MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. XLIII **1992** **No. 1**

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Published biannually since March 1947, treating Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Fundamental Theology, Holy Scripture, Canon Law, Spiritual Theology, Liturgy, Patrology, Ecclesiastical History, Christian Archaeology, Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology.
Books and Articles are accepted for reviewing.

Articles for publication should be sent to:
Rev. Dr A. Abela
The Editor
Melita Theologica
Faculty of Theology
University of Malta
Msida
Malta

Subscriptions and all other communications are to be addressed to:
The Administrator
Melita Theologica
Theology Students' Association
c/o Foundation for Theological Studies
Tal-Virtù – Rabat
Malta

Annual Subscription: Local: Lm2.00
Foreign: US$ 27.00

Typesetting: Charles Bajada
Printing: Veritas Press, Zabbar

THE FIGURE OF PAUL IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES*
The Areopagos Speech

Paul Sciberras

As the second part of a single work the Acts of the Apostles provides the reader with a clear picture of the witnessing to the saving name of Jesus Christ by the first Christian Communities. At this stage the Church was doing its utmost to propagate this name beginning from Jerusalem to Judaea, Samaria and to all the ends of the world, wherever her members were dispersed. Paul was one of the most important of these members, and he too did his utmost to make the name of Christ be proclaimed to all. The speech before the Areopagos in Athens (Acts 17,22-31), apart from the few verses in 14,15-17 delivered at Lystra, is the only discourse made to a Gentile audience in Acts. However, it presents us with an important depiction of this Apostle to the Gentiles. It is the aim of this study to bring out the figure of Paul as it emerges from this speech, as of one who obeyed the command of Jesus to the apostles to be His witnesses to the ends of the world. Paul did not completely act on his own initiative, but submitted his whole proclamation to the first responsible for that very proclamation – the Church.

Luke's aim in Gospel/Acts

Luke presents Jesus Christ as Son of God, Lord, Messiah and light to all nations. Certain aspects of Jesus' message were intended to be fulfilled only after his departure from this earthly life, after his programmed death and resurrection,[1] as the Scriptures had foretold. His disciples would be commissioned to propagate his message so that He would be acknowledged by all nations. For such a purpose he would send the Holy Spirit, after being exalted at the right hand of the Father[2] from where He would return to clothe his disciples with power. The time of witnessing was as important for Luke as Christ's terrestrial life. Hence the need for a second volume to his work – Acts.

* Paul Sciberras, born on 15/6/1962 at Mosta, ordained priest on 8/7/1988 is currently studying at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. This paper was read at the First Symposium of Maltese Biblical Scholars held at the University of Malta, 20-22 December 1991.

1. Cf. Luke 9,22; 17,25; 24,25-27; Matt 16,21; 17,12; Mark 8,31; 9,12.

2. Acts 2,33; 5,31; 7,55-56.

Just before ascending to the right hand of the father, Jesus tells his eleven and those who were with them that as it was written that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, so also repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem (Luke 24,44-49). Acts 1,8 presents Jesus foretelling to the apostles that "you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth". Acts serves as the story of the fulfillment by the apostles of that prophecy/command. Athens, therefore, as the gateway to wisdom, and Rome (at the end of Acts), as the gateway to power and to reaching the rest of the world are two extremely important stages in the completion of that last command of the Master.[3]

The General Context of the Speech

The second missionary journey of Paul

After the definition of the religious statute of the converted Gentiles within the Church by the Council of Jerusalem,[4] the Christian mission turns towards the great cities of the eastern Mediterranean basin. As leaders of the Church, the Apostles and Elders of the Council commission Paul, Silas and Barnabas to communicate the decisions taken in a letter to the Church in Antioch. Some days after the letter is handed over, Paul takes the initiative and invites Barnabas to go with him for his second missionary journey, with the specific aim of visiting the brethren in every city in which they had already proclaimed the Word of the Lord and to see how they were faring (Acts 15,36). This journey supposedly began around 49 A.D., was completed towards the end of winter of c. 50 A.D.[5] Departing from Antioch, they passed through Troas in Asia Minor, and stopped

3. Although Acts 1,8 does suggest an outline for the whole work, the narrative itself does not follow this programme faithfully. Depending on how "Judaea and Samaria" of v.8 is understood, whether strictly linked together to the preceding *pasē tē* to denote the whole of Palestine or understood as two proper place-names like Jerusalem, the book may be seen to be programmed in three or four parts. But in the book itself Luke distinguishes four stages, of which the two middle ones are more strictly linked together, as in v.8. It follows that a basic division in three parts of the exposition does not correspond to v.8. Cf. G. SCHNEIDER, *Gli Atti degli Apostoli* (Commentario Teologico del Nuovo Testamento; Brescia 1986), I, 278-281.

4. According to Acts 15,29, this statute demanded that Gentiles converted to Christianity should abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, from blood, from what is strangled, and from unchastity. Cf. R.P. BOOTH, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity* (JSNTS 13; Sheffield 1986) 117-187 for the concept and the history of purity in eating.

5. Cf. R.J. DILLON, "Acts of the Apostles", in R.E. BROWN/J.A. FITZMYER/R.E. MURPHY [eds] *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (New Jersey 1990) 44:93-94; J.A.

at Philippi, Thessalonica and Boerea in Macedonia and then Athens and Corinth in Greece.

Athens

We should immediately note that Athens features rather late within the literary reality of Acts, which means that the narrator is presuming that this city did not actually make part of the already evangelized world. Athens, however, is very important for the author of Acts. It appears in the narrative as the gateway to wisdom.[6] Here Paul comes into direct contact with pagan culture and religiosity, spiritual syncretism and idolatric fanaticism of the masses, typical of great cities. Athens, at that time a quiet little city of some 5,000 citizens, lived on its glorious past, sculptured in its monuments and temples. It still exerted an extremely great attraction upon those who aspired to acquire science and culture. It served as a centre of study, where one could get philosophical instruction in line with the ancient tradition. Its religious sensibility was proverbial, witnessed by its innumerable religious symbols and monuments: temples, statues and votive altars. This environment, representative of hellenistic civilization, offered the scenario where the missionary and Jewish Paul roamed. Far from being a tourist curiously viewing objects of art, Paul was a missionary with the sensibility of the religious man. Early Christians did not consider these monuments as objects of art at all.[7]

Luke knew that Athens had a long and dominant association with philosophy, and philosophy was that search of the mind to attain happiness in finding the meaning of all things in relation to man. Luke wanted to show whether this philosophical method was valid or not as a way to recognize God. Athens could serve the author to drive home the point that it is God who comes to man and not man to God, as he searches for the Divine through his intellectual considerations. Athens still had a feeling for the unknown and a curiosity to hear something new (cf. Acts 17,21). But it was probably this intellectualism which resisted the simple message of Christian salvation offered to all by God through Christian missionaries. The subject of the clash of these two worlds, namely that

FITZMYER, "A life of Paul", *NJBC*, 79:38-39; C.M. MARTINI, *Atti degli Apostoli* (Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia; Milan 1986) 226; G. OGG, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul* (London 1968) 112-126; R. JEWETT, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia 1979); T.H. CAMPBELL, "Paul's 'Missionary Journeys' as Reflected in his Letters", *JBL* 74 (1955) 80-87.

6. Cf. M. DIBELLIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London 1956) 76.

7. Cf. MARTINI, *Atti*, 244-245; R. FABRIS, *Atti degli Apostoli* (Commenti biblici; Rome 1984) 486.518; E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford 1971) 517; A. WIKENHAUSER, *Atti degli Apostoli* (Il Nuovo Testamento Commentato 5; Brescia 1979) 255.

of the successors of the Athenian philosophers and that of the preacher of the gospel, was especially attractive to the writer of our narrative. This narrative takes as especially significant Paul's short stay in Athens; and confers a symbolical meaning to the scene on/before the Aeropagos.[8]

Agnōstos theos

The narrative slowly builds up to Paul's speech. Paul is brought before the council to explain his position. *Theōrountos kateidōlon ousan tēn polin*, in v.16, and *boulometha gnōnai*, in v.20, serve to prepare the way for the speech concerning the *agnōstos theos*. The Athenian philosophers confess that they could not understand Paul's teachings, but would like to do so. With v.22 Paul begins his speech. As from its commencement the attention is remarkably centred upon the religious devotion of the Athenians. Following oratorial rhetoric, at the outset Paul seeks to render his hearers benevolent, beginning his speech with a *captatio benevolentiae*. In vv.16-17 Paul's spirit is aroused by the idolatry he found flourishing in the city. Against this state of affairs he argues and gives vent to his indignation. Without narrating or even referring to his anger and recalling his wandering about in the city in which he had been aroused to indignation at the prevalence of idolatry (v.16), he singles out for special attention one altar among the many "objects of worship" upon which was inscribed *agnōstō theō*. The presence of such an altar offers an excellent exordium to Paul's address. Literary references to altars dedicated to "unknown gods"[9] may have inspired Luke's recasting in the singular, which furnishes an ideal fulcrum for the parrying of the accusation about "strange gods" by the philosophers before he was taken to the Areopagos (v.18). The apostle calls the attention of the citizens of Athens to the presence of the true God in their midst, the God whose special protection they had experienced and publicly acknowledged with the altar, but whose identity was still unknown to them.[10] We might note the difference of perspective between Paul's and the Athenians' viewing

8. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 79-80.

9. PAUSANIAS, *Description of Greece*, 1 (Attica).1,4 (tr. by W.H.S. JONES) (London-Cambridge-Massachusettes 1954):"...Here there is also a temple of Athena Sciras, and one of Zeno some distance away,and altars of the gods named Unknown." The Greek text reads: *bōmoi de Theōn te onomazomenōn Agnōstōn*; PHILOSTRATUS, *Life of Apollonius*, 6.3,5. (tr. by F.C. CONYBEARE) (London-Cambridge-Massachusettes 1950) has: "For it is a much greater proof of wisdom and sobriety to speak well of all the gods, especially at Athens, where altars are set up in honour even of unknown gods." The last phrase in the Greek text being: *"hou agnōstōn daimonōn bōmoi hidryntai."*

10. Cf. P.P. PARENTE, "St. Paul's address before the Areopagus", *CBQ* 11 (1949) 144-147; N.B. STONEHOUSE, "The Areopagus Address", *Paul before the Areopagus and other N.T. studies* (London 1957), 10-15; HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 518-519.

the altar in question. Paul viewed it as the Athenians' way of honouring whom they worship as unknown, the one, true God. On the other hand, the altar served the Athenians' wish to honour each and every existent god, to ensure that no one of them is left out of their cult. Did such an altar exist in Athens?

Some authors hold that the dedication of an altar in the singular could never have existed in Athens, the possibility being averse to Greek mentality.[11] Others say that archaeology has not yet uncovered an altar with such an inscribed dedication.[12] Others have proved the contrary. In fact, altars to unknown gods have been found in Athens itself. Although they are no exception to the rule, most dedications being in the plural, dedications to unknown gods in the singular have also been unearthed.[13]

The reason for this unusual use of such a dedication by Paul to begin his speech has also been widely discussed. Some say that Paul is using the sophistical trick of slightly misinterpreting the evidence in his own favour. Others hold that only the singular version of the inscription could be used by the speaker, for he regarded the inscription as evidence of the Athenians' latent awareness of the true God.[14] Whether that kind of altar existed or not remains an object of debate; but the speaker makes good use of their presumed existence (with a dedication in the singular) in the exordium of his speech. We would opt for the opinion that in such an inscription Paul wisely recognized that there was in the heart of Athens a witness to the deep unsatisfied yearning of humanity for a clearer and closer knowledge of the unseen power which men worshiped dimly and imperfectly. The worship of an unknown god, coming to expression within the framework of polytheism, remains an idolatrous act of worship of one god among many. But the singular expression of idolatry exhibited by the altar which especially attracted Paul's attention, intimating as it did its own defectiveness, provided a starting point for Paul's proclamation of the living God who was still unknown to them, but whom they worshiped (v.23). Paul wanted to proclaim

11. Cf. E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschischte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin ^{2}1929). His thesis was contradicted by P.W. van der HORST and proved to be wrong on the grounds that there is enough evidence to make it not only possible but also highly probable that in Athens and elsewhere there were altars to unknown gods. It is also probable that there were than one such altar and they might have had different backgrounds for their erection. Cf. "The unknown gods (Acts 17:23)", *Knowledge of God in the Greco-Roman World* (eds R. van der BROEK/T. BAARDA/J. MANSFELD) (EPRO 112; Leiden 1988) 19-42.

12. Cf. MARTINI, *Atti*, 247; BARNES, 418.

13. Cf. J.J. KILGALLEN, *A Brief Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York-Mahwah 1988) 139; van der HORST, *Knowledge*, 19-42.

14. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 41.

the One, True God and so made use of the dedication in the singular. The speech does not begin with the presupposition that the Athenians were already worshiping this true personal God unknowingly. V.23b indicates that their ignorance did not consist in not knowing only the name of the one God, but also in their misunderstanding the nature of the divine in general. Paul's claim was that he was able to explain to his hearers that it was this Unknown God who would inform them about the creator of heavens and earth. It is this true living God, unknown to them up to that moment, that Paul wants to proclaim now to his hearers.

The audience

Among the ordinary crowds of the Athenian Agora there were the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers who undoubtedly are much involved in the preliminary discussions with him whom they now are so eager to hear (v.18). Luke singles these two out even before Paul's speech itself begins. After his anger was provoked at seeing the city full of idols (v.16), he argues with the Jews and the devout persons, and with all those who happen to be in the market-place at the moment (v.17). The Stoics and the Epicureans are then introduced.

The *Stoics*, who claimed the Cypriot Zeno (c.340-265 B.C.) as their founder, were so called because they used to hold their meetings in the *stoa poikilē*, in the agora,[15] where they habitually taught in Athens. In a pantheistic perspective of the world pervaded by a universal divine dynamism, they propounded an elevated ethical ideal and a high sense of duty. To live in conformity with a universal law that controls all things and events was their motto. Their key philosophical ideas were the unity of humanity and the natural kinship of humans with God.

The *Epicurean* school, founded by Epicurus (340-270 B.C.), member of Athenian settlers on Samos, based its ethical theory on the atomic physics of Democritus and presented pleasure as being the chief end in life; the pleasure most worth enjoying was for the Epicureans a life of tranquility (*ataraksia*), free from pain, disturbing passions, and superstitious fears (including, in particular, the fear of death). The Epicureans did not deny the existence of gods, but emancipated themselves from a false image of the divinity by maintaining that they (the gods) took no interest in the life of men. They shared a fervent opposition to common people's groveling superstition and a conviction that the gods are unaffected by human maneuvering.

15. The famous ruins of the agora lie just NW of the Acropolis. It was the city's governmental and commercial hub and the meeting place par excellence for all matters of community life.

Luke, even before giving us what Paul said in the speech, completes the picture of the Areopagos Speech by these particular details about Paul's audience, giving the scene a precise local colour.[16] The narrator is fully aware which schools of thought had most influence at this time. So he mentions these two, typical representatives of the spiritual-humanistic currents of the Greek environment contemporary to Paul. Whatever their different understanding might be as to how man is to relate to all things in order to find and secure his happiness, both Epicureans and Stoics agreed on the ephemerality of the traditional gods of Greece and Rome. For them these gods had no value at all, since they never guarantee to man what he so eagerly longs for. They knew so well that man must recognize the forces that surround and dominate him and the world. Being unable to overcome these forces man seeks to adjust himself to them. In the discussions he has with the Jews and the devout men in the synagogue and the agora (v.17), prior to the speech before the Areopagos, Paul touches upon these subjects and now he addresses himself to this way of thinking.[17] Thus, Paul starts with a very accidental fact, and underlines a very deeply rooted reality in the Athenians' (and Gentile) religious convictions. Hearing Paul speaking in the agora these philosophy experts spring to the occasion to know something new about the eternal question of God. "What the speech now attacks, with arguments from the philosophy of the Greek enlightenment, is the heathen popular belief and not the religion of the philosophers. If the speech is nonetheless directed to these philosophers, it is because Greek culture has to be exhibited in its highest representatives".[18]

Paul is called a "charlatan" (*Bruce*), "babbler" (*Kilgallen*, *Haenchen*, *RSV*), "parrot" (*JB*) by some who heard him speaking (v.18). The Greek word reported by Luke is *spermologos*, seed-picker, one who makes his living by picking up scraps, a rag picker, or in this context, used non-literally, gossip, chatterer, one who picks up and retails scraps of knowledge, an idle babbler.[19] But through his speech Paul picks up and reduces to nothing the different trends of thought which the philosophers had about the point in question by showing the futility of mental exercise to the full realization of this quest.

16. Cf. W. NEIL, *The Acts of the Apostles* (The New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids 1973) 189.

17. Cf. KILGALLEN, *Brief Commentary*, 138.

18. HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 528.

19. Cf. W. BAUER/W. ARNDT/W. GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago-London ^{4}1979) 762.

The motif of the Athenians' ignorance with respect to God is the point of departure for Paul's speech. Biblical wisdom tradition had already stigmatized idolatric aberrations as ignorance (Wis 13,1; 14,22; Jer 10). The Old Testament denied that God can ever be contained in statues or houses made by human hands. Nor can this Unknown God depend on humans for food or drink through offerings. Paul reiterates this point, with which his audience of philosophers would agree (v.25), because it is He who gives life (*zōē*) and breath (*pnoē*) and all else to mankind, the one in whom all live and move and have their very being (vv.24.28). Paul presumes his hearers would agree with this line of argumentation; he even quotes their writings.[20] In this way Paul joins YHWH with the idea of the Greeks that there exists another Unknown God who is beyond all the gods of their ancestors. Paul was coming to the crux of his speech. This god who controls man's life, epochs, boundaries (v.26), wanted to be searched for and found, if possible. However, men, though acknowledging his laws, have scorned them by not acknowledging his due sovereignty and so were expected to repent in this time of history (v.30). These men of knowledge approved of this too.[21] Christian proclamation put an end to this religious ignorance taking place between the age of ignorance and the moment of the full manifestation of God's salvific activity. From here comes the need for *metanoia* that delivers man from his ignorance and helps him adhere to the true God who offers his salvation through his Only begotten Son Jesus.[22] Paul wisely makes no mention of Jesus except indirectly and towards the end of his speech.

It was this ending of the speech that brought about a tremendous reaction. God will judge the world through his Son raised from the dead. The Greeks could never accept the fact that man can enjoy complete happiness by coming back to life, to the same circumstances from which he has departed with death. This would constitute for them a contradiction in itself, something they could in no way stomach. And as unacceptable did they hold it in the narrative. Pagan wisdom refutes the Christian message, not because the latter lacks the foundations for credibility, but because self-sufficiency and superficiality closes it in a refractory world to the free gift of salvation by God.[23]

20. Paul quotes ARATUS (d. 240 B.C.), the Stoic poet and philosopher in his poem *Phaenomena*, 5: *"gar kai genos eimen"* G. MURRAY/C. BAILEY/E.A. BARBER/T.F. HIGHAM/C.M. BOWRA (eds.) *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse* (Oxford 1954). This point is also hinted at by CLEANTHES in his *Hymn to Zeus*, 4 (cfr Ibid.). Cleanthes expresses the invocation to Zeus as: *"ek sou gar genometha"*.

21. Cf. KILGALLEN, *Brief Commentary*, 139.

22. Cf. FABRIS, *Atti*, 533.

23. Cf. FABRIS, *Atti*, 534.

This speech is a fine example of aperture and audacity on the part of the speaker as well as of the author who reports it. Luke does not portray a pitiful departure, but rather lets the reader feel that Paul has emerged from a difficult situation. It was not he who has failed to grasp Paul's intention in this speech, but the audience.[24] Indirectly, Luke has been given the motive why Paul could know, and preach, "nothing except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor 2,2.3-5), as the only way to meet God. This does not mean that the method Paul used with the Athenians was not the correct one; rather the narrator is implying that the knowledge of God can never be separated from belief in the Only begotten Son, crucified but raised from the dead, as propounded in the Christian message.[25]

The literary aspect of the Speech

According to a study of the speech genre in Acts, M. DIBELLIUS concluded that the ancient historian was not aware of any obligation to reproduce only, or even preferably, the text of a speech which was actually made.[26] He concludes that the speech before the Areopagos was essentially constructed by Luke. It consists of a Hellenistic speech about recognizing God and doing so philosophically; the arguments employed are nearer to those of second-century apologists than to those of Paul's epistles. Luke has put in Paul's mouth a speech to the Athenian intelligentia. It offers a synthesis of philosophical argumentation combined with the corresponding motives taken from Biblical tradition and Jewish propaganda aimed at vilifying arguments for pagan polyhteism and idolatry. The philosophical elements of the speech can easily be isolated by a process of literary criticism; one can allot different parts of the speech to the different sources employed by the author. The speech would thus lose its homogeneity and unity. On the other hand, B. GÄRTNER defends the unity of the speech,[27] attributing to Luke, though, some formal revisions. A third opinion holds the speech to be a completely Lucan composition with hints to speeches and treatises in pagan sources.[28] The first two views which are diametrically

24. Cf. HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 526.

25. Cf. W.R. RAMSAY, *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman citizen* (London ^{14}1920) 252; cf. also the critique of this point in STONEHOUSE, *Paul before the Areopagus*, 31-40 and F.F. BRUCE, *The Book of the Acts* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids 1988) 344.

26. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 139.

27. Cf. B. GÄRTNER, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (ASNU 21; Uppsala 1955) 45.

28. E.g., PAUSANIAS, PHILOSTRATUS.

opposed are representative of the majority of opinions about this speech.[29] Considering the aim of speeches in documents such as Acts, we may say with DIBELLIUS that the author had specific aims for incorporating speeches in his narrative. Such aims could be intended to give a deeper insight into the total situation the narrator is describing, or to focus on the true significance of the historical moment concerned; the narrator might wish to enframe the character of the speaker into a close-up. Very often only close reading of the literary unit as a whole will reveal the real motive for the speech. The criticism of idolatry rests on a true conception of God in so far as this can be attained by His self-revelation to men. Thus, the purpose of the missionary preaching as exemplified in the Areopagos Speech was not to reinstate the natural knowledge of God by enlightening the misapprehensions of man's mind, but to show the uselessness and the vanity in the Gentiles' natural conception of God. According to the Christian missionaries ignorance is the prevailing condition in this manner of conceiving the Divinity; but this offered the reason for the universal act of salvation through Christ, *ta nun paraggellei* (v.30).[30]

This gives us a hint for solving the problem of the genuinity of the speech before the Areopagos. Luke had a very specific aim for this speech; he wanted to demonstrate through Paul the uselessness of philosophy alone in order to recognize God. He makes use of a speech which the historical Paul had most probably delivered and, by giving it a more ordinate form, conveyed his message. Here we have a case where Luke incorporates another speech in Acts by one of his main protagonists to show his readers what the Christian faith was.

The structure and the division of the episode determine the speech itself as central (vv.22-31), for which the narrator dedicates the preceding six verses (v.16-21) as its scenario. Paul's speech provokes the conclusion of the Areopagos experience as narrated by Luke (vv.32-34).

