;
- (iii) the dependence on character and psychological conditions remove the theory of statistical artifact, based on the binomial formula.

If, therefore, the theory of statistical artifact is to be universally admitted, it should work evenly in all experiments. But, as Soal wisely notes, 'statistical artifact is no respecter of the experimental conditions, the difference can be due only to the fact that in one case the sender looked at the cards and in the other he did not'.<sup>10</sup>

This defence of the Rhine theory and experiments on ESP and PK – it should be underlined – was built up after 1948, because till that date experiments in England had been done, with but very scanty success.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Soal & Bateman, op.cit., p. 353.

<sup>11</sup> M. Brierley, op.cit., pp. 237-8: 'Much difference of opinion still exists among psychologists as to the validity and utility of the work (i.e. parapsychology), but the experimental study of telepathy has become a recognised scientific pursuit... The aim of the experiments is, in the first instance, to establish the fact of telepathy. Rhine uses special cards, Carrington uses drawings, and other test objects have occasionally been used, but the principle of most of the experiments is the same. Elaborate precautions having been taken to ensure that the subjects have no opportunity to receive information through sense channels, the experimenter chooses a series of test objects at random and the subjects or recipients guess what these are... The experiments and the methods of statistical analysis have been subjected to much criticism, but the experimenters are themselves convinced that they have established telepathy as a fact of nature. Dr. Soal, of London University, repeated Rhine's experiments for five years without success but, on re-examining his results, discovered that two of his subjects displayed pre-cognition, since they guessed the card next ahead in the trial series more often than they should have done by chance, an occurrence which aligns with some of Dunne's views on Time'.

The reason for all this bad luck is most probably ascribable to tact in conducting experiments, although Mr. Soal does not give us the reason for it himself. Yet it is most significant that after 1949, — i.e. after obtaining the Fulbright grant, — he was completely for the theory. And this fact, in our opinion, helps a great deal to exonerate Mr. Soal of any biased approval, since he may be considered as a sort of convert to the field of parapsychology.

This curious fact, namely the failure of experiments especially in PK, was also underlined by Mr. W.H. Salter who, reporting for 'The Society for Psychical Research' (London, 1948), mentions the success of Dr. Rhine in dice throwing as early as 1943, and the disappointingly negative results of carefully imitated experiments in England.

'In the *Journal for Parapsychology*, published at Duke University, U.S.A., Dr. Rhine in 1943 reported on experiments conducted by him in dice throwing, in which he claimed that he had been able to make dice fall as he wished them, by sheer willing, without muscular effort directed to that end. To this faculty he gave the same *psychokinesis* usually abbreviated to PK. Very careful experiments in this country (England), made on the same lines, have so far mostly failed to produce positive results'.<sup>12</sup>

It is therefore no wonder that Mr. Soal was so sceptical before as to admit *unconscious whispering* in card guessing, and to scorn the *ludicrously* small number of successful experiments and good subjects. This is what he wrote in 1947 in his book *The Experimental Situation in Psychical Research* (London, 1947), substantiated by facts, not excluding his own experiences:

- (a) 'Is there any possible abnormal explanation that we have overlooked? Well, there is the remote possibility that as the Agent looked at each card he whispered the name of the card to himself without being consciously aware that he was doing it. It is well known that certain persons when they read a book to themselves, their lips are moving most of the time. This is specially true of people who are only semi-literate. Now though these sounds emitted by the Agent might be far too faint for Mr. P. to be consciously aware of them in the next room, they might yet be of sufficient intensity to set a train of thought moving in his hand. That is to say some part of his mind might register them and thus Mr. P. might get a clue to the initial sound of the name of the animal.

That the above possibility is more than a mere hypothetical conjecture is confirmed by the case of the Latvian child Iļģ K, studied

<sup>12</sup> W.H. Salter, *The Society for Psychical Research* (London, 1948) p. 46.

by Prof. V. Neureiter, Dr. Hans Bender and others' (p. 12).

- (b) 'The number of experiments carried out and the number of subjects discovered are both so ludicrously small that there is hardly a finding reported that has been adequately confirmed. Take for example the phenomenon of displacement in card-guessing. By this is meant the discovery that certain subjects tend to guess correctly one or two places ahead of or behind the card which the Agent is looking at. I found 2 persons who displayed this peculiarity in their guessing. But is this a rare phenomenon or is it fairly common among persons who possess card-guessing gift? Again Dr. Rhine and several of his followers found the majority of card-guessing subjects succeeded even when no Agent looked at the cards and the order of the cards in the pack was unknown to anyone until the time of checking up. But both Basil Shackleton and Mrs. Gloria Stewart failed entirely in the case when no one looked at the cards. Would it always be found that card-guessers whose performance shows displacement of guesses succeed only when an Agent knows the order of the cards? We do not know' (pp. 14-5).

B. Mr. J.B. HIRST, who wants to prove his thesis that the mind cannot work independently of the body, considers Dr. Rhine as one of his chief adversaries, since he defends dualism by advancing the findings of parapsychology. These in point of fact amount to a direct denial of Hirst's basic assumption in the claim that in psi-phenomena there are examples of activity which the mind pursues independently of and without the body being involved. Mr. Hirst makes his criticism converge on ESP and dismiss PK on the ground that it is 'rather more dubious as experimenters are apparently not all agreed that it really occurs - the figures obtained' - he explains - 'may not be significant, or the effects may be due to the experimenter's choosing the target under unconscious guidance of ESP, or to slight unconscious physical reactions by agent or experimenter'.<sup>13</sup>

This theory on PK does not sound new to Dr. Rhine who considers precognition through ESP as a counterhypothesis to PK. But let us note here that, first of all we should recall what has already been stated regarding mechanized experiments, in which it is very hard to tell that ESP was to account for a selected face of the dice to fall. Secondly, if the target face was agreed upon in advance of the experiment by the throwing of a dice, there seems to be in play a certain vicious circle: because precognition itself would be through the PK influence on the

<sup>13</sup> R. J. Hirst, *The Problems of Perception* (London, 1959) pp. 204-5. Until further notice all numbers in brackets from pp. 203-7 refer to pages in this book.

die. Hence, PK in the first place accounts for PK in the second.

Let us now hear Dr. Rhine's answer to this objection of Mr. Hirst:

'At any rate, it is possible to rule out precognition as a counterhypothesis to PK. To do so it is necessary only to agree upon a rigid order of target face and to adhere to it throughout the series of tests. Better still, as sometimes happened, the subject was allowed to determine his own target for a given unit by throwing a die. Then, if precognition entered into it, it would have to be through the PK influence on this die. At least one investigation has been made with the use of an elaborate design (Latin Square Method) of selecting the target sequence by which is excluded the step choice of target on which the counterhypothesis depends. But the best answer to the precognition counterhypothesis is given by the QD (Quarter Distribution) analyses already described. It adds something too that these were made on the data long after the tests were finished. These give the best evidence of PK, and show that the hits were not a 'selected chance distribution' as the precognition counterhypothesis assumes' (pp. 62-3).

To confirm his argument, Dr. Rhine cites other results obtained by different people engaged in the same research, who are in agreement with the independence of PK from ESP:

'In general it can be said that a good case has been made for the occurrence of PK as an aspect of psi. It is the newest of the distinguishable psi-phenomena and as a result much of the research has been concentrated in the Duke Laboratory, just as it has with precognition. Among the important independent confirmations that have, however, been carried out in other centres of research is that by McConnell, Snowden, and Powell of the University of Pittsburgh, in which a completely mechanized operation was involved, including the photographic recording of the fall of the dice' (p. 63).

#### Hirst's Arguments Examined

I. The first argument brought by Mr. Hirst against ESP is based on the notion of the *unconscious* which Rhine attributes to this psi-capacity. He is, therefore, inclined to ascribe all guesses to luck rather than to any other psychological function. Hence such extrasensory knowledge should not go by the name of *perception*, since it is more akin to an activity of the unconscious.

'If the phenomena are mental in this important way we would expect them to be conscious, but they are not. In laboratory ESP subjects have no mental image or picture or consciousness of the unseen card they guess, and they do not know or even feel confident when they

have guessed correctly. Hence it is very tendentious to call ESP *perception*, and if it establishes anything about the mind it is about the unconscious mind, which anyhow is a problem for dualism' (p. 204, Hirst).

(a) But according to Dr. Rhine, perception is not taken in the Aristotelian sense, for he takes *percipient* as the equivalent of *subject* which is in turn defined as 'the person who makes the calls in an ESP turn' (Rhine: p. 209). Hence perception is rather synonymous with the act of guessing in an extrasensory test, and, imperfect and misleading though it may be, cannot be replaced or expressed by a better word.

(b) Dr. Rhine seems to be misinterpreted by Hirst's suggestion of the unconscious. Dr. Rhine admits the unexplored regions of the unconscious *negatively*, in that he falls back to unconsciousness to explain with probability conspicuous psi-missing as an effect of abnormal mental life.

'And of course, above all, the two branches are concerned with the more submerged area of personality, the unconscious level of mental life. When more pieces of the puzzle of man's nature have been fitted together and the pattern of unconscious mental functioning becomes clearer, there will likely be other common ground discovered; we suggest that the psi-missing effect that is so conspicuous a part of parapsychological study may be found to have its comparable effect in abnormal mental life' (Rhine: p. 107).

(c) It in no way follows that all mental phenomena are strictly conscious in themselves as in sensory perception; the basic process in itself may be unconscious, and in ESP 'the individual in his conscious recognition of the phenomena gets only a converted *aftereffect* or secondary result' (Rhine: p. 87). This aftereffect is brought to consciousness through ESP's operation in four ways:

- (i) by intuitive experiences;
- (ii) by experiencing a veridical or meaningful dream or hallucination;
- (iii) in a symbolic way, such as in a dream or day dream;
- (iv) by experiencing a pictorial realization of a meaningful event in such a dream or day dream (*ibid.*).

It is, therefore, for this reason too that Dr. Rhine admits that subjects 'do not feel confident when they have guessed correctly' (Rhine, p. 88).

II. The second argument of Hirst tries to bring into contradiction the Rhine theory of mind working independently of the body by pointing out that in ESP and PK the mind acts on physical objects like cards and dice. Hence his objection:

'But if psi-phenomena are instances of the mind acting independent of

the body and showing its immaterial nature by escaping physical boundaries, why are they predominantly instances of the mind's perceiving or acting on physical objects like cards or dice?' (Hirst: p. 205).

We think that the term *immaterial* is equivocal. Rhine does not say that the independence of ESP or PK from matter is such as to dispense with physical objects altogether. It is in the nature of the process itself whereby physical objects are influenced that the notion of immateriality is applied. In other words, since Rhine himself uses the notion of causality, such physical effects, we may be permitted to say, are produced by a final cause without the help of any physical external instruments. Such a process is clearly explained in the complex case of ESP influencing PK, in which Rhine expressly asserts that 'it is necessary to suppose that some other perception than that of the senses must direct this influence exerted upon them'.<sup>14</sup>

III. The third argument proves the fantastical inefficiency of ESP when compared with normal perception of the senses. In America, Mr. Hirst writes, 70% of the guesses were wrong if you consider the sum total of chance and ESP hits on the other side; while in England you get 77% failures. From this evaluation of poor results he goes on to conclude that 'the phenomena are admittedly elusive in that the capacity of good subjects declines so that they get runs of chance or worse than chance results. Even if this is not luck evening out, it is, especially with the inefficiency, a very poor advertisement for mind, and suggests that the beneficial effects of the phenomena are chimerical' (Hirst: p. 205).

(a) The low margin of hits should not be compared with the sensorimotor system in human beings, in which both object and sentient always meet, and the subject is always sure, for example, that a few feet away there is a tree; nor should it be compared with the activity of the brain which draws conclusions from materially acquired premisses e.g. that if you

<sup>14</sup> Rhine, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-1: 'The complexity of the target from a physical point of view is even greater when we consider that ESP is necessary in PK experiments too. If the falling dice are to be influenced so that the target face or combination is to be favoured in the results, it is necessary to suppose that some other perception than that of the senses must direct this influence exerted upon them. In most experiments the dice fall too rapidly for visual perception to follow. In other experiments the subject does not actually see the dice at the time of release. Sometimes the dice are thrown in considerable numbers at one time so that the eye cannot follow the complete movements with sufficient clarity to allow the intelligent direction of a casual influence through PK. Accordingly, we must suppose an extrasensory aspect to the PK operation — one that operates too fast for sensorimotor reaction time. ESP itself could only function in such a case by operating on something else than a physical type of causality'.

strike your finger with a hammer you will feel pain as a result of the impact. The case is not analogous. In ESP and PK we are exploring a completely new realm of activity for the mind, aware of or influencing an external event not apprehended by sensory means.

(b) Again, the low percentage of hits seems in a way to undermine the theory of Rhine in that, if taken in itself, it offers very poor consolation for the pains taken in establishing a theory. But what Rhine wants to prove is that there is a certain relationship between scores and the mind guessing them if, as a safeguard, scoring by chance is deducted, as in the binomial formula. The legitimate conclusion is that one can with a certain degree of almost surety predict the probability value of scores for any given individual.

IV. In the fourth objection raised, namely that even allegedly trans-physical capacities are greatly influenced by physical factors, e.g. drugs and narcotics by which results fall off badly (Hirst: pp. 205-6), Rhine's point is missed altogether. The immaterial aspect of the process in parapsychology has already been exposed in refuting the second contention of Hirst, and need not be repeated here. These physical factors together with favourable psychological conditions are not and cannot be ignored by Rhine, seeing that the psyche depends always on the suitable physical conditions of the subject. The mind always depends on the brain, as the vision depends on the sanity of the eye. If therefore, the argument of Hirst were to be applied correctly to the immaterial process, it would be tantamount to an absurdity: namely that you can have a mind without a brain.

The last two contentions of Hirst, however, seem to be quite reasonable since they attack the Rhine theory in its weak points.

V. One cannot tell with certainty 'how common good ESP subjects are or how many score chance or less than chance results... there is the suggestion that below-chance results are due to *seeing* the right answer but avoiding it and giving a wrong one. This allegation of unconscious deception is not very plausible, and one is left wondering whether runs of luck, good and bad, are not much more common than is allowed for on the current theories of probability on which Rhine relies' (Hirst: p. 206).

To this observation we need add nothing further, and we are of the same opinion as Hirst in this respect.

VI. Finally, Rhine's theory and hypothesis is inadequate in that it still leaves us in the dark as to how these allegedly mental capacities work. There is even disagreement among the investigators as to which of the phenomena are the best established: e.g. British investigators seem to find more precognition than Rhine, and much less clairvoyance and psy-

chokinesis; and they also differ as to whether the phenomena can all be explained in terms of one psi-capacity, and as to which this is.<sup>15</sup>

We have to admit that in Rhine's work we can find no adequate answer to these serious objections. Nay, he himself confesses especially this last difficulty; and this without doubt marks one of the weakest points of his theory. He takes for granted, for instance, that there is some mental energy but leaves 'for a later stage of research an account of its peculiar qualities', because 'most of the energies now recognised were at one stage as mysterious as this one'. The proof of this mental energy so far has only reached an experimental stage, and cannot be defined in square set terms, although we have some effects of a completely immaterial nature.<sup>16</sup> But — we might be permitted to argue — an immaterial effect can have for its cause something material, as in the case of intellectual perception wherein the mind depends upon the brain to develop a thought or ideal!

C. More independent criticism from MARJORIE BRIERLEY in *Trends in Psycho-analysis* is more lenient and kind with Dr. Rhine. Yet there is always the difficulty of accepting the hypothesis as working. The just and impartial critic, like Brierley, finds himself on the horns of a dilemma: Rhine on the one hand cannot be accused of insincerity or fraud, and the data furnished by him is worthy of serious consideration; on the other hand there are many points of interrogation especially in the psychological aspect of the theory, which has been unfortunately subjected to the hard and fast rules of impeccable mathematics. Hence she suggests a new cause for the theory, namely *fate neuroses* as a possible explanation of PK.

'In the view of the force of unconscious belief in the 'omnipotence of thought' and the amazing subtlety of many of its disguises, a psychoanalyst may still be justified in hesitating to yield too readily to the

<sup>15</sup>Hirst, *op.cit.*, pp. 206-7. The immaterial nature of the process, however, to our judgement, should be sustained in the way explained further up. Hence there is no begging of the question, as Hirst points out; but he is simply missing the point of Rhine and disappointingly misunderstanding him.