It is because Athens is the centre of hellenistic piety and Greek wisdom that this city bears so great an importance to the message that the speech portrays. The cultivated style of the Areopagos speech and of the one delivered at Lystra[31]

29. In favour of DIBELLIUS we find P. GARDNER, "The speeches of St. Paul in Acts", *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (Cambridge 1909), NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*. In favour of GÄRTNER, B.W. BACON, *The Story of St. Paul* (London 1905); E. MEYER, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentum* (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1931), III; H. CONZELMANN, "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus" (1958), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville-New York 1966); HAENCHEN, *Acts*.

30. Cf. GÄRTNER, *Areopagus Speech*, 169.

31. Cf. *en tais parōchēmenaisgeneais eiasen panta ta ethnē poreuesthai tais hodois autōn* (Acts 14,16-17).

enables the solemn proclamation about God, and the evidence of God's existence that is found in the order of nature, especially in the seasons of the year, to stand out more forcefully. Comparing the Areopagos Speech to the Lystra Discourse would shed further light on the former (Acts 14). In contrast to 17,4, 14,15-17 does not contain the word *kosmos*; the speech follows the Old Testament style completely (e.g. Ex 20,11). The gods are described as *hoi mataioi* as in the Old Testament. In Acts 14,16 there is a reference to the motif of ignorance, as in 17,30, but none to the revelation of salvation as having put an end to ignorance. The context determined this modification. In the speech at Lystra, as in conformity with the OT thought, God is said to have filled men's hearts with food and gladness. But in the Stoic proof of God these ideas are arranged thus: God revealed himself by a purposeful ordering of human life; men were therefore able to recognize him.[32]

The way Luke employs speeches as well as the comparison between these two discourses (Areopagus/Lystra), both having Gentiles as their addressees, bring us nearer to Luke's aim for the Areopagos Speech and the figure of Paul that emerges from it.

One last word about the Speech's ending. Since there is no mention of a major interruption, this apparently sudden ending serves to emphasize what is most important in the speech; an essential role is here played by the opposition of the listeners.[33] The composition of the speech makes it abundantly clear that it forms a unity, which reaches an intended ending. Whatever is felt as missing was not expressed in this speech.[34] The speaker is interrupted precisely at his argument's target: raising him from the dead (v.31); this is the point where propaedeutic theodicy reaches out to Christian kerygma, the point where the kerygma, with the Resurrection as its core, predictably repels many of its educated prospects.[35]

In 1 Thess 1,9-10 Paul summarizes the preaching to the Gentiles, and we can see a certain similarity between this summary, Romans[36] and Acts 17,22-31: *epestrepsate pros ton theon apo tōn eidōlōn, douleuein theō zōnti kai alēthinō*, and *anamenein ton huion autou ek tōn ouranōn, hon ēgeiren ek [tōn] nekrōn,*

32. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 71-72; KILGALLEN, *Brief Commentary*, 112-113; HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 429-434; BRUCE, *Acts*, 276-277.

33. See the same effect in Acts 10,44; 22,22; 26,24.

34. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 57.

35. Cf. DIBELLIUS, *Studies*, 56-57.

36. See, e.g., 1,1-6; 2,1-4-11.16.22; 3,6.27-31; 5,1-11; 6,1-11.

Iēsoun ton rhuomnon hēmas ek tēs orgēs tēs erchomenēs. The pattern of the proclamation is very similar: conversion from idolatry and serving the true God, resurrection faith, judgment/rule of the world by the Risen One: a pattern shared also by 1 Cor 4-7. "The christological conclusion is no ill-fitting appendix, but the climax of an established, two-pronged kerygma to pagans in which the summons to monotheism, nourished by Hellenistic-Jewish apologetics, formed the necessary premise of the proclamation of Christ."[37]

The Figure of Paul in the Speech

The purpose of missionary preaching is not to reinstate natural knowledge of God by enlightening men's minds, but to show the uselessness and vanity in the pagan conception of God and his worship. This is much in line with traditional missionary preaching based on the OT tradition. To be complete this preaching has to be followed by a proclamation of salvation in Christ. This is what Paul is determined to do in his speech.

In this discourse Paul appears as the missionary who is compelled to proclaim repentance in Him who will save, in the *Kyrios* (Lord of everything) who dominates in order to judge and to save, as he comes again sitting at the right hand of the Father. Acts 17,23.30 contain key phrases to this depiction of the missionary figure of Paul. he feels the compulsion to preach his Lord, even while idling in Athens and waiting for the others. Together with this speech we may take into account other pronouncements by Paul about his mandate to preach: Acts 10,42 – "He commanded us to preach to the people and to testify that he is the one ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead"; 1 Cor 9,16-17 – "For if I preach the Gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the Gospel. For if I do this of my own will, I have a reward, but if not of my own will, I am entrusted with a commission"; Eph 3,8-13 – The eternal plan of God that the Gospel of Christ is to be preached to the gentiles; Rom 1,1-6 – He is set apart to preach to all nations, both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish (cfr also Rom 1,14); Rom 1,15 – "So I am eager to preach the Gospel also to you who are in Rome".

The persuasion and consciousness in Paul of being chosen by Christ and sent by the Church[38] places upon him the responsibility not to preach anything

37. DILLON, *NJBC*, 44:94.

38. See, for example, Acts 9,22.29. The Ananias episode in Acts 9,10-19 and parallels convey this message. In a special way Acts 22,12-21 inculcates the idea of the sending of Paul through Ananias in the name of Christ and the Church. Even the context of Paul's defense before the Jews in Jerusalem is of utmost importance as to this point.

against or even outside what this Church teaches. The conformity in the contents of this preaching is creatively propagated by Paul according to the concrete situation in which he finds himself. The climax in this preaching is reached as Paul touches the theme of the day of the saving judgment when God will judge the world in righteousness. Here it is announced on the authority of this Apostle of Christ, to declare to the Jews and Gentiles that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance (Acts 14,15-17; 26,20). Paul was commanded to go to the Gentiles (Acts 13,46-49) to preach the Message. However, it was not Paul himself who formulated the contents of his kerygma. Here he followed tradition, proclaiming those truths according to the pattern defined by the Church. Thus, the narrator sees Paul as the missionary who preaches the kerygma determined by the Church who sends him in the name of Christ who had chosen him. Indirectly, we can also see the pattern the Church followed in her proclaiming Christ and his Message to Gentile and pagan communities. Luke's aim for his Gospel and Acts is thus vindicated.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BACON, B.W., *The Story of St. Paul* (London 1905).

BARNES, T.D., "An Apostle on trial", *JTS* 20 (1969) 407-419.

BAUER, W., ARNDT, W., GINGRICH, W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago-London ^{2}1979).

BLASS, A., DEBRUNNER, F., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (Chicago 1969).

BOOTH, R.P., *Jesus and the Laws of Purity* (JSNTS 13; Sheffield 1986).

BRUCE, F.F., *The Book of the Acts* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids 1988).

CAMPBELL, T.H., "Paul's Missionary Journeys as Reflected in his Letters", *JBL* 74 (1955) 80-87.

COLWELL, E.C., "A definite rule for the use of the article in the Greek New Testament", *JBL* 52 (1933) 12-21.

CONZELMANN, H., "The Address of Paul on the Areopagus", *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville-New York 1958).

DIBELLIUS, M., *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London 1956).

DILLON, R.J., "Acts of the Apostles", in R.E. BROWN, J.A. FITZMYER, R.E. MURPHY [eds], *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (New Jersey 1990) 44:93-95.

FABRIS, R., *Atti degli Apostoli* (Commenti biblici; Rome 1984).

FITZMYER, J.A., "A Life of Paul" in R.E. BROWN, J.A. FITZMYER, R.E. MURPHY [eds], *NJBC* (New Jersey 1990) 79:38- 39.

GARDNER, P., "The speeches of St. Paul in Acts", *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (Cambridge 1909).

GÄRTNER, B., *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (ASNU 21; Uppsala 1955).

HAENCHEN, E., *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford 1971).

JEWETT, R., *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia 1979).

KILGALLEN, J.J., *A brief commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York-Mahwah 1988).

KNOX, W.L., *St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge 1939).

MARTINI, C.M., *Atti degli Apostoli* (Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia; Milan 1986).

MEYER, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentum*, III, (Stuttgart-Berlin 1931).

NEIL, W., *The Acts of the Apostles* (The New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids 1973).

NORDEN, E., *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschischte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin ^{2}1929).

OGG, G., *The Chronology of the Life of Paul* (London 1968) 112-126.

O'TOOLE, R., "Paul at Athens and Luke's notion of worship", *RB* 89 (1982) 185-197.

OWEN, H.P., "The scope of Natural Revelation in Rom I and Acts XVII", *NTS* 5 (1958-59) 133-143.

PARENTE, P.P., "St. Paul's address before the Areopagus", *CBQ* 11 (1949) 144-147.

RAMSAY, W.R., *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman citizen* (London ^{14}1920).

SCHNEIDER, G., *Gli Atti degli Apostoli*, II (Commentario Teologico del Nuovo Testamento; Brescia 1986).

SHERWIN-WHITE, A.N., *Roman society and Roman law in the New Testament* (Oxford 1963).

STONEHOUSE, N.B., "The Areopagus Address", *Paul before the Areopagus and other N.T. studies* (London 1957).

van der HORST, P.W., "The Unknown God (Acts 17:23)", *Knowledge of God in the Greco-Roman World* (eds R. van den BROEK, T. BAARDA, J. MANSFELD) (EPRO 112; Leiden 1988) 19-42.

WIKENHAUSER, A., *Atti degli Apostoli* (Il Nuovo Testamento Commentato 5; Brescia 1979).

WILLIAMS, C.S., *A Commentary of the Acts of the Apostles* (London 1957).

ZERWICK, M., *An analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome 1981).

– – – – – *Grecitas Biblica* (Rome ^{4}1960).

PARTICIPATION, PROPERTY AND WORK IN CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING

George Grima

Catholic social teaching developed mainly as 'an answer' to what has been traditionally called 'the social question'. Put simply, this question is about how people can live together and collaborate in a way as to ensure and promote not only their own individual interest but also the common good. As Pius XI wrote, it is basically "the problem of human fellowship."[1] Human fellowship is problematic for the simple reason that it is a fellowship which needs to be re-affirmed and built up again and again in the face of continuous conflict and oppression. The *status quo* is questionable in so far as it constitutes a state in which individuals, classes, regions or countries are somehow excluded from adequate participation.

As the Church became more aware of the conflictual aspect of the social reality, the more it perceived the need of emphasizing and encouraging participation. Paul VI spoke of the *aspiration* to equality and participation that is becoming increasingly more widespread today and represents a constant living protest against discrimination, marginalization and other forms of oppression.[2] Having sketched the extensive and pervading network of domination existing in the contemporary world, the Bishops' Synod of 1971 declared that participation "constitutes a *right* which is to be applied both in the economic and in the social and political field."[3]

The right to participation is today the subject of wide discussion. There is, in the first place, the question about its status in relation to other rights. Since it has a very wide scope of application, covering the economic, political, and other areas of social life, it has been placed generally on the same level as freedom and equality which are the roots from which several particular rights are derived.[4] For the same reason, it has been related to the right to life which

1. *Quadragesimo Anno*, (Catholic Truth Society Edition 1960) n.2. To be referred to as *QA*.

2. *Octogesima Adveniens*, (Vatican Polyglot) nos. 22-23. To be referred to as *OA*.

3. "Justice in the World" in Vincent P. Mainelli, *Social Justice: A Consortium Book*, (North Carolina 1978) 1039-1114, no. 1055. Italics not in the original.

4. Cf. Wolfgang Huber and Heinz Eduard Tödt, *Menschenrechte: Perspektiven einer menschlichen Welt*, (Stuttgart/Berlin ^{2}1978) 88ff.

again is not just another right but the right on which the other human rights rest.[5] It has also been related to development which also enjoys a special rank among human rights, since it points to where the exercise of all other rights should lead.[6]

The second area of discussion centres on the specific function of the right to participation. Given its basic character, this right, as I have noted, is generally considered to fall within the same class of such basic rights as freedom and equality. Freedom, equality and participation complement and explain each other. Paul VI touches precisely on this point in *Octogesima Adveniens*. Equality and participation, he says, are two forms of freedom, that is, two ways or modes in which human freedom should express itself. In the absence of "the preferential respect due to the poor ... equality before the law can serve as an alibi for flagrant discrimination."[7] The Marxist ideology of freedom is untenable, he holds, because it restrains individual freedom more than is necessary and, hence, it renders participation impossible. The liberal ideology of freedom is equally untenable as it generates various kinds of domination rather than a truly participating form of life. Besides complementing each other, freedom, equality and participation offer, as Huber and Tödt argue, a hermeneutical key for the proper understanding of the various human rights. They function like Weber's concept of "type" in the explanation of complex social and historical processes.[8]

The subject of this essay is the concept of participation in the context of the early and later phases of the Catholic social tradition (beginning with *Rerum Novarum*). Oswald von Nell-Breuning maintains that the priority which the Church has assigned to ownership until recently has now been shifted to work.[9] Today this is a commonly accepted view among experts in Catholic social teaching.[10] It is useful, however, to try to bring out the relevance of this important

5. Cf. Jacques Meurant, "'Droit de vivre' et participation" in *Essais sur Le Concept de "Droit De Vivre"*, (Daniel Prémont, ed.) (Bruxelles 1988) 121-131.

6. Cf. Bishops' Synod, "Justice in the World." For a discussion on participation and development in recent Catholic social teaching see David Hollenbach, *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition*, (New York/Ramsey/Toronto 1979) 84-100.

7. *OA*, 23.

8. Huber/Tödt, *Menschenrechte*, 80-83. The authors argue that to understand the full meaning of a human right one has to see it in the light of freedom, equality and participation.

9. Oswald von Nell-Breuning, *Mitbestimmung — Wer Mit Wem?* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1969) 51,63.

10. Cf. Gregory Baum, *The Priority of Labour: A Commentary on Laborem Exercens, Encyclical Letter of Pope John Paul II*, (New York/Ramsy 1982); Friedhelm Hengsbach, *Die Arbeit hat Vorrang: Eine Option Katholisher Soziallehre*, (Mainz 1982) especially pp.239-242; Franz Klüber, *Der Umbruch des Denkens in der katholischen Soziallehre*, (Köln 1982) 65ff; Hermann Josef Wallraff, *Eigentumspolitik, Arbeit und Mitbestimmung*, (Bachem Köln 1968) 145ff.

shift of emphasis or, better, perspective for a more adequate understanding of the right to participation.

Participation and Property

The major problem which Leo XIII and Pius XI raised was the right of the working class to participate in the fruits of economic progress. This was a particularly urgent problem since most were living in a condition that was only a little better than that of slavery itself.[11] At the time, it was possible to speak of 'the working class' as a more or less sociologically identifiable group. This was the class of skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled workers who were trying to earn a living as farmers or, which was increasingly more the case, employees in the newly established industries.

Share in the Fruits of Production

Leo XIII and Pius XI thought that the only way of emancipating the working class was to give workers a much larger share in the fruits of production than they were actually receiving. Since the wage was, as it still is, the usual source of income for the average worker, the central question was that about the nature of the wage-contract and the criteria establishing a just wage.

Leo XIII rejected the liberal view that labour is merely another factor of production that may be bought and sold like any other piece of merchandise according to the market law of supply and demand. Keeping wages low because there are many people seeking few jobs may unjustly deprive the worker of even the minimum of material means he requires to support himself and his family. Although Leo XIII and Pius XI were extremely cautious regarding State intervention in economic and social life, they insisted strongly on such intervention in order to ensure that workers receive a just wage.

The edifice on which Leo XIII and Pius XI were trying to build their whole argument on wages, however, could stand only on one condition, namely, that the worker could keep his earnings. This is one of the main reasons, if not the main reason, why they gave so much importance to the right to private property. Leo XIII declared in very clear and explicit terms that the first and most fundamental principle to improve the condition of the masses "must be the inviolability of private property."[12] He called upon the State to give priority to suitable legislation to safeguard effectively the institution of private property.

11. *Rerum Novarum*, (Catholic Truth Society Edition 1964) 2. To be referred to as *RN*.

12. *Ibid.*, 12.

Similarly, Pius XI was convinced that the right to private property was a basic element in the structure of society.[13]

Unlike the prevailing liberal philosophy, however, Leo XIII and Pius XI developed the doctrine, which was an essential part of the earlier Christian tradition, about the use of private property. The original purpose of natural resources and the goods which mankind produces in the course of history is that they should serve everyone to maintain oneself and one's dependents. The distribution of goods according to sound principles of justice is, therefore, a central question in both ethics and politics. The fact that ownership confers the right to hold and to control one's property does not entitle one to abuse of one's goods. They are neither to be wasted nor to be used as a means of domination. They have to be given to those who need them and they have to serve as a means of promoting solidarity and collaboration. Pius XI taught that social charity should dispose one to discern the needs of the other and help him or her, while social justice should lead, especially the State, to prevent the exclusion of some people from a share in the available resources. Regarding the working class, he stated that every effort must be made that "at least in future a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy, and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the worker."[14]

Independence

Why was it, in the first place, so essential to uphold the right to private property? The reason was the need of protecting the individual and the group, especially the family, from the threat of increasing State interference in social life. Even the traditional natural law theory seems to have been adapted specifically to provide the ultimate ground for individual freedom *vis-à-vis* the looming power of the totalitarian State.

In fact, a comparison between the view of Aquinas and that of Leo XIII on private property reveals a very significant difference.[15] The former regarded private property as an institution which may be called natural only in a derivative or secondary sense, having been discovered in the course of history to be useful for the maintenance of orderly human relationships and for the promotion of

p

13. For Pius XI's understanding of ownership cf. *QA*, 44-51.

14. *Ibid.*, 61.

15. For a study of the sources of Leo XIII's teaching on private property and a comparison between Leo XIII and Thomas Aquinas see Helmut Sorgenfrei, *Die Geistesgeschichtlichen Hintergründe der Sozialenzyklika "Rerum Novarum"*, (Heidelberg/Löwen 1970) 99-158.

ersonal and group initiative.[16] The latter spoke of the right to private property simply as "a natural right" which enables one to rely on a stable and permanent source of self-subsistence (which he identified with the land) rather than on the State. "There is no need to bring in the State," he asserted, for "man precedes the State, and possesses, prior to the formation of any State, the right of providing for the sustenance of his body."[17] Similarly, he interpreted "the natural and original right" of marrying and having a family as the ultimate proof of the priority of the family in relation to the State. The family or "the 'society' of a man's house" is "older than any State" and has rights and duties "peculiar to itself which are quite independent of the State."[18] Again the State is bound to recognize and protect, Leo XIII confirmed, the natural right of association. If the State forbids its citizens to form associations, "it contradicts the very principle of its existence, for both they and it exist in virtue of the like principle, namely, the natural tendency of men to dwell in society."[19]

The affirmation of independence in the sense of freedom from State interference was, however, only meaningful to the extent that the individual or group, especially the family, were really independent. By itself the right to private property was not enough to give the person actual independence for the simple reason that he could not actually be in a position to own anything. This is why Leo XIII stressed that the solution to the labour, not to say the social, question lay in giving an opportunity to "as many as possible of the people to become owners."[20]

The inviolability of the right to private property had to be defended in view of the threat of totalitarian regimes to the right of the individual to a relative measure of independence from the State. At the same time, it was essential to insist on the right use of private property, since so many people at the time were dominated by a liberal capitalistic regime which, in practice, denied them proper access to the fruits of economic progress.

Pius XI followed basically the same line of thinking. Like his predecessor, he was preoccupied by the 'individualist' and the 'collectivist' trends in contem-

16. Cf. *S. Th. 2a 2ae*, Q. LXVI, art 2. In his reply to the first objection, he stated that the right to private property is not contraiy to natural law; it is an addition to natural law: "Unde proprietas possesionum non est contra jus naturale, sed juri naturali superadditur per adinventionem rationis humanae."

17. *RN* 6.

18. *Ibid.*, 9.

19. *Ibid.*, 38.

20. *Ibid.*, 35.

porary society. On the one hand, man was more and more constrained to fall back on his own individual resources, having lost the social backing that had characterized pre-industrial society. On the other hand, man was threatened with being absorbed into the collectivity and losing his personality. The reconstruction of social life, hence, involved the cultivation of individual initiative from the base. The ethical principle that should guide this process of growth from the base was, Pius XI claimed, the principle of subsidiarity. As its very name suggests, this principle requires that, as a general rule, the larger group, above all the State, should not absorb and eliminate but help and promote the smaller groups.

Oswald von Nell-Breuning is certainly correct in saying that the right to private property plays a key role in the early Catholic social teaching. At least for both Leo XIII and Pius XI, individuals and groups, especially the family, could actually and effectively emancipate themselves from the domination of a liberal capitalistic regime and, at the same time, maintain a measure of relative independence from the State, if they owned and used, as they deemed fit, those means which they required for their own self-development.

The 'personal' aspect of work, as Leo XIII called it, was not excluded.[21] But it was the notion of work as a means of earning a living or, better, as a title of ownership that was elaborated in *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. The reason is very simple: man develops himself not so much in and through productive labour as in and through other activities. The worker has a right to a just wage, because it is only with the help of the remuneration which he receives for his work that he can raise and manage his own family properly. At the place of work, the worker is expected to follow the orders and instructions of the owner/s and manager/s. In this sense, he is in a subordinate position. At home, he is 'the head'. The human person, Leo XIII wrote, "receives a wider extension in the family group."[22] It is in his capacity as 'father' that the worker realizes his profoundest wish that his children "carry on, so to speak, and continue his personality."[23] But the worker can only exercise his responsibility as 'head' of a family and realize his deepest aspiration as 'father', if he is not denied the right to keep what he earns through his labour and if he actually earns enough to enable him to fulfill adequately his responsibilities in life.[24]

21. *Ibid.*, 34.

22. *Ibid.*, 10.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Quoting Hanna Arendt, *Between Past and Future*, (London 1961), Andrew Reeve notes that the ancient Greek and Roman concept of independence presupposed power over others: "A precondition of independence from necessity was power over others, but this freedom was

Workers' Participation

Neither Leo XIII nor Pius XI made any distinction between reasons justifying *personal* and reasons justifying *productive* property. They used the same kind of arguments to justify the right of the individual to own a house and those means which are normally required to live one's own personal and family life in relative independence as well as the right to own land, natural resources and technological means of production. It is well known that the latter type of property may give excessive power to the owner.[25] It is one thing to justify the right to own personal and quite another to justify the right to own productive property. The absence of such an important distinction led to a fundamental prejudice. This was the assumption that the capitalist, that is, the one (individual or group) who owns the means of production is "the head" of the enterprise. As the workers generally have no share in the ownership of such means, they can, at most, only ask for, without demanding, some kind of participation.

Indeed, Pius XI encouraged the gradual introduction of a system of partnership or, as it is called today, workers' participation. "We deem it advisable," he wrote, "that the wage-contract should, when possible, be modified by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain both of the wage-earners themselves and to the employees ... (so that) wage-earners and other employees participate in the ownership or the management, or in some way share in the profits."[26] But he was merely *recommending* the introduction of workers' participation in the form of co-ownership, co-management or profit-sharing.

Pius XII re-affirmed the teaching of his predecessor on workers' participation. He continued to promote the gradual introduction of workers' participation. But he also maintained that the owner of the means of production should, always within the limits of the public law regulating economic activity, "remain master of his own economic decisions."[27] Surely, as F.X. Arnold noted, the Pope

to be located in a particular sphere a man could call his own, the base from which his operations in the public world could be conducted," *Property: Issues in Political Theory*, (Hampshire/London 1986) 81.

25. Pius XI, however, acknowledged that: "... certain forms of property must be reserved to the State, since they carry with them a power too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large," *QA*, 114. But he did not explain the relevance of this fundamental idea to the imposition of certain limitations to the ownership of, at least, some kinds of productive property.

26. *QA*, 65.

27. "Il propretario dei mezzi di produzione qualunque esso sia – propretario particolare, associazione d'operai o fondazione – deve, sempre nei limiti del diritto pubblico

was limiting his assertion to the right of the owner/s to decide on matters connected with the *economic* aspect of the enterprise and he acknowledged the right of civil authorities to impose certain restrictions.[28] This was a very relevant remark at the time since it was generally taken that the Pope was reacting to a very key statement made at the conclusion of the *Katholikentag* which had been held in Bochum in 1949. It was stated that the workers' right to co-determination in social, personal and economic questions was a natural right.

We may accept that Pius XII was not actually giving the owner/s of the means of production very wide power of decision. Nevertheless, he seemed to have been caught in the same net of difficulties which his predecessors had to face as a result of the emphasis they had placed on the rights emanating from ownership. Oswald von Nell-Breuning rightly stressed this point when commenting on the controversy that ensued. "The crux of all the difficulties concerning the right to co-determination," he wrote, "lies in that the owner should share the power of control over his own property, which as such belongs to him, with a non-owner or also with a multitude of non-owners."[29] In other words, the way in which Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII understood and interpreted the right to own productive property gave the workers no right as such to demand participation in ownership, management or profits.

Yet the arguments which Leo XIII adduced in support of the usefulness, if not the need, of agricultural workers to become owners of the land they were cultivating could easily open the way for a better understanding of the reason or reasons why workers' participation, for example in industry, should be regarded as something which is intrinsically related to the pre-eminent value of work. The Pope developed two lines of argument.

One line proceeds from the remuneration due to work. He held that such remuneration was just, if it enabled agricultural workers not only to support themselves and their families but also to become eventually the owners of the land they were cultivating. Such ownership, he believed, would make farming more enjoyable and self-satisfying and would increase the level of production.[30]

dell'economia, rimanere padrone delle sue decisioni economiche." Address "Ai Congressisti delle Associazioni Patronali Cattoliche," 7.5.1949, reproduced in *Atti e Discorsi di S.S. Pio XI*, Vol. XI, (1949) 115-120, p.119.

28. Cf. F.X. Arnold, *Das Mitbestimmungsrecht im Lichte christlicher Soziallehre*, (Stuttgart 1951) 35-40.

29. Oswald von Nell-Breuning, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Heute*, Vol. II, (Freiburg 1956) 96.

30. *RN*, 35.

The other line of argument proceeds from the nature of the relationship which the farmer establishes with the land through his work. Echoing Locke, he argued that through his work the farmer leaves "the impress of his individuality" on the portion of land which he is cultivating.[31] The further elaboration of these arguments and their application to the question of workers' participation came later as a result of the change of perspective in Catholic social teaching. This was the change from (private) property to work as the fundamental element of social life.

Participation and Work

The right of ownership which Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII regarded as a basic element of social life concerns mainly one aspect of participation, namely, one's right to share in the fruits of production. Besides, it is only related to the question of remuneration that is due to work. But the right to participation includes, above all, one's right to take an active part in the development of oneself, society and the world. Moreover, there is much more to consider in work than the problem of remuneration.

A New Perspective

It was John XXIII who broke fresh ground on the nature both of participation and work. His predecessors emphasised particularly the space of freedom which man required to develop on the personal and social level. They appealed to the natural rights of man – e.g. to own private property, to marry and raise a family, to associate with others – principally to assert the freedom of the individual from outside interference. While John XXIII continued to uphold the fundamental value of individual freedom and, consequently, the necessity of the institution of private property, he observed that people had developed closer ties with each other on the national and international levels. This new development which he called "socialization", changed the earlier view of freedom and independence.

In his view, the right of freedom from outside interference was still fundamental. It constituted the so-called right to independence, that is, the right to take a direct and active part in the process of one's development. But he noted that today man has to exercise his freedom in a world where people have become increasingly more dependent on each other. It is an illusion to pretend that one can actually develop on an individual and collective level without taking part in decisions that are affecting whole groups, areas, countries and, ultimately, even

31. *Ibid.*.

the whole of mankind. In the context of an inter-dependent world, the right of independence is only meaningful to the extent that it implies the freedom to take part in the shaping of a new world.

The change in the notion of independence was accompanied by a corresponding change in the notion of work. Leo XIII recognized the personal aspect of work. But he was concerned only with the right of the person to dispose of his work as something which is "his" in so far as it is his "own" activity. He mentioned this aspect of work to say that it could not provide an altogether valid criterion for the determination of a just wage. In fact, he argued that if one does not take into account that work is the normal means of earning a living, one may (falsely) conclude that the worker is free to offer his work for any amount of remuneration. But while seeing the importance of the "necessary" character of work, that is, work as a means of earning a living, he ignored the more positive dimension of work as a creative activity. This explains why he did not regard work but other human activities such as raising up a family as the medium of self-realization and self-development.

In work John XXIII saw much more than a means of earning a living. He saw in it much more than something which man must undertake in order to live. He introduced in Catholic social teaching the Hegelian notion of work as one of the media of human self-expression and self-development.[32] "Every man has, of his very nature," he wrote, "a need to express himself in his work and thereby to perfect his own being."[33]

The way in which man expresses and develops himself through work, however, is a very complex process. One aspect of this process, as Vatican II observed, is the control or mastery which man seeks to acquire over nature. Science and technology which are themselves a product of human labour, constituting, as John Paul II says, the *objective* aspect of work, allow man to control not only the world but also the physical, the biological, including genetic, psychological and sociological nature of man.[34]

Surely, this control over nature can only help man to become more human and to create a more hospitable world, if it is exercised in the interest and for the benefit of each and every person and his environment. The fact that science and technology are produced by human labour should be a constant reminder that their original purpose is not to serve as an instrument of domination but as

32. For a discussion of Hegel's concept of work, especially its relationship to the right to private property see Reeve, *Political Theory*, 136-142.

33. *Mater et Magistra*, (Catholic Truth Society Edition) no. 82. To be referred to as *MM*.

34. *Laborem Exercens*, (Vatican Polyglot) nos. 4-6. To be referred to as *LE*.

an instrument of liberation, that is, as a means through which man can continue to develop and perfect himself and the world.[35]

The notion of work as a medium of self-expression and self-perfection opened the way to a reconsideration of productive labour. Work includes but goes beyond the production of economic goods. It embraces all that human activity in which men and women are engaged to promote the well-being of society.[36] Vatican II regards "even the most ordinary everyday activities" as part of human labour and John Paul II extends the notion of work to "any activity by man whether manual or intellectual, whatever its nature or circumstances".[37] The Church adopts this rather very wide concept of work because it believes that any human activity, whether paid or unpaid, that contributes in some way or another to the development of a more human life should be considered as being useful for the well-being of society and recognized as being worthy of the dignity that is due to work.

Participation in Development

In the light of this comprehensive notion of work the Church has been in a better position to explore the logical link between the right to work and the right to participation in development and the fruits of development.

If the transformation of the self, society and the world is a process taking place through the work of each and every individual, the right to work implies the right of contributing to human development. "Each and every individual, to the proper extent and in an incalculable number of ways," John Paul II wrote, "takes part in the giant process whereby man 'subdues the earth' through his work."[38] The right to work is not a natural one, simply because man is bound to work in order to maintain himself. Work is not merely a natural necessity. It is a natural right for man to work, because it is natural for him, being a member of a human community, to contribute, in his own way, toward his individual and social well-being. John XXIII said that it is a natural need – one can say that it is a natural right – for man to participate in the creative process through which man becomes more human by means of his work.

35. *"Gaudium et Spes"* in *The Documents of Vatican II*, (W.M. Abbott/J. Gallacher eds.) no. 35. To be referred to as *GS*.

36. John Paul II mentioned the work of mothers at home which is essential for society and yet is not properly recognized as such. *LE*, 19.

37. *GS*, 34; *LE*, Preface.

38. *LE*, 4.

Men and women, however, are truly participating in their own individual and social development to the extent that they are doing so as *responsible human beings*. In fact, it is not enough for them to work together in order to change the conditions of life in the world. Co-operation has to be accompanied by co-responsibility. It would be unjust to have people contributing materially to development and then exclude them from those decisions on which the quality of development depends. Indeed, the person remains, as John Paul II says, "the subject of work," as long as he is actually in a position to guide the course of history – something which is possible only through decision-sharing.

In this context, I cannot enter into the scope of this basic ethical principle. It should suffice to recall that John XXIII made it the cornerstone of his social teaching. He maintained that the criteria that one should apply to judge the justice of an economic system are not those of efficiency and productivity or even equity in distribution. There is one basic criterion, namely, the scope people actually have to exercise their own responsibility in the system: "... if the structure and organization of an economic system is such as to compromise human dignity, to lessen a man's sense of responsibility or rob him of any opportunity for exercising personal initiative, then such a system, we maintain, is altogether unjust – no matter how much wealth it produces, or how justly and equitably such wealth is distributed."[39]

On the basis of this principle of co-responsibility, he argued, workers in industrial enterprises and other employees have the right to participate in management; farmers have the right to establish cooperatives. Besides, since conditions of work depend, partly at least, on decisions taken by public authorities and institutions on the national and international level, as a working community, people are also entitled to influence such authorities and institutions. Likewise, Vatican II focused on the emergence of the sense of personal responsibility people were exhibiting in the context of a growing inter-dependent world. It said that alongside the trend toward "socialization", which John XXIII had already explicitly noted, there was the trend toward "personalization".[40] This second trend, the Council said, had generated a need in individuals, groups and countries to take their own history and destiny, in other words, their development, into their own hands.

John Paul II introduced the distinction between the direct and indirect employer to elucidate the complex network of dependence of workers on such factors as the national labour and trade policy as well as the international

39. *MM*, 83.

40. *GS*, 6.

economic system. Following his immediate predecessors, he said: "it is respect for the objective rights of the worker – every kind of worker: manual or intellectual, industrial or agricultural, etc. – that must constitute *the adequate and fundamental criterion* for shaping the whole economy, both on the level of the individual society and State and within the whole of the world economic policy and of the systems of international relationships that derive from it."[41]

Share in the Fruits of Development

The notion of work as a direct and active way of participating in the development of oneself, society and the world has enabled the Church to shed new light on the problem of sharing in the fruits of development.

In the first place, it enabled the Church to view the problem in a far wider context than it had done in the past. Originally, it discussed the problem in terms of the share which capital and labour were entitled to have in the fruits of production. This made sense, because what was involved was the enterprise as the basic unit of production. The Church has realized in the meantime that the whole issue today is not so much how the fruits which the economic enterprise produces are to be fairly distributed between capital and labour as to how the whole human community can actually benefit from the development that mankind has achieved through its collective effort.

The Church took a long time before it arrived at this extremely important conclusion. In fact, both Leo XIII and Pius XI acknowledged that the wealth of a country is the product of human labour. But they presupposed that natural resources as well as the technological means of production have their proper owner or owners and that the interests of these should be safeguarded. The right of ownership which the capitalist possessed over natural resources and means of production was considered to be a legitimate one, even though it was not acquired through work. Although the Church always insisted that the goods which nature gives or man produces are to be used for the benefit of all, it originally explained the relations that should govern capital and labour on the basis of the principle that everything has its proper owner. Relying on the earlier tradition on property rights, it maintained that not only work but also first occupancy confers a valid and legitimate title to ownership.[42]

Now one can conceive the possibility that at a time when not the whole land was occupied and people were not organised in different states as they are today,

41. *LE*, 17.

42. "The original acquisition of property takes place both by first occupancy an by labour ..." *QA* 52.

an individual could acquire a title of ownership simply by occupying a portion of the still unowned land. This is, however, inconceivable in the present circumstances. Besides, the natural resources which are being discovered, developed and used today for various human purposes would not have been available had it not been for the high level of present-day scientific expertise and application of advanced technology. It is for this reason that John Paul II is justified to maintain that the discovery and development of natural resources have been possible only through work. This is only in part the work of this or that individual; ultimately, it is the accumulation of knowledge and the development of technique over the years that are responsible for such discoveries.[43]

This is even more so in the case of the means of production. Such means, John Paul II said, *"are the result of the historical heritage of human labour."*[44] In other words, these means are the product of generations' building on the work of previous generations. They are the fruit of the collective labour of mankind which gradually builds up a common heritage.

Men and women share in this common heritage of mankind originally for the simple reason that they are human beings having the same fundamental dignity and right. Although this point is not explicitly stated by John Paul II, it is presumed. His statement that through his work man enters into "the inheritance of what is given to the whole of humanity in the resources of nature, and the inheritance of what others have already developed on the basis of those resources ..."[45] has to be understood in the light of the more fundamental principle of the primacy of the human person over work. The right of everyone to share in the fruits of human development is grounded ultimately on the fact that one is a human being and, as such, part of mankind. Nevertheless, it is true to say, as John Paul II said, that through work the person enters into the common heritage that generations have built up through their collective labour and have passed on to each other in the course of *history*. In fact, the process through which men and women actually appropriate this common heritage and contribute to it is work.

The notion of common heritage can easily be extended to other human resources besides technology. Such human resources as know-how and skill in the use of highly sophisticated technology, in the organization and management of productive factors and in the anticipation and satisfaction of people's needs — resources to which John Paul II gives importance in *Centesimus Annus* —

43. *LE*, 12.

44. *Ibid.*.

45. *Ibid.*, 13.

also form part of a common heritage for they have been developed through the collective labour of mankind. They provide an additional and even clearer proof of the key role which work has acquired as a productive factor of non-material wealth.

The right of everyone to share in these human resources lies in the fact that one has a right to develop one's own potential and in the fact that these resources also form an integral part of a heritage that is common to all.

Workers' Right to Participation

One of the areas to which the Church, from John XXIII to John Paul II, has applied the principle of the priority of labour over capital is that of workers' participation. As I have pointed out, Pius XI and Pius XII did encourage the gradual introduction of some form of workers' participation. In their opinion, workers' participation was to be promoted as a highly desirable goal, but it was not to be demanded as a natural right. Besides Pius XII presupposed, the lawful right of the owner/s of the means of production to decide, at least, on economic matters.

The new perspective which the Church has formed in recent years has allowed it to approach the problem of workers' participation in a theoretically more adequate way. Yet its present position can be viewed as an evolution of the two lines of argument which Leo XIII developed in order to justify the need of agricultural workers to become owners of the land they were cultivating.

In fact, the first argument which the Church has brought lately in support of workers' participation is precisely that remuneration for work should allow the worker not merely to earn a living but also to come gradually "to share in the ownership of their company by suitable ways and means."[46] Basically, this is an extension of what Leo XIII had said regarding agricultural workers to other categories of workers. The central point here is that remuneration for work is not adequate, unless and until it is enough to enable the worker to share in the ownership of the means of production, besides meeting his own personal and family needs. The present Pope sought to justify such a claim by explaining that the discovery and use of natural resources as well as the development of the means of production are, in the last resort, to be considered as the fruit of the collective labour of mankind and, hence, they form part of a common heritage.

It is the right which workers have to co-ownership of the means of production as a right flowing from the remuneration due to work (considered on a

46. *MM*, 77.

collective rather than merely on an individual plane) that John Paul II analyses in his encyclical on work.[47] To some this may seem a deviation from the position of Vatican II on the matter.[48] Indeed, the Council tried to justify workers' participation on the basis of the concept, already noted by John XXIII, of the enterprise as "a community of persons".[49] But this actually constitutes a separate justification, mentioned also by John Paul II, of the right of workers to participate in the activity of the enterprise with which they are working.[50]

The argument in support of the right of workers to co-responsibility and co-determination is based on the principle that the worker is entitled to participate in the economic process as a responsible human being. In other words, irrespective of who is the owner of the means of production in a particular firm, each and every worker is a human being who has the right not just to earn a living through his work but also and, above all, to express and perfect himself in his work. Leo XIII, as I have pointed out, perceived precisely the significance and value which greater interest and initiative on the part of farmers in their work could have for the humanization of agricultural work. Again the attempt of the more recent Catholic social teaching to derive the workers' right to co-responsibility/co-determination from the right of the worker to develop himself through his work is continuous with Leo XIII's view that the farmer has a right to a self-satisfying type of work.

Final Remark

The right to participation is an extremely complex one. It was not the purpose of these few observations to discuss its relationship to such values as freedom and equality, even though, as I have pointed out at the beginning, this is quite a relevant area for further investigation.

The analysis of what the main social documents of the Church have said on the relationship of participation to property and work has shown, I hope, how

47. On workers' participation in *Laborem Exercens* see Oswald von Nell-Breuning, "Mitbestimmung in Laborem Exercens," in *Sinn und Zukunft der Arbeit: Konsequenzen aus Laborem Exercens*, (Wolfgang Klein and Werner Krämer eds.) (Mainz 1982) 161-165.

48. See, for example, the view of Friedhelm Hengsbach, "Die Gesellschaftliche Dimension menchlicher Arbeit," in *Sinn und Zukunft*, 85-99, p.92.

49. *MM*, 91; *GS*, 68.

50. "When man works, using all the means of production, he also wishes the fruit of this work to be used by himself and others, and he wishes to be able to take part in the very work process as a *sharer in responsibility* and *creativity* at the workbench to which he applies himself," *LE*, 15. Italics not in the original.

a change in the meaning of property and work has resulted in a change in what it means for man to say that he has a right to participation.

Department of Moral Theology
Faculty of Theology
University of Malta
Msida, Malta.

EUROPEAN VALUES STUDY IN MALTA[1]

Anthony M. Abela S.J.*

Over the past thirty years sociological research on Maltese society has employed variants of the secularization model in order to explain change in contemporary Maltese society. It has generally been assumed that socio-economic development in Malta[2] was conducive to a decline in the social significance of religion and the erosion of traditional values. Social scientists presumed that Malta would follow the trends of secularization which were evident earlier in Europe. The passage of time, however, and further analysis by the same social researchers, has shown that the secularization model does not fit the Maltese case completely.[3]

In fact, representatives of the Maltese often voice the concern of the aged who witness the disappearance of their inherited values, on how youths working in the tourist industry are affected by foreign culture and on how head of families are eaten by consumerism. At the same time many workers are found to be excellent head of families, not a few are proud and ambitious of their jobs and some see in work the development of creation. In the same way, Maltese youths experience the pains of broken marriages, the deception of false ideas and the rat-race for a successful career, materialism and consumerism though not a few

* Anthony M. Abela born in Malta 1954, graduated B.A. Hons in Philosophy from the University of Malta in 1977. In the same year he joined the Society of Jesus, graduated S.T.B. from the Gregorian University in 1983 and Maîtrîçe en Theologiè from the Centre Sevres in Paris (1985). Was Visiting Lecturer at the Institute of Religious Studies, Malta (1986). Read for an M.A. in Sociology at Loyola University of Chicago (1987-88) and D.Phil from Oxford University (1991). Assistant Professor at the Pontifical University in Rome, and since Jan 1992 he lectures in Social Policy at the University of Malta.

1. An earlier version of this article was translated into Italian by Michele Simone S.I. and published in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 1992 II 42-47 *quaderno 3403*.

2. The small Mediterranean Islands of Malta have a total surface area of 246 square kilometers, 93 km away from mainland Europe and 290 km from North Africa. Since its independence from Britain in 1964, Malta has become a Republic, non-aligned and neutral Nation-State, joined the Council of Europe, established trade agreements with the European Community and has applied for full membership on July 16, 1990. Most of its 350,000 population is practicing Roman Catholic.

3. See, for instance, J. Bossevain's *Saints and Fireworks. Religion and Politics in Rural Malta* (1965) and his follow-up study "Ritual Escalation in Malta", in E.R. Wolf (ed.) *Religion, Power and Protest in Local Communities*, (1984).

are animated by much goodness and generosity and strive for unity, solidarity and a more just society.[4]

Replying to these concerns, at the end of his three-day pastoral visit to the Islands of Malta, Pope John Paul II urged the Maltese to keep firm to their traditional religious values and beliefs. He recalled how Malta has historically been admired for her uncompromising defence of the Christian faith and her willingness to endure heroic sacrifices for the upkeep of its culture. John Paul II called on the Maltese to contribute to the spiritual unity of the Old Continent by offering their treasures of Christian faith and values. As a pastor and leader of the Church he observed that as Europe prepares to enter a new phase of its history, "Europe needs Malta's faithful witness too." But, we might ask, what is really happening to Christian culture and civilization in Malta? To what extent do the Maltese share traditional or alternatively, modern European values?

Research on values

A recent book on the transmission of values in European Malta adopts a scientific approach to the study of values.[5] It makes use of comparable data available from the *European Value Systems Study Group*,[6] in order to present an objective picture of Maltese values in an European perspective. This study builds on previous sociological theory and research but applies new methods of social scientific analysis in order to develop further the understanding of values, their meanings, transmission and transformation in the process of their communication. It addresses the problem of social change in Maltese society in terms of values and value systems. It adopts a reversal of the European model of secularization in that it takes as its point of departure the communication of tradition, rather than its erosion. It addresses such questions as: Which values unite and distinguish the Maltese from each other *and* from other Europeans?

4. See the addresses to Pope John Paul II in Malta (May 25-27, 1990) by the representatives of workers and youths.

5. Anthony M. Abela, *Transmitting Values in European Malta: A Study in the Contemporary Values of Modern Society*, (Jesuit Publications; Valletta, & Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana; Rome 1991).

6. A Maltese version of the Values questionnaire was administered by Gallup in 1984 but the data was not reported in the European or World Values studies. Gordon Heald summarily reported how Malta emerged as the proudest, most religious yet intolerant country, the most hardworking with the highest levels of family life satisfaction in Europe, closer in attitudes to Northern Europe than to neighbouring Catholic countries. M. Vassallo in *Close Up*, (Media Centre; Malta 1985) held that Maltese youths, unlike their peers abroad, are very traditional and have no strong aspirations for radical social change. Then P. Delooz, "The Church in Malta", *Pro Mundi Vita Dossiers*, (Brussels 1986) observed that although Malta is not a consumerist country people enjoy good physical and moral well-being, a matter which is not unrelated to their high religiosity.

What happens to their traditional value system as they come under the influence of *new* work opportunities, education, leisure, the media, overseas travel and mass tourism? Which values are deemed important to be transmitted to future generations and how are they transformed in the process of their reproduction? How is the family, religion and the quality of life of the local community likely to be affected as post-traditional Maltese adopt as European identity? Where does Malta stand on the map of European values?