<sup>16</sup>Rhine, *op.cit.*, p. 74: 'To make sense with the present situation, this mental energy would have to be one that does not stimulate the sense organs. There are already known energies in the same category. Second, such an imperceptible energy would have to be convertible to other energy states which would be perceptible to the senses. There are many known energies that are only recognisable through such translation or conversion. These are facts of familiar elementary physics. The only unique feature of this physical energy lies in the fact that it functions without any restrictive relation, yet known, to space-time-mass criteria. But that is only to say again that such energy is not physical, since the space-time-mass criteria are the defining concepts of the field'.



increased pressure of experimental evidence. Further, it is well known, e.g. among biologists, that impeccable mathematics can, on occasion, make nonsense of natural phenomena; it is also possible that the highly artificial conditions of experiment introduce sources of error not yet apparent. However, there is no fundamental contradiction between the findings of psycho-analysis and telepathy, nor are phenomena such as 'fate neuroses' inconsistent even with the assumption of PK' (Brierley: p. 241).

But the notion 'fate neuroses', vague as it is in meaning, makes the theory pass on from the frying pan to the fire without shedding any new, special light on what Rhine could not explain. There still remains the question how this 'fate neuroses' works in determining what is neutral without foreboding either good or evil, as in the Rhine experiments.

#### IS THE RHINE THEORY A WORKING HYPOTHESIS?

From the foregoing critical treatment it is evident that for the time being one cannot accept the theory of Rhine as a working hypothesis. There are serious objections which cannot be ignored, but on the contrary demand a deeper investigation of the findings to date until one can prudently accept or rule out the theory entirely. The novelty of the theory, however, asks for more sober judgements concerning its validity, and for more patience and experimental experience.

If the theory were to be sufficiently proved, it would add a considerable contribution in its practical application to science by explaining some natural events hitherto classed as above nature owing to their mysterious character. But here, too, there is much that will not be acceptable to the catholic scholar if the theory is stretched too far and posited as a substitute for religious conceptions regarding the supernatural origin of miracles, the survival of the soul after death and the like.<sup>17</sup> These last elements constitute the object of another science and

<sup>17</sup> Rhine is rather sceptical about Religion; he thinks that his hypothesis should in time replace religion: cfr. pp. 118-22 the subtitles *Parapsychology & Religion, The hypothesis of Spirit Survival*.

The *Chamber's Encyclopaedia*, op.cit., vol. 11, pp. 287-9, in an article to this effect accepts the validity of the Rhine theory, and likewise is also dismally materialistic (as opposed to spiritualistic in the catholic sense). He starts by including such a notion in the very definition of psychical research which 'is that branch of inquiry which is concerned with applying scientific methods to the study of phenomena once classed as 'supernatural'. It was recognised at an early stage that no observable event can possibly be 'above' nature or even outside it, and the term 'supernormal' was soon introduced as a preferable alternative' (p. 287). He then proceeds to enumerate the contribution

would be utterly out of reach and beside the scope of a natural science like parapsychology.

To wind up we should like to summarize our opinion on this theory in a few items:

1. Rhine's methods of procedure in experiments seem to be really consonant with the rigour of scientific research.

2. Rhine's sincerity and integrity should also be presumed in furnishing data and reporting his findings.

3. The use of the binomial formula — though it considers also chance results — leaves us in the dark as to the exact and precise number of hits or misses through chance or psi-capacity. The formula in itself may be true as far as mathematics go and able statisticians assert; — but still the doubt so many cherish is not dispelled.

4. One is left wondering whether the irregular behaviour of the human psyche obeys always in meek submission to the rigidity of an immovable mathematical formula to assess its hits through chance and psi, when it is already hard enough to say which of them was in play. Hence statistical formulae are insufficient proof of the hypothesis.

5. There are many unexplained loopholes in the theory; and strange enough to say, Dr. Rhine himself is the first to point them out to the reader. No organic faculty or mental capacity, for example, could be assigned to account for psi-effects which are apparently of an immaterial nature. Nor can any rules be drawn out to explain and regulate the behaviour of these psi-phenomena.

6. Rhine is rather too comprehensive in his approach to parapsychology. He assumes that all can be its subjects and that all can also be good subjects if they are favourable and not sceptical in their attitude

to science emanating from this research from pp. 288-9. After accepting the scientific approbation of Parapsychology as a science, asserting that 'it is far from being a pastime for dilettanti and has become important on, so to put it, three different levels', he gives the practical applications, which are the same as embraced by Rhine. These are briefly the following:

(i) It dismissed *superstition* (e.g. seeing ghosts, etc.) as 'primarily telepathic hallucinations of explicable character and great scientific interest'.

(ii) It has *practical applications* when recognised and assimilated, especially regarding telepathy: 'the bare fact that it does occur and is apparently by no means the prerogative of the privileged few, is bound to be highly relevant to the often-mooted concepts of collective minds and the like and hence psychology of human communities and social groups'.

(iii) It is a denial of *Nineteenth Century materialism*: 'Many psychical phenomena clearly go beyond any explanation that can be offered in terms of the traditional concepts of space and time, matter and energy — this is, indeed, virtually the definition of 'psychical' for this purpose'.

towards the possibility of ESP.<sup>18</sup> This assertion may hold true, but first one has to prove and localize more neatly the capacity from which effects, averaging more or less an equal and similar function in connection with psi experiments, flow.

Given all these serious and unsolved doubts concerning the Rhine Theory we cannot but suspend judgement and wait for further elucidations on the hypothesis. At any rate, we can and should acknowledge the merit of Rhine in giving a spur to the study of these new phenomena of the human psyche, and let us hope that sufficient grounds will be adduced to prove parapsychology's validity as a working hypothesis.<sup>19</sup> But

<sup>18</sup> Rhine, pp. 92-3: 'For example, the studies of Schmeidler at City College, New York, brought out the fact that if students tested in the classroom for ESP capacity were first separated on the basis of their attitude toward the possibility of ESP, the results showed a different level of scoring for those who were favourable (sheep) and for those who were sceptical (goats). The sheep as a group almost invariably averaged higher than the goats. The goats, however, scored below mean chance expectation and did so with a degree of consistency that was impressive. The difference between the sheep and the goats has over the years of testing contributed a phenomenally significant difference between the amassed data of the two groups.'

Now it was quite evident that in this work the principle of separation was concerned more with the sign (or direction) of the deviation of the scoring of a given subject than with the amount of ESP measured. The attitude of the subjects allowed a separation of the individuals in the classes on the one hand into one group that tended to score positively and a second group on the other hand that preponderantly scored a negative deviation. The fact is, the goats showed statistical evidence of an ESP effect just as the sheep did'.

<sup>19</sup> M. Fordham, *New Developments in Analytical Research* (London, 1957) pp. 41-2: 'Rhine's experiments have been successful in drawing attention to the peculiar phenomena under consideration and are particularly interesting here because he has used statistics. They have given rise to much uncritical credulity together with increased scepticism as if to balance it. Rhine started from the idea that the phenomena he observed were due to chance (i.e. he started from a Null Hypothesis), and then believed he had shown that they could not thus be explained.

He believed that he had shown that certain individuals can predict the random behaviour of cards or dice with a frequency greater than would be expected if the predictions were based upon chance. Rhine further discovered that the number of correct predictions rose if the subject was credulous, and diminished if he was sceptical about the whole proceeding. This means that there is some connection between the psyche of the subject predicting and the turn of the cards or the fall of the dice. The psyche must be important in his experiments since the objects behaved according to chance — Rhine and his co-workers took much care to ensure this — but the prediction by the subject appeared not to do so. Further, he showed that the conscious attitude of the subject was significant and that the experiments were not influenced by changes in space and time. Rhine does not seem to see that this upsets a casual hypothesis and he thinks in terms of perception and energy (Cfr. Rhine, *The Reach of the Mind*, London, 1948).

## DR. RHINE'S THEORY OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY

as things stand at present, the theory is still unacceptable as a real branch of psychology (still less as a science in itself). For these reasons several authors of psychology skip over the theory without even daring to give it a passing remark in their works.<sup>29</sup>

C. BLANCO

Rhine's experiments in fact open a door for those who want to think that his observations reveal the existence of something more than chance, and they conclude that since chance is most improbable there must be a cause. Jung, however, points out that Rhine's results transcend space and time, therefore, they cannot be energetic phenomena, and further that causes do not work if space and time are fixed. Therefore the Rhine results are exceedingly peculiar, i.e. they are predictable but no cause can be conceived; they are meaningful phenomena, or in a word fall into a class of events which Jung calls synchronistic'.

<sup>29</sup>Ed. Nowlan, S.J., *Psychologia Experimentalis* (Romae, 1960) p. 18. We are of the same opinion of his in this respect, where in these private notes for his students at the Gregorian University he writes: 'Adhibent methodos scientificas et formulas statisticas bene cognitae ad existentiam harum potestatum stabilendam. Nihilominus maior pars psychologistarum conclusiones eorum reiiciunt propter, uti dicunt, insufficientem probationem statisticam. Forsitan nonnullum praeeudicium contra phaenomena quae non directe mensurari possunt in hac oppositione parapsychologiae operatur. Sed verum est parapsychologiam tractare de potestate quae, si detur, non inveniatur in omni persona neque semper manifestetur in subiecto qui hac potentia gaudeat. Si dantur leges stabiles de operatione huius facultatis, tales leges non cognoscimus. Proinde parapsychologia generatim non habetur ut vera schola psychologiae scientificae, (immo auctores in genere ne mentionem quidem parapsychologiae in suis textibus faciunt!).'

## PROTESTANT PROPAGANDA IN MALTA (1800-30)

AS WE have said in our previous article,<sup>1</sup> Great Britain had, on several occasions, renewed her assurances to protect the Catholic Religion in Malta, and most particularly in the commissions to newly-appointed Governors of these Islands. But let us not forget that Great Britain is a Protestant Country, and as such, while promising to safeguard all the interests of our Church, she would not let her Protestant subjects spiritually unprotected in the Island. The Catholic minority in Britain were, particularly with the Emancipation Act of 1829,<sup>2</sup> gradually obtaining their civil rights and freedom. Britain, consequently, expected that her Protestant subjects were similarly treated in a Catholic Country as ours.

On their occupation of Malta, the number of the English people in the Island was very scanty, and consequently there could arise no religious problem for the time being. But in course of time this number went on increasing. From the Census of 1829, we make out that on a population of approximately 119,000, there were 360 Jews, 72 Mohammedans, and about 4,500 Englishmen (Government officers, merchants, industrialists and soldiers).<sup>3</sup> The latter were of different denominations, but presumably very few were Catholics. Hence we might reckon that well over 4,000 Protestants inhabited Malta at that time. With the increase of the English people in the Island, had its origin the question of Protestant propaganda and proselytism.

One of the first and foremost factors of Protestant propaganda and proselytism in our Island was the publication and the distribution of unauthorized bibles among the Maltese. Since some years, but mostly in the year 1809, the Bible Society of London suove to establish itself in Malta, and for this purpose it sent many boxes full of bibles in the Italian language to be distributed in the Island. This activity, however, was soon frustrated, because some of the bibles distributed in Valletta reached the local priests, who energetically fought this kind of Protestant propaganda and banned the reading of these bibles by the Catholics. This opposition kept in check for some years the activity of the Protestant Missionaries. But in 1814, after the end of the plague, the Biblical Sectarrians tried to infect the Island with their doctrines. For a second time they started spreading similar biblical versions, this time in greater

<sup>1</sup> *Melita Theologica*, Vol. XI (1959), pp. 45-50.

<sup>2</sup> By the Emancipation Act of 1829.

<sup>3</sup> Miège, *Histoire de Malte*, pp. 160-1.

quantities. They rented a house at Valletta, where to hold their religious gatherings, and they even translated St. John's Gospel in vernacular and published advertisements of their congregations in the public paper,<sup>4</sup> styling themselves the 'Biblical Society of Malta'.

Archbishop Ferdinando Mattei (1808-29), as in duty bound, immediately protested to the Governor against this proselytism, and asked him to expel the sectarians, who were openly conspiring against the Catholic Religion of the place. The Governor Thomas Maitland (1813-24) called the Ministers of the Society and prohibited them the use of their Printing Press, the name of the Society and any activity which could affect the Religion of Malta.<sup>5</sup> With the help of the Governor, therefore, the Bishop succeeded in stemming this initial Protestant proselytism.

A year later, however, Lord Bathurst, the then Secretary of State, informed the Governor that according to a constitutional principle of the English Nation, everybody was to be reckoned free in his religious operations. Consequently, he could not comply with the Archbishop's wish to expel the Sectarians, he only prohibited them to bear the name of 'Bible Society of Malta' and substituted therefor another name, i.e. the 'Bible Society in Malta', and banned the distribution of the Maltese version of the Gospel of St. John.<sup>6</sup> The Archbishop, with the aid of the local priests, as well as of the Governor himself, succeeded in gathering the Maltese versions, together with those in Italian and Greek, as well as other books containing dialogues and catechisms in favour of the Protestant Creed.<sup>7</sup>

Early in 1825, the Bible Society was again busy in its propaganda work in the Island. This caused the Bishop to send a Pro-memoria to the Holy Father, and to make representations to the British Government. In the meantime, the people ostensibly showed themselves contrary to the proselytizing system of the Protestant Missionaries. As a consequence, Lord Bathurst directed the attention of the Bible Society to the distribution of the Bible among the Roman Catholic Inhabitants, and directed them not to raise any inconvenient with a systematic attempt to make proselytes. He instructed the Governor Marquis Hastings (1814-26)

<sup>4</sup>When the English occupied Malta in 1800, there was only one Printing Press and this belonged to the Government. The censorship of writings was entrusted to the Government Chief Secretary and to the Superintendent of the Printing Press. By way of exception the American Missionary Society and a Society of English Independents were permitted to have and use their own Printing Press. A similar permit was granted later to the Church Missionary Society.

<sup>5</sup>Archiepiscopal Archives (A.A.)— 1826, pp. 615ss; 1827, p. 300: Bishop Mattei's Pro-memoria to the Holy See, 1825.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, 1826, p. 645 — Deputy Governor to Card. Secretary of State, 30.v.1825.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid, Pro-memoria, l.c.

that the gratuitous distribution of the Bible to the ships and vessels was a measure against which the Bishop could not offer any reasonable objection and informed him that the Bible Society in London had assured him to cease the distribution among the Roman Catholic Inhabitants.<sup>8</sup>

Later, the Cardinal Secretary of State, Giulio della Somaglia, strongly remonstrated to the Deputy Governor, Sir Manley Power, against the gratuitous distribution and the sale of the Holy Bible in Malta adducing that the Bible without the necessary comments which serve to point out the true meaning of the several passages, could lead the readers to different conclusions and different interpretations, and thus destroy that uniformity of belief, which is the essential and peculiar characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>9</sup>

In reply to this letter, the Deputy-Governor asserted that the man in whose hands were the reins of power in this Island would be failing from his duty and neglecting His Majesty's instructions, were he to deny any possible protection to the Inhabitants, who professed the Roman Catholic Religion. He reminded the Cardinal of what his predecessors had done against the Bible Society. He added that the Government did ban the printing of bibles not only in vernacular, but even in Italian, unless intended to be exported; and, if some tracts were being circulated in the Island, sure it was that they had been imported from abroad, and consequently the Government could not take steps, without destroying individual right.<sup>10</sup> He assured the Cardinal that the Government as in the past, would, in the future, take steps as would be deemed necessary to preserve the Roman Catholic Religion against the attempts of any Society or class of persons. He finally asked the Cardinal Secretary to stress to the Holy Father the point 'that the steps which sometimes it was expedient to take about this subject, would never be such as to violate the forms and practice constantly observed under the British Domination'.<sup>11</sup> This correspondence was communicated by Power to Lord Bathurst on the 15th September 1825.<sup>12</sup>

In spite of all this, on the 11th of June 1825, the Joint Treasurers to the Bible Society established in Malta – William Jowett, Daniel Temple and Cleardo Naudi – asked the Lt. Governor, through his Chief Secretary Sir Fred. Hankey, the licence to open a shop in premises No. 277, Strada Reale, Valletta, for the business of the sale of the Scriptures,

<sup>8</sup> Colonial Office (C.O.) 159/8: Lord Bathurst to Hastings, 4. v. 1825, p. 54.

<sup>9</sup> Royal Malta Library (R.M.L.) – *Despatches* 1822-1825: Power to Bathurst: 15. vi. 1825, pp. 112-6.

<sup>10</sup> Curiously enough the law of the time prohibited the printing of immoral and irreligious books or pamphlets; but it did not prohibit the importation thereof.

<sup>11</sup> A.A. – 1826, p. 645 – Power to Card. S. of S.: 30. v. 1825.