Contemporary studies on European values discovered a unity alongside diversity and change. Divergent patterns are found to be coupled by an underlying organisation of values. Europe has distinct cross-national cultural contrasts but also a unified value system, demonstrating at a number of points an internal logic which clearly transcends national and linguistic boundaries.[7] Such homogeneity at the structural level could be traced to a shared inheritance of European culture and civilisation. Yet, the separate analyses for each country reduces the risk of over-simplification and over-prediction of the behaviour of individuals.[8]

The most significant value system for Europe and by extension for each European country taken separately, is the traditional and post-traditional value orientation. Such a traditional-post-traditional divide, later to be constructed into a continuum links together family, religion, work, politics, morality, education, age and other social variables. At the traditional end stand the religious, the politically right, the morally strict, those educated in traditional qualities like obedience, good manners and thrift, parental duty and respect and the acceptance of instructions at work. In contrast, the post-traditional stands for the qualities of personal autonomy such as independence, imagination and a sense of responsibility. At this end of the scale are to be found the morally liberal, the politically left, the non-religious and those who are critical of social institutions and authority, the higher educated and the young. Generally, those adhering to traditional values report being well-contented with their lives, whereas those upholding secular-radical values emerge as more alienated, with low reported well-being, experiences of meaningless and lack of control.

7. See the first report by Jean Stoetzel, *Les valeurs du temps présent: une enquête européenne*, (Presses Universitaires de France; Paris 1983) followed by a more scientific study undertaken by Harding Stephen, David Phillips and Michael Fogarty, *Contrasting Values in Western Europe. Unity, Diversity and Change. Studies in the Contemporary Values of Modern Society*, (Macmillan and EVSSG; London 1986).

8. The studies for separate European countries were published by Orizo in Spain (1983); Rezsohazy and Kekhofs in Belgium (1984); Fogarty *et al.* in Ireland (1984); Abrams *et al.* in Britain (1985); Calvaruso and Abbruzzese in Italy (1985); and Halman *et al.* in Holland (1987).

More recently Inglehart's analysis of survey data gathered from 1970 to 1988 from twenty-six nations, strengthens his earlier contention that in the post-war era there has occurred an inter-generational shift from materialist to post-materialist values. Materialist values are one component of traditional values, just as post-materialist are of post-traditional values. Inglehart shows how advanced industrial societies are gradually departing from a traditional value system. In his view, traditional value systems emerge in economies characterized by very little technological change and low economic growth and where social mobility is a zero-sum game and heavily loaded with conflict. Traditional societies discourage social mobility but encourage the accumulation of wealth. They achieve social integration by a rationale that legitimates the established social order and inculcates norms of sharing, charity and other obligations that help to mitigate the harshness of the economy. By contrast, in post-traditional societies where scarcity has been eliminated and the time-lag of socialization superseded, there gradually emerge post-materialist values. Socio-economic development, coupled with a high civic culture as an intervening variable, results in a post-materialist orientation. Inglehart insists, however, that shifts in culture are extremely slow because there is a remarkable stability of values within each society. He finds that there is seven times as much cross-national variation as there is change over time within a society.[9]

In the Maltese study a systems approach differentiates between terminal and instrumental values operating in distinct spheres of social life and examines the extent to which they are eroded, transformed or reproduced in a changed social context. Following previous European research the value system of the Maltese is identified in terms of traditional and post-traditional value orientations. Social values are first organized into systems by factor analysis, then differentiated and predicted in terms of socio-demographic characteristics. The chapters examine the values of the family, religion, work and leisure, tourism, social organisations, community and society.

As in other Western European countries, Maltese values have both a traditional and a post-traditional dimension. The predominant traditional Maltese culture is reproduced in the family and the institutions of the Catholic Church and is transformed in the process. Religion is an integral dimension of social life in Malta. Religious values permeate all spheres of social life in Malta be it leisure, marriage, work, community and politics. The religious factor contributes to maintain the high traditionality of the Maltese but, curiously enough, also to the development of a post-traditional orientation by young religious leaders. Totally distinct from young people abroad who in the main

9. Ronald Inglehart, *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*, (Princeton University Press; New Jersey 1990).

abandon the practices of the Church, not a few Maltese youths find a balance between tradition and modernity. In the local situation they experiment with the inherited models of religion and give new forms to the received traditional content. Generally, the Maltese at large have a high esteem of the institutions of the Catholic Church in Malta, most have high confidence in the leaders of the Church and want explicit guidance on major moral issues dealing with the family, social life, the spiritual needs of the individual even if a considerable number do not tolerate any interference in party politics.

The greatest variance between the traditional and post-traditional Maltese is to be observed for distinct levels of education. The lower educated tend to be predominantly traditional and materialist, whereas the higher educated are in the main post-traditional. Generally, when compared to other Europeans, the Maltese are highly traditional, religious, family-oriented but intolerant of others who hold different opinions and values from themselves.

Change in values

One would expect a rapid change in values that corresponds to a rapid social and economic development. Our findings, however, are counter-intuitive. Thus, for instance, there is no one-to-one relationship between exposure to tourism, foreign travel or the media and sexual permissivity. Only education remains the determining factor. The higher educated tend to favour an European identity and a post-traditional value orientation. Whereas most people think that change is inevitable irrespective of direct foreign influence or not, the higher educated tend to evaluate such change as not altogether beneficial. In their view the Maltese are becoming excessively materialistic. Accordingly, post-traditionality significantly depends on education, civic culture and a sense of European identity and less on social class, gender and foreign influence. Unlike other European countries Maltese post-traditionality is independent of age. Although there is no evidence to support a culture shift, the youngest generation is found to be the most diversified in post-traditional values.

The final chapters trace Malta's place on the European map of values – the quality of life of the traditional as against the post-traditional Maltese, the locally-bound as against the European-oriented – in order to assess the impact of Malta's aspiration for European integration. Contrary to expectations, whereas in the advanced industrial societies of Western Europe traditionality is strongly related to materialism, traditional Malta stands on middle ground between materialist and post-materialist countries. Thus, on the map of European values Malta emerges as a traditional country, highly traditional and religious but also a country where people enjoy high levels of satisfaction in their family, work, leisure and everyday life. As the Oxford sociologist Professor A.H. Halsey observes in the preface of the book: "Malta, in short, turns out to be a

critical laboratory of contemporary social experiment in adaptation to the transformation of traditional European society."

The initial results from the Values repeat study in the Nineties report how the Maltese have retained their strong religiosity and a high confidence in the Church. Out of all European countries, the Maltese claimed the most satisfaction with their home-life, a matter not unrelated to their traditional attitudes towards marriage and the family. In fact, Malta figures as the most satisfied country in Western Europe, where the Maltese report more satisfaction in life than people in Britain, Italy, France or Belgium. They are second only to the Irish in national pride but they are still very suspicious of their fellow citizens, even if they have become more trusting in recent years. Although the Maltese are still fairly intolerant, particularly with regard to people with a criminal record, heavy drinkers, those with AIDS and homosexuals, Malta has become more tolerant of political extremists.[10] It remains to be seen through a deeper sociological analysis of the repeat Values study in the Nineties whether the Maltese are successful to mitigate their social intolerance, to adopt post-materialist values, counter secularization and translate their religious faith into works of justice for the common good.

In a situation where not a few Maltese are motivated by a materialistic mentality of a traditional society, the Church has a duty to teach on the right use of material resources, to warn against greed and overwork, to elaborate on the morality of work, the responsibility that behoves workers and employers on the workplace, as well as on the protection of the environment.

Anthony M. Abela S.J.,
Dar Patri Magri,
Tower Street,
Msida MSD 06,
Malta.

10. See the preliminary report on the Values Study in the Nineties, Gallup Press Release, February 7, 1992.

THE SERVANT IN A FELLOWSHIP OF SUFFERING AND LIFE WITH THE LORD

An exegesis of John 12,26

Nicholas Cachia*

Introduction

The Synoptic Gospels, while visualizing discipleship as a fellowship in suffering and life with the Master, prefer to emphasize in a particular way the communion of the disciple in the suffering and death of Jesus. After his decision to follow Christ, the disciple is associated in a very special way to him and accompanies his Master on the way which leads to the cross. Hence, the communion of the disciple with Jesus is accounted for in the terms of the cross.

The Gospel of John underlines the intimate relationship of faith and love between the Lord and the disciples, who are completely aware that all they are and have is a gift of God. Jesus promises to those who follow him a complete fellowship in suffering and life with him, who is now in the Father's abode where he went to prepare for them a place (Jn 14,1-4) in order that they may be "there where he is" – this being the typical Johannine note of the Christian discipleship. It is a supra-temporal and a supra-spatial promise which Christ makes to all Christians of all ages. Jn 12,26 thus becomes central for one's understanding of discipleship in the Fourth Gospel: «If any one serves me, he must follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also; if any one serves me, the Father will honour him.»

This study will consider the context wherein the Evangelist has placed this verse, since in John, in particular, the context is also a carrier of theological ideas which influence the singular elements that make up the whole context. Thus, the study of the dynamism of the pericope will shed light on the right understanding of the verse itself. The exegesis of the verse will follow; this endeavours to usher out the significance the Evangelist has put into this saying about discipleship. The study of the similitudes and divergences of this Johannine saying of Jesus with that of the Synoptics (Mk 8,34; Mt 16,24; Lk 9,23 and

Nicholas Cachia was born at Siggiewi, Malta, in 1961 and ordained priest in 1988. He obtained the bachelorship in Philosophy and Theology from the Faculty of Theology in Malta, the Licentiate in Theology (Pastoral) from the University of Malta and the Licentiate in Theology (Biblical) from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. At present he is preparing his doctoral thesis at the Institute of Spirituality of the same University in Rome.

Mt 10,38; Lk 14,27), will bring out the particularities of the viewpoint of John as compared to that of the Synoptics.

The context of John 12,20-36

The verse finds immediate context in the pericope 12,20-36 near the end of chapters 11 and 12 of the Gospel of John, which owing to their thematic importance, serve as a conclusion to the first part of the book and an introduction to the second part, focusing as they do on the hour of glorification of Jesus. Brown, in fact, groups these chapters together under the theme of «Jesus moves toward the hour of death and glory».[1] The fact that they are situated within the context of "the passover of the Jews" (11,55; 12,1) already suggests that they are meant to serve as a prelude to the passion narrative. The same do the references to the objections of the disciples to Jesus' decision to go to Judea where he had previously found hostility (cf. 11,5-16).

Chapter 11,1-44 recounts the "sign" of Lazarus' resurrection which underlines that Jesus is the resurrection and the life (11,25-26; cf. also 11,11.23.43) and that this had happened «so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it» (11,4; cf. also 11,40). The following verses (11,45-54) narrate the consequences that this miracle had on the population but, especially, on the Pharisees who decide that Jesus should be put to death for, in the words of the high priest, «it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish» (11,50). This comment is underlined by the Evangelist by what he says in vv.51-52, interpreting it in universalistic terms. Verses 55-57 serve as a transition from this "sign" to that which follows in Chapter 12.[2]

Chapter 12 begins with two significant narratives: the Anointing at Bethany (12,1-8) and the Triumphal Entry in Jerusalem (12,12-15) both of which are presented by the Evangelist as a preparation for the passion of Jesus. In fact, in the Anointing scene Jesus refers the action of Mary to "the day of my burial" (12,7) while the messianic tenor of the second narrative is quite visible. Dodd summarizes the import of this Triumphal Entry saying that «it is a *sēmeion* of

1. Cf. R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John*, I (AB 29; New York 1966) 419.429; E. RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", *Verbum Domini* 37(1959) 19. C.H. DODD, although he suggests that these two chapters constitute two different episodes (11,1-53: the sixth episode; and 12,1-36: the seventh episode), seems to underline just as well their thematic unity. In fact, he says that the theme of chapter 11 is «Christ Himself manifested as Resurrection and Life by virtue of His self-sacrifice», *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) 368. It is the same theme, more or less, of the seventh episode: life through death to which Lazarus is the privileged witness (cf. Jn 12,17-18).

2. Cf. DODD, *Interpretation*, 369; BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 445-446.

the universal sovereignty of Christ as Conqueror of death and Lord of life, and as such the sequel to His (symbolic) death».[3]

In the verses set between the two narratives (12,9-11) the Evangelist underlines the hostility of the chief priests against Jesus stating that they had decided to kill also Lazarus since because of him many people were believing in Jesus. The verses 12,16-18 are in themselves a comment on the crowd's attitude towards Jesus, while serving also to link all this to the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead. Verse 19, reporting the statement of the Pharisees that "the world has gone after him" is the link with what follows.

Next comes the pericope where the verse under study is situated (12,20-36). This is followed by what commentators consider to be the epilogue of the first part of the Gospel (12,37-50).[4]

The Pericope 12,20-36

Brown considers this scene, from the viewpoint of thought sequence, as «an ideal conclusion to chapters 11 and 12».[5] Many times in this Gospel we have heard Jesus state that his hour had not yet come (2,4; 7,30; 8,30), the hour of his return to his Father through crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension. In 11,4 we had heard Jesus say that the death of Lazarus was for the glorification of the Son of Man. Now this hour of glorification has come (12,23). The immediately preceding scenes include a series of actions which show the imminence of the passion of Jesus and, thus, of his being lifted up in the resurrection and drawing all men to himself to give them life (12,32; cf. v.24). Also, the fact that this is not exclusive to the Jewish people is underlined by a series of universalistic references which reach their climax in the coming of the Greeks (12,20).

It is, in fact, their approach which gives the occasion to Jesus to make the following speech. The inclusion of this incident by the Evangelist is not to be considered as insignificant.[6] For even if it were possible to speak of 'insignificant

3. *Interpretation*, 371; BROWN says that it is «an affirmation of a universal kingship that will be achieved only when he is lifted up in death and resurrection», *Gospel according to John*, I, 463.

4. Cf. DODD, *Interpretation*, 379-83; BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 481-93 who refers to this section as the evaluation and summation of Jesus' ministry.

5. *Gospel according to John*, I, 469.

6. Cf., for example, Lagrange who together with others links this incident with the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem saying that the Greeks' question was mere curiosity. Cf. G. FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo nel Quarto Vangelo: Analisi di Strutture Letterarie* (Excerpta ex dissertatione; Roma 1970) 23, footnote 3.

scenes' in other parts of the Fourth Gospel, it is much the less here where the moment presents itself as solemn and the themes of utmost importance[7] Their coming gives Jesus the opportunity to make a very important revelation about Himself and His mission.[8] They stand for the whole world which shows that the unfolding of the hour assumes universalistic dimensions. «These Greeks are the vanguard of mankind coming to Christ».[9] Brown synthesizes the matter thus: «The *coming* of the Gentiles is so theologically important that the writer never tells us if they got to see Jesus, and indeed they disappear from the scene in much the same manner that Nicodemus slipped out of sight in ch.3».[10] It is only a right understanding of this incident of the approach of the Greeks to Jesus that can adequately explain his exclamation that the hour of glorification of the Son of Man has come (v.23).

In fact the main theme of this pericope is the glorification of Jesus and of the Father which is supported by a number of other themes which illustrate this reality and revelation, even through contrast. Owing to the number of themes present in this pericope, Brown refers to it as «a climactic scene» while Rasco states that this brings out the importance of the pericope which assumes the role of an introduction to the imminent drama of the passage of Jesus to the Father (13,1).[11]

Rasco also points out that in this pericope the themes of death and glorification of Jesus are so intimately connected one to another that they identify themselves. The death of Christ is his glorification. It is under this light that the Evangelist wants the reader to approach his passion narrative.[12] Barrett

7. Cf. FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 24; also C.K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St John: An Introduction with commentary and notes on the Greek Text* (London 1962) 350.

8. Cf. RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 20.

9. DODD, *Interpretation*, 371; cf. also BARRETT, *Gospel according to St John*, 350; M. DOSIO, *L'Ora di Cristo nel discepolato: saggio di teologia biblica giovannea* (Roma 1980) 14; J. JEREMIAS, *Jesu Verheißung für die Wölken* (Stuttgart 1956) 31-32 as quoted in FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 25. This is also the line of thought that St Augustine follows in his Commentary of the Gospel of John. He says: «Ex occasione igitur istorum gentilium qui eum videre cupiebant, annuntiat futuram plenitudinem gentium; et promittit iam iamque adesse horam glorificationis suae, qua facta in caelis, gentes fuerant crediturae.» *In Ioannis Evangelium* in: *Opera Omnia di Sant'Agostino: Commentario al Vangelo di San Giovanni — Edizione Bilingue* (Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana XXIV/1-2; Roma ²1985-6) Tract. 51,8.

10. *Gospel according to John*, I, 470.

11. Cf. BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 469; RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 20; also M. DE LONGE, *Jesus: Stranger from heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (SBLSBS 11; Montana 1977) 173.

12. Cf. RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 20: «Et revera in hac pericopa intimius quam alibi coniunguntur sane usque ad identificationem, thema mortis et glorificationis. Mors Christi

adds that the death of Jesus is seen, here, as the climax of his complete obedience to the Father and thus becomes the judgement of this world (v.31), the exaltation of the Son of Man (vv.23.32), the fruition of the whole ministry (v.24) and a challenge to Israel (vv.35-36).[13] This is, in Johannine terms, the "hour of glorification" which comprises the totality of the paschal mystery and the convergence point of the whole public life of Jesus.[14]

The dynamism of this pericope as presented hereunder will help us understand the different sections of the whole scene which are, in turn, strictly connected one to another. The speech-answer of Jesus (vv.23.30.35) is always introduced by the verb *legō*. In vv. 23 and 30 this verb is united with the other 'answering' verb *apokrinomai*. The key words of every speech of Jesus (indicated in brackets) underline the theme treated in every section and which sheds light on the main theme of the whole pericope:

- 1st speech: the hour of glorification – its impact on Jesus and his servant;
- 2nd speech: the judgement of the world through the exaltation of Christ;
- 3rd speech: the contrast between light and darkness – necessity for the people to decide owing to the exaltation of Christ.

est eius glorificatio. Utrumque thema paulatim per evangelium evolutum erat, hic iam commiscetur. Auctor nos veluti admonet ut sub hoc lumine eventus Passionis legamus.»

13. Cf. *Gospel according to St John*, 350-351; also K. TSUCHIDO, "Tradition and redaction in John 12,1-43", *New Testament Studies* 30(1984) 613.

14. Cf. FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 186-187; also BARRETT, *Gospel according to St John*, 350; DOSIO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 8.28; H., VAN DEN BUSSCHE, "Si le grain de blé ne tombe en terre" *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 5(1954) 55.57.

The dynamism of the pericope

I.	12,20-22	: Introduction (Some Greeks want to 'see' Jesus);
	12,23-28	: Speech – Answer (*hōra*: vv. 23.27.27; *doksazō*: 4x in vv.23.28 thus enclosing the whole speech; *psuchē*: vv.24.24.27; the stem *diakon-* 3x in v.26);
II.	12,29	: Reaction of the crowd – Incomprehension (links up with the preceding verse in that the crowd reacts to the sound);
	12,30-32.33	: Speech – Answer of Jesus (*hupsoō*: v.32; *krisis*: v.31; *kosmos*: v.31);
III.	12,34	: Reaction of the crowd – Incomprehension (links up with the preceding verse in that the crowd takes up what Jesus had said about himself, including also the important verb *hupsoō*);
	12,35-36a.36b	: Speech – Answer of Jesus (*phōs*: vv.35.35.36(x3); *peripatein*: v.35.35; *skotia*: v.35; *pisteuō*: v.36);
		Conclusion (Jesus "hides himself").[15]

The verse 12,26 within the pericope

The main theme and the dynamism of the whole pericope will enlighten the right understanding of the verse which, in turn, sheds light also on the whole context. Some authors believe that « in vss. 20-33, what is being discussed is the ultimate destiny of Jesus' disciples, which is directly connected with the "lifting

15. A similar schema is presented by FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 27. X. LÉON-DUFOUR, "Trois chiasmes johanniques (Jn 12,23-32; 6,35-40; 5,19-30)", *New Testament Studies* 7(1960-61) 249-251 and A. DI MARCO, *Il chiasmo nella Bibbia: contributi di stilistica strutturale — ricerche e proposte* (Torino 1980) 145-146 propose a chiastic structure of 12,23-32 which, they contend, «sottointende la teologia giovannea sull'unione del discepolo e del maestro» (DI MARCO, *Il chiasmo nella Bibbia*, 145). They do not find a place in this chiastic structure to 12,29-30, which as they say, break the structure. So they unite them to 12,33-35. This shows the fragility of this position.

up – glorification" of the Son».[16] However, I think that although there is an intimate relationship between Jesus and his disciples, the pericope is above all Christological. Still, we cannot deny that «Jesus and his exaltation can be spoken of only in terms of its significance for his followers. One can treat Jesus and those who belong to him only together».[17] Thus the ecclesial significance of the pericope, although always subordinate to the Christological one, is also important.

The disciple is related intimately to Christ, his Lord. The disciple believes in the Light, and, thus, becomes the son of Light (cf. v.36). He listens to the word of Jesus: "I am the Light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (8,12). He is united so much to Christ that there is almost an identification between one and the other. Through his uncompromising behaviour, lived always in complete obedience to the will of the Father, the disciple becomes a continuing appeal to the world to decide for Jesus, to forsake darkness in order to embrace Light itself. It is a way of life, which like that of Jesus, brings about persecution and suffering from those who are interested to remain in the realm of sin. This implies that the disciple, like his Master, has to renounce himself and make the experience of suffering and death in order to be honoured by the Father.[18]

The intimate relation that there is between Christ and his disciples is made visible in a most particular way in the first section of the whole discourse of Jesus (12,23-28), the immediate context of our verse. The verb *doksazō* in vv. 23 and 28 (3x) makes an inclusion of the whole section, thus calling for an interpretation in the light of this glorification. The same does the noun *hōra* in vv. 23 and 27 (2x). This speech explains what is meant by the "hour of glorification"; it explains what is meant by Jesus when he says that "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" (v.23). It is the death which has as its end the bearing of fruit which is not merely a separate and successive moment from the disintegration of the grain of wheat, which became a seed, but it is already contained in it (v.24). It is, again, the total gift of oneself, of one's life to God and to others even to the point of death wherein one finds the true significance of life (v.25). It is, finally, the complete obedience of one's will to God even though this perturbs one's soul, creating no small suffering (v.27). The recompense of all

16. Cf., for example, DE LONGE, *Jesus: Stranger from heaven*, 174. In the lifting up – glorification of the Son he sees the «bringing together in the Father's house (14,1-3) of all God's children who are scattered over the whole world».

17. M. VELLANICKAL, "Discipleship according to the Gospel of John", *Jeevadhara* 10(1980) 145.

18. Cf. LÉON-DUFOUR, "Trois chiasmas johanniques", 250.

this is the honour of the Father, which, again, is not a separate, successive moment but is simultaneous to one's self-renunciation and self-sacrifice (v.28[19]).

The passage between Christ and the disciple is quite easy to make at this point. While v.23 clearly refers to Jesus himself followed immediately by v.24, which explicates in parabolic form the "hour of glorification", v.25 is left quite ambiguous as regards its application. It can refer both to Jesus and to the disciples, applying to them that which was said of Christ before. Here, in this verse, they have become almost identified. This is brought to its ultimate consequence in v.26 when Jesus promises his disciples that "where I am, there shall my servant be also".[20] At this point the complete fellowship between Jesus and his disciples is transparent. Schweizer says in this regard:

> The last phrase (v.26) shows that v.25, which one would at first apply to Jesus, has, quite as a matter of course, been extended to the disciples in the same sense in which it is applied to Jesus. This seems so self-evident that one can no longer even say whether a particular phrase refers to Jesus or to his disciples. It holds good for both because they have reached full communion. An all-embracing "being where he is" has been granted to whosoever follows him.[21]

And it is in this spirit that verse 12,26 will be studied.