<sup>12</sup> R.M.L. – *Despatches* 1822-25: Power to Lord Bathurst: 15. vi. 1825, pp. 112-6.

sent by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The Chief Secretary was instructed to inform the petitioners that the licence applied for could not be granted, without giving them any reason for its withholding.<sup>13</sup> Copies of the Joint Treasurers' petition and the Chief Secretary's respective reply were transmitted to the British Secretary of State, as enclosures in a letter wherein the Deputy Governor informed the latter that the Bishop could not be reconciled to the proceedings either of the Bible Society or of the Missionaries established in Malta. He would, however, continue, as thitherto, to listen to what the Bishop had to represent on the matter, and to comply with his suggestions as far as might be compatible with His Lordship the Secretary of State's instructions. In the same letter Power remarked that the Joint Treasurers did not say in what languages the books they proposed selling were published, and, since there was an understanding between the Government and the Ecclesiastical Authorities that no translation of the Scriptures in Maltese should come forth, he could avail himself of this agreement to refuse the licence applied for.<sup>14</sup>

One of the signatories of the application was, as we have said, a certain Cleardo Naudi -- dubbed by Sir Manley 'a venal character, who had formerly been a Roman Catholic'. This fact considerably heightened the idea of the Maltese population that a desire prevailed on the part of the British Government to convert the Catholics to Protestantism. Sir Manley consequently stressed the point that no such idea should exist among the people for the peace and the tranquillity of the Island, 'because -- he said -- the Maltese had shown themselves the most peaceable people in the World on all occasions, since they came under the British Crown, as a consequence of Britain's non-interference with their Religion and of Her toleration of their habits on this subject, and they had only shown symptoms for a disposition to attack some of the Missionaries who a short time before tried to make converts in the Island'. The Deputy Governor revealed his doubts as to whether the Secretary of State, after his interview with the Bible Society in London, would expect an application from them to take 'such a decided step in a Catholic Country where the heads of the Church are violently hostile to the sale of the Bible altogether, and where the people are extremely bigoted in their Religion'.<sup>15</sup>

On the same day he transmitted this letter, the Joint Treasurers addressed another petition to Hankey, expressing their concern to find their request not granted and pointed out that the taking of that shop was a

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. pp. 118-20.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. p. 112.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 112.



measure adopted in consequence of an express recommendation, more than a year before, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, 'whose privilege it has been, in a manner most honourable to Great Britain and most gratifying to every Christian mind to impart the knowledge of the Word of God to almost every Nation under Heaven'. They added that, by withholding the licence, the progressive usefulness of the Society, instead of being confirmed, would become essentially impeded and restricted. Hence they begged a new consideration of their petition.<sup>15</sup> To which Hankey replied that he was far from wishing to throw impediments in the progressive usefulness of the Society, yet he did not deem it fitting to order the issue of the licence.<sup>17</sup> Both petition and answer were transmitted by the Chief Secretary to Robert Wilmot Horton, the Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, on the 18th of June, 1825.<sup>18</sup>

On the 7th of September, the Secretary of State, answering Power's letter, wrote that he could not admit the prohibition; but, at the same time, he instructed him to issue a licence permitting the Society to sell bibles *at their own Establishment with as little display as possible, and with as much tenderness as could be shown to the feelings of the Roman Catholic Inhabitants.*<sup>19</sup>

A. BONNICI

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 165.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 167.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 163.

<sup>19</sup> C.O. 159/8, pp. 99, 101 — Bathurst to Power: 7.ix.1825.

DE ORDINE CARITATIS  
INTER PROPRIAM ALTERIUSQUE VITAM  
IUXTA THEOLOGOS FRANCISCANOS SAEC. XVII(3)

CAPUT II

SENTENTIA AUCTORUM

VITAM ALTERIUS PROPRIAE PRAEFERRE PROHIBENTIUM

Sententia Auctorum vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittentium exposita examinataque, remanet ut consideremus hanc alteram sententiam id prohibentium; quam similiter in duobus articulis explanamus.

Art. I. EXPOSITIO SENTENTIAE

Patroni huius sententiae sunt: Sporer, Brancati et Hermann, quibus aliquomodo accedit Marchant. Iamvero, iuxta eos, ordo caritatis exigit ut quisque, quoad bona tum spiritualia cum corporalia, ceteris paribus, se ipsum magis et prius quam alterum diligat, seu diligere debeat. Proinde illicitum est pro Sporer vitam alterius propriae praeferre, seu propriam vitam corporalem et quidem certo periculo exponere ob solam vitam corporalem alterius.<sup>182</sup> Similiter tenet Brancati regulariter non esse licitum, ceteris paribus, corpus proprium pro corpore proximi periculo exponere,<sup>183</sup> neque Hermann aliter asserit.<sup>184</sup>

<sup>182</sup>P. Sporer, o.c., tom. I, p. 480b: 'Contra tamen: Non solum neminem teneri, sed neque licere corporalem vitam exponere, vel amittere ob solam vitam corporalem amici, post D. August. cit. docet communis Recentiorum, post Navar. aliis citt. Laym. cit. c. 3 n. 4. Ratio est: quia si virtus, et ordo caritatis dictat, ut propriam quis praeferat alienae, ut omnes concedunt, sequitur nullam virtutis, et honestatis rationem esse contrarium agere, et sic ruit fundamentum oppositae sententiae. Dixi autem: Pro sola vita corporali. Licebit enim vitam exponere corporalem pro vita corporali proximi, si eius morti annexa esset mors spiritualis animae'.

<sup>183</sup>L. Brancati, o.c., tom. IV, p. 153a: 'Dico 6. regulariter loquendo, non est licitum, caeteris paribus, exponere se periculo cruciatuum, et mortis, pro salvanda vita, vel arcendis proximi cruciatibus, aliquando tamen ex divina inspiratione licitum est'.

<sup>184</sup>A. Hermann, o.c., tom. II, p. 211b: 'An liceat se pro alio morti offerre? Suppono hoc licitum esse, si ille alius sit talis, a quo dependet publicum bonum, ut si v.g. esset princeps, aut aliqua alia persona Reipublicae valde necessaria.

Hi Auctores adhibent tantum terminum *vitam exponere* vel eam periculo exponere, neque loquuntur de 'mori pro alio', 'morti se exponere' aut 'morti seipsum tradere' etc.; neque distinguunt 'exponere se periculo certo aut *probabili*', vel 'morti *certae* se tradere', ratio probabiliter est quia verbis 'ceteris paribus' iam subintelligunt quod agitur heic de pari necessitate, ideoque sufficit eis adhibere terminum genericum; ceterum practice difficile erit scitu quando subsit mors certa aut probabilis, agendo praesertim de casibus, in quibus causae sunt liberae.<sup>185</sup> Deinde in solo Sporer notamus illud 'pro *sola* vita amici', in aliis vero Auctoribus id deest verbaliter, sed, cum asserant quod res considerari oportet ceteris paribus, id relinquunt subaudiri. Quod vero Brancati illo 'regulariter' excludere voluerit casum divinae inspirationis dignum est notatu, quia optime fieri potest casus exceptionalis, quo ex. gr. facta heroica nonnullarum personarum virtuosarum explicantur.<sup>186</sup>

Fortasse summi momenti est pro istis Auctoribus subsignare illud 'ceteris paribus', nempe quando cetera sunt paria, si ex parte ipsius diligentis et dilecti bonum eiusdem ordinis attendatur, aliis semper sepositis circumstantiis, ut notabilis inaequalitatis, alterius virtutis vel etiam excellentioris caritatis,<sup>187</sup> heroicae caritatis,<sup>188</sup> divinae inspirationis<sup>189</sup> et boni communis.<sup>190</sup> Ceterum isti Auctores pro sua thesi sustinenda bene poterant influxum subire ex illo nostri Halensis quod propria vita corporalis, relate ad animam, plus quam alterius diligenda est.<sup>191</sup>

## Art. 2. EXAMEN ARGUMENTORUM

Patroni huius alterius sententiae similiter recurrunt ad argumenta auctoritatis et rationis pro sua thesi probanda.

Tota ergo difficultas est, an hoc liceat facere pro persona particulari? Dico. Non licet vitam propriam exponere pro vita alterius. Ita Doctor in 3 dist. 29 quaest. unica et in 4 dist. 15 q. 2'.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. A. *Ex philos.* in fine.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. notae 12-6, 160.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. P. Sporer, o. c., tom. II, p. 162a (vid. etiam nota 64).

<sup>188</sup> L. Brancati, o. c., tom. II, disp. 32, p. 764b: 'Dico... heroica vero charitatis signa sunt haec... in effectu agere; vel in efficaci affectu, si desit occasio effectus, et vitam temporalem propriam pro temporali proximi... postponere, ac profundere'.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. nota 183.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. nota 184.

<sup>191</sup> Alexander de Hales, *Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum* tom. III dist. XXIX (Quaracchi 1954, p. 342): '4. In primo capitulo huius distinctionis dicitur quod 'alius homo plus quam corpus proprium diligendus est'. Contra: plus diligere debeo animam meam quam proximum meum; sed stola secunda est de beatitudine animae; ergo, cum sit in corpore materialiter, plus diligere deberem proprium corpus in relatione ad animam quam proximum'.

I. ARGUMENTA AUCTORITATIS<sup>192</sup>

Eodem modo ac patroni primae sententiae Auctores huius sententiae argumenta sumunt ex S. Scriptura, ex SS. Patribus, ex theologis et ex philosophis.

## I. Ex S. Scriptura

Quando agunt de ordine caritatis in genere auctores argumentum potissimum quod ex SS. Litteris sumere consuescunt, est textus Matthaei 22, 39: 'Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum', ex quo inferunt quod quis seipsum plus quam alterum diligere debet. Sed nostri Auctores, quaestionem considerantes in particulari, nempe utrum ordo caritatis dicet alterum alteri praeferre quoad vitam seu corpus, hunc locum Matthaei omittunt, fortasse quia illum supponunt ex capite de ordine caritatis in genere.

Nihilominus hunc textum scripturasticum pro hac sententia explicite revocat Cotonius, nempe pro sententia Scoti asserentis quod ibi proponitur dilectio sui tanquam regula dilectionis proximi; ex quo ceteris paribus non licet homini propriam vitam periculo exponere pro altero.<sup>193</sup> Ast idem Cotonius pro hac altera sententia id explicat dicens quod utique illicitum est propriam vitam morti certae exponere pro altero privato, minime vero eam exponere periculo cum aliqua spe, seu quod iuxta regulam diligendi, primum prohibetur, non vero secundum.<sup>194</sup>

Revera locus Matth. favere videtur huic alteri sententiae et difficultatem facere primae sententiae, ut nonnulli alii auctores id evidenter tenent; nempe amorem sui proponi a Christo ut ideam et mensuram dilectionis proximi non distinguendo de vita spiritali aut corporali, ex eo quod illud 'sicut' pro 'ad similitudinem' seu 'ad imitationem', non vero pro 'ad aequalitatem' intelligi oportet,<sup>195</sup> ideoque, uti mensura potior est

<sup>192</sup> Secundum Lorca (1554-1606) stant patroni etiam gravissimi pro hac sententia (Petrus de Lorca OCist, *Commentaria et disputationes in secundam secundae D. Thomae*, Madridi 1614, p. 718b).

<sup>193</sup> A. Cotonius, o. c., P. I, p. 70a: 'An liceat pro servanda vita temporali privati? Scotus in 3 d. 29 arg. ad oppos. apud Dianam p. 5 tr. 4 res. 28 negat: quia dilectio sui est mensura dilectionis proximi, dicente Domino Matth. 22: *Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum*'.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. nota 24.

<sup>195</sup> Sic inter alios S. Bonaventura, *In tertium librum Sententiarum d. XXIX a. un. q. III* (3, 939a) imprimis obiectionem ex loco Matthaei refert: '2. Item, Matthaei 22, 39: *Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum*: hoc quod est 'sicut' aut est nota similitudinis aut aequalitatis. Si similitudinis tantum, eadem ratione posset dicere: diliges proximum tuum sicut Deum. Si aequalitatis, ergo non videtur quod sit ordo dilectionis respectu nostri ad dilectionem respectu proximi...'. Ad quod respondet: 'Concedendae sunt igitur rationes ostendentes quod in ordine caritatis praefertur dilectio sui dilectioni ipsius proximi. Et huius signum est,

mensurato, quis se ipsum prius et plus quam alterum diligere debet.

## 2. Ex SS. Patribus

Potius argumentum sumunt auctores huius alterius sententiae ex Patribus, speciatim ex S. Augustino, qui in libro *De mendacio* ita explicite huic sententiae favisse videretur ut unanimiter eius patroni atque nonnulli etiam adversariorum, validitatem textus augustiniani aperte agnoscant.<sup>196</sup> En verba S. Doctoris:

‘... Quandoquidem si pro illius temporali vita suam ipsam temporalem perdat, non est iam diligere sicut seipsum, sed plus quam seipsum: quod sanae doctrinae regulam excedit.’<sup>197</sup>

Probabiliter S. Augustino veniebat in mentem illud saepe a vulgo tanquam rectum habitum, nempe bene ageret homo, qui proximo prodesset etiam mentiendo, saltem in rebus parvi momenti. Hoc adhuc illicitum esse affirmat S. Augustinus, quia sic homo periculo exponeret propriam vitam spiritualem propter proximum, quod regulam dilectionis excedit; sicut regulam sanae doctrinae excedit ille, qui propriam vitam corporalem exponit pro vita corporali alterius.

quia illi reprehenduntur et stulti reputantur qui saltem propriam negligunt ut procurent alienam. Huius etiam signum est, quia, si homo ex caritate deberet diligere proximum quantum se ipsum ita quod esset ibi omnimoda aequalitas, iam duos proximos deberet diligere duplo quam se ipsum, et tres in triplo, et sic ulterius ascendendo; quod in nullo habente caritatem reperiri contingit, quantumcumque perfecto.../ - 2. Ad illud quod obicitur, quod secundum divinum mandatum debet homo diligere proximum sicut semetipsum, dicendum quod ‘sicut’ non est nota perfectae aequalitatis sive commensurationis, sed expressae similitudinis...’. Cornelius A Lapide, o. c., tom. VIII, p. 330b: ‘Omittit hic Christus dilectionem sui ipsius, quia haec omnibus insita est et quasi naturalis, ut si habens erga alios charitatem, illam primo in seipsum exerccas: qui enim sibi nequam, cui bonus? Unde illam hic Christus praesupponit, imo dilectionem sui, statuit ideam et quasi mensuram dilectionis proximi, dicens, *Sicut seipsum amas et diligis*’. E. Müller, *Theologia moralis*, lib. II, p. 102: ‘Regula I. Quisque ordinario debet se magis diligere quam proximum. Probatur I. quia a Christo Domino [Matth. 22, 39] dilectio sui ipsius ponitur tamquam regula dilectionis erga proximum...’.

<sup>196</sup> Patroni huius alterius sententiae textum S. Augustini unanimiter referunt: P. Sporer, o. c., tom. I, p. 480b: ‘Contra tamen: Non solum neminem teneri, sed neque licere corporalem vitam exponere, vel amittere ob solam vitam corporalem amici, post D. August. I. cit. docet communis Recentiorum’. L. Brancati, o. c., tom. IV, p. 153b: ‘Prob. prima pars videtur contra ordinem charitatis, qui exigit ut se prius, et plus quam proximum quis diligat. ergo. Prob. 2. ex August. lib. de mendac. Cons. c. 6 *Si quis...*’. A. Hermann, o. c., tom. II, p. 211b: ‘Probatur auctoritate S. Augustini lib. de mendacio cap. 6 ubi sic ait: *Si quis exponat vitam...*’. Cf. inter auctores primae sententiae F. Pitigianis, o. c., P. II, p. 318a; E. Bassaeus, o. c., tom. I, p. 132a et G. Herzinx, o. c., p. 213a.

<sup>197</sup> S. Augustinus, *De mendacio liber unus* 6 (ML 40, 494).

Textus sic simpliciter propositus videtur difficultatem facere primae sententiae; sed auctores illum explicare conantur pro sua sententia. Dubitant enim utrum illud 'regulam excedit' sumi oporteat pro contra aut praeter regulam ita ut heic habeatur excessus illicitus; alii id intelligunt sensu quo propria vita pro vita proximi exponitur seipsam morti tradendo sive vitam amittendo: iam vero hoc sensu certe id illicitum est, quia homo non est dominus vitae suae,<sup>198</sup> non vero alio sensu quo homo propriam vitam periculo exponat, negative cooperando propriae morti.<sup>199</sup> Alii autem id intelligunt eo sensu quod non cadit sub praecepto propriam vitam exponere pro vita alterius, non vero quod illicitum est.<sup>200</sup> Alii tandem id volunt sumere sensu quo utique illicitum est propriam vitam exponere pro altero, si nihil aliud omnino spectetur quam vita pro vita ponatur, hoc enim regulam excedit, non vero si habeatur ibi aliqua causa;<sup>201</sup> vel etiamsi adsit excessus in illo qui, ceteris paribus, propriam vitam pro altero exponit, huiusmodi tamen excessus erit tantum exiguus, qui sine mortali praetermitti potest.<sup>202</sup>

Hoc non obstante, textus augustinianus ita difficultatem facere videtur primae sententiae, ut Soto id expresse fateatur<sup>203</sup> atque nonnulli, ut Vitoria, Aragon et Bañez, de eo sileant.

### 3. *Ex theologis*

Auctores huius alterius sententiae similiter, post SS. Patres, ad auctoritatem theologorum recurrit, tum affirmando hanc alteram esse sententiam communem recentiorum,<sup>204</sup> cum explicite referendo nonnullorum

<sup>198</sup> Ita E. Rodriguez, o. c., P. I, f. 164d: 'illicitum est ob salutem temporalem hominis privati tradere se morti. Haec conclusio est Diui Augustini, quae probatur, quia tenetur homo amare se, & proximum, ita ut non amittat vitam suam, quod homo est dominus suarum rerum temporalium, non tamen est dominus vitae suae'.

<sup>199</sup> E. Rodriguez, o. c., P. I, f. 164c (cf. nota 22).

<sup>200</sup> Sic. G. Sayer, o. c., P. I, f. 225: 'S. Augustinus vero tantum vult ibi, quod regulam doctrinae excedit, vitam suam pro alio ponere, cum hoc non sit sub praecepto, non tamen negat esse licitum'.

<sup>201</sup> Ita inter ceteros I. Azor, o. c., P. II, p. 702b asserit: 'Ad id vero quod ex S. Augustino adferebatur; respondeo, eum id significare voluisse tantummodo, hominem, qui vitam propriam ponit pro amico, magis in hoc diligere amicum, quam seipsum; hoc tamen vitiosum non esse, dummodo bonum gratiae, gloriae, et virtutis sibi ipsi magis velit, et optet, quam amico. Et fortasse S. Augustinus dicere voluit, contra ordinem charitatis facere, qui temere, et vane vitam suam pro amico perdit, non qui perdit, ut amicitiae bonum tueatur, et seruet'.

<sup>202</sup> F. Suarez, *De caritate*, in *Opera Omnia* tom. XII tr. III disp. IX sect. III (p. 713b): '... ordo charitatis, quando non est magnus excessus, potest praetermitti sine mortali... solum hoc sibi volunt August...'

<sup>203</sup> Cf. nota 128.

<sup>204</sup> Cf. nota 182.

nomina, quorum principaliores sunt sequentes: S. Thomas, S. Bonaventura, Scotus, Durandus, Navarra et Laymann.<sup>205</sup>

1) S. Thomas. Etsi iste favisse videatur sententiae vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittenti, ipse tamen habet adhuc textus, qui videntur facere pro hac altera sententia. Etenim, agendo de eleemosyna, duobus in locis nostram quaestionem insinuat, scilicet in commentario in IV *Sententiarum* et in II-II *Summae theologiae*, loquendo vero de homicidio in eadem *Summa* textum producit huic sententiae favorabilem.

(a) In commentario in IV *Sententiarum* affirmat Doctor Angelicus quod esset contra ordinem caritatis dare eleemosynam de necessario necessitate absoluta.<sup>206</sup> Nunc quomodo illud 'contra ordinem caritatis' intelligatur et de quanam necessitate proximi agatur, inquirendum est. Vitoria, inter ceteros, asserit S. Thomam verbis 'hoc esset contra ordinem caritatis' voluisse intelligere non de ordine caritatis id praecipiente, sed de ordine conveniente et ad id inclinante; aliunde neque eum explicite locutum fuisse de extrema necessitate proximi, cum optime potuerit ille intelligere quod homo faceret contra ordinem caritatis, si, de necessariis necessitate prima proximo extra extremam necessitatem constituto eleemosynam daret.<sup>207</sup>

Etsi haec interpretatio Vitoria sit bona, non tamen sibi evicisse videtur sectatores; e contra nonnulli auctores ex prima sententia textum S. Thomae aperte revocant pro hac altera sententia.<sup>208</sup>

(b) Textus adhuc frequentiores sumuntur ex eodem S. Thoma, et quidem ex eius *Summa theologiae*, in qua duo textus principales inveniuntur scilicet articulus VI quaestionis XXXII et articulus VII quaestionis

<sup>205</sup> Inter quos enumeratur etiam Thomas Hurtado CRM (1598-1659), *Tractatus varii solutionum moralium* 2 partes (Lugduni 1651), cuius tamen textum, proh dolor, non potuimus invenire.

<sup>206</sup> S. Thomas, *Scriptum super quarto Sententiarum* d. XV q. 11 (tom. IV, p. 678): 'Et ideo dicitur communiter quod dare eleemosynam de superfluo, cadit in praeepto... dare autem de eo quod est necessarium secunda necessitate [conditionata], non autem de eo quod est necessarium necessitate prima [absoluta], quia hoc esset contra ordinem caritatis'.

<sup>207</sup> F. Vitoria, *De caritate et prudentia*, pp. 107-8: 'Ad illud *Quarti Sententiarum*, quod esset contra ordinem caritatis, transeat, quia verum est quod convenientissimus ordo caritatis est quod potius servem vitam meam. Ergo est malum: nego consequentiam, quia non semper ille ordo caritatis est in praeepto, ut postea dicemus. Con-/venientissimum esset quod ego me plus diligerem, sed non teneor; et ideo non esset peccatum ponere vitam pro amico'.

<sup>208</sup> Sic explicite F. Suarez, *l.c.*, p. 713a: '... ubi divus Thomas [in IV *Sent.*, d. XV] q. 2 a. 1, dicit esse contra ordinem caritatis dare alteri extreme indigenti, id quo ego etiam extreme indigeo'. R. Aversa, *o.c.*, p. 548a-b: 'Et plane S. Thomas q. 32 a. 6 dicens, hominem plus teneri vitae suae providere quam alienae, et in 4/d. 15 q. 2 a. 1 dicens esse contra ordinem caritatis in casu extremae indigentiae praeferre alterum sibi ipsi'.

LXIV, ambo ex Secunda Secundae.

Quod attinet ad primum textum invenimus quid simile ac in illo commentarii in IV *Sententiarum*. Aserit enim S. Doctor quod homo [paterfamilias] non debet, de necessariis necessitate absoluta, eleemosynam alicui privato dare, etsi, ex amore boni communis, possit laudabiliter eam dare personae publicae.<sup>209</sup>

Hunc textum, quoad partem affirmativam, idem Vitoria duplici suppositione explicat, nempe quod S. Doctor agebat de re, minime ceteris paribus. Nam vel loquebatur de persona publica succurrente personae privatae, vel de persona privata ex utraque parte; si primo casu, patet conclusio Angelici; si vero secundo, adhuc supponi potest vel loquebatur de extrema necessitate ex parte succurrendi vel non; etiamsi ipse affirmaverit, nondum tamen constaret eum locutum fuisse de re, ceteris paribus, sed e contra constat eum asseruisse, ex parte succurrentis de persona, familiae aliisque pro sustentatione corporali necessaria, ex parte vero succurrendi, de simplici privato.<sup>210</sup>

Similiter dicendum est de hoc textu ac pro illo praecedenti.<sup>211</sup>

Quod attinet vero ad alteram argumentationem, nempe illam *Summae theologiae* II-II q. LXIV a. VII mens S. Doctoris clarior apparet, quia in eo vita corporalis ex utraque parte expresse asseritur, nempe quod homo debet prius propriae vitae corporali providere quam alienae;<sup>212</sup> quod ita

<sup>209</sup> S. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II q. XXXII a. VI (vol. II, pp. 174b-175a): 'Respondeo dicendum quod necessarium dupliciter dicitur. Uno modo, sine quo aliquid esse non potest. Et de tali necessario omnino eleemosyna dari non debet: puta si aliquis in articulo necessitatis constitutus haberet solum unde posset sustentari, et filii sui vel alii ad eum pertinentes; de hoc enim necessario eleemosynam dare est sibi et suis vitam subtrahere. / Sed hoc dico nisi forte talis casus immineret ubi, subtrahendo sibi, daret alicui magnae personae, per quam Ecclesia vel respublica sustentaretur: quia pro talis personae liberatione se ipsum et suos laudabiliter periculo mortis exponeret, cum bonum commune sit proprio praefendum'.

<sup>210</sup> F. Vitoria, *De caritate et prudentia*, p. 107: 'Ad hoc dico, tenendo partem affirmativam, quod hoc intelligitur quando non est necessitas extrema aliorum, et ego sum in extrema necessitate, non debeo erogare aliis bona mea. Secus si omnes sumus in extrema necessitate, quia tunc bene possem. Praeterea, quia S. Thomas ibi dicit quod qui de necessariis ad vitam faceret eleemosynam, subtraheret sibi et suis vitam. Unde nos quoque dicimus quod si iste habeat solum necessaria unde sustentetur eius familia, non potest dare eleemosynam de illo. Sed si dando solus ipse detrimentum patiatur, credo quod licet dare amico'.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. id quod paulo prius diximus sub littera a).

<sup>212</sup> S. Thomas, *Summa theologiae* II-II q. LXIV a. VII (vol. II, p. 319b): 'Et ideo si aliquis ad defendendum propriam vitam utatur maiori violentia quam oporteat, erit illicitum. Si vero moderate violentiam repellat, erit licita defensio: nam secundum iura, vim vi repellere licet cum moderamine inculpatae tutelae. Nec est necessarium ad salutem ut homo actum moderatae tutelae praetermittat ad evitandum occisionem alterius: quia plus tenetur homo vitae suae providere quam vitae alterius'.



pro hac sententia probat, ut difficultatem facere videatur ipsi etiam Vitoria,<sup>213</sup> et ut vim probativam eiusdem agnoscant nonnulli adversarii.<sup>214</sup>

Nostri tamen Auctores, perpensis forsitan variis rationibus habitis inter theologos, tum pro cum contra hanc alteram sententiam, mentem Aquinatis interpretari penitus se abinent.

2) S. Bonaventuram huic sententiae favisse in eius commentario in III *Sententiarum* testatur Cotonius.<sup>215</sup> Iamvero Doctor Seraphicus, loquendo de bono proprio et alterius diligendo, interrogat utrum secundum ordinem caritatis praeponendum sit bonum proprium bono proximi, quasi ex sola ratione bonorum, et respondet quod amor salutis propriae praeferendus est amor salutis proximi. Notamus quod is de salute loquitur simpliciter, neque constat utrum intellexerit de vita corporali aut spiritali.<sup>216</sup>

Evidenter S. Bonaventura disserit heic de ordine caritatis, seu de bonis ordinate diligendis, cuius oppositum est bona praepostere diligere: Ast, quisnam est ordo caritatis pro illo? 'Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum'<sup>217</sup> et 'Attende tibi et doctrinae'<sup>218</sup> sunt textus scripturistici qui pro S. Bonaventura ita insinuant dilectionem sui haberi tanquam regulam dilectionis erga alterum ut ordo caritatis a se ipso incipere oporteat. Hoc tamen non obstante, quaerit idem Doctor utrum hic ordo praeposterari possit necne, et respondendo in eadem d. Dub. I distinguit quod est praeposteratio *ex debita causa*, quod facit ad cumulum meriti et quod est praeposteratio *praeter causam debitam*, quod subtrahit meritum et

<sup>213</sup> F. Vitoria, *ib.*: '... Sed certe nescio quomodo S. Thomas respondeat ad illum locum ubi laudat gentiles, scilicet Pyladem et Orestem ponentes vitam pro amicis'.

<sup>214</sup> Cf. nota 208.

<sup>215</sup> A. Cotonius, *o. c.*, P. I, p. 70a: 'An liceat pro servanda vita temporali privati? Scotus in 3 d. 29 arg. ad oppos. apud Dianam p. 5 tr. 4 res. 28 negat... Hanc sententiam tenet novissime Thomas Hurtado de vero mart. res. 63 § 5 et fuit etiam doctrina D. Bonav. eadem d. q. 3 et Durandi in 4 d. 17 q. 6 n. 10'. G. Sayer, *l. c.* idem affirmat (cf. nota 144).

<sup>216</sup> S. Bonaventura, *In tertium librum Sententiarum* d. XXIX a. un. q. III (in *Opera omnia*, vol. III, p. 644b): 'Respondeo: Dicendum quod secundum ordinem caritatis amor salutis propriae praeponendus est amor salutis alienae, secundum quod auctoritates Sanctorum innuunt manifeste et secundum etiam quod consonat et dicitur iudicium rationis rectae et instinctus naturae. Ratio enim huius est, quoniam unumquodque plus appetit perfectionem in se ipso quam in suo simili: et quodlibet pondus plus trahit corpus in quo est ad situm sibi debitum quam trahat aliud corpus illi annexum...'

<sup>217</sup> Matth. 22, 39.

<sup>218</sup> S. Bonaventura, *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Lucae* c. VI (7, 162a): 'Debet enim caritas esse ordinata, ut primo intendat sibi et post alii, secundum illud primae ad Tim. quarto: 'Attende tibi et doctrinae. Hoc enim faciens, et te ipsum salvum facies et eos qui tecum sunt'. Cf. 1. Tim. 4, 16.

quod est praeposteratio *contra* debitam causam quod inducit peccatum; homo solum licite et laudabiliter agere potest *ex* debita causa, bonum commune bono privato praeferendo.<sup>219</sup> Unde ex hoc capite videtur mens S. Bonaventurae favisse sententiae vitam alterius propriae praeferre prohibenti.

Aliunde Doctor Seraphicus quaestionem insinuare videtur respectu illius Ioann. 15, 13 dicens quod signum et effectus caritatis perfectae est mori pro fratre,<sup>220</sup> vel pro alicuius amore,<sup>221</sup> aut signum praecipuum caritatis est mori pro amico.<sup>222</sup> Cum in istis textibus nihil sit explicitum utrum consulendum sit vitae spirituali aut corporali proximi seu amici, interpretari licet saltem S. Bonaventura, cum loquatur de proximo aut de propria salute in genere, nempe de bono unius bono alterius praefereendo, bene potuisse intelligere, ut bonum spirituale unius bono spirituali, a fortiori corporali alterius seu proximi, aut etiam ut bonum corpo-

<sup>219</sup> S. Bonaventura, *In tertium librum Sententiarum*, ib. Dub. I (3, 652a): 'Respondeo: Dicendum quod quaedam est praeposteratio huius ordinis ex debita causa, quaedam praeter causam, quaedam contra debitam causam. Tunc est praeposteratio ex debita causa, quando quis bonum commune praeronit bono proprio in temporalibus; et haec quidem praeposteratio facit ad meritum cumulum, et licet videatur praeposteratio, multo magis est perfectior ordinatio. Alia est praeposteratio praeter causam debitam, uti si ex sola liberalitate voluntatis meae magis me exhibeam alicui extraneo quam domestico et consanguineo et etiam patri meo, considerando in ipso aliquam strenuitatem magis quam Dei voluntatem aut meriti dignitatem; et haec praeposteratio aufert meritum, quia in hoc non meretur. Tertia vero est praeposteratio contra debitam causam, utpote si pater meus magis indigeat et ego possim ei subvenire, et, ipso neglecto, subventionem extraneo; et ista inducit peccatum et de hac intelligitur auctoritas Magistri in littera'.

<sup>220</sup> S. Bonaventura, ib. Dub. V (3, 654a): 'Respondeo: Dicendum quod *signum* perfectae caritatis et *effectus* est promptitudo moriendi pro fratre; ista tamen promptitudo non inest caritati solummodo ex dilectione fratris, sed ex dilectione fratris relata ad dilectionem Dei, quem perfectus propter se et super omnia diligit et ob cuius amorem etiam pro ipso fratre vult mori'.

<sup>221</sup> S. Bonaventura, *Apologia pauperum* c. IV (8, 253a): 'Ubi igitur perfectus est amor, ibi et perfecta diffusio vel actu, si opportunitas adest, vel si non adest, saltem desiderio pleno. Cum igitur traditio sui in mortem pro alicuius amore sit diffusionis permaximae, necesse est perfectum caritatis amorem ad id aspirare, iuxta quod dicitur in Ioanne: *Maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet, ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis*'.