19. Note that in the voice that comes from heaven the verb *doKsazō* is used once in the aorist and once in the future. BROWN, following THÜSING, says that a plausible explanation of this is that «the aorist refers to the whole ministry of Jesus, *including the hour*... The past tense used by the heavenly voice means that God has heard the prayer and accomplished that glorification in the hour now begun... The future glorification of the divine name will be accomplished by the exalted Christ who, as vs. 32 assures us, will draw all men to himself», *Gospel according to John*, I, 476-477.

20. Cf. RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 75-76: «Illa oscillatio versuum 25-26 inter Christum et discipulos suos, fortasse sub luce theologica sufficienter explicari potest. Graeci volebant Iesum videre (vv.20-22) et Iesus "respondet" affirmando horam glorificationis advenisse (v.23) per exaltationem in cruce, qui "ad eius horam pertinet coadunatio communitatis", et sic saltem indirecte responsum Graecis datur per passionem eius, ad Iesum tamquam exaltatum, accessum habent. Via igitur glorificationis per mortem transit (v.24); haec est lex cui Christus ex amore sese subiecit, quae directe quidem ad eum applicatur, ita tamen ut non excludatur, immo quodammodo exigatur, eiusdem legis ad suos applicatio... Haec vero lex iam in versu 25 directe ad Christi discipulos applicatur ... potissimum ratione illius inseparabilitatis vitae discipulorum a Iesu, illius solidarietatis consequentis sacrificium Christi.» Cf. also BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 474.

21. E. SCHWEIZER, *Lordship and Discipleship* (SBT 28; London 1960) 86; F.B. WESTCOTT says that «the truth expressed in vss 24-25 is applied specially to the claims of discipleship. Service is progressive (comp. 21,19ff) and the effort of 'following' does not fail its issue.» Moreover, he notes as remarkable the repetition of the pronouns in v.26. *The Gospel according to John with Introduction and Notes* (London 1958) 181.

John 12,26

Since this verse, together with the preceding two, seems to be an insertion between v.23 and vv.27-28, product of editorial rearrangement,[22] some authors tend to think that they are not Johannine. Rasco established that the literary criteria indicate Johannine paternity to vv.24-26. Verse 26, he says, «implies more certain criteria of authenticity».[23] This verse, in fact, contains one of the Johannine characteristics, that is *(e)an (mē)tis*, used twice: *ean emoi tis diakonę̄* and *ean tis emoi diakonę̄*.[24] There is also chiasm which is favoured by John in the central part of the phrase.[25] Finally, there is also the typical Johannine use of the pronoun *emos* instead of *mou*. In our text this is combined to the noun with a repetition of the article, which thus becomes exclusive: *ho diakonos ho emos*.[26]

The verse opens with a *protasis*, followed by an *apodosis*, which in turn is followed by two promises of Jesus to those who decide to serve him in following him. The verse is thus structured:

A *ean emoi tis diakonę̄,*
emoi akoloutheitō,

B *kai hopou* *eimi* *egō*
ekei kai *ho diakonos ho emos*
estai.

A[1] *ean tis emoi diakonę̄*
timēsei auton ho patēr.

22. Cf. BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 471.

23. "Christus, granum frumenti", 14.

24. Cf. E. SCHWEIZER, *Ego eimi ... Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums* (Göttingen 1939) 93, as quoted by RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 14.

25. DI MARCO says on the use of chiasm in the Fourth Gospel that «il vangelo di Giovanni è opera non solo di un grande teologo, ma di un grande artista. Teologia e arte vi sono scambievolmente complementari.» *Chiasmo nella Bibbia*, 140.

26. Cf. RASCO, "Christus, granum frumenti", 14.

The *protasis* in A finds its equivalent in A^1 (although here *tis* is put before *emoi*[27]), forming a saying which is synthetically parallel and creating an inclusion. The centre of the structure of the verse is, then, characterized by the chiasm that there is between the subject (*egō* and *ho diakonos ho emos*) and the verb (*eimi* and *estai*) of the two parts of the phrase (clearly indicated by *kai hopou* and *ekei kai*). Silva comments on this, saying that «the chiasmic disposition of the *logion* in the Fourth Gospel underlines the dialectic union of both moments in the following of Christ».[28]

The *protasis* is formulated by *ean* together with the verb in the subjunctive present. This conditional phrase indicates eventuality and iteration[29] which, with the verb in the present, refers to the future.[30] In the Johannine conditional statements the *protasis* and *apodosis* are integral one to another. Together they explain what it means to be Jesus' disciple.[31] This is also true of our verse. In the central part of the *logion* the verb *eimi* is considered to refer to the future, a present with a future value.[32] This is confirmed by the use of the future tense in the second part of the phrase, *estai*.[33]

The condition which opens the phrase is an invitation to one and all, leaving everyone in full freedom of choice. It includes, taking account of the whole

27. Some authorities change the order of the first *protasis* putting *tis* before *emoi* to make it conforming with that in A^1. These include the capital-letter manuscripts D and Θ, the small-letters manuscripts $f^{1.13}$, 33, 565 and others. The majority text (𝔐), moreover, puts *diakonē* before *tis*. However, the order as it presents itself is witnessed by the Papyrus (𝔓) 66 and, probably also, 75, as well as by the capital-letter manuscripts ℵ,A , B, K, L, W, Ψ and 0250 and some small-letter manuscripts such as 892 ans 1241. The present order creates also a chiasm between the pronoun and the indefinite pronoun. This will be discussed shortly.

28. S. GONZALEZ SILVA, "El seguimiento de Cristo en los logia Akolouthein", *Claretianum* 14(1974) 158.

29. Cf. F. BLASS/A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Chicago/London 1961) § 371(4).

30. Cf. Idem, § 373(1).

31. J.S. SIKER-GIESELER, "Disciples and Discipleship in the Fourth Gospel: A canonical approach", *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 10(1980) 213-214: The conditional statements where the disciples are the subject include 11,9.10 (those who walk in the day will not stumble); 11,40 (those who believe will see the glory of God); 14,7 (those who know Jesus will keep his word and commandment); 14,15.23 (those who keep his commandment will abide in Jesus' love). Siker-Gieseler says that «both the *protasis* and *apodosis* in each condition are part of being Jesus' disciple. Each is integral to the other. The conditions appear miscellaneous, and in most cases the context lends little help in interpreting the conditions, which have a maxim-like quality to them.» This latter statement, obviously, does not apply in our case.

32. Cf. BLASS/DEBRUNNER, *Greek Grammar*, § 323(1).

33. The same formula is used in Jn 7,34 and 14,3. The link with 12,26 of these verses will be discussed later.

context, not only the Jews but also those who came from outside this people. In fact, the formulation of the conditional phrase as well as the general tenor of the Fourth Gospel allows us to state that this is an invitation that Jesus makes to all those – whoever they may be – who read or listen to these words.

This saying of Jesus includes no less than four uses of the possessive pronoun *emos* which have to be coupled to the use of the pronoun *egō*. According to Westcott, their use is in each case emphatic.[34] We need also note the internal chiasm in A and A^1. While in A the pronoun is put first, in A^1 it follows *tis*. This chiastic form (*emoi tis* in A, and *tis emoi* in A^1) gives prominence to the pronoun. It underlines the intimate personal relation to which Jesus is inviting his disciple, a relation which will find its fulfillment in a complete fellowship.

Specific to this Johannine saying on discipleship is the verb *diakonein*, which is used twice. The verb is only used once more in John, also in this chapter, in relation to Martha's service to Jesus. Also used in this *logion* is the noun *diakonos*. The noun is used twice more in the Fourth Gospel, in the context of the miracle of Cana, when the waiters are referred to as *diakonoi*. What is meant, in this context, by these words?

According to Beyer, *diakonein* «has the special quality of indicating very personally the service rendered to another. It is closest to *hupēreteō*, but in *diakoneō* there is a stronger approximation to the concept of a service of love».[35]

Beyer states that there are three meanings to the verb *diakonein* in secular Greek:

a. to wait at table;

b. more generally: to provide or care for;

c. to serve in a comprehensive sense.

In Greek mentality serving is not very dignified since ruling, and not serving, is proper to man. Service acquires a higher value only when rendered to the state. Judaism, as part of eastern thinking, does not find anything unworthy in service. The relation of a servant to his master is accepted, especially when he

34. Cf. *Gospel according to John*, 181.

35. H.W. BEYER, *"Diakoneō"*, *TDNT*, II, 81 (to whom I am indebted in this part). E. BEST compares *diakonos* to *doulos* saying that the latter can refer to the status of an individual while the former to a particular kind of unimportant or degrading service. He, however, admits that this can involve a service of a personal nature freely offered. *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSS 4; Sheffield 1981) 126.

serves a great master. This, therefore, attains a supreme value when the service is rendered to God.

The New Testament moves along this line. However, «Jesus' attitude to service is completely new as compared with the Greek understanding. The decisive point is that He sees in it the thing which makes a man His disciple».[36]

Even when in the New Testament the term is used in its original sense, "to wait at table" (cf., for example, Lk 17,8; Jn 12,2), one can notice the appraisal of service that Jesus makes, especially in his ethical estimation of the relation between serving and being served (Lk 22,26-27). In fact, Jesus institutes «a new pattern of human relationships».[37] Mt 25,42-44 proves this. Here the term comes to have the full sense of active Christian love for the neighbour and as such is a mark of true discipleship of Jesus. Moreover, Mk 10,44-45 states the role of Jesus as a servant which is explained in 10,45b to the extent of giving his life for the redemption of all. Hence, it results that *diakonia* «is of the essence of the messianic ministry in which the disciples are called upon to participate – which is to say, it is of the essence of discipleship».[38] Quoting Brandt, Beyer states: «*diakonein* is one of those words which presuppose a Thou, and not a Thou towards whom I may order my relationship as I please, but a Thou under whom I have placed myself as a *diakonōn*».[39] This is the specificity of the disciple of Jesus.

Jesus understood this kind of service as the offering of his life, as a full and perfect sacrifice, that is of being for others whether in life or in death. Thus the concept of 'service' achieves its final theological depth, it comes to mean much more than a comprehensive term for any loving assistance.[40] What is true of Christ Himself is made a command for all his disciples in Jn 12,26. The

36. BEYER, "*Diakoneō*", 84.

37. Cf. Idem, 84.

38. W. MUNRO, "Women disciples in Mark?", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44(1982) 234; cf. also P.S. PUDUSSERY, "Discipleship and Suffering in the Gospel of Mark", *Jeevadhara* 18(1988) 121-139.

39. Cf. BEYER, "*Diakoneō*", 85. This emphasis can be perceived in Jn 2,4.9, the marriage at Cana, where the *diakonoi* are put in direct relation with Jesus. In fact, the Evangelist is careful to say that they alone, besides Jesus, knew the source of the new wine. Cf. P.H. BOULTON, "*Diakoneō* in the Four Gospels" in: K. ALAND, F.L. CROSS, et al. (eds), *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin 1959) 418. Boulton says that the fact that the waiters are called *diakonoi* and not *douloi* in this account when the marriage feast is already under way can be influenced by the place of the former in the organization of the Church. He confirms this by quoting Mt 22,1-14.

40. Cf. BEYER, "*Diakoneō*", 86; J.G. INRIG, "Called to Serve: toward a philosophy of ministry, (Ex 18,17; Mk 9,33-37; Jn 12,23-26)", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 40(1983) 340; VELLANICKAL, "Discipleship", 144.

association of this verse to the previous two within the context where it is found demands that we understand *diakonein* as service even unto death which is rewarded, then, by the honour given by the Father to the disciple.

Thus in Jn 12,26 we have a reference to the *diakonia* of true discipleship as seen in the light of glorification of Jesus through the Cross. Boulton says that «Jesus had breathed into this usage all that His vocation to be the Suffering Servant meant to Him, and should, in consequence, mean for His disciples».[41] Thus, the use of this word now implies also the identification that there should be between the disciple and his Master in that the disciple learns from him that he has to surrender everything – even one's life. As it meant to Jesus, so to the disciple, this life should be translated into a life of complete obedience to the will of the Father. It is in this line that Augustine understands the service that the disciple should render to Jesus as doing Christ's will which will reach its climax in surrendering one's life for others.[42] Still, as we have already mentioned earlier the fellowship in this life in the service of Christ does also involve the honour that the Father has reserved for those who are faithful to him. «Service is the secret of life, for it produces fruitfulness, an unwasted life, and divine honour».[43]

Hence the use of the verb *diakonein* by John in this *logion* is not to be explained by John's wish to avoid a tautology, as Schulz says.[44] His intention goes much beyond this. The sense which we give to this word influences the whole significance of the verse in its context. However, the use of this word here (concentrating three uses of the stem on the six it is used in the whole Gospel) has given rise to a discussion among commentators on whether this word is traditional or not. Dodd says that *diakonein* «is more readily transferred to the situation of the Christian in the world than *opisō mou elthein*, and if so, then the form of tradition behind the Fourth Gospel perhaps betrays a *Sitz im Leben* somewhat farther removed from the original historical situation in the life of Jesus».[45] Brown, commenting on Dodd's position, says that although the Synoptics do not refer to the disciples as servants of Jesus there is the coupling of the verbs *diakonein* and *akolouthein* in the Synoptics in Mk 15,41 and par. (cf. Lk

41. BOULTON, "*Diakoneō*", 419.421; cf. also BARRETT, *Gospel according to St John*, 353.

42. *In Ioannis Evangelium*, Tract. 51,12.

43. INRIG, "Called to serve", 340.

44. A. SCHULZ, *Suivre et imiter le Christ d'après le Nouveau Testament* (Paris 1966) 87, footnote 69.

45. C.H. DODD, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1963) 353.

10,40). This may indicate that it is not impossible that John's form of this statement is ancient.[46]

The pregnant significance with which the Evangelist seems to have loaded the verb *diakonein* sheds light on the meaning which we should give to the verb *akolouthein* in this context. Schulz says that, owing to the external structure of the verse and the parallelism there is between the first part (A) and the last part (A^1), the verb *akolouthein* in A should be translated by the future as it corresponds to the promise made in the future of A^1.[47] I think, however, that translating the imperative present by the future would be interpreting in one's way the mind of the Evangelist. In effect one would impoverish the text were the verb *akolouthein* translated by the future. For this present imperative includes the decision to follow Jesus in serving him in the present and continuing to do so in the future which will eventually lead to one being definitely honoured by the Father. Thus, it has the same range of the "hour of glorification" of Jesus.

The verb *akolouthein*,[48] here, includes the various meanings that the Fourth Gospel attributes to this important verb, becoming, as it were, the privileged *terminus technicus* for discipleship.[49] This verb becomes a synonym of faith in that it embraces the meaning of a process through which the disciple discovers

46. Cf. *Gospel according to John*, I, 475; also R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel according to St John*, II (New York 1987) 385 is of the same opinion as Brown. MUNRO, discussing Mk 15,41, arrives to the conclusion that *diakoneō* here has to be interpreted as a parallel to *akolouthein* and, thus, in terms of discipleship. A main reason supporting this theory is that both verbs are followed by the personal pronoun *autō*. However, he says, this would apply to after the death of Jesus since as such it could possibly accord with Mark's theological stance to acknowledge Jesus' female following then rather than before, "Women disciples", 231-235.

47. Cf. *Suivre*, 88-89.

48. The verb *akolouthein* recurs 19 times in the Gospel of John (1,37.38.40.43; 6,2; 8,12; 10,4.5.27; 11,31; 12,26; 13,36(x2).37; 18,15; 20,6; 21,19.20.22). Four different meanings can be identified:
    a. the simple classical usage of 'following after, accompanying';
    b. the derived meaning of 'being a disciple';
    c. at times the verb is equated in John to the meaning of 'to believe';
    d. the meaning of entering into a fellowship with Jesus as to participate also in his death and glory.
    There are four different recurrences in John's Gospel which convey the external meaning 'walking after': 6,2; 11,31; 18,15 and 20,6. However, the context of 6,2 and 18,15 may indicate something deeper than this.

49. Cf. BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 78; F. SEGOVIA (ed.), *Discipleship and the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1985) 96, footnote 26. John, as the Synoptics have already done, uses several times the verb *akolouthein* and *mathētēs* as synonyms. In the Fourth Gospel the term *mathētēs* becomes an eminently theological concept, a *theologoumenon* characterizing the Christian faithful. Cf. R. MORENO JIMENEZ, "El discípulo de Jesucristo según el Evangelio de S. Juan", *Estudios Bíblicos* 30(1971) 287-88; SCHULZ, *Suivre*, 69-70.

more deeply the mystery of Christ.[50] This is evidenced by the "vocation narrative" of Jn 1,35-51. Here, the verb is used as a means to depict the «movement toward the progressive discovery of the mystery of Jesus».[51] It is the beginning of the process of faith which intertwines with that of being a disciple. A disciple is one who, living with Jesus, gradually obtains a deeper insight into the person of Jesus and shares this experience with others.[52] By answering the call to follow Jesus, a person is believing in him, putting all his trust in him and, thus, begins a process wherein he enters more and more into an intimate relationship with him who called him. This will eventually lead to a complete fellowship of both in that the destiny of one becomes the destiny of the other.[53]

Hence, this concept of 'following' goes much further than just implying imitation, as De Longe wants.[54] Schweizer says:

> The word 'follow' therefore has a middle position. It certainly indicates 'serving', that is to say, the attitude of a disciple upon earth who walks behind his Master step by step and is appointed by him to the service of witness (John 1,35ff). But John 8,12 and 10,4f,27f have already shown how the main emphasis is on the disciples' being guarded and supported by Jesus, which is not implied in the idea of service.[55]

It is, thus, a step forward from what the idea of service implied; through 'following' Jesus the disciple enters in full fellowship with him – a notion which will be explicated further in the central phrase of this Johannine saying.

The expression *kai hopou eimi egō ekei kai ho diakonos ho emos estai* is typically Johannine.[56] Similar expressions are found also in Jn 7,34.36; 8,21.22;

50. Cf. G. TURBESSI, "Il significato neotestamentario di 'Sequela' e di 'Imitazione' di Cristo", *Benedictina* 19(1972) 191.

51. E. COTHENET, "Sacred Scripture" in: E. MALATESTA (ed.), *Imitating Christ* (The Religious Experience Series 5; Hertfordshire 1974) 30; cf. also DODD, *Interpretation*, 293; ID., *Historical Tradition*, 302.

52. VELLANICKAL, "Discipleship", 141; SCHNACKENBURG, *Gospel according to St John*, I, 308; SEGOVIA, *Discipleship*, 90.

53. Cf. N. LAZURE, *Les valeurs morales de la théologie johannique* (EB; Paris 1965) 59 as quoted in COTHENET, "Sacred Scripture", 32-33.

54. Cf. *Jesus: Stranger from heaven*, 160-161.

55. *Lordship*, 87.

56. The expression is used also in the Synoptics (Mt 6,21; 24,28; Mk 6,10; Lk 12,34; 17,37), but in a different impersonal sense. DODD is of the opinion that since this expression is coined with what he considers as the non-Johannine word *diakonos* then this may be traditional. In

13,33; 14,3; 17,24. In all these the main idea is the listeners' relation to Jesus and their possibility or impossibility to be where he is. A study of these recurrences would show that where Jesus is speaking to the Jews (7,34 and 8,21) he speaks in the negative: "where I am you cannot come", whilst when he speaks to the disciples in the last discourse (14,3; 17,24) he speaks in the positive: "where I am you may be also". When he speaks to Peter in 13,33, he again speaks in the negative but in v.34 he makes him the promise that he will follow afterward. Thus, as it can be contemplated, it is a promise-gift which Jesus makes only to those who believe in him, those who serve him and follow him, that is those who are ready to enter into a complete fellowship with him.

It is obvious that here we are not dealing with a simple local reference. Christ is speaking as the glorified one. The presence of the "hour" informs all the subsequent words of Jesus. His servant will be in him with the Father (cf. Jn 14,3-6), participating in the glory that the Son had even before the world was made (cf. Jn 17,5). So, here we have to understand this "being where I am" in the sense of what John means by the permanence of the disciple in the Son, which comes out clearly in the Johannine vocabulary through the use of the verb *menein*. This verb suggests overtones of the deep and abiding fellowship established between Jesus and his disciples. The relationship they established with Jesus has about it the character of constancy and stability. This is already suggested by the first uses of the verb in relation to the disciples in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1,38.39). Brown comments: «If the training of the disciples begins when they *go* to Jesus to *see* where he is staying and *stay* on with him, it will be completed when they *see* his glory and *believe* in him (2,11). This scene is the anticipation of what we shall hear in 12,26».[57] Thus, it is a theological space which will then be specified both as soteriological and eschatological, in that the disciple participates in the self-sacrifice of Christ through his communion with him and, consequently, also in his glory in the Father's house.

As it was already stated, the tense of the verb 'to be' used here is the present with a future value for *eimi* and the future for *estai*. Does this imply that this communion with Jesus would be only in the future, perhaps in the consummation of time, as at least Jn 14,3 seems to imply? De Longe moves in this direction. Speaking of this expression with reference to the whole community he says:

> The community finds itself still in the midst of the world (17,11.15.18), only later to be "where I am" (17,24), beholding the glory which the Son

fact, he is not certain whether to consider this central part of v.26 as a supplement to v.26a or as a separate saying, *Historical Tradition*, 353.

57. *Gospel according to John*, I, 79; cf. also VELLANICKAL, "Discipleship", 137; G. ZEVINI, "I Primi Discepoli seguono Gesù", *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 2(1980) 140-153.

shares with the Father... We find the expression "where I am" used in 12,26 also to indicate the ultimate goal of the true servant of Christ... and in 14,1-3, where in v.3 it is connected with the expression *palin erchomai kai paralēmpsomai*. It is only natural here to think of the stage of consummation.[58]

But it seems that here we are dealing with different conceptions of time: the present which prolongs into the future, in the eschatological.[59]

As, in John's theology, the glorification of Christ includes not only his suffering and death but also, in the same moment, his exaltation (note here the remarkable double meaning of the verb *hupsoō*: 'being lifted' on the cross and the exaltation to new glory), consequently, owing to the full communion that there is between Jesus and his disciple, "being where he is" implies also a present moment which will prolong and reach its fulfillment in the future. Hence, "being where he is" achieves its full consummation only after death.[60] Feuillet states on this point: «John maintains the traditional eschatological perspective, which can be harmonized with the mystical perspective. The Christian now shares really, although imperfectly, in the life of God, but he will share it fully at the Parousia».[61]

Hence, the expression "to be where he is" does not entail only a participation in Christ's death,[62] but it comprises – as the "hour of glorification" does – the different moments of this complete fellowship of the servant with Jesus. In this sense, "to be where Jesus is" is a promise which includes also an order: if the disciple is persecuted as the Master was (15,8-16,4), he will accompany him also in the house and the glory of the Father (14,3; 17,24). For the Father does the same honour to the disciples as he does to Christ, his Son. As a matter of fact, we already share in the glory which the Son has.[63]

58. *Jesus: Stranger from heaven*, 173. This is also the opinion of SCHNACKENBURG, *Gospel according to St John*, II, 385-386. He says that it signifies the end that the disciple will reach through death – the celestial world. Cf. also SCHULZ, *Suivre*, 86; D. RAMOS-LISSÓN, "El Seguimiento de Cristo (En los origenes de la espiritualidad de los primeros cristianos)", *Teología Espiritual* 88(1986) 11.