<sup>222</sup> S. Bonaventura, *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis*, c. XV (6, 451b-452a): 'Quaestio II. Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis*. Contra: 1. Ex parva caritate alius facit, alius ex maiori potest mori pro amico; quid est ergo, quod dicit *maiolem*? / 2. Item, in patria erit multo maior caritas, quam sit in via; quid est ergo, quod dicit *maiolem caritatem* etc.? Respondeo, quod hoc non dicitur quantum ad *habitus* caritatis, vel *actum eius praecipuum*; sed quantum ad *signum* vel *effectum*, quia hoc est praecipuum signum dilectionis'.

rare unius bono spirituali coniunctum, solo corporali alterius praeferatur. Ceterum hoc confirmari potest etiam textibus eius citandis, nempe de obligatione proximum, in articulo extremae necessitatis constitutum, eripiendi<sup>223</sup> et de exemplo Christi suam vitam pro salute nostra ponendi.<sup>224</sup>

3) I.D. Scotus allegatur ab Hermann pro hac sententia sustinenda tum ex commentario in III *Sententiarum* cum in IV *Sententiarum*. Etenim Doctor Subtilis in primo loco iuxta Hermann asserit ordinem caritatis obligare ut homo prius et magis se ipsum quam alterum diligat, quod confirmatur in loco IV *Sententiarum* in quo Scotus, iuxta eundem Hermann, tenet illicitum esse propriam vitam ponere pro vita alterius privati.<sup>225</sup>

Re quidem vera Scotus in commentario in IV *Sententiarum* absolute sententiam pronuntiat dicens caritatem ita debere esse ordinatam ut homo rem alienam, etsi extreme sibi necessaria sit, domino restituat, quia caritas ordinata cum iustitia currere, non vero ei contraire, oportet; ita ut homo magis conservationem *iustam* vitae proximi diligere debet.<sup>226</sup>

<sup>223</sup> S. Bonaventura, *Commentarius in Evangelium Ioannis* c. X (6, 388b-389a): 'Quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus suis*. / Ex hoc videtur 1. quod *praelatus* teneatur mori pro subditis. *Sed contra*: Pati martyrism est supererogationis; sed ad opera supererogationis nullus tenetur, nisi voto se adstrinxerit: ergo videtur, quod *praelatus* ad hoc non teneatur. 2. Item videtur, quod *omnes* teneantur ad hoc; primae Ioannis tertio: *Nos debemus pro fratribus animas ponere*. Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *mori* pro grege dominico potest esse tripliciter: aut pro ipso *de bono in melium promovendo*, et sic est *supererogationis* quantum ad *omnes praelatus*; aut pro ipso *ab imminente periculo liberando*, et sic tenetur *quilibet praelatus*, quia suscepit curam gregis dominici, et *de manu eius requiretur sanguis* [Ez. 3, 18]; aut pro ipso *in extremae necessitatis articulo constituto*, quod non potest evadere damnationem, nisi homo se morti exponat; et sic dico, quod est *necessitatis quantum ad omnes*'.

<sup>224</sup> S. Bonaventura, *ib.* (6, 434a): 'Et *modus diligendi* exprimitur: *Sicut dilexi vos, ut et vos diligatis invicem*. Ipse autem sic dilexit, ut magis diligeret salutem nostram quam vitam suam; sic unusquisque magis animam proximi quam corpus suum' (cf. I Ioann. 3, 16).

<sup>225</sup> Cf. A. Hermann, *o.c.*, tom. I aphor. V tr. IV disp. II q. IV, p. 231a: cf. etiam nota 184.

<sup>226</sup> I.D. Scotus, *Quaestiones in quartum librum Sententiarum* d. XV q. II (18, 255b) refert imprimis obiectionem dicens: 'Item, *quilibet* tenetur magis diligere se quam proximum, secundum illud Cant. 2 *Ordinavit in me charitatem*: ergo quando restitutio est sibi ipsi damnosa, ut si est in extrema necessitate, tenetur magis illud sibi retinere, quam ex dilectione alterius alii restituere'. Et respondet: 'Et si arguas, quod magis debet *quilibet* se diligere quam proximum, et per consequens, magis vitam suam corporalem quam vitam proximi, et per consequens, istam rem simpliciter necessariam sibi magis retinere quam dare proximo; respondet, magis debet diligere vitam suam ordinate, ut est diligibilis ad vitam aeternam, et ita magis conservationem justam vitae suae, quam conservationem justam vitae proximi, sed non magis conservationem injustam vitae suae, quam conservationem justam vitae proximi... Cuius ratio est, quia dilectio vitae corporalis injuste custoditae, non est dilectio ordinata, quia non est ad dilectionem animae, nec Dei'.

Nihilominus Subtilis hic loquitur tantum de obligatione propriam vitam proximi antepone[n]di, non autem dicit explicite utrum homo possit id agere aut non, cum accedat alia motiva. Hoc non obstante Scotus videtur fuisse huic alterae sententiae, eo quod absolute affirmat hominem debere magis diligere propriam vitam quam alterius.

4) G. Durandus pro hac altera sententia a Pitigianis et Cotonio<sup>227</sup> adducitur. Durandus enim in commentario in III *Sententiarum* asserit quemlibet se ipsum plus quam amicum diligere debet, etiam quando pro eo multa pati et mori oporteat;<sup>228</sup> hoc est, ut postea asserit ipse in commentario in IV *Sententiarum*, quod homo facere debet id quod pertinet ad rationem amicitiae, etiamsi ex hoc propria mors sequatur, non autem mortem propter amicum oppetere.<sup>229</sup>

Etsi Durandus in priori textu fuisse videatur primae sententiae, difficile est tamen dictu[m] quid reapse sibi voluerit; probabiliter, ut tenent iidem Pitigianis et Cotonius,<sup>230</sup> quod non licet homini propriam vitam exponere morti certae aut periculo certo, licet tamen eam exponere peri-

<sup>227</sup> F. Pitigianis, o.c., P. II, p. 318a: 'Hoc supposito de hac quaestione est duplex modus dicendi; Primus est Durandi in 4 d. 17 a. 6 qui tenet nunquam esse licitum exponere certo periculo vitam propriam ad tuendam vitam amici, bene tamen quando est spes euadendi periculum'. Cf. nota 215.

<sup>228</sup> G. Durandus, *Commentarius in III librum Sententiarum* d. XXIX a. un. q. II (pp. 593b-594a): 'Unde non est verum quod aliqui dicunt quod quando Arist. dicit quod studiosus exponens se pro amicis, vel patria vult sibi maximum bonum, et ita maxime diligit se, quod ibi non fit comparatio dilectionis qua homo diligit se uno modo ad dilectionem qua diligit se alio modo. Et est sensus quod homo exponendo se morti pro bono communi magis diligit se hoc faciendo, quam faciendo oppositum vel quodcumque aliud. Istud enim non est verum, imo fit prima comparatio et non secunda / ut patet ex ordine textus... ergo plus debet quis diligere bonum virtutis sibi quam communitati. Quod si exponat se pro communitate, hoc est tribuendo communitati minus bonum, scilicet bonum corporale, sibi autem maius bonum, scilicet bonum virtutis... constat quod quilibet debet diligere se plusquam amicum. Et tamen sicut dicit Philosophus 9 Ethic. oportet pro amicis multa pati et mori si oporteat, ergo ex hoc quod aliquis exponit se morti pro alio non sufficienter arguitur quod diligit alium plusquam se, quicquid sit illud sive persona privata, sive res publica...'

<sup>229</sup> G. Durandus, *Commentarius in IV Sententiarum* d. XVII q. VI (p. 764b) relata obiectione '2. Item nono Ethic. dicit Philosophus, quod oportet pro amicis multa pati, & mori si oporteat, sed plus tenetur aliquis diligere communitatem quam privatos amicos, ergo pro bono communi debet homo eligere mori si necesse est...', asserit: '12. Ad secundum argumentum dicendum quod illud confirmat nostrum, quia constat quod nullus debet diligere amicum plusquam seipsum; & ideo nullus debet eligere mori pro conservatione vitae amici, sed solum debet facere id quod pertinet ad rationem amicitiae. Et si ex hoc sequatur mors, non tamen sequitur ex electione, sed casualiter, nec solum exponit se homo licite periculis mortis pro defensione reipublicae, vel amici, sed etiam pro defensione bonorum suorum temporalium...'. (p. 766a).

<sup>230</sup> Cf. nota 227.

culo cum aliqua spe vel cum spe periculum evadendi; aut etiam homo, proximi seu amici gratia, ita agere debet, ut non timeat propriam mortem.

5) P. Navarra iuxta Sporer<sup>231</sup> et Bassaeum<sup>232</sup> pro hac altera sententia facit in libro secundo *De restitutione*, et quidem cum argumentis non contemnendis. Sed quid tenuerit ipse Navarra, examinandum est textus eius. Is enim in loco citato, loquens expresse de quaestione et pariter prolixè,<sup>233</sup> se exhibet sectatorem S. Bonaventurae imò S. Augustini tenendo partem negativam esse veriolem, quod et probat variis argumentis, praesertim ex S. Augustino et ex ipso ordine caritatis.<sup>234</sup>

6) P. Laymann allegatur pariter pro hac sententia ab eodem Sporer,<sup>235</sup> asserens eum tenuisse ordinem caritatis exigere quemque ceteris paribus seipsum magis quam alterum diligere, nisi agatur de bono communi

<sup>231</sup> Cf. nota 182.

<sup>232</sup> E. Bassaeus, o. c., tom. I, p. 132a: 'Tota controversia est de vita, utrum liceat se exponere morti ad servandum amicum; nam D. Augustinus... dicit hoc excedere regulam sanae doctrinae: & sunt argumenta non contemnenda, quae probare videntur hoc esse illicitum: idque defendit P. Navarra'. Cf. tom. II, p. 374a.

<sup>233</sup> Petrus A. Navarra, *De ablatorum restitutione in foro conscientiae* lib. II cap. III (Lugduni 1593, pp. 180-5).

<sup>234</sup> P. Navarra, o. c., pp. 180-1: 'In hac re. Primo arbitramur licitum esse & excellentissimum religionis opus, vitam pro Deo eiusque fide ponere, quod, vt de fide certissimum esse debet de quo latius dub. 8... His suppositis verius nobis videtur, non esse licitum pro salute temporali hominis privati morti voluntarie se tradere. Ita docuisse videtur Bonavent. loco citato. Estque August. expressa sententia li. de Med. cap. 6, Vbi docet doctrinae regulam excedere, vitam temporalem perdere pro vita temporali alterius. Cui testimonio nihil respondet Sot. quamvis illud citavit. Forsan quis respondeat Aug. doctrinae regulam excedere dixisse, non quod sit contra rationem, sed quod supra. Sicut quodlibet aliud perfectionis opus posset dici rationis regulam excedere. Sed hoc nihil est, Ibi enim August. intendit hoc dicto probare non esse licitum mendacium hac ratione. Quia dare vitam temporalem pro temporali alterius, rationis regulam excedit, ergo / multo magis excedet dare aeternam pro temporali alterius. Si autem in antecedente loqueretur, de excessu perfectionis nihil colligeret vitij in eo, qui vitam aeternam commutare pro temporali alterius, sed potius colligeret esse opus egregiae perfectionis, esseque magis supra rationem; quod & falsum esse constat. & contra intentionem Augustini, loco citato. Verum ratione probo hanc sententiam. Primo supponendo, quod ordo caritatis non tantum est in consilio, sed in praecepto, saltem respectu eorum, quorum homo non est dominus, vt vitae spiritualis, & honoris necessarij, & c. Haec enim non sine prodigalitate perderentur, sine iusta & sufficienti causa. Cur enim in spiritualibus est in praecepto, & non in temporalibus? Item, quia illud praeceptum, *Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum*, absolute loquitur: illa autem particula *sicut*, vt omnes fatentur, non significat aequalitatem, sed proportionem. Ea ergo lege praecipitur homini, se & proximum diligere, & suam & proximi vitam conservare, & inter has dilectiones debeat esse ordo, manifestum est, quod non proximum, sed se plus diligere tenetur, & per consequens tenetur sibi maius bonum velle, quam proximo'.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. nota 182.

praeferendo. Revera Laymann in *Theologia moralis* huic sententiae favit, etsi noverit ipse sententiam contrariam. Assertit enim ordinarie illicitum esse propriam vitam postponere vitae alterius, quia ordo caritatis sic exigit; quod dicit *ordinarie*, quia non tantum licitum sed interdum etiam necessarium est vitam propriam postponere, agendo de salute personae publicae vel de salute spirituali alterius praeponenda.<sup>236</sup>

#### 4. *Ex philosophis*

Sicut respectu S. Scripturae, sic etiam respectu philosophorum nulla auctoritas explicite adducitur a patronis huius alterius sententiae, si excipias Pitigianis, qui auctoritatem Senecae revocat ex eius libro *De beneficiis*, in quo Philosophus tenet amorem erga proximum mensuram accipere ex amore erga se ipsum,<sup>237</sup> quod revera comprobatur textu ipsius Senecae, ita ut merito afferatur pro hac altera sententia roboranda.<sup>238</sup>

## II. ARGUMENTA RATIONIS

Patroni huius alterius sententiae suam thesim potissime probant argumentis rationis, quae tria allegari solent: parallelismus inter vitam spiritualem et corporalem; ipse ordo caritatis et praeceptum propriam vitam conservandi.

### 1. *Parallelismus inter vitam spiritualem et corporalem*

Hoc primum argumentum adductum ab Hermann in eo consistit quod ordo caritatis prohibet vitam proximi, ceteris paribus, propriae praeferre; nam, sicut illicitum est, ut omnes concedunt, vitam spiritualem periculo

<sup>236</sup> P. Laymann, *Theologia moralis*, tom. I, p. 176a: '*Ordinarie licitum non est, vitam propriam postponere vitae alienae. Quia caeteris paribus quisque secundum Charitatis ordinem, magis propensus esse debet ad diligendum se, quam alterum. Nihilominus multi docent... Licitum atque laudabile esse, vitam suam certo periculo exponere pro seruando amico... Ordinarie id licitum non esse; Pro salute, & incolumitate personae publicae... bona temporalia relinquere, quin & propriam vitam periculo exponere, non tatum laudabile, sed interdum etiam necessarium est... Deinde ad impediendam spiritualem aeternam damnationem iniusti aggressoris... tolerere mortem propriam corporalem, abundantioris charitatis opus est*'.

<sup>237</sup> F. Pitigianis, o. c., P. II, p. 318a: '*Et Seneca etiam lib. 2 de beneficiis, c. 15. Summa, inquit, amicitia est aequare sibi amicum. Sed utrique consulendum est. Dabo agenti, sed vt ipse non egeam; consulam perituro, sed vt ipse non peream*'.

<sup>238</sup> L. A. Seneca, *Dei beneficii* lib. II cap. XV (Milano, s. d., p. 71): '*Non devemo far mai beneficio nessuno, ch'abbia a risultare in vergogna nostra: la maggiore amicitia, che sia è di farti l'amico eguale, et però devemo aver rispetto a l'uno, et a l'altro parimente. Io donarò bene a un mendico, ma di maniera, che non debba mendicare io. Soccorrerò uno, che ruini, o che si muoia, ma non però, che debba o ruinare io, o morire, se già non richiedesse il debito...'*

exponere pro vita spirituali, a fortiori pro vita corporali alterius, ita a pari corporalem pro corporali.<sup>239</sup>

Dicendum est tamen quod argumentum sic propositum ab Hermann vera, ut iudicat Herincx,<sup>240</sup> nimis probat; ratio est quia vitam spiritualement exponere nunquam licet, corporalem vero exponere nonnunquam licet. Nihilominus hoc argumentum vim probativam potest habere si id aliter proponatur, nempe si vita corporalis, non iam simpliciter, sed in relatione ad animam consideratur.<sup>241</sup>

## 2. Ordo caritatis

Secundum argumentum ex ordine caritatis sumunt auctores huius alterius sententiae, asserentes imprimis ordinem caritatis exigere ut quisque, ceteris paribus, magis et prius se ipsum quam proximum diligit, ut ab omnibus admittitur,<sup>242</sup> insuperque dictare hoc esse non tantum de consilio, sed etiam de praecepto.<sup>243</sup>

Argumento sic proposito aliquomodo consentire videntur quidam adversarii, ut Bassaeus et Mastrius;<sup>244</sup> alii vero nedum ei consentiunt, sed explicite obiciunt dicentes ordinem caritatis non necessario postulare ut homo semper se ipsum praeferat proximo seu amico,<sup>245</sup> quia vita pertinet ad bona temporalia quae non sunt tam necessaria ut, quoad haec, idem ordo caritatis a se ipso incipiat, semper servetur.<sup>246</sup>

Ast videtur dicendum esse quod utique vita corporalis non est sic

<sup>239</sup> A. Hermann, o. c., tom. II, p. 212a: 'Non est licitum effundere vitam spiritualement propriam pro vita spirituali proximi; ergo nec corporalem pro corporali...'

<sup>240</sup> G. Herincx, o. c., P. III, p. 213a: 'Accedit ratio desumpta ex vita spirituali propria, quae non potest exponi pro aliena, seu postponi eidem. Sed haec ratio nimium probat...'

<sup>241</sup> Cf. nota 191.

<sup>242</sup> Cf. nota 182.