59. Cf. BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, II, 779-780.

60. Cf. SCHWEIZER, *Lordship*, 69.87.

61. A. FEUILLET, "Man's participation in God's Life: A key concept in John", in M.J. TAYLOR (ed.), *A Companion to John: Readings in Johannine Theology* (New York 1977) 144.

62. Cf. K.J. SCHELKLE, *Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg 1949) 222.

63. Cf. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, "Si le grain de blé", 60: «Là où je suis, la aussi sera mon serviteur est un ordre, mais également une promesse: si le disciple est persécuté comme le Maître le

This makes Augustine say: «What great honour could the adoptive son receive as that to be where the Only-Begotten Son is, not equal in his divinity, but associated to him in eternity.»[64] In this same note, perhaps a little more mystical, we find the Third Ode of Solomon which sings:

> I love the Beloved, and my soul loves Him.
> And where His rest is, there also am I.
> ...
> I have been united (to Him), for the lover has found the Beloved:
> In order that I may love Him that is the Son, I shall become a son.[65]

The *Pistis Sophia* goes somewhat further by stating, speaking of the twelve apostles and, in particular of Mary Magdalene and John, the two "virgins": «I will be you and you will be me»; thus, a complete fellowship which has to pass through suffering «for the sake of all men».[66] Thus, we see that the preference the patristic writings show to the escathological fulfillment of this complete fellowship is not made at the detriment of eliminating the possibility of this communion before death.

The repetition of the conditional phrase, which we found in the opening of this saying, seems to lead to such an interpretation. Hence, what is at stake here is not only the future – the destiny of the disciple once he is dead and, therefore, has passed the proof of suffering and death here on earth – but also the here-and-now of the disciple. That is, this complete communion of the disciple with Jesus begins on earth, including, thus, not only the moment of glory but also the moments of suffering and, possibly even death.

The last phrase of the saying includes the verb *timaō* in the future which has as its subject the Father and as its object the disciple. This is the only occurrence in the New Testament where this occurs. In 5,23, where the verb is used four times, the subject is *pantes* for the first two uses while for the second two uses the subject is indefinite, but always human beings. The object of the

fut (15,18-16,4), il l'accompagnera aussi dans la maison et la gloire du Père (14,3; 17,24) ... Car le Père nous fera les mêmes honneurs qu'au Fils: la même gloire nous est déjà donnée (17,22) et nous en contemplerons l'épanouissement dans la maison du Père (17,24)»; also SCHULZ, *Suivre*, 87-88.

64. *In Ioannis Evangelium*, Tract. 51,12: «Nam quem maiorem honorem accipere poterit adoptatus, quam ut sit ubi est Unicus, non aequalis factus divinitati, sed consociatus aeternitati?»

65. R.HARRIS and A. MINGANA (eds), *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, II (Manchester 1920) 216, stanzas 5.7.

66. Cf. *Pistis Sophia*, Chap.96, lines 15-32 in: C. SCHMIDT and W. TILL (eds), *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (Erster Band; Berlin 1954) 148.

verb is twice the Father and twice the Son. In 8,49 Jesus is the subject (speaking in the first person) while the Father is the object.

It is a new affirmation of the union, almost identification of the disciple with Jesus. The Father honours the disciple of Jesus for he sees in him his own Son. This 'identification' comes about through service, in the following, in being where Jesus is, that is, being with him in death and resurrection.[67] «Just as for Jesus, the exaltation on the cross is at the same time his glorification, so also for the disciple, serving and following him and being where he is means participating in his glory.»[68] Thus, the *diakonia* of the disciple of Jesus attains its final development: «To be a *diakonos* in the mind of St John ... is one who, in his life of *diakonia* has so identified himself with the *diakonia* of his Master that he can look forward to being not just a *diakonos* but an honoured guest at the Heavenly banquet.»[69]

The Link of John 12,26 with the Synoptics

The question of the relation between John and the Synoptics has been and still is a subject of discussion among scholars into which I do not intend to enter here. A chapter which aroused much interest because of its material was precisely chapter 12, where our saying is found.[70] The different positions vary a

67. Cf. FERRARO, *L'Ora di Cristo*, 34. However, it is important to note the care John takes to use two different verbs to say the honour which the Father will give to the Son: *doksazō* in v.23 and v.28, and the honour which the Father will give to the disciples of his Son: *timaō*. As Gonzalez Silva notes, the difference in the use of the verb indicates that, while underlining the almost 'identification' of Jesus with his disciples, there is an essential difference between the Son and his disciples, bringing out the mediating role of Jesus. GONZALEZ SILVA, "El Seguimiento", 159.

68. VELLANICKAL, "Discipleship", 145; cf. J. PATHRAPANKAL, "Jesus and the Greeks: reflections on a theology of religious identity (Jo 12,20-26)" *Journal of Dharma* 10(1985) 400-401.

69. BOULTON, "*Diakoneō*, 422.

70. I limit myself to give some bibliographical indications of material on the subject with special reference to our chapter 12: C.K. BARRETT, "John and the Synoptic Gospels", *Expositary Times* 85(1974) 228-233; M. GOULDER, "From ministry to passion in John and Luke", *New Testament Studies* 29(1983) 561-568; L.R. KITTLAUS, "Evidence from Jn 12 that the Author of John knew the Gospel of Mark" in: P.J. ACHTEMEIER (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature. 1979 Seminar Papers*, I (SBLASP; Missoula, Montana 1979) 119-122; A.B. KOLENKOW, "Two Changing Patterns: Conflicts and the Necessity of death: John 2 and 12 and Markan Parallels" in: P.J. ACHTEMEIER (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature. 1979 Seminar Papers*, I (SBLASP; Missoula, Montana 1979) 123-126; D.M. SMITH, "Jn 12,22ff and the Question of John's Use of the Synoptics", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82(1963) 58-64; IDEM, "John and the Synoptics: Some dimensions of the problem", *New Testament Studies* 26(1979-80) 424-444; IDEM, "John and the Synoptics", *Biblica* 63(1982) 102-113.

great deal as one would expect. There are those who deny that John made any use of the Synoptics, at least as a principal source;[71] others say that John, if the traditional date of the Gospel is correct, should have known at least one of the Synoptics, which was used by his ecclesial community. But also here the opinions vary. There are those who say that John knew Mark, and had pondered its meaning.[72] Others say that in some parts of his Gospel, among which also John 12,20-50, John was dependent on Luke.[73] It is very difficult to decide for one position or for the other. However, it is not really essential here to determine this issue.

The same problem lies also with our saying. Barrett, for example, says that «the material introduced by the coming of the Greeks is based mainly upon the Synoptic tradition».[74] Kittlaus says that «for the announcement of Jesus' hour, John has used the language found in Mark and then has continued Jesus' speech with a pattern familiar from the Markan passion prediction units».[75] Rasco, on the contrary, states that in the number of sayings which we have in Jn 12,24-26, it seems that at least v.25 has a synoptic parallel, hence not pronouncing himself on our verse.[76] Brown, Dodd and Schnackenburg, in their commentaries, study this saying in relation to what they consider to be its parallel in the Synoptics, that is Mk 8,34 (and par.). Dodd, in particular, says that «if it is unlikely ... that the separate sayings were borrowed by John from the Synoptics, it is also unlikely that the sequence as a whole was drawn from them; yet it has a manifest affinity with Mk 8,34-9,1».[77] What position should we assume? And what do we mean when we say 'affinity'?

Studying the context of the saying in both the Synoptics and John we witness that they have many elements in common. We are in the framework of the passion (passover in John; passion prediction in the Synoptics) which does not exclude the aspect of the resurrection. In the Synoptics, Jesus makes a specific reference to the resurrection in his prediction while the series of sayings is followed by the Transfiguration theme. In John, the "hour of glorification"

71. Cf. SMITH, "Jn 12,22ff and the Question", 64; KOLENKOW, "Two changing patterns", 123-125 (although the latter's position is not completely clear).

72. Cf. BARRETT, "John and the Synoptics", 233; KITTLAUS, "Evidence from John 12", 121.

73. Cf. GOULDER, "From ministry to Passion", 566.

74. *Gospel according to St John*, 350.

75. "Evidence from Jn 12", 122.

76. Cf. "Christus, granum frumenti", 13.

77. *Historical Tradition*, 390.

includes all the different moments of the paschal mystery. It is also considered by some that in 12,27-36 John incorporates some of the motifs that the Synoptics have embodied in the scene of the Transfiguration. These would include the voice from heaven and the fact that Jesus will be 'lifted up'.[78] In Matthew and Mark the whole pericope is situated in Caesarea Philippi, a place where there were many non-Jews. John puts at the beginning of this pericope the request of some Greeks to see Jesus. In the Synoptics,it is only Matthew who restricts the saying to the circle of the disciples; the others have a wider auditorium. John addresses the saying to one and all – a conclusion to which we arrive from the formulation of the conditional phrase. From this we can see that there are a number of similarities. However, there are also a number of important divergences especially in the structure of the *logion* itself.

In the Johannine saying it is only the first part (A) which could be presented as a parallel to the Synoptics. In fact, while the latter have the *protasis* followed by the announcement of two requirements and only then by the *apodosis*, in John we have the *protasis* followed by the *apodosis* and he says nothing, at least on the level of terminology, of the other two requirements. The Johannine saying includes, instead, two promises which *follow* the first part (A). Again, in the *protasis*, while the Synoptics use the phrase *opisō mou elthein*, John uses the verb *diakonein*. Finally, the Synoptics accentuate the obligation of the disciple to follow (cf. the use of the verb *thelein*) while John, using the formula for the condition *ean tis*, accentuates rather the liberty of the disciple. This, apart from the other characteristics which were referred to earlier when dealing specifically on the saying itself.

Considering all these elements, we have to say that John does share something with the Synoptics but then he moves his own way. Thus, it seems quite sure that, at least for this saying, John is not using directly any of the three Evangelists except for the context although he is following a separate tradition which brought down to him that which Jesus said to his disciples.[79] Any further assertion does not seem to be well supported. However, one can state with more certainty the close affinity that there is in the theology of the *logion* in the Synoptics and in John. This would indicate firmly the unique origin of the saying on the mouth of Jesus.

78. Cf. BROWN, *Gospel according to John*, I, 476.

79. Cf. also in this direction DODD, *Interpretation*, 452.

Conclusion

Jn 12,26 is the saying *par excellence* of the discipleship of Jesus; it embodies the fullest idea of the *sequela Christi*. The *sequela* of Jesus in full communion with him will lead not only to death but also to participation in his victory and fulfilment in his Father's house. Suffering and death are underlined as a stepping-stone, albeit necessary, toward the glory, especially that which is definitive. This means that in the Church, both in its life as a community as well as in the life of individuals, the Risen Lord is present and sheds his light on all the difficulties and perplexities through which they have to pass making of the moment of suffering a moment of glory. It is a call to all Christians to live in a loving obedience to the will of Jesus in full communion with him so that what he promised might come true.

Hence, this verse 12,26 shows that 'serving Jesus', 'following Jesus' and 'remaining with Jesus' are all parallel phrases expressing the reality of discipleship. If 'serving Jesus' involves a dying to self, obedience to his will, 'following Jesus' is a pathway of suffering and death which the disciple has to walk behind our Lord. The sum-total of this serving and following Jesus is therefore indicated in the words, which epitomize all the Johannine idea of discipleship: "where I am there my servant shall be also" (12,26).

UMBERTO CASSUTO'S *THE DOCUMENTARY HYPHOTESIS* : THIRTY YEARS LATER*

Anthony Abela

1991 marked the occurrence of two anniversaries connected with the late Jewish scholar Umberto Cassuto: the fortieth anniversary of his death that took place in 1951 as he was preparing the third volume of his commentary on Genesis, that was to be entitled *Abraham and the Promised Land*, to cover *sidra* or pericope Gen 12,1-17,27;[1] and the thirtieth anniversary from the publication in 1961 of the small volume *The Documentary Hypothesis* and the Composition of the Pentateuch.[2] Of course, we are speaking here of its first English edition since in modern Hebrew it had already been published in 1941 and reprinted twice, in 1953 and 1959.

With the author's demise ten years past, this booklet still constituted an important publication event for three reasons:

1. It offered to a wider readership the principal insights into the composition of the Torah held by this distinguished scholar and expressed at greater length in his 1934 monograph *La Questione della Genesi*, published in Florence.

2. Here, as in his 1934 work, Cassuto is said to have offered one of the best critical appraisals of the documentary hypothesis which for most had become a dogma of critical scholarship.[3] In the words of S. Segert: "Of all the attempts to criticize the documentary hypothesis, this one by Cassuto is perhaps the most

* This paper was read at the *Society of Biblical Literature* International Congress held in Rome 14-17 July, 1991.

1. Cfr Israel Abrahams, in Umberto Cassuto *Commentary on Genesis*, II, *From Noah to Abraham* (Magnes Press; Jerusalem 1964)VIII

2. (Trans. Israel Abrahams) (Magnes Press; Jerusalem 1961)

3. Cassuto quotes H. Gressmann's emphatic statement: "We must stress, with the utmost emphasis, that there is no school of Biblical scholarship today that is not founded on the critical analysis of the sources in the Hexaleuch (that is, the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua), ... and anyone who does not accept the division of the text according to the sources and the results flowing therefrom, has to discharge the onus, if he wishes to be considered a collaborator in our scientific work, of proving that all the research work done till now was futile", *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1924). This text has been translated and reproduced by Cassuto in *Documentary Hypothesis*, 7.

clearly presented. The weak points of the classical Pentateuch literary analysis are detected and characterized with great perspicacity, the argumentation is consistent, the discussion is presented in a very dignified form".[4]

3. This volume has been read by some as introductory to Cassuto's own Genesis commentary in several volumes.[5]

One cannot expect in a short paper to find an exhaustive evaluation of Cassuto's contribution to the understanding of Scripture; I shall limit myself to sharing a number of considerations I made on perusing this "excellent summary of the author's earlier publications" (Abrahams). For the sake of colleagues who may have read *The Documentary Hypothesis* a very long ago I shall first offer a description of the book's contents and then come to the reflections I made as I followed Cassuto in his argumentation. Again, I shall refrain from presenting in detail his arguments against the documentary hypothesis. This has been done by others.[6]

In the Preface to *The Documentary Hypothesis* Cassuto describes the present volume as "a popular digest of a comprehensive scientific work" (p.2). The stress on the popular nature of this book comes out not merely in the conversational tone and style, proper to lecture-giving to audiences more or less ignorant of the subject-matter of the lectures, but also in the almost total

4. *Archiv Orientálni*, 33(1965)126. For the sake of completeness one should report that other reviewers criticized Cassuto for waging his war against a dead foe: the classical form of the documentary hypothesis which Cassuto so vehemently opposed had already become "a thing of the past", cfr André Caquot in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 163(1963)88-89, and L.H. Brockington in *Journal of Theological Studies* 14(1963)109-111.

5. "Altogether *The Documentary Hypothesis* serves as a valuable introduction to the late Professor Cassuto's Hebrew Commentaries on the Pentateuch, which have helped so much to illuminate our understanding of Scripture with the light of new knowledge and interpretation, expounded by one of the most original minds among modern Biblical exegetes", Israel Abrahams, *Documentary Hypothesis*, translator's forward p.VI. Notwithstanding the cynicism of some — cfr the review of Marvin H. Pope in *Journal Biblical Literature* 82(1963)360 — and neglect and cautiousness of others — cfr Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, (Basic Books, New York 1981)14 — Cassuto's works have greatly influenced a whole generation of scholars, especially those who were sensitive to the narrative poetics of the OT; cfr for instance, Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading (Indiana University Press; Bloomington 1985); Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Eisenbrauns; Winsnahake, Indiana 1986).

6. I refer in a special manner to the long debate that followed the publication of *La Questione della Genesi*, which Cassuto himself labelled "a comprehensive scientific work", between the author and Prof. Carlo Bernheimer published in the *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 16(1937)307-336.337-374. Bernheimer was very critical of Cassuto's solution to the problems created by the Pentateuch. Cassuto answers to Bernheimer's critical remarks on pp.337-361 while on pp.362-374 he reviews the principal reactions to his monograph. Other contributions by the two savants are to be found in the next volume of the same review (1937-1938)pp.453-459.

absence of technical details and of a critical apparatus, and in the author's frequent resorting to imagery in order to explain his thoughts. In the same preface, though, Cassuto insists that the non-academic character of these eight lectures should not lead to the belief that what the author says in the book has no scientific basis: "I have not conceded one iota, I need hardly stress, in regard to the scientific character of the content; the scholarly apparatus is not visible, but in actuality it constitutes the foundation of my entire dissertation" (p.2).

Similes and metaphors are frequent. The documentary hypothesis is compared to a "beautiful and majestic edifice ... which was erected and completed by the devoted and industrious labour of many generations of distinguished workers" (p.13); or to the "mighty structure in which European scholarship has hitherto taken so much pride" (Ibid.). This reminds me of Genesis 11 where we are told how *Yahweh* looked with awe at the mighty structure labelled 'city' or 'tower' in the present masoretic text, which *ha'ādām* (the subject of most narratives within Gen 1-11) were building, and somehow entered the new building to sow discord and disquietude! Cassuto likewise invites his readers to enter this beautiful and majestic edifice, this mighty structure, in order "to test, together with me, its soundness and the stability of the pillars upon which it rests" (p.13). The five pillars in this building stand for the criteria of differentiation which served the classical source critical analysis of the Pentateuch, that is , the use of different names for the Deity; variations of language and style, contradictions and divergencies of views; duplications and repetitions; signs of composite structure in the sections.

Cassuto dedicates a separate lecture to the examination of each of these pillars – for the diversified use of the divine names he devotes lectures Two and Three. Lecture One is introductory and in it Cassuto discusses in general terms the documentary hypothesis and the criteria employed for source criticism. Lecture Eight carries the author's conclusions. To proceed with the metaphor of the building and its pillars: "We shall see if they (i.e. these pillars) rest on a firm foundation, if they are hewn from hard rock, and if they are strong enough to bear the weight of the structure. As a result of our investigation, we shall be able to decide whether the building can still be considered solid and sound, or whether, on the contrary, it is something that is irretrievably doomed" (p.14).

On reading closely Cassuto's contribution to the discussion of the documentary hypothesis thirty years after its publication, as expounded in his 1961 monograph, the present writer made a number of considerations:

1. The first lecture Cassuto devotes to introducing the subject-matter of his book: the documentary hypothesis and the criteria employed to distinguish the various sources in the Pentateuch. One should not search in this lecture an

outline reconstruction of Pentateuchal research, for such is not offered, even though important moments of this history of research are referred to. What we find in this chapter is a comparison between Pentateuchal and Homeric research. "My purpose is only to indicate briefly the relationship between the course taken by research with respect to our problem (the origin and composition of the Torah) and that followed by scholarship relative to the analogous question in Greek literature concerning the works of Homer, to wit, the origin of the two poems, the Iliad and the Odyssey, which are attributed to him" (p.9).

For Cassuto there exists "a surprising parallelism between the evolution of views and theories in the two fields of inquiry; in every generation similar concepts and hypotheses prevail at the same time in regard to the Homeric and Biblical problems" (p.9). Parallels include similar patterns of research development, for instance: in both fields amateurs discover paths which are later taken up and developed by professionals (Astruc-Eichhorn/Abbé d'Aubignac-Wolf); there were also similar compositional theories (a Fragment Theory and a Supplementary Hypothesis, p.11); but the most important similarities were methodological ("It will suffice to note that the analytical method developed in the two branches of learning on similar lines, particularly the technique of studying repetitions and duplications, contrasts and contradictions, linguistic and stylistic variations and the like, and it led in both fields of investigation to the minutest differentiations and successive dissections, the verses being subjected to microscopic examinations," p.12). This parallelism goes so far as to include in the two areas of research identical reactions to "this exaggerated process of analysis" (p.12).

What interests us most for our purpose is Cassuto's interpretation of this historical phenomenon. He admits to the possibility of explaining these parallels by reciprocal influence or by "the general progress in the methods and techniques of research which is common to all humanistic studies." "But undoubtedly it is affected also by the opinions and concepts, the trends and demands, the character and idiosyncrasies of each age. This being so it may well be that we have not before us an objective discovery of what is actually to be found in the ancient books, but the result of the subjective impression that these writings have on the people of a given environment" (p.12). Cassuto nurtured the suspicion "that the investigators' conceptions are not based on purely objective facts, but that they were appreciably motivated by the subjective characteristics of the researchers themselves" (Ibid.).

He then suggests we take up the whole issue of the origin and compositional process of the Torah "with complete objectivity marred by no bias – either towards the views of one school or the opinions of another". Nor should the researcher allow his religious beliefs to influence his search for objective truth. In the specific case of Pentateuchal studies, "the honour and sanctity of our

Torah" transcend the literary critical problems of how or when the Torah originated. Finally Cassuto recommends to prospective scholars not to approach "the Scriptural passages with the literary and aesthetic criteria of our time, but let us apply to them the standards obtaining in the ancient East generally and among the people of Israel particularly" (p.13).

There is little doubt that the greater part of what Cassuto states here stands for credal in literary circles. But to say that the criteria for source criticism, that led to the slow construction of the documentary hypothesis, and that were interpreted as being symptomatic of multiple origin of the material of which the Pentateuch is composed, are not objective, rather they are to be found in the minds of the builders themselves of the documentary hypothesis, is to be considered as a hazardous statement. This for two reasons: (i) Even if some of these "pillars" do constitute an exaggeration on the part of the source critics,[7] the literary phenomena listed are there to be interpreted: the alternation of the divine names, doublets, repetition, chronological difficulties, contradictions. The problem arises when we come to interpret them. Julius Wellhausen and colleagues explained these phenomena source-critically which is not so very different from what Cassuto himself proposes. Cassuto opted for unitary authorship of the Torah, but admitted the use of sources – written it seems – by the presumed ingenious writer who gave us the first five books of the Hebrew Bible.[8] This means that with Cassuto we are back to square one regarding the complex issue of the *Tôrāh*'s origin concerning which we should perhaps adopt R.N. Whybray's pessimistic view that it is doubtful "whether it will ever be possible to establish with any degree of certainty how the Pentateuch was composed".[9]

(ii) The accusation that the arguments against the monolithic nature of the Pentateuch are subjective projections of source critics may backfire on Cassuto himself; his arguments for a unitary authorship are as conclusive as those brought forward for a multiple compositional process. We may cite his rules for the use of the divine names, which may reflect his decision to opt for a unitary reading rather the objective and historical employment of these names in the

7. I would refer to Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (Sheffield 1990) chapter 3.

8. "Egli ammette quindi in conclusione che l'autore unico abbia raccolto, ordinato e riunito fonti varie, quindi fonti scritte, giacchè per tradizioni orali il processo immaginato dal Cassuto non è ammissibile. Ora questo mi pare che, mutate le espressioni, sia nè più nè meno di ciò che ammettono i critici della scuola documentania; la sola differenza sta in ciò che il Cassuto chiama autore quello che essi chiamano redattore e che le varie fonti che racchiudono le contraddizioni evidenti di cui parla il Cassuto essi le chiamano JEPD," Bernheimer, *La Questione della Genesi*, 320.