<sup>243</sup> Sic explicite P. Sporer, o. c., tom. II, p. 161b (cf. nota 167). Hoc arguitur ex illo S. Thomae, *Summa theologiae* II-II q. XLIV a. VIII de praecepto caritatis (vol. II, p. 226b). Cf. etiam nota 234.

<sup>244</sup> Cf. notae 29 et 30.

<sup>245</sup> I. Azor, o. c., P. II, p. 702b sic inter alios ordinem caritatis explicat dicens: 'Ad ea veto, quae principio sunt obiecta, respondeo: Ad primum, praeferre quidem posse nos vitam nostram vitae amici; sed nihilominus etiam, posthabita vita nostra, amici vitam licite anteferre, nec in hoc charitatis ordinem laedi, ac violari, quia non postulat necessario charitas, ut vita nostra, amici vitae anteponatur.'

<sup>246</sup> Cf. nota 21. — Ceterum H. — D. Noble, *L'ordre hiérarchique de la charité*, in *La Vie Spirituelle* 18 (1928) 321 loquitur etiam de altero sibi praeferendo, nondum tamen licite simpliciter, sed ex aliis obligationibus: '... Toutefois, certaines obligations de bien commun, de parenté, d'amitié, peuvent nous exciter à nous gêner davantage et même à encourir de notables désagréments pour aller au secours de quelqu'un que nous aimons ou dont nous avons la responsabilité...'

necessaria ut vita spiritualis, ideo, exigente necessitate, postponi potest bono superioris ordinis; sed, ceteris paribus, non apparet ratio cur propria vita postponatur vitae alterius.

### 3. *Praeceptum propriam vitam conservandi*<sup>247</sup>

Tertium argumentum rationis, quod saepissime sumitur ab Auctoribus huius alterius sententiae in hoc consistit quod homo, cum non sit dominus, sed administrator vitae suae sue corporis, obstrictus est ad eum, mediis permissis defendendam et conservandam; quod praeeptum per se gignit gravem obligationem ita ut excludat inter alia omne suicidium et expositionem periculo mortis; et per consequens homo, huiusmodi praeeptum negligens, vitam sibi auferendo vel sine sufficienti ratione periculo mortis exponendo,<sup>248</sup> sine dubio peccatum committit.<sup>249</sup>

Attamen, ut patet, heic non de directo, sed de indirecto suicidio<sup>250</sup> atque de sui expositione periculo mortis<sup>251</sup> sermo est. Ratio petitur quia suicidium directum nunquam licet, indirectum vero et sui expositio periculo quandoque licita sunt, praesertim si fiant ex causa gravi et rationabili.<sup>252</sup>

Iamvero quaerunt auctores quibusnam in circumstantiis licitum sit suicidium indirectum, ut aiunt, et vitae expositio, manente semper inconcusso illo principio quod homo debet propriam vitam conservare; et quomodo explicetur illud quod homo non est dominus vitae suae. Alii verbis: quod homo cum non habeat dominium in propriam vitam seu cor-

<sup>247</sup> Quoad naturam huius praeepti cf. ex.gr. I. De Lugo, *Disputationes scholasticae et morales*, tom. VI, Parisiis 1893, p. 56a-b.

<sup>248</sup> Ita inter ceteros H. Jone OFM Cap, *Katholische Moralthologie* (Paderborn 1953) p. 172 pro indirecto suicidio expresse requirit causam *gravem*: 'Indirekt sich töten ist an sich verboten; kann aber aus einem entsprechend schwerwiegenden Grunde erlaubt sein' et p. 173 pro sui expositione rationem *sufficientem* petit: 'Sich einer Lebensgefahr aussetzen ist nur aus einem hinreichenden Grunde gestattet'.

<sup>249</sup> Sic. F. Cuniliati, *Universae theologiae moralis complexio*, tom. I, p. 236: 'In quavis necessitate temporali aequali, non tenetur homo subvenire potius alteri privatae personae, quam sibi ipsi, immo nec debet; nisi occurrat motivum alterius virtutis. Nam docemur a Christo diligere proximum sicut nos ipsos, non plus quam nos ipsos... Si enim id agerem ob solum motivum vitae proximi, absque ullo motivo virtutis, graviter peccarem; quia in re gravi delinquerem contra ordinem caritatis'.

<sup>250</sup> Cf. G.B. Guzzetti, *Problemi del quinto comandamento*, in *La Scuola Cattolica* 86 (1958) 161-85, 241-63.

<sup>251</sup> Cf. L. Bender, *Vitam vel incolumitatem periculo exponere* in *Periodica de re morali canonica liturgica* 46 (1957) 429-36; G. Migliori, *Suicidi di comandanti in Cento problemi di coscienza* (Assisi 1958), pp. 370-1.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. L. Bender, 'Ius in vita' in *Angelicum* 30 (1953) 57-8; F.M. Cappello, *SI, De suicidio*, in *Casus conscientiae*, P.I, pp. 447-50.



pus, ex qua ratione pro vita alterius propriam periculo mortis licite exponat aut eam indirecte in morte inducat. Difficultas consistit in explicando quod, ex una parte, huiusmodi actus saepissime ut honesti habentur et laudantur<sup>253</sup> et, ex alia parte, homo dominium in propriam vitam non habet.<sup>254</sup>

Quaestio iuxta nostros Auctores, faciliter invenit solutionem, nempe aut quia revera in casibus allatis bonum inferioris ordinis exponitur pro bono superioris ordinis, aut quia persona privata pro persona maiori iuri obstricta vel, in casu urgentiori, puta in necessitate spirituali constituta, se periculo exponit.<sup>255</sup>

Alii vero theologi illud dominium explicare conantur. Aliqui affirmant utique hominem non esse dominum vitae suae, sed non propter hoc ei nullam potestatem competere in propriam vitam; unde, aiunt, utique ei competit *aliquod* dominium, quatenus, saltem aliquando ex iusta et rationabili causa vitam propter alterum exponere possit seu eam non conservet.<sup>256</sup> Quid sibi vult hoc 'aliquod dominium', neque ipsi id definire poterant aut volebant, unde id in omni casu non discederet a notione dominii, quod homo in vitam suam non habet.

Alii difficultatem quidem ponunt, sed eam non explicant.<sup>257</sup>

Moderni, occasione Patris Kolbe arrepta, difficultatem solvere conantur per viam administrationis in vitam. Nam, si difficulter explicetur huiusmodi liceitas per viam dominii, videtur tamen satis sufficienter explicari per viam administrationis, qua homo talem potitur potestatem in propriam vitam ut eam possit custodire, defendere imo et tractare secundum necessitates, salva tamen eius substantia. Revera homo a Deo accepit potestatem vita utendi aut non utendi secundum necessitates, salva semper eius substantia, nempe quod haec potestas non debet

<sup>253</sup> P. Bongiovanni, *l.c.*, p. 697: 'Citiamo a mo' d'esempio alcuni fatti ammessi da tutti come eroici sacrifici. La cessione ad un altro del paracaduto quando l'apparecchio sta per essere divorato dalle fiamme; sostituirsi ad un padre di famiglia che sta per essere fucilato; due alpinisti stanno per sfracellarsi entrambi, se quello sospeso nel vuoto non si distacca: questi taglia la corda e si sfracella sul fondo, mentre il compagno si salva ecc.'

<sup>254</sup> Cf. G. B. Guzzetti, *ib.*

<sup>255</sup> Sic explicite P. Sporer (cf. nota 182).

<sup>256</sup> Inter alios F. Vitoria (cf. nota 124) et G. Sayer (cf. nota 144). Cf. etiam I. D'Annibale, *Summula theologiae moralis*, P. II, p. 61-3.

<sup>257</sup> Sic F. Suarez, *l.c.*, p. 712b: 'Difficultas ergo est praecipue in vita conservanda, cujus homo non est dominus, et de hoc probatur conclusio; quia potest homo se exponere periculo moraliter probabili corporalis mortis, ut subveniat proximo; ergo licitum erit illam velle, cum in moralibus pro eodem reputentur periculum et res ipsa'. Ceterum F. Sylvius, *Commentarii in totam secundam secundae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, tom. III, pp. 126b-127b dicit quod in hoc casu Deus permittit ut homo agat propter virtutem.

esse sic ampla ut, etiam postulante necessitate, vitam destruere possit. Nihilominus casus explicari debent, videlicet qualem potestatem exercuit P. Kolbe in propriam vitam, quando pro altero voluntarie intrabat locum subterraneum mortis; certe non mere administrativam, quia sic absolute disponebat de propria vita; ergo aliquantulum ea ampliorem, quae, si realiter non constaret, saltem rationabiliter supponi posset ea concessa vel concedenda in casibus exceptionalibus, ubi illa amplior potestas per viam ordinariam obtineri nequit.<sup>258</sup>

Haec explicatio non bene satisfacit, quia non esse necessaria, imo et difficultatem magis involvere videtur. Nam, ex una parte patet nobis non competere nisi mere administrativam potestatem in nostram vitam, eo quod Deus habet dominium absolutum in eam; ex alia vero parte nostra potestas in vitam realiter maior et amplior supponi nequit nisi constet. Unde thesis huius alterius sententiae sic confirmari videtur hoc ultimo argumento, ut contra eam ex hoc capite, nondum appareat obiectio omnino valida.

\* \* \* \* \*

Quaestione in exitum perducta, liceat heic aliquas observationes prae oculis habere.

Imprimis duplicem sententiam, uti iacet in nostris Auctoribus, breviter sed attente exposuimus et explicavimus, atque pro ea varia argumenta examinavimus. Tum circa sententiam cum circa argumenta in decursu nostri tractatus aliquod iudicium sobrie tulimus, etsi quandoque, prae

<sup>258</sup> J. Pereda, *La mutilación y el trasplante de órganos*, in *Estudios de Deusto*, 2(1954) 483: 'Se debe notar también que es muy distinto el caso del administrador cuando no se puede consultar al propietario y en estas circunstancias, sin duda, que sus poderes han de ser mayores, reales o racionalmente supuestos...'; p. 494: 'Pues bien; los moralistas, mientras no vean actos positivos de destrucción directa, querida como tal, abren amplisimamente la mano y conceden, sin duda con pleno acierto, el poder permitir aun la destrucción completa de la cosa administrada, por razones más o menos altruistas: no están acordes, ni es fácil estarlo, en cuándo el acto es de destrucción directa...'; p. 495: 'Hemos dicho también que no están acordes, ni mucho menos, en cuándo el acto es de destrucción directa y no hay armonía ni aun en los casos indicados. Así, v.g. Henno F... ya llama suicida al que da el único pan que tiene para que el otro no muera de hambre, mientras que Lesio lo justifica porque llena un deber de caridad con el prójimo...' et p. 496: 'Si somos meros administradores de nuestra vida, es laudable ese acto por el que dispone de ella en forma tan absoluta? Si es laudable, como lo es, no prueba claramente que hay ciertas reglas superiores, que pueden ampliar en grado sumo el poder sobre nuestra vida y miembros? A qué queda reducido el concepto de administrador? Y hasta qué punto se puede decir que ese acto del P. Kolbe es meramente permisivo de la muerte, cuando entra positivamente en el subterráneo fatal, cuya puerta sólo se ha de abrir para sacar los cadáveres?'

difficultatis mole, mentem ancipitem monstraverimus.

Dein, hoc non obstante, censemus alicuius adhuc momenti esse circa interpretationem theologorum nonnihil pro maiori claritate declarare, nempe quando loquuntur de nostra quaestione, saepissime inter se discrepant non solum ob rationes quas tum pro sententia vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittente, cum pro ei contraria consideravimus, sed etiam, probabiliter, ob rationem qua res aliena iuxta alios, non obstante propria extrema necessitate, domino restituenda est;<sup>259</sup> iuxta alios vero hoc in caus nulla obligatio foret eam restituendi, cum in necessitate melior sit conditio possidentis.<sup>259</sup>

Quaestio certe est difficilis, quia utraque sententia bonis fulcitur argumentis, proinde eam solvere minime intendimus, nihilo tamen minus eam heic volumus notare, quia divergentia sententiarum ex hoc capite bene etiam explicari potest.

Alia adhuc videtur esse ratio, cur Auctores diversimode de nostra quaestione sentiunt, nempe, agendo de tabula salvationis, alii affirmant solum licere eam alteri *relinquere*, id est, sese negative gerendo, non eam accipiendo, minime vero eam dare;<sup>261</sup> alii e contra tenent licere etiam alteri eam *dare*.<sup>253</sup>

Haec dissensio utique orta est imprimis inter ipsos auctores vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittentes, ut Soto, Azor aliique; sed ceteri auctores, probabiliter non distinguentes vel nolentes distinctionem facere inter 'tabulam relinquere' et 'eam dare', terminum aliquomodo genericum vel etiam ambiguum adhibendo, ut 'tabulam cedere, permittere aut eam relinquere', in duas sententias abierunt, quorum alii adhuc affirmant,<sup>253</sup> alii autem id negant.<sup>254</sup>

<sup>259</sup> Cf. nota 226.

<sup>260</sup> Sic P. Laymann, o. c., tom. I, p. 245b inter ceteros arguit contra Scotum dicens: '... excipitur tamen semper necessitas extrema, quippe in qua melior est possidentis, seu manu tenentis conditio, licet aliter sensisse videatur Scotus in 4 d. 15 q. 2 a. 4 in resp. ad argum.<sup>o</sup>, Paulo aliter asserit I. Pistoni, *De causis eximentibus a restitutione, in casus conscientiae* (Torino 1958) P. I, pp. 512-3.

<sup>261</sup> Sic expresse tenent inter alios D. Soto, o. c., p. 296: 'Respondetur ergo quod antequam tabulam filius capiat, potest illam relinquere patri, quia non hoc est positive se occidere, sed permittere se mori: postquam vero eidem insidet, re vera non apparet licitum esse ut se in fluctus deiciat'. Soto sequitur noster Rodriguez (cf. nota 126).

<sup>252</sup> Ita inter alios I. Azor (cf. nota 137). Vid. etiam T. Tamburini o. c., lib. VI cap. I §. 1, ubi asserit quod in naufragio possum patri cedere tabulam ex motivo *pietatis*, etiam a me occupatam, imo illam ipsi *tradere*, mea vita neglecta et affirmat hanc sententiam esse communem cum I. Sanchez disp. 10 n. 9 vers. fin. (tom. I, p. 168a-b).

<sup>263</sup> Sic nostri Auctores pro prima sententia allegati, ut Rodriguez (cf. nota 22), Bassaeus (o. c., tom. II, p. 374a) et Sannig (cf. nota 25). Similiter alii auctores, ut Ae. Berardi, o. c., vol. II, p. 51: 'Licitum esse... in communi naufragio tabu-

Tandem quod attinet ad auctoritatem S. Bonaventurae et Scoti, qui pro hac altera sententia ab auctoribus adducuntur, dicimus quod ipsi in illis locis probabiliter volebant ut caritas erga alterum non sic facile destruat propriam caritatem, eo quod vita sit fundamentum operationum supernaturalium, sed ut manente hoc fundamento, omnia prorsus proximo procuraret; ceterum ambo praecise loquuntur de obligatione se ipsum diligendi et alteri praeferendi, minime vero ex professo de liceitate propriam vitam corporalem alterius postponendi. Unde nondum apparet contradictio cum illo quod in introductione alludimus, nempe quod schola franciscana sequi videtur conceptionem ecstasticam vel moralem.<sup>265</sup> Et enim caritas non tantum corporalem sospitatem, verum etiam salutem aeternam, nempe omnia, proximo desiderat,<sup>266</sup> ita ut ex sola ratione caritatis, sic opinamus, subiectum diligens maxime liberalitate gaudeat et in societate dilecti delectetur; sed, cum in via caritas sit intime unita cum virtute spei, patet caritatem haec minime agere ex sola propria ratione; sicque spes hominem potius ad agendum ex tendentia egocentrica, dum autem caritas maxime ad agendum ex tendentia altruistica inclinatur.

### CONCLUSIO

Doctrina Auctorum nostrorum exposita, probata atque crisi subiecta, remanet ut in conclusione conspectum problematis praebeamus.

Iuxta imprimis meminisse illam duplicem sententiam in duobus capitibus expositam, nempe unam permittentem vitam alterius propriae praeferre, pro qua militare vidimus argumenta non contemnenda, et alteram

iam socio cedere'; noster L. Ferraris, o. c., v. Homicidia (tom. IV p. 136a): 'Licere... in naufragio tabulam cedere amico naufraganti' et R. Sasserath, *Cursus theologiae moralis*, vol. II, p. 71: '... potes in naufragio alteri permittere tabulam, qua te salvares'.

<sup>264</sup> Ita intelligendi sunt Auctores alterius sententiae, ut explicite asserit P. Sporer, o. c., tom. II, p. 162a tenens ceteris paribus quilibet propriam vitam praeferre debet vitae alterius, quam tamen per accidens potest praeferre, ut ex motivo pietatis.

<sup>265</sup> Cf. ibi notae 17 et 18.

<sup>266</sup> S. Bonaventura, *De sex alis Seraphim* c. II (8, 133b-134a): 'Quarti sunt optimi, qui cum prioribus bonis innocentiae et virtutum zelo iustitiae et animarum calent, qui non recipiunt consolationem de propriae salutis profectibus, nisi alios secum trahat ad Deum, exemplo Domini, qui, cum in se plenum semper habeat gaudium, non contentus gloriam solus habere, exivit, assumpta forma servi, multos filios in gloriam secum adducere opere et doctrina... Amor proximi desiderat non tantum eius corporalem sospitatem et temporalem prosperitatem, sed magis eius aeternam salutem. Ubi ergo caritas ista perfectior, ibi ferventius desiderium ista promovendi et instantius / studium et purius gaudium, ubi haec invenit...'

id prohibentem, pro qua similiter aderant bonae rationes. Quod vero atinet ad censuram dicimus quod prima sententia, ob numerum auctorum et abundantiam argumentorum, valde probabilis dicenda est; sed neque altera sententia ob penuriam auctorum atque argumentorum, utique gravium, minus probabilis appellari debet.

Ast, suntne revera contrariae hae duae sententiae? videntur nondum sibi contradicere; ex quonam vero capite auctores discrepant inter se, liceat heic aliquid insinuare.

Iamvero auctores rem tangere poterant sub diversa ratione. Etenim illi, qui permittunt vitam alterius propriae praeferre, generatim non adhibent terminum 'ceteris paribus', etsi aliquando id insinuent; dum autem auctores vitam alterius propriae praeferre prohibentes id semper ponunt. Unde prima sententia, tendens ad amorem altruisticum, resultat magis practica et pia, eo quod Auctores optime poterant intelligere praecise de vita alterius, sed non necessario exclusive, vel etsi agant etiam de re, ceteris paribus, practice tamen facile poterant motiva proximum sibi praeferendi invenire, ita ut homo, semper suppositis supponendis, agere queat in favorem alterius, quin nimis illud 'ceteris paribus' attendat; e contra sententia prohibens vitam alterius propriae praeferre, tendens ad propriam seu egocentricam dilectionem, videtur esse magis theorica et minus pia, eo quod ordinem valorum, iuxta illud, quod est proprium et illud quod est alienum absolute statuit, ita ut, ceteris paribus, haberi non possit ratio cur proximum nobis praeferamus.

Alia adhuc est ratio cur Auctores inter se discrepant, nempè difficultas in determinanda causa rationabili, quatenus licitum sit vitam alterius propriae praeferre; quoad hoc punctum adest forsitan maior confusio, quae notari potuit in decursu nostrae dissertationis, praesertim relate ad sententiam vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittentem; nam si non apparet ratio cur, ceteris paribus, vita corporalis alterius propriae licite praeferatur, via tamen aperitur ampla ad quaestionem aliter explicandam ex consideratione causae rationabilis.

Statim pro causa rationabili admittuntur ab omnibus bonum publicum, bonum spirituale proximi et bonum tertii; sed revera dicendum est heic non amplius agi de re, ceteris paribus. Similiter facile admittuntur aliae virtutes, ut fidelitas, pietas, caritas heroica, religio ceteraque huiusmodi. Difficultas tantum adest respectu amicitiae et virtutis seu perfectionis virtutis: quae difficultas solvi videtur, si bene determinetur ambitus seu comprehensio amicitiae vel virtutis; scilicet si nae ita considerantur ut minime solae vel exclusive intelligantur, tunc sententia ordinem caritatis vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittens, secus vero, sententia id prohibens, obtinet.

Ultima ratio qua Auctores in duas vias abierunt, videtur esse deter-

minatio medii liciti a medio illicito. Haec difficilem reddit quaestionem, praesertim pro auctoribus vitam alterius propriae praeferre permittentibus. Etenim inter hos alii censent medium illicitum esse, mortem vel periculum mortis certe et immediate, non vero probabiliter et mediate, adire, alii vero, forsitan ob utilitatem practicam, hanc distinctionem negligunt; dum autem pro auctoribus vitam alterius propriae praeferre prohibentibus, sufficit ut periculum mortis adire, ceteris omnino paribus, tanquam medium illicitum habeatur.

Unde liceat hoc affirmari: ceteris omnino paribus, illicitum esse vitam alterius propriae praeferre. Sic intelligendi sunt Auctores sententiae prohibentis; Auctores vero sententiae permittentis explicari possunt et debent. Etenim isti procul dubio in mente concipere poterant actum honestum in vita alterius propriae praeferenda, quia, urgente necessitate, homo, propriam vitam pro vita proximi sacrificando, videt revera in proximo non solum illud bonum corporale, quod est vita corporalis, — intelligendo semper de vita temporali inter personas privatas, vel inter aequales —, verum etiam aliud bonum, quod est supernaturale, seu supernaturaliter consequendum, sicque, sibi acquirendo meritum, ipse adhuc dicitur se ipsum magis diligere quam proximum; aut in ipsa vita proximi homo videt aliud bonum spirituale praeferendum, quod ita superat bonum propriae vitae corporalis, ut res nequeat dici amplius ceteris paribus.

Ceterum quoad theologos et auctores antiquiores in genere liceat observare, quod cum loquantur de proximo diligendo vel de propria salute procuranda aut de vita exponenda pro amico, semper in communi disserunt, non distinguendo de vita corporali aut spiritali, sive propria sive proximi. Unde quando dicunt salutem propriam esse praeferendam proximi, optime intelligere possunt de salute spiritali, vel etiam quando loquantur de salute corporali, id tamen possunt intelligere non exclusive. Similiter quando asserunt hominem debere propriam vitam ponere pro salute proximi. Hoc admissio, via aperitur, uti nobis videtur, ad fructuose interpretandam sacram Scripturam et traditionem.

B. TUNG, O.F.M.

## CASUS MORALIS

## DE ABUSU MATRIMONII ET DE HYSTERECTOMIA

SOPHIA, 28 annos nata, non absque maximo periculo vitae suae in lucem dedit filium suum tertio genitum. Periculi causa fuit et est status morbosus uteri. Medicus, catholicus quidem, Sophiam instantissime monet de absoluta necessitate aut vitandi aliam praegnationem aut extirpationem uteri peragendi, quia secus mors certa pro illa habetur.

Matthaeus, vir Sophiae, cupiens uxorem suam vivam servare, actus coniugales tantum imperfectos cum illa perficit. Factus poenitens Matthaeus haec omnia Homobono confessario dicit, qui confessarius poenitenti auxilio venire desiderans, declarat hisce in rerum adiunctis nullum adesse peccatum si ipse Matthaeus bis vel ter in hebdomada actum coniugalem inciperet et abrumperet sine seminatione etsi ipse sciret fere semper pollutionem esse secuturam dummodo ipsam non intenderet.

Accidit tamen ut decursu temporis Sophia iterum praegnans evadat. Idem medicus, de quo supra, ad servandam vitam matris, omni alia via deficiente, ad hysterectomiam recurrit. Operatione peracta, et quidem cum felici exitu, actum coniugalem cum viro suo, sine ullo timore, peragit.

## QUAERITUR

- I. Quid imprimis de modo ratiocinandi Homoboni confessarii dicendum sit.
- II. Utrum extirpatio uteri, sive ante sive ultima praegnatione durante, Sophiae licita evadat.
- III. Utrum Sophia, operatione peracta, actum coniugalem cum viro suo licite peragere possit.

## SOLUTIO

AD I. Agitur hic de actibus mutuis imperfectis conjugum. Ut rectum responsum detur sciendum est imprimis num omnes actus mutui imperfecti coniugibus liciti sint. Moralistae<sup>1</sup> distinguunt:

(a) Si actus mutui imperfecti uti aspectus, tactus, oscula, amplexus, colloquia et alii minus pudici obiter facti exercentur in ordine ad copulam perfectius et delectabilius nunc habendam, liciti sunt coniugibus

<sup>1</sup> Aertnys J. Damen C. A., C.S.S.R., *Theologia Moralis*, II, ed. xiv, n. 913; Merkelbach H., O.P., *Quaestiones de Castitate et Luxuria*, Liege - Paris 1926, p. 91; Noldin H., S.J., *De Sexto et Nono praecepto*, ed. xviii, n. 94.

quia tamquam preparatio et inchoatio ad finem considerantur. Utiq̄ue omnis diligentia habenda est in casu ne semen extra vaginam emittatur et si fortuito casu pollutio sequatur conjugēs consentire non debent delectationi.

(b) Imo et isti actus omni culpa carent si sine periculo pollutionis fiunt ex alio fine honesto puta ad fovendum mutuū amorem. Status enim coniugalis sicut copulam reddit licitam ita etiam actus imperfectos. Ne tunc propter instantem pollutionem coniuges actum coniugalem exercere coguntur, dummodo consensus periculum in pollutionem removeatur.

(c) Si vero illi actus mutui exercentur ob solam voluptatem, sine utique periculo proximo pollutionis, illiciti evadunt sed non excedunt culpam venialem. Ratio est quia, etsi fine naturali et debito priventur, sunt actus solummodo excessivi usus rei licitae.

(d) Tandem si actus mutui imperfecti sunt per se et omnino proxime procurantes delectationem satiativam seu pollutionem vel qui cum moraliter certa pollutione in alterutro conjuncti sunt, sub gravi conjugibus prohibentur. Ratio patet. Etenim si pollutio peccatum mortale est, ita etiam causa posita quae per se et notabiliter illam concitat nisi saltem in iis adjunctis ponatur ubi conjugēs copulationem conjugalem exercere possint et velint.

His positis et bene consideratis statim apparet quam erroneum fuit consilium Homoboni Matthaeo datum. Nonne imprimis confessarius distinguere debuerat ea quae licita sunt ab illis illicitis conjugibus? Et ubinam Homobonus didicit actum conjugalem incipere et abrumpere sine seminatione ex quo actu praevidetur fere semper pollutionem secuturam esse licitum evadere? Et quaenam causa excusare posset ab illis actibus ita turpibus ut vix sine pollutione fiant quando conjugēs nequeunt vel nolunt copulam perfectam habere? Audiamus Merkelbach<sup>2</sup> quoad rem: 'E contra nequit admitti, quod aliqui dixerunt: conjugēs qui prolem multiplicare nolunt, posse ad mutuū amorem fovendum, concupiscentiam sedandam, vel compensandum matrimonii usum, inchoationem copulae etiam per vaginae penetrationem exercere ad modum actus imperfecti quem ad consummationem perducere nolunt; et quidem licite, etiam si pollutio non solum raro, verum et frequenter inde oriatur, dummodo ipsi non consentiant'. Pollutio conjugum estne forsā minus illicita quam solutis? Nonne ideo onanismo est aequiparandus actus conjugalis ab Homobono descriptus atque commendatus? Excusatne status morbosus uterī vel negatio consensus in pollutionem praevisam? Ad quaestionem enim quid sentiendum sit de opinione quae tenet 'ob rationes honestas conjugibus uti licere matrimonio eo modo quo usus est Onan', die 21 Maji, 1851, S.O. respondit: 'Propositionem esse scandalosam, erroneam

<sup>2</sup> *Merkelbach*, op. cit., p. 98, 5).



et juri naturali contrariam'. Et iterum ad quaestionem 'An usus imperfectus Matrimonii, sive onanistice sive condomitice fiat, sit licitus', die 6 Aprilis, 1853, respondit: 'Negative, est enim intrinsece malus'.<sup>3</sup> Et Pius XI in suis litteris encyclicis *Casti Connubii* promulgavit: 'quemlibet matrimonii usum, in quo exercendo, actus, de industria hominum, naturali sua vitae procreandae vi destituatur, Dei et naturae legem infringere, et eos qui tale quid commiserint gravis noxae labe commaculari'.<sup>4</sup>

AD II. (A) *Ante praegnationem*. Moralistae omnes docent mutilationem suis ipsius vel aliorum illicitam esse nisi saltem necessaria sit ad vitam salvandam. Ratio primi est quia si nullus homo est dominus vitae suae, ita nec membrorum; et ratio secundi est quia pars ordinatur ad totum et ideo pars toti postponenda est. Igitur extirpatio uteri, quae est gravis mutilatio, illicita est Sophiae. Sed nonne, quis diceret, hic agitur de utero morboso maximo periculo pro vita Sophiae pleno? Utique, sed ubinam praecise ponendum est periculum vitae Sophiae, in ipso utero morboso vel in praegnatione si secuta sit? Uti clare ex casu constat medicus commendat extirpationem uteri ne gravida evadat Sophia quia secus mors certa sequitur. Causa ergo mortis est praegnatio et non status morbosus uteri. Igitur extirpatio uteri morborum non est per se necessaria ad salvandam Sophiam a morte certa aut a gravioribus aegritudinibus aut doloribus. Hic tantum agitur de ablatione uteri utique non ex omni parte boni, sed vitae Sophiae non nocivi. Neque agitur de aliqua operatione necessaria aut utili ad reddendam Sophiam magis idoneam ad actum conjugalem sicuti a natura requisitum peragendum. Etenim actus conjugalis cum vel sine extirpatione uteri perfecte a Sophia peragi potest.

Totum igitur periculum pro vita Sophiae consistit in iis quae actu conjugali sequuntur, scilicet ex evolutione foetus in utero morboso concepti. Re quidem vera medicus, ne hoc sequatur, alternative commendat sterilizationem in muliere ut maritaliter vivere possit sine ullo periculo. Sed qui directe inducit sterilitatem male facit.<sup>5</sup> Ergo sive medicus qui commendat sive Sophia quae recurrit aut acceptat consilium medici male faciunt quia ut eveniant bona ad mala media recurrunt quod nunquam licitum est.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Hartman — Batzill, O.S.B., *Decisiones S.S. De usu et abusu matrimonii*, Taurini 1937, pp. 15, 16; Boschi A., S.J., *Nuove questioni matrimoniali*, Marietti 1950, ed. iii, pp. 101-2.

<sup>4</sup> A. A. S., 1930, p. 560.

<sup>5</sup> Cfr. P. Tabone, O.F.M., *Human Sterilization*, Progress Press 1950, n. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Ad Rom. 3, 8. Cf. etiam Bender, O.P., in *Angelicum* XXX (1953), pp. 273-80. Fatemur paucos moralistas uti Ford, Kelly, Conney et Paquin tenere potius opinionem contrariam. Sed adjungimus argumenta eorum, salva reverentia, non convincere ne dicamus minus correcte. Cf. *The Clergy Review*, XLI (1950), no. 8, p. 485.

(B) *Praegnatione durante*. Juxta opinionem medici, uti patet ex casu, nulla alia via habetur ad matrem salvandam nisi hysterectomia mediante. Per hanc autem operationem chirurgicam foetus una simul cum utero extrahitur et si viabilis non est certo moritur; est ergo abortus. Nunc quaestio venit utrum abortus in casu nostro licitus sit necne.

Imprimis moralistae distinguunt abortum directum et abortum indirectum. Primus habetur si media adhibentur eo fine ut foetus expellatur; secundus si media adhibentur in alium finem etsi ex ipsis prevideatur abortus secuturus. Abortus directus nunquam licitus esse potest cum id idem esset directe occidere hominem quod numquam licet; indirectus, juxta principium de duplici effectu, licitus est quia in casu actio bona est vel saltem indifferens, effectus bonus qui intenditur antecedit vel saltem concomitatur effectum malum qui permittitur et habetur causa proportionata gravis hunc finem permittendi.<sup>7</sup>

His positis redeamus ad nostram quaestionem. Estne scilicet licita hysterectomia in casu proposito? Si medicus mortem certam matris praevidet non praecise orituram ex utero morbo sed ex alia aegritudine puta phtisi vel debilitate cardiaca, certum est non licere hysterectomiam peragere etsi mater in certo vitae periculo versetur nec aliud medium existat ad matrem salvandam quam per procurationem abortus. Hoc enim nil aliud esset nisi abortus directus. Sed si infirmitas uteri, praegnationis causa, ita creverit ut ipse uterus nunc fieret causa principalis periculi mortis Sophiae, uti accidit generatim per tumorem malignum, moralistae non concordant inter se. Pater Gemelli et Mancini negant licitatem hysterectomiae in casu, quia operatio chirurgica haec non constituit abortum indirectum sed directum cum effectus malus (mors foetus) non contingat saltem eodem tempore effectus boni (sanitatis matris) sed praecedit.<sup>8</sup> Alii vero censent hysterectomiam pro abortu indirecto habendam esse, ideoque eam licitam pronunciant cum medium unicum sit matris vitae servandae, secus periturae. Huius sententiae praecipuus patronus est Vermeersch<sup>9</sup> cui adhaeret Janssen<sup>10</sup> et Kelly.<sup>11</sup> Piscetta-Gennaro

<sup>7</sup> Noldin H., *De Praeceptis*, ed. xxxi (1957), nn. 342-3. Cfr. etiam P. Tabone, O.F.M., in *Scientia*, XI (1945), pp. 27-37.