9. *The Making of the Pentateuch* A Methodological Study (JSOT Supplement 53; Sheffield 1987)9.

way Cassuto indicates in the second and third lecture. His interpretation of the literary phenomena present in the Pentateuch may be as subjectively projectional as that of the proponents of the documentary hypothesis.

Notwithstanding his avowal of absolute objectivity in approaching the text, Cassuto often approaches the text from the stance of the believing Jewish tradition. This becomes painfully evident when he discusses contradictions in the fifth lecture of his book, or what in his 1934 monograph he terms "i valori morali".[10] Cassuto's treatment in these cases is apologetic and is armed solely to prove that what the *Tôrāh* says is true and irreprehensible. His discussions reminds one of the rabbinical disputes of long ago when the canonicity of such scriptures as Ezekiel, Proverbs or Ecclesiastes was being debated.[11] These disputes were aimed at explaining away through harmonization any contradictions with the *Tôrāh* that were detected in these books. Because there could exist no contradictions within the Word of God. The explanation of why the Pharaoh in Gen 12,10-13,1 had to pay Abraham on behalf of his wife Sarah offers an example of the apologetic nature of Cassuto's exegesis and approach to the text.[12]

2. Cassuto's approach provides a welcome focusing on the moment of the literary composition in the formation process of the Pentateuch. The second and third lectures in *The Documentary Hypothesis* are dedicated to prove whether "the central pillar of the documentary hypothesis" (p.17), that is, the use of divine names *YHWH* and *'Elōhîm* as a basis for source identification and isolation is "strong and durable" (p.15). For Cassuto the question of the Divine names "is in truth the ultimate foundation of the documentary hypothesis, not only historically, but also theoretically" (p.16). We have to read these two lectures together with chapter One of his 1934 work[13] in order to appreciate Cassuto's insight into the text as he examines closely the use of these divine names. I shall not enter into a detailed analysis of this issue in this paper as I mean to dedicate a whole study to Cassuto's treatment of this problem in the near future. After defining the main thrust of Cassuto's argumentation, I shall stop upon a consideration to which his approach gives rise.

Rather than explaining the use of the two divine names *YHWH* and *'Elōhîm* by their belonging to separate sources, Cassuto believed we owe this use to the strong literary and theological tradition to which the author belonged; this

10. *Questione*, 210 ff.

11. Cfr Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (SPCK; London 1985) chapter 7.

12. Cfr also *Questione*, 303-313.

13. *Questione*, 1-91.

tradition dictated now the use of one name, now the use of the other. "It is not a case of disparity between different documents, or of mechanical amalgamation; every Hebrew author was compelled to write thus and to use the two names in this manner, because their primary signification, the general literary tradition of the ancient East, and the rules governing the use of the Divine Names throughout the entire range of Hebrew literature, demanded this" (p.41). He believed to be able to distinguish different nuances in the use of the two words even when *'Elōhîm*, similar to *YHWH*, is employed as a proper name (p.31). Cassuto thought he could identify seven rules which governed the use of either divine proper name (pp.31-32). For the purpose of our discussion we shall quote two rules (mine is the numbering of the rules).

Rule number one:

> "It selected the name YHWH when the text reflects the Israelite conception of God, which is embodied in the portrayal of YHWH and finds expression in the attributes traditionally ascribed to Him by Israel, particularly in His ethical character; it preferred the name *'Elōhîm* when the passage implies the abstract idea of the Deity prevalent in the international circles of 'wise men' – God conceived as the Creator of the physical universe, as the Ruler of nature, as the Source of life" (p.31).

Rule number Six:

> "The Tetragrammaton appears when the reference is to the God of Israel relative to His people or to their ancestors; *'Elōhîm*, when He is spoken of in relation to one who is not a member of the Chosen People" (Ibid.).

Some comments: (1) In *La Questione* Cassuto warns his reader that in the application of these rules we should not be too mechanical. In Lecture Three of *The Documentary Hypothesis* Cassuto writes: "Sometimes, of course, it happens that two opposite rules apply together and come in conflict with each other; then, as logic demands, the rule that is more material to the primary purport of the relevant passage prevails" (p.32). This is a thinly hidden admission that the subjective element in the interpretation of the datum in the text is rather strong.

2. I shall refrain here from a text to text analysis of Cassuto's discussion of individual passages. This would have probably landed me in several different evaluations of what the texts offer. Carlo Bernheimer was very critical of Cassuto's study: "Se lo studioso ha la pazienza di analizzare sotto questo aspetto

il materiale narrativo in generale, constaterà che il risultato è assai spesso press' a poco lo stesso, cioè che esso non corresponde ai principi sostenuti dal Cassuto".[14] Bernheimer then passes to examine the application of the rules on the Genesis narratives and arrived to the conclusion that in Gen 1 one would have expected *YHWH* rather than *'Elōhîm*, while in Gen 2-3 we should have read *Elōhîm* alone given the several parallels to the story in other languages and cultures.[15]

3. The quandary into which Cassuto leads his readers by offering a number of hermeneutical tools based on contents elements, which appear to misfire on the very first application to a Genesis narrative, leads into the current debate concerning the literary and poetical dynamics involved in the formation of our texts. For Cassuto this is not a traditio-historical or historico-redactional but a literary issue. What has actually happened as tradition was crystallizing into script, that is, into a literary reality? Why has the narrator here used *YHWH*, there he used *'Elōhîm*? Were there really guiding principles that influenced his choice of the proper name employed? Were these principles epistomological or simply aesthetic?

This is a basic question which the documentary hypothesis leaves unanswered. Were the writers of the documents primarily authors or collectors?[16] If we say that the use of the divine names depended rather on the sources which stand at the basis of the present text, we have still to answer how come that the two names are at times found in the same smaller units which are the episodes like Gen 17. I would agree with Cassuto[17] that the use of the divine names was not indiscriminate, just as the selection of the narrative material was not haphazard.[18] This would bring us to the original question: why this name in this particular text? Cassuto's rules may provide welcome enlightenment on particular texts, but the principle guiding the use of these names has yet to emerge. Cassuto's contribution, though, served to turn the spotlight upon this elusive moment when Pentateuch was being written.

14. "La Questione della Genesi", 309.

15. Ibid., 310-312.

16. Cfr Whybray, *Making of the Pentateuch*, 29.

17. Cfr *The Documentary Hypothesis*, 18.

18. In my essay, "The Redactional Structuring within the Abraham Narratives in Genesis", Vincent Borg (ed), *Veterum Exempla* (Melita Theologica Supplementary Series, I; Malta 1991)35-82, I have tried to show that the narrator of the Abraham narrative employed a global structure not merely to keep the narrative, constituted of diverse materials, as a whole together, but also to use fruitfully the analogy principle by which two or more texts help to throw light on each other.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH AS A LIVING TRADITION 100 YEARS AFTER *RERUM NOVARUM*

Franz Furger*

1. Catholic social teaching is a dynamic theory

Catholic social doctrine is often said to be just a logically coherent system, which started to develop with the first social encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII in 1891 and which has been based, since then, on the several papal documents dealing with social problems in politics and economics. But in such a statement there is little consideration of the fact that *Rerum Novarum* already was a synthesis of different currents of Christian social questioning and reflecting on different cultural backgrounds, different historical and political experiences and also on different philosophical traditions. Catholic social doctrine is – according to the German scholar H.J. Wallraff – a "network of open sentences" (*ein Gefüge offener Sätze*) rather than a closed system.

According to the double meaning of the Latin word "doctrina", it is, therefore – as said in the title of this conference – a way of teaching rather than a real doctrine. There is, of course, an internal unity in this doctrine regarding goals, aims and principles. Human nature defines man as a person with its inalienable dignity and as an individual who may exist only as a truly human being in a social context in which justice and equality are being sought. This definition of man is in line with the bible, where Adam is shown as becoming fully a person only in partnership with Eve, and in line also with the theological tradition of the Church in the West. Since the Middle Ages, man has been defined as *animal sociale* according to the definition of Aristotle *zoon politikon*. This is also the understanding of St. Thomas Aquinas, whose commemoration you celebrate today. Human "nature", man's very essentia, is social. But social relations in today's world are not any more as they used to be in the past: direct

* FRANZ FURGER is Professor of Christian Social Ethics in the Catholic Faculty of Theology and Director of the Institute for Christian Social Sciences of the University of Münster. He is the author of *Christ und Gesellschaft* (1978), *Bawaffnet gewaltlos?* (1981), *Die Zehn Gebote* (1983), *Was Ethik begründet?* (1984), *Ethik Der Lebensbereiche* (1984), *Weltgestaltung aus Glauben* (1989) and several other publications.
This is the text of a lecture which the author gave in May 1991 on the invitation of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Malta in commemoration of the centenary of *Rerum Novarum* as part of the annual academic celebration in honour of St. Thomas Aquinas.

connections as one finds in a family, a tribe or a village. Modern men live in a state, work mostly in factories, belong often to big transnational companies; they are affected by distant events as shown dramatically in the Gulf war. Briefly, man today is living in a real world-wide society. Respect for the personal dignity of every man cannot be, therefore, restricted just to the neighbour. Indeed Christians knew that always, at least theoretically. But in our days this truth acquired a practical significance. We have to ask how justice, as respect for human dignity, can be granted for everyone, for rich and poor, white or black, young or old.

Evidently it is impossible to satisfy the present day exigencies of justice by means of personal acts of charity and good will. What we need are rules and laws to prescribe how justice has to be realized in economics, politics, in the field of security and in other spheres of social life. We need what is called "social structures" and, as Christians, we ought to look very carefully not only to act according to what we feel to be just, but also and, even more so, that these social structures promote justice instead of privileges of the rich and the powerful. That is what Leo XIII asked for in his social encyclical *Rerum Novarum* on the basis of the social nature of man as seen by Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas and in view of the needs of modern times. As a remedy for the poverty of workers in the factories he did not ask just for works of charity but for a just salary to support not only a normal family but also to make some savings to provide for emergency cases. In the face of all kinds of injustice he did not ask people for patience but he invited them to defend the legitimate rights of the working people by forming unions and – if necessary – to insist on their rights even by striking. Before the word was even known, this Pope insisted on "social human rights" or, as we would say in our days "option for the poor". In this respect *Rerum Novarum* remains very much up to date, even 100 years after its publication and it is really worthwhile to make a *relecture* of it as John Paul II does in *Centesimus Annus*.

Disregard of man as a person, created in the image of God, is always an offence against God Himself and a violation of face-to-face relations as well as social relations characteristic of the modern big and sometimes even world-wide society. This moral duty and the ethical theory dealing with it, however, was never seen as a static doctrine. Its cultural and historical background has to be taken also into account. That was already the case in the time before *Rerum Novarum*, when Christians first started to reflect on the misery of the growing class of workers in the industrial centres. Even afterwards Catholic social teaching did not evolve into a real unity of doctrine. The social teaching of the Church has a rather dynamic unity in the sense that at one time, for some reason, a particular tradition may predominate without necessarily excluding other traditions or currents.

Some German theologians happen to consider their own tradition as the really true one. The important influence of German theologians in the time of Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII may give some credit to this view but it is an exaggeration. Since the pontificate of John XXIII and Paul VI and since Vatican Council II the French understanding of the social teaching of the Church became more important. With the election of John Paul II in 1978 the Church's social teaching began to reflect more his specifically Polish experience. *Centesimus Annus* gives us the Polish experience of Solidarnoscz as an example how to struggle in a Christian way for right and justice. Nevertheless, that is just one way to resolve social problems, and not – as mentioned already in commentaries in Latin America – the only one. But every one of these traditions remain an important stream in Catholic social doctrine. It may be, therefore, of some interest to consider these currents for a moment while keeping in mind that each one is just a part of the whole Catholic social tradition.

2. Different currents

2.1 Different approaches before 1891

In German speaking countries social responsibility as an ethical duty was strongly felt long before *Rerum Novarum*. In 1848, the same year in which Karl Marx published the *Communist Manifesto*, Bishop G.W. von Ketteler preached his sermons about the "social question" in the Cathedral of Mainz underlining the Christian obligation to work for social justice. Marx was very angry about that. But in Christianity religion is not "opium for the people" but a challenge to work for social justice. Besides these initiatives in Germany one finds in Austria the ideas of K. von Vogelsang who proposed the rather romantic concept of the so-called *berufständische Ordnung*, the re-establishment of the medieval order in the different unions of arts and crafts, as a way of overcoming class opposition and struggle. In Belgium it was also a Christian layman, Mr. Perin, who organized Christians in pressure groups for human rights. He had, of course, the support of the Pope, who was in 1830 the first nuntio in Belgium after its liberation and separation from the Netherlands. In Italy during the same period different groups were studying the "social question" and in France, especially since the Revolution of 1848, people like Ozanam and de Mun started their initiatives to help the working class – the "misérables" as Victor Hugo described it most successfully in his famous book. But again this help was not just a form of charity organization; it was also the beginning of a pressure group for rights and justice in social structures. In Switzerland finally, the later Cardinal G. Mermillod had the idea of bringing together several people who were dealing with the social question in the different European countries. Under the name of *Union de Fribourg* he established international contacts for

all these groups. The result of all these contacts was that the Pope asked the *Union de Fribourg* to elaborate a first draft for the very first social encyclical of the Church.

2.2 The German Current

It is, certainly, not an exaggeration to say that currents of experience and thinking were important in the elaboration of Catholic social doctrine. But in the subsequent evolution of this doctrine German influence increased. On the basis of the experiences of the so-called *Mönchengladbacher Volksverein* (an association of working people set up to instruct and educate its members how to be able to defend their own interests) F. Hitze felt it was necessary to study the propositions of *Rerum Novarum* on an academical level at the university. In Münster in Westfalia he founded the first Chair of Christian Social Sciences two years after the publication of *Rerum Novarum*, i.e. in 1893 and I am now the fifth Professor in this Chair. This idea was so popular that after 1920 Chairs for social ethics in Catholic Theological Faculties were set up and the teaching of Christian social ethics became by law a compulsory component of the regular theological curriculum for future priests. Nowadays these Chairs are even granted by the concordat at German universities.

In the following years German influence became even more predominant. The threat of the emerging ideologies of National Socialism and Stalinist Communism led the general of the Jesuits, W. Ledochowski, to persuade Pope Pius XI that the concept of society in these ideologies, despite their differences, would put the human being as a person in great danger. A new statement of the magisterium on the social problem of the day was in order. The Pope agreed and asked whether the general could propose a scholar to prepare a first draft. The general mentioned O. von Nell-Breuning who was then only recently appointed Professor for Social Ethics in Frankfurt. Having been well trained in economics and social science by the Jesuit H. Pesch, he was promoted Doctor in Moral Theology with a thesis about the morality of stock exchange. Thus this young professor was the right man for the task to prepare a new social encyclical. As Fr. Nell-Breuning was also a member of a small association of people interested in social problems, – the so-called *Königswinterer Kreis* – he could discuss various points of the social problem with the other members without letting them know why he was specifically doing so. There was also another Jesuit in the group, a social philosopher with a solid training in neo-scholastic ontology, called Fr. G. Gundlach, who later became the main adviser to Pope Pius XII in matters of social ethics. Without mentioning the reason why, Nell-Breuning brought all the social problems featuring in his draft for discussion in this *Königswinterer Kreis*. The result of this process was the second social

encyclical of the Church *Quadragesimo Anno* in 1931, forty years after *Rerum Novarum*, an encyclical which betrays clearly a German way of thinking.

In view of the needs of those days the emphasis of this document was put on the rights of the individual human being as a person and on the autonomy of smaller groups rather than on common welfare or on the rights of society. Therefore, the principle of subsidiarity seems to be of greater importance than the principle of solidarity. The right to private property and personal initiatives in economic activity is obviously still understood as being linked with social responsibility but it is also very much defended against every attempt at its socialisation. Socialism is clearly rejected. One can find – so to say – the same sound again in *Centesimus Annus*. As a whole, the teaching of *Quadragesimo Anno* is put in a neo-scholastic framework and its systematical logic clearly gives the impression of a "doctrine" with stable principles but it is not sufficiently dynamic to respond to the new problems of the time.

In the following years, especially after the election of Pope Pius XII (1939) as Fr. Gundlach became the main adviser for social ethics in the Roman curia, Catholic social doctrine continued to develop as a result of the many statements of the Pope, particularly those dealing with practical political problems. But the main influence of this kind of social teaching came after World War II with the elaboration of the principles of the constitution (the *Grundgesetz*) of the Federal Republic of Germany, that is, as a federal democracy in the framework of Human Rights (according to the UN declaration of 1948) and in the order of a socially mitigated competitive profit system of a *soziale Marktwirtschaft*, a "social market economy" which now *Centesimus Annus* seems to regard as a model how to organize the economy even on a worldwide level. The great success of this new German state in Europe regarding democratic rule and economic evolution – everyone spoke of the "German economic miracle" – increased greatly the prestige of this type of social doctrine. But after the death of Pius XII in 1958, the new Pope, John XXIII, who was before a nuntio in Paris (contrary to Pius XII who stayed in Berlin) changed the staff of his advisers. The fairly exclusive influence of German theology diminished and another current of thought became decisive for the social teaching of the Popes.

2.3 The French Current

French experience and thinking became more important. New problems arose particularly regarding economic justice – not only on the level of every single nation but on a world scale. The former colonial system disappeared, but there was the need for a global solidarity and, therefore, special regards in view of the fact that the newly independent countries remained under-developed economically. Their problems got now a central importance both in Christian

social ethics in general and in the social doctrine of the magisterium of the Church, i.e. in papal encyclicals and in the Pastoral Constitution of Vatican II. Dominicans like Louis Lebret and Marie-Dominique Chenù became important; together with Pierre Bigo (a French Jesuit working in Chile) and Professor Pietro Pavan (today cardinal) of Rome, they changed in 1960 a first draft, written by Fr. Gundlach, for the social encyclical which John XXIII had ordered for the 70th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*. Chenù insisted that in the Pastoral Constitution of Vatican II the word social "doctrine" was changed into "teaching" and Lebret was charged by Paul VI with the preparation of a draft for the famous encyclical *Populorum Progressio* of 1967.

But what was so different from earlier documents that led quite a number of commentators to speak of a turning-point or even a rupture in Catholic social doctrine? It was, of course, not the general Christian understanding of man and the duty, based on social justice, to help especially the poor peoples and nations. It was rather the way of thinking that was different. The German scholars were philosophers, thinking in a rationalistic and systematic way. Out of general principles they deduced a whole system of laws and rules, valid for all times and nations. The French instead were much more practical; according to the advise of the later Cardinal Joseph Cardijn, the Belgian founder of the Young Christian Movement (YCW) the method was: see – judge – act. They started by analysing the reality, its needs and possibilities and then they looked out for a strategy of improvement. Before becoming a Dominican and an expert in social science, Fr. Lebret was a sailor; he knew the misery of the poor in the harbours of the world. His social teaching was, therefore, very practical and Pope Paul VI agreed: *Populorum Progressio* is word by word written by Lebret. (I know a scholar who is a friend of the family Lebret which obtained the draft after the death of Fr. Lebret and still has it and who compared this draft very carefully with the final document). It represents a new way of thinking and was easier to be understood by modern people – especially by Latin Americans. Quite a number of liberation theologians studied in Belgium and France in those days. The emphasis was put on the principle of solidarity. The new social documents of John XXIII and Paul VI were felt as new and encouraging orientation in the social teaching of the church. There was a measure of understanding for the aims of socialist policy and the emphasis was put on the social obligation of private property. These points were, of course, not completely new – but still the accent was different!

The acceptance of this change among German scholars was, nevertheless, rather slow as one could see from the fact that in a lecture held last year before German Professors of social ethics a German bishop raised the question whether they had really understood the challenge of *Gaudium et Spes*.

Despite the well-established position which social ethics enjoyed in theological faculties at German universities its influence on the political scene and public opinion decreased substantially. It is often somehow reduced to an apologetical defence of the programmes of the Christian political parties but still presented as the social doctrine of the Church (by minimizing of course the changes in the Church since 1958). many of the younger generations of theologians got even the impression that the social doctrine of the Church did no longer contribute to a solution of the actual social questions.

3. General Consequences

That may be a lesson for us – and perhaps even for you here in Malta: The way to teach social ethics in a certain historical epoch and culture can be very useful and successful but it cannot be valid for all times. Changing situations demand changing theories. Who forgets this point becomes sterile and hides the aims of the Gospel rather than preach the Gospel according to the actual needs of modern society.

I think that Latin American liberation theologians understood that; certainly many of their proposals are not yet established critically enough. Many of the concepts as those of socialism, dependence as a factor of exploitation, etc. remain very vague; the historical analysis is often incomplete and unfair, while criticism of corruption in Third World countries or quarrels among the poor themselves remain very weak. But to base the theory of social improvement on action not only for but also with the poor is an approach which is close to the Gospel. The social encyclical of John Paul II *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1987) is very open to this kind of thinking; it is certainly not lacking in criticism but it does not issue any kind of condemnation as it was expected by some conservative groups of Catholic theologians and politicians, and *Centersimus Annus* retained this general orientation in its analysis of the changes that took place in Eastern Europe following the collapse of socialism.

After the German and the French period of the Church's social teaching it seems that a third period is beginning. This teaching will probably be less systematic, less a product of university scholars working alone in their study-office but rather the product of a wide and open discussion. Professors are still needed for drafting, for defining the problem, for asking questions; but the experience of all the faithful has then to be taken into consideration. That may then be followed by pastoral letters of local Churches on their specific social problems. Such a pastoral letter was elaborated by the Bishops' Conference of the USA in 1986 and the Austrian bishops did the same in 1990. The results are encouraging and I think that it could be the way to go for a social teaching close to the living experiences of the faithful involved in the daily social problems of

our societies. Without such an orientation the social teaching of the Church risks to lose its power and unity as, unfortunately, it is the case in different parts of the world. Among young (and often rather leftist) people social questions are raised only in the context of the life experiences of basic groups from which theological reflection is absent. The case among academic people varies; some try to stay in contact mainly with working people and the unions others still follow the traditional way by trying to keep good contacts with the politically and economically leading groups of society.

But all these approaches remain too unilateral. Our own tradition invites us to go back to the dynamic origins of social ethics since *Rerum Novarum* by defining clearly the anthropological foundation of ethical principles and retaining the post-conciliar emphasis on human values as understood in the light of Christian faith and life experiences in a pluralistic society. Seen in this way, one may be realistically hopeful that Christian values can still play a relevant role actually in all spheres and at all levels of social life.

I am personally convinced that this is a healthy way to communicate the Gospel in the actual historical context and restore the importance of the social doctrine of the Church. As the most recent documents of the magisterium *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Centesimus Annus* seem to confirm this view and the demand for such theory of social ethics is increasing among the public at large, I think that this opinion is not quite unrealistic. The social teaching of the Church can be a living tradition, if it responds to the needs and the problems of changing situations by presenting the Gospel as the good news of Jesus for all men, especially for the poor.