<sup>8</sup> 'Neimmo in quei casi - praticamente eccezionali - in cui l'ostetrico ritenesse necessario un aborto che, d'altra parte, la sua coscienza di cattolico condannerebbe, gli sarebbe lecito interrompere la gravidanza, ma dovrebbe ricorrere a tutte le possibili risorse sanitarie per salvare la madre rispettandone, al tempo stesso, il figlio in corso di gestazione. E se la gestante o qualche familiare o il medico di casa chiedono insistentemente l'a. terapeutico, l'ostetrico dovrà ritirarsi e non gli è consentito collaborare all'intervento abortivo neppure con consigli tecnici'. Ita *Dizionario di Teologia Morale*, Ed. Studium, Roma, ed. 2, 1957 ad v. *isterectomia*.

<sup>9</sup> *Periodica* etc., 1932, pp. 101-6; 1934, pp. 193-6.

<sup>10</sup> *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1934, pp. 552-61; 1935, pp. 335-49.

ita sentit quoad quaestionem: 'Urgente mortis periculo, probabiliter licita est praegnantis hysterectomia, seu ablatio morbidi uteri, cum unicum medium est servandae vitae matris, licet exinde foetus mors sequatur'.<sup>12</sup> Et concludit: 'Quaestio adhuc sub iudice est; ideoque, donec authentica declaratio data non fuerit, cuique integrum est sententiam, quam maluerit, sequi'.<sup>13</sup>

AD III. Quaestio habetur inter moralistas et canonistas utrum mulier recisa vel excisa impotens sit quoad matrimonium contrahendum. Sententia communior atque verior est illa quae tenet mulierem excisam aequiparari mulieri sterili. Sterilitas autem neque dirimit neque impedit matrimonium.<sup>14</sup> Ad conjugatos autem quod attinet, uti in nostro casu, quaestio oriri potest num uxor recisa uti licite possit iuribus matrimonialibus. Si talis uxor impotens redditur ad copulam per se aptam ad proli generationem peragendam, tunc licite uti non potest iuribus suis. Sed si nonobstante hysterectomia, etsi voluntaria, vagina uxoris remanet integra, si ve ipsa uxor sive maritus licite possunt coitum peragere. Ergo si nonobstante operatione chirurgica, vagina Sophiae apta remansit ad copulam perfectam peragendam, etsi nunc reddita sit uti dicunt 'saccus clausus', potest Sophia licite actum conjugalem peragere. Actus enim conjugalis in casu substantialiter integer est quamvis sterilis ex parte mulieris.<sup>15</sup> Sterilitas autem certe matrimonii usum non impedit.<sup>16</sup> Defectus enim in organo femineis postvaginalibus subsequens est ad copulam quae perficitur in vagina, ideoque eidem extrinsecus.

A. TABONE

<sup>12</sup> *Medico-Moral Problems*, Dublin 1955, pp. 279-82.

<sup>12</sup> *Elementa Theologiae Moralis*, III, (ed. vi), n. 227.

<sup>13</sup> Piscetta-Gennaro, loc. et n. cit. Cfr. etiam *Perfice Munus*, 1937 (a. xii), p. 83.

<sup>14</sup> Canon 1068, § 3.

<sup>15</sup> Bender, O.P., in *Angelicum*, XXX (1953), p. 280. Cfr. etiam P. Tabone, O.F.M., *Human Sterilization*, Progress Press 1950, p. 18.

<sup>16</sup> Gasparri R., *De Matrimonio*, 1932, II, n. 1088.

## BOOK REVIEWS

P.S. Palmier, O.P., *De Participatione Sancti Joseph in Mysterio Incarnationis Formaliter Redemptivae*, Malta, Lux Press 1958, pp. xi, 56.

In recent years some theologians have been engaged in establishing with greater theological accuracy the place and function of St. Joseph in the plan of Salvation. The work under review is a recent notable contribution to the ever increasing literature on the subject.

Fr. Palmier's book is part of a doctoral dissertation originally written in Italian under the title 'La Predestinazione di San Giuseppe nel Decreto dell'Incarnazione.' The original work contains three unpublished chapters on St. Joseph's Marriage with the Blessed Virgin, his Paternity towards Jesus Christ and his Patronage over the Church. The published section includes chapters on St. Joseph's cooperation with the Incarnation and the Redemption respectively.

The A. departs from the fundamental assertion that St. Joseph's predestination was included alongside that of Jesus and Mary in the decree ordaining the Incarnation. Hence St. Joseph somehow belongs to the Hypostatic Order and is connected with the main purpose of the Incarnation which, according to the doctrine of St. Thomas, is man's redemption. These two relationships are separately studied in the two chapters that make up the book.

In ch. 1 the A. studies St. Joseph's relation with the Incarnation. He distinguishes between the Hypostatic Order *in fieri* (i.e. in its execution) and *in facto esse* (i.e. in its conservation). That St. Joseph belongs to the latter is clear enough, since he was appointed to nourish and educate the Incarnate Word. But the A. proves also that St. Joseph cooperated with the Incarnation *in fieri* as well, if only 'extrinsece, mediate et moraliter.' He argues that since, according to the present decree, the Incarnation was to take place in the womb of a married woman, St. Joseph, by his marriage with Mary, gave her the last, extrinsic but necessary disposition to become the Mother of God, and so somehow contributed to the execution of the Incarnation. Similarly, by consenting to a virginal wedlock and by preserving his wife's virginity, he made possible Mary's divine maternity. And since the Incarnation depended on Mary's maternity, it in turn somehow depended on St. Joseph. Further, it is argued on St. Thomas's authority that, since Christ is the 'bonum prolis' of the marriage between Mary and Joseph, by taking Mary to wife Joseph influenced on the realisation of the Incarnation. Lastly, since the virginity of Mary and Joseph was decreed alongside the Incarnation, even by his virginity Joseph somehow belongs to the Hypostatic Order *in fieri*.

To this, however, he does not belong intrinsically, but only *extrinsically*, for the marriage through which he cooperated with the Incarnation was only an extrinsic disposition, both to Mary's maternity and a fortiori to Christ's generation. Besides, his cooperation in this mystery was only *moderate*, i.e. exercised *through* his virginal marriage, and *moral* as opposed to physical cooperation, which is proper to Mary alone. His moral cooperation was however a true cause, although only a dispositive one, of the Incarnation.

Ch. 2 contains a discussion of St. Joseph's cooperation with the Redemption. Here an analogy is drawn between him and Mary as Co-redemptrix. The A. is conscious of the extreme delicacy of his argument, and proposes to proceed with great caution. He distinguishes between objective redemption, which consists in the acquisition of the merits whereby men can be saved, and subjective redemption, which is the application of those merits to individuals. The main question hinges on St. Joseph's cooperation in objective redemption. This the A. admits basing himself on Papal pronouncements and liturgical prayers, on a few but surprisingly pertinent testimonies of tradition, and on theological arguments. He argues that if Joseph was predestined to cooperate with the Incarnation, he was predestined to cooperate with the purpose of the Incarnation, namely Redemption. If in fact he cooperated with the Incarnation he cooperated also in our Redemption. Besides, St. Joseph's intimate association with Jesus and Mary was formally and morally an association with them qua Redeemer and Co-redemptrix. Hence he was also their associate in the work of Redemption. This cooperation was especially exercised when Joseph accepted, at the Angel's bidding, to receive the divinely pregnant Virgin for wife and the Redeemer as his son, thereby undertaking to share in the future sufferings of both. His consent embraced them and their redemptive mission, and, in merit and influence, touched the Redemption, although in an inferior way to Mary's own consent to the divine maternity and its consequences. Joseph, besides, has had his counterpart to Mary's maternal compassion on the cross at the time of Christ's presentation at the temple. Here Simon's prophecy pierced his own heart no less than that of his wife, and henceforth he suffered for us in moral conjunction with the future sufferings of Jesus and Mary. But, as with the Incarnation so also with the Redemption, Joseph's cooperation was 'extrinseca, mediata et moralis'. Even so, however, he merited for us analogically like Mary, and, by a similar analogy, he is like her distributor of graces, in consequence of which prerogative he has the universal patronage of the Church.

The above arguments are dealt with by the A. with remarkable lucidity and correctness. Firmly adhering to Thomistic principles, the A. is in

perfect ease and control of his subject. Perhaps not all readers will ascribe to the Patriarch all the consciousness of his mission that the A. admits, and some may doubt whether St. Joseph's appreciation of Isaiah 53 and his anticipated share in the sufferings of Jesus and Mary (to such a degree as to become a co-redeemer), may not have been over-emphasised. But Fr. Palmier's thesis is undoubtedly a valuable contribution to our understanding of St. Joseph's unique function, and, no doubt, the book will be appreciated by all its readers.

C. CASSAR

NAZARENO CAMILLERI, *Defensor Puritatis* — PP. Pio XII e il problema della purezza nei giovani, S.E. I, Torino 1959.

In occasione del primo centenario di fondazione della Congregazione Salesiana, Don Camilleri ha voluto affrontare il problema dell'educazione morale alla purezza, particolarmente in ordine alla fanciullezza e alla gioventù: Di questo problema si è sommamente occupato il Papa Pio XII, meritando così di essere considerato in modo eminente come *Defensor Puritatis* e incamando così la caratteristica più specifica della sua pronosticata figura di *Pastor Angelicus*: Citando largamente dagli innumerevoli discorsi del grande Pontefice, Don Nazareno ha ampiamente esposto il pensiero del Papa sull'importanza del problema della purezza nell'educazione giovanile, sui grandi responsabili dell'odierna situazione morale così preoccupante, sull'obbligo e sulla possibilità di conservarsi puri, sui metodi di educazione alla castità, sulla cooperazione personale del giovane e sull'urgenza di "lavorare in grande" senza sosta unendo tutte le forze cristiane. Nel ricco e profondo magistero pedagogico dell'immortale Pontefice, il problema della purezza morale dei giovani è prospettato nella sua solida e indivisibile unità, sia come impostazione del problema in se stesso sia come impostazione della azione educativa per preservare e per recuperare l'innocenza.

La conclusione dell'opuscolo è un appello a formare eserciti di fanciulli e di giovani eroi della purezza, veri santi ed emuli di Domenico Savio e di Maria Goretti. Solo uniti, con le stesse convinzioni e gli stessi propositi, in un'unica azione e con un indirizzo comune, confidando nella protezione e nella grazia divina, potremo ingaggiare con successo contro le potenze del male la lotta di cui però è già assicurato l'esito finale, garante l'infallibile parola di Dio.

J.L.

J.H. ZIEGLER, C.S.P., *The Obligation of the Confessor to Instruct Penitents*, The Cath. Univ. of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1959, pp. VI, 60.

The Booklet is an 'Abstract' of a Dissertation conducted by the A. under the direction of Rev. F.J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., as major Professor and approved by Rev. E.M. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D. and the Rev. A.C. Rusch, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., as readers and submitted to the Faculty of the School of S. Theology of the Catholic Univ. of America for the Degree of Doctor of S. Theology.

\* 'The original and complete dissertation — as the A. himself declares in the *Introduction* of this *Abstract* —, examines first the historical and theological basis of the teaching office, then proceeds to formulate general norms of instruction, and finally applies these norms to some of the more common needs of penitents today. This abstract deals fully with only the first point: the historical development of the office of teacher and its derivation from various virtues'.

And so in Chapter I the A. discusses the basis of the obligation of the confessor to teach. First of all the A. studies the historical term 'Teacher' as applied to the confessor and making a very adequate survey of the XIXth and XXth century authors, and excluding some notable canonists who prefer to reject the title of teacher as superfluous, very rightly admits that nearly all moralists make specific mention of the office of teacher and concludes his assertion with a decree of the H.O., May 16, 1943, which directs the confessor to fulfil his office about matters relating to the sixth commandment 'as a physician and teacher'.

After the survey the A. passes to explore the sources of the teaching office and shows that this is derived from the virtue of:

(1) *Religion*. Because, as the A. says, religion requires that he who administers a sacrament makes certain as best as he can that it is administered validly and licitly. And how can a sacrament be administered in this way if the confessor does not instruct the penitent about his dispositions?

But the A. does not stop here. He tackles another subtle question, namely whether the confessor as the minister of the sacrament is bound or not to remove that ignorance which, while it does not here and now prevent a fruitful confession, will soon become a serious obstacle to the penitent's remaining in the state of grace or bring harm to the common good. The A. is of the opinion that the confessor is bound 'ex officio' although other theologians do not agree on this question.

(2) *Justice*. Although only a few theologians attempt to derive this obligation also from justice, the A., very rightly, supposes that the silence of others is due to their presuming that whenever a penitent

sincerely seeks absolution he has a right to expect that the confessor will see that the sacrament is properly administered. Furthermore, continues the A., the confessor, being a member of society and one ordained for the good of the Christian people, is also bound by legal justice to both Church and State to point out those obligations in which the penitent is failing and thereby is causing harm to the common good.

(3) *Charity*. The A., very wisely, admits that moralists agree that there exists an obligation in charity to give spiritual aid to a neighbour both by turning him away from sins he has already committed and by preventing sins he may commit in future. But does the obligation extend to formal mortal sins only or also to venial and material sins? The A. admits that although simple venial sin does not dispose to mortal sin, the more common opinion obliges that correction be given although this will bind *sub levi* only. Venial sin is always a deformity although not a serious one. And with regard to those who are already sinning through ignorance, the A. distinguishes between *vincible* and *invincible* ignorance. In the former case the A. admits the obligation, in the latter if the ignorance causes a violation of the natural or divine positive law, at least some kind of assistance must be given. For the A. invincible ignorance is a spiritual poverty. Hence, asking to what extent the confessor must provide instruction to remove ignorance, he applies to it the principles regarding the degrees of spiritual need. But with regard to 'ordinary sinners' the A. sagely remarks a complete variance with what theologians demand of the confessor in practice. Many authors, following St. Alphonsus, call the obligation to teach penitents a serious one and this *per se*.

The A. after having shown the duty of the confessor to teach penitents, passes to a summary of Chapter II of his Dissertation. In this chapter the A. studies the acts of the penitent about which the confessor himself must have a sound appreciation. So he begins with *contrition* which is either *perfect* or *imperfect* that is *attrition*. The A. very rightly observes that although fear of hell and other divine punishments are sufficient for the valid reception of Penance, in practice, the confessor must not be satisfied with an attrition inspired only by fear of punishment in this life. Then the A. gives some practical points to the confessor with regard to venial sins about which even the well-instructed penitents may be in error and concludes that when the penitent resolves to *do better*, such a purpose will be sufficient and, in some cases, more efficacious because more realistic.

Then the A. considers the need of the confessor's guidance to the faithful in making a *complete confession*. To be complete the penitent must confess each and every mortal sin according to species and number. But the A. observes too that this is not always possible in practice.



Furthermore, the A. adds that when the penitent accuses himself of no certain sin, although some manualists teach that instruction must be given on the truths necessary *necessitate medii*, it is more likely that the penitent must rather be instructed on how to examine his conscience than on the necessary truths of faith, although in a few extraordinary cases the confessor may find himself obliged to teach these truths.

The A., at last, passes to a summary of Chapter III, which, in my opinion, is the most important part of his Dissertation because it includes the obligation of the confessor to instruct penitents on their duties in life. The detailed rules which authors give for carrying out this office are reduced by the A. to two general principles which consider the penitent not only as an individual but also as a member of society. In the first principle the A. states that the penitent is to be informed of his obligations when the instruction will be spiritually profitable to him and remarks that those whose ignorance harms the common good must be instructed even if there is no immediate hope of amendment. In the second principle the A. states that a) when it seems probable that instruction will do more harm than good, ordinarily it should be omitted; b) if it seems certain that it will result in harm rather than profit to souls, then instruction must not be given.

The 'Abstract' ends with an 'outline of the complete dissertation', with a complete bibliography and with an alphabetical Index.

I conclude this short review congratulating Rev. Ziegler on giving us this interesting work which, although 'An Abstract', reveals the A. a scholar with lucidity of exposition and soundness of doctrine, and I hope that the Dissertation will be published *in toto* as soon as possible because I feel sure that it will be of great help to all priests who seek to form consciences through the administration of the sacrament of Penance.

A. TABONE