Institut für Christliche Sozialwissenschaften
Westfälische Wilhems-Universität
Münster

THE HOMILY: COMMUNICATING THE WORD OF GOD TO TODAY'S WORLD
(Liturgical, Theological and Pastoral Aspects)

John A. Frendo O.P.*

Two disciples of Christ, walking from Jerusalem to Emmaus, met the Risen Lord, listened to him announcing and explaining the Good News, and received him as their host during the breaking of the bread. At first they did not recognize him. But he was really present amongst them. Then, still not knowing who he was, their hearts were burning within them as he was explaining to them the Scripture. And finally, at the table, when he broke the bread, their eyes were opened. And they wanted to share their joy of meeting the Lord by relating this experience to the other disciples

This is an account of a liturgical assembly and celebration which took place on a Sunday evening in the first century.[1]

This account described, primarily, the nature of our liturgical celebration. The liturgy is:

(a) a meeting with Christ "on the way" when we meet together in his name;[2]

* Born in Cospicua in 1937, JOHN A. FRENDO joined the Dominican Order in 1954 where he finished his studies for the priesthood at the College of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rabat (Malta). He was ordained priest in 1961. In 1962 he got a Licentiate in Theology from the Università San Tommaso (Angelicum) in Rome. He got his Doctorate in Theology from the Institut Catholique de Paris with the thesis *The Post-Secreta of the 'Missale Gothicum' and the Eucharistic Theology of the Gallican Anaphora* published in Malta in 1977.
He thought at INSERM from 1967-1988 and the Faculty of Theology since 1980. In 1989 he was elected as Head of the Department of Pastoral Theology within the same Faculty.
He wrote several works in Maltese especially *Omeliji* (3 volumes, 1977-1979) and *L-Ewkaristija.* He has been editor of the review *Riflessi* these last twenty-five years.
This paper was read at the Congress of the "Societas Liturgica Internationalis" held in Toronto, Canada: 12-17 August 1991. This short communication was delivered on the 14th of August.

1. Lk 24,13-35.

2. Lk 24,15; cf Mt 18,20.

(b) a dialogue with him as we receive his word which enlightens us;[3]
(c) an invitation for the breaking of the bread in which we sit at the table to receive him;[4]
(d) and finally, the joy of spreading the Good News of his resurrection.[5]

Besides this, we have to notice here the relation between "the word" and "the Eucharist", both being, in different ways, a "celebration" of Christ's presence in the liturgical assembly.

And finally we observe in this biblical account that between "Word" and "Sacrament" there is a link, a sort of mediation between the Word of God proclaimed and God's people assembled. This mediation is what we call "the Homily". St. Luke says that Christ was explaining "to them (the disciples) the passages throughout the Scriptures that were about himself" (24,27).

Thus we may conclude that in the liturgical celebration there is a passage realized in a threefold action: the Written Word is *proclaimed*, – the Word is *explained* and *applied*, – the Word is *realized* in the Eucharist Meal.[6]

A. *Relation between the Word and its interpretation — application, in the Gospel and the Acts*

I refer here to three biblical accounts from the New Testament:

(a) Lk 4,16-22: Christ went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day as he usually did. "*He stood up to read*, and they handed him the scroll of the prophet Isaiah. Unrolling the scroll he found the place where it is written ... He then rolled up the scroll ... Then *he began to speak* to them, 'This text is being *fulfilled today even as you listen*'. And he won the approval of all, and they were astonished by the gracious words that came from his lips".

We can easily say that here we encounter *a prototype of a homily*. Jesus reads the text from the Old Testament, interpreting it and applying it to himself.

(b) Lk 24,25-26: I have already referred above to this passage regarding the disciples of Emmaus. Here Christ explains the texts from the Old Testament

3. Lk 24,18-27.
4. Lk 24, 28-32.
5. Lk 24,33-35.
6. Cf A. BEA, "Valeur pastorale de la Parole de Dieu dans la liturgie," *La Maison-Dieu* (*LMD*) 47-48(1956) 127-148, p.131. See also A.M. ROGUET, "Renouveau de la liturgie et renouveau de la prédication," *Ibid.*, 149.

and interprets them, applying them to himself. So, here again, the Written Word is explained and applied 'hic et nunc'.

(c) Acts 13,14-16: Paul and his friends went to the Synagogue. "After the lessons from the Law and the Prophets had been read, the presidents of the Synagogue sent them a message: 'Brothers, if you would like to address some words of encouragement to the congregation, please do so'. Paul stood up, ... and began to speak: ..." Paul's sermon here was an interpretation of the Old Testament events applying them to the New Testament as they were fulfilled in Christ. Thus Paul's sermon was a homily in which he communicated the Word of God to that particular assembly. The result was that "many Jews and devout converts joined Paul and Barnabas" (13,42.43).

B. *The Word proclaimed and interpreted, and its relation in the Eucharist, up to the 2nd Century*

In a short period of 100 years a great development took place regarding the structure of the Eucharistic celebration and the relation: Word – Eucharist. We can distinguish four stages:

a) The Last Supper according to the Synoptics (Mt 26,26-29; Mk 14,22-25; Lk 22,15-20). Here we have a special assembly with Christ himself present. Christ delivers farewell discourses (cf Jn 13-17) and then institutes the Eucharistic meal.

b) The eucharist during the apostolic age (1Cor 11,23-25). Around the year 55-57 AD, the first Christians meet together for a fraternal meal (*agapé*) and then they celebrate the Lord's Supper. In this text there is no reference to readings or a sermon, but only to a meeting or an assembly of Christians who eat together a fraternal meal, as it was supposed to be, before celebrating the Eucharist.

c) St. Paul in Troas (Acts 20,7-12) around the year 58. This was a vigil celebrating the Lord's day; it began on the evening of Saturday and it was Sunday at daybreak that Paul and the first Christians broke the bread (the Eucharist). During this assembly there was a sermon preached by Paul and then the Breaking of the Bread.

d) The Eucharist around the year 150, and surely before, according to St. Justin.[7] This is the text which describes the Sunday Eucharistic Assembly:

7. *Apologia I* 67, 3-5. English translation as published by ROBERT CABIÉ in *The Church at Prayer*, Volume II: *The Eucharist* (translated by MATTHEW J. O'CONNELL) (The Liturgical Press; Collegeville, Minnesota 1986) 14-16.

"On the day named after the sun, all who live in city or countryside assemble in the same place. The memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read for as long as time allows. When the lector has finished, the president addresses us and exhorts us to imitate the splendid things we have heard.
Then we all stand and pray.
As we said earlier, when we have finished praying, bread, wine, and water are brought up.
The president then prays and gives thanks according to his ability.
And the people give their assent with an 'Amen!'
Next, the gifts, which have been 'eucharistified' are distributed, and everyone shares in them, while they are also sent via the deacons to the absent brethren."

It is clear from this text that in the second century the celebration of the Eucharist already had a definite structure, as it is today. These are the main points:

- assembly of the Christians on Sunday morning;
- readings from the Bible (Old and New Testament);
- homily;
- prayers;
- offering of bread and wine;
- eucharistic prayer ending with an 'Amen';
- distribution of the Eucharist to those present;
- distribution, by the deacons, to the absent brethren.

It is important here to note the relation between: the Word of God *read*, the Word of God *Preached and communicated* to the brethren assembled, and the *celebration of the Eucharist*.

Comparing the four stages in the development of the eucharistic celebration: the Last Supper, Corinth (A.D. 55-57), Troas (A.D.58), and St.Justin (A.D. 150), we can conclude that:

a) In the post-apostolic period, when the "living word" of Christ and the apostles was over, the "Written Word" read from the Sacred Books makes its regular appearance.

b) The Word of God, that is the readings from the Sacred Books, takes the place of the fraternal meal (the "Agapé") and its role is double; it "forms" the assembly and it "nourishes" the faithful. Instead of a "material" meal, now we

have a "spiritual" meal. For, as Jesus says: "man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God".[8]

c) From this development in the structure of the celebration, it results that the eucharist combines in one a double meal or two tables; the Table of the Word of God and the Table of the Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ.[9] They are so "closely connected with each other that they form but one single act of worship".[10] They are two different ways of Christ's real presence in the liturgy: in the Word and in the Sacrament.[11]

d) Word and Sacrament are so closely related to each other that:

(i) The Word is, in a way, realized and rendered active in the Sacrament. There is a parallelism between the mystery of the incarnation: "the Word becomes Flesh" and thus a Sacrament, and the mystery of the Eucharist: this Sacramental Word becomes a Sacramental Meal.

(ii) The Sacrament is the "action" which realizes the "Word": in this sense: "do this" is followed by "we celebrate your order".

e) Around the year AD 150, St. Justin, in the first description of the celebration of the Eucharist,[12] gives us for the first time the real definition of the homily when he says: "When the lector has finished (reading the Word of God from the Sacred Books), the president *addresses us and exhorts us to imitate the splendid things we have heard*". Thus the homily is set clearly in connection with the Word of God read, and communicates the message contained therein to the faithful assembled.

8. Mt 4,4; cf *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (*SC*), The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, art. 51.

9. Cf *SC*, art. 48 and 56; see also the commentary by P. JOUNEL in *LMD* 77(1964) 127.

10. *SC*, art. 56.

11. Cf *SC*, art. 7.

12. Text quoted above, note 7; English translation, p.15.

C. The Homily: A mediation between the Word of God and God's people in the early Church tradition[13]

What is the homily? This Greek word *homilia* originally meant an interchange of thoughts by words (1Cor 15,33), a dialogue, a familiar conversation.[14] In the biblical account of Lk 24, in vv. 14.15 we read that the disciples "were talking together about all that had happened. Now as they *talked this over*, Jesus himself came up and walked by their side..." The phrase "talked this over" in the Greek text is *homilein*, in the sense of a conversation. And in Acts 24,26, the word *hōmilei* means 'speaking with'.

It was Origen (AD 185-254) who first gave to the word *homiliai* its proper meaning. These "homilies" were the "talks on select chapters or passages of the Bible" which he delivered in liturgical assemblies. The nature of these homilies "is that of a familiar talk to impart spiritual edification".[15] And, as we have already seen from Justin's *Apologia*, these homilies were from the very start intimately connected with the Bible readings.

So we can already conclude that two points characterize the homily in the early Church tradition, namely: its intimate connection with the Word of God just read and its reference to the people of God assembled.

Let us take a few examples from the early writers-preachers of the Church. Origen himself who, though a layman preached the homilies in the eucharistic assembly,[16] composed 200 homilies on the Sacred Scriptures.

St. John Chrysostom (c. 344-407) gave innumerable talks on biblical texts read in the assembly, in which his main intention was to actualize the Word of God and apply it to the particular situation of the christian community.[17]

13. I suggest two studies on this particular topic, regarding the nature of the homily in the Church of the Fathers: DOM JEAN LECLERCQ, "Le Sermon, Acte Liturgique" in *LMD* 8(1946) 27-46; (I – "La Période des Pères", p.29; II – "Le Moyen Âge", p.37). And ALEXANDRE OLIVAR, "Quelques remarques historiques sur la prédication comme action liturgique dans l'Église Ancienne" in *Mèlanges liturgiques offerts au R.P. Dom Botte O.S.B.* (Abbaye de Mont Cèsar; Louvain 1972) 429-443.

14. J. GELINEAU, "L'Homèlie, forme pleniére de la prèdication", *LMD* 82(1965) 29-42, p.35.

15. J. LUPI, *The Homily", Melita Theologica*, Vol. XVII/2 (1956) 35-48, p.35. See also M. RIGHETTI, *Storia Liturgica*, Vol. III, *L'Eucaristia*, (ed. Áncora; Milano 1956) 200-244, especially p.234.

16. J.A. JUNGMANN, *Missarum Sollemnia*, Tome 2 (Aubier; Paris 1952) 227.

17. OLIVAR, "Quelques remarques", 432.

St. Augustine (AD 354-430) in his Sermon 95,1, states clearly that the preacher is the messenger of God's Word: he is the one who hears the Word no less than his hearers themselves. These are his words: "What I give you is not mine. I eat what you eat, live on what you live. We have a common store in Heaven; from there, in fact, comes the Word of God".[18]

St. Gregory the Great, Pope (AD 590-604), in his homilies, used a method of exposition which applies the revealed Word of God to the various categories of persons in a way similar to an individual conversation.[19]

According to Egeria's *Peregrinatio* (c. AD 400), referring to the homilies preached in Jerusalem on Sundays, these sermons had as their aim "to instruct the people on the Scriptures and in the love of God".[20]

As a general conclusion on this period of patristic writings we may say that "The homily was certainly the most important way of bringing out the "today" of God's word. Biblical exegesis, historical commentary, doctrinal and moral instruction all of which were aspects of the preaching of the Fathers played their part in the intention of actualizing the Scriptures in the life of the Christians who had gathered for ecclesial prayer and were soon to scatter again and return to the world".[21]

D. From the homily to the "thematic" sermon after the tenth century

After the 10th century we notice a great lack in the use of the Bible and much less variety in the selection of readings from the Scriptures. Instead of the lectionary, the plenary Missal came into use with a smaller number of biblical pericopes.

During that same period the homily had degenerated and there was even a time when hardly any preaching was done at all.[22] Towards the end of the Middle Ages, preaching is separated, more and more, from the Mass.[23]

18. L. DELLA TORRE, "Omelia", in *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia* (DOMENICO SARTORE/ACHILLE M. TRIACCA eds.) (Ed. Paoline; Roma 1984) 923-943; see also p.928. See also R. CABIE, *Church at Prayer*, 68.

19. LECLERCQ, "Sermon, Acte Liturgique", 35.

20. *Peregrinatio Egeriae* n.25; cf DELLA TORRE, "Omelia", 942, note 24.

21. CABIÉ, *Church at Prayer*, 67.

22. LUPI, "Homily, 38.

23. JUNGMANN, *Sollemnia*, 227 note 5.

The thirteenth century brought a revival of preaching thanks to the mendicant orders, but the preaching tended to be unrelated to the liturgy. Generally the discourse was not a homily but an explication of dogma or moral principles.[24]

The Council of Trent insisted on the duty of pastors to preach to the faithful on the readings of the Mass often, but especially on Sundays and feast days:

> "...the holy Council, in order that the sheep of Christ may not go unfed, lest 'the children beg for food but no one gives to them' (Lam 4,4), orders that pastors and all who have the care of souls must frequently, either by themselves or through others, explain during the celebration of Masses some of the readings of the Mass, and among other things give some instruction about the mystery of this most holy sacrifice, especially on Sundays and feast days".[25]

However, even after the decrees of the Council of Trent, and in spite of Can. 1344-1345 of the Code of Canon Law,[26] preaching in modern times was still separated from liturgical actions and mostly thematic.[27] Benedict XV, in his Encyclical *Humani Generis Redemptoris* on preaching of the Word of God[28] condemns the fact that many preachers put aside and ignore the Sacred Scriptures, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church and the arguments from Sacred Theology, and speak almost exclusively the language of reason!

E. The homily: a liturgical act: Vatican Council II and after

The Conciliar Constitution "Sacrosanctum Concilium" of Vatican II, in arts. 24, 35, 51 and 52, underlines the importance of the Word of God, its application through the homily, and its relation to the Sacrament itself. The homily is a "liturgical act". These are the texts:

> *Art. 24:* "Sacred scripture is of the greatest importance in the celebration of the liturgy. For it is from it that lessons are read and explained in the homily, and psalms are sung. It is from the scriptures that the

24. CABIÉ, *Church at Prayer*, 154.

25. 22nd Session: *Doctrine on the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* (1952). Text translated and published in *The Christian Faith*, (J. NEUNER/J. DUPUIS eds) (Collins; London 1986) 427, n.1554.

26. See also Can. 1347 of CIC (1917).

27. DELLA TORRE, "Omelia", 930.

28. Published on the 15th of June 1917; cf DELLA TORRE, "Omelia", 931.

prayers, collects, and hymns draw their inspiration and their force, and that actions and signs derive their meaning."

Art. 35: "That the intimate connection between rite and words may be apparent in the liturgy:

(1) In sacred celebrations a more ample, more varied, and more suitable reading from sacred scriptures should be restored.

(2) The most suitable place for a sermon ought to be indicated in the rubrics, for a sermon is part of the liturgical action whenever the rite involves one. The ministry of preaching is to be fulfilled most faithfully and carefully. The sermon, moreover, should draw its content mainly from scriptural and liturgical sources, for it is the proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation, which is the mystery of Christ ever made present and active in us, especially in the celebration of the liturgy".

Art. 51: "The treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly so that a richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's word. In this way a more representative part of the sacred scriptures will be read to the people in the course of a prescribed number of years".

Art. 52: "By means of the homily the mysteries of the faith and the guiding principles of the Christian life are expounded from the sacred text during the course of the liturgical year. The homily, therefore, is to be highly esteemed as part of the liturgy itself. In fact at those Masses which are celebrated on Sundays and holidays of obligation, with the people assisting, it should not be omitted except for a serious reason".

From these texts we can draw the following conclusions:

1. There is an intimate link between the Word and the Sacrament, as I have already stated above.

2. The importance of the Word of God lies in the fact that it is a continuation of Christ's real presence among his people in an efficacious way, as a spiritual meal.

3. The homily is "part of the liturgy itself" and should be based on scriptural and liturgical sources. It is the proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation. By means of it the mysteries of the faith and

the guiding principles of the Christian life are expounded from the sacred text during the course of the liturgical year.

What do we mean when we say that the homily is "part of the liturgy itself" and a "liturgical act"?

First of all the homily is an integral part of the liturgy itself (*SC*, art. 52) in the sense that one of the aims of the liturgy is to instruct the faithful (*SC*,art. 33). It distributes the Word to man, the Word of God incarnate. One can understand the profound sense which lies in the link between preaching and the celebration of the sacrifice as it is set in the ceremonial of bishops.[29]

Secondly, according to *SC*, art. 7, "The liturgy ... is ... an exercise of the priestly function of Jesus Christ". This means that Christ, as the supreme and only priest of the New Testament, offered himself to the Father and was the only mediator between God and man. Thus his self offering had a twofold aim: the glorification of God and the sanctification of man. So the homily, being a liturgical act, is in an analogous way the act of Christ himself and has a sacramental value. In fact the homily aims to be an efficacious means to bring out God's glorification and man's sanctification.

As regards God's glorification we can observe, with A.Olivar,[30] that many ancient sermons or homilies ended with a conclusion which had the nature of a doxology. In this way the homily expresses the wish that God be praised and glorified in the Christian's way of life.

Regarding the "sanctification of man" we may conclude that the homily has a sacramental value. C. Vagaggini[31] stresses this point when he asserts: "preaching is a *mysterium*, a *sacramentum*; *mysterium* and *sacramentum*, of course, in the general sense of ancient tradition, which we already know, involves a sensible sign, efficious in its own way, significant of supersensible realities in relation to God's economy of salvation in Christ". The sensible sign is the Word of the preacher. The supersensible reality is salvation in Christ or man's sanctification.

Finally, the homily is a continuation of Christ's presence in the word, as we read in the Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*, n. 11,[32] and is intimately related to the

29. LECLERCQ, "Sermon, Acte Liturgique", 32.

30. OLIVAR, "Quelque remarques", 438.

31. *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy*, (Trans. L.J. DOYLE) (The Liturgical Press; Collegeville, Minnesota 1976) 861.

32. Published on the 3rd September 1965. See the text in *Enchiridion Documentorum*

sacraments. In all sacramental celebrations, the Word of God, read and preached, announces the salvation and sanctification which are realized in the sacraments.

This means that it is a mistake to insist only on the cultural value of the sacramental celebration, and it is incorrect to create a parallelism between word-homily and cult as if these were two separate actions. On the contrary, we have to insist on the unity of the liturgical act and the integrity of the liturgical assembly. Here the priest is the minister of the "word" and the "sacrament" at the same time.[33]

F. Pastoral aspects regarding the homily[34]

We are fully aware of the difficulties one has to encounter when one wants to preach a good homily in the sense of "communicating the word of God to today's world".

a) There is a great variety of biblical texts read during the liturgical celebration, at times very difficult, at other times nearly identical, especially certain selections from the Gospel.

b) On Sundays during the year how can we preach on the second lesson of the lectionary?

c) Can we find a particular theme for particular Sundays during the year?[35]

Instaurationis Liturgicae, I-(1963-1973) (REINER KACZYNSKI ed) (Marietti; Roma 1975) 147 n.434: "... Praesens adest Ecclesiae suae praedicanti, cum Evangelium, quod annuntiatur, verbum Dei sit, et nonnisi nomine et auctoritate Christi, Verbi Dei incarnati, ipsoque adsistente, praedicetur..."

33. Regarding the sacramental value of the homily, see ĠORĠ FRENDO, "L-Omelija Sagramentali", *Pastor* 71(June 1974) 22-28.

34. See BEA "Valeur pastorale de la Parole de Dieu dans la liturgique" (note 6) and J. ARTAUD, "L'Homélie" *LMD* 84(1965) 134-139.

35. See on this point A.M. ROGUET, "Lectures Bibliques et Mystère de salut", in *LMD* 99(1969) 7-27, p.18.

1. What the homily "is not"

From what we have already stated above, we can make a whole list of qualities which do not fit a "liturgical homily". Being a liturgical act, the homily is not:

- a "didascalia" pronounced by a catechist; it is not an exegesis of the biblical texts; it is not a course of theological lectures;
- it cannot be just an instruction which appeals to the intellect;
- it should not be too moralistic. The homily is distinct from, for example, lenten sermons;
- it should not be sentimental, though it has also to touch man's sentiments;
- it has to avoid abstract and difficult terms, hard for the hearers to understand;
- it has to refer to the person without being too personal, but neither impersonal.

2. What the homily ought to be

- It should be a familiar conversion, a dialogue with the hearers, or at least provoking a response.
- It has to be an application of the message contained in the word of God to today's world.
- As a liturgical act it must aim towards the glorification of God and the sanctification of man.
- According to C. Vagaggini,[36] these are the modern desires with regard to the homily: it has to be concrete, take a unified view of revelation, that is, to be liturgical, biblical, theological and Christocentric.
- During the eucharistic celebration, it would be desirable that, sometimes, the homily be oriented towards the Eucharist. In this way it is presented as part of the mystery.

36. *Theological Dimensions*, 876-879.

3. Who preaches the homily?

As a rule it is the right and duty of the president of the assembly, bishop, presbyter or deacon, to preach the homily. However there is a possibility of "participated homilies"[37] especially in small communities, where lay people can participate by bringing forward their experiences in christian life.

And there is a particular possibility in the case of children's masses in which only a few adults participate. In fact, in the *Directory on Children's Masses*[38] in n. 24 we read: "There is no reason why one of the adults should not preach a homily to the children after the Gospel, especially if the priest has difficulty in adapting himself to the mentality of the children ..."

4. The object or content of the homily

The homily has to expound the "main theme" contained in the biblical readings, not the most intellectual idea but the most vital one. There may be also a secondary theme so as to make reference to a larger and more diverse assembly.

On Sundays during the year, this theme is found in the Gospel with reference to the first reading. This Old Testament text might launch the main theme of the Gospel.

On certain occasions one may preach the homily on a particular verse or text from the biblical readings, such as the responsorial psalm.[39] In this case one has to refer to the whole context.

The contents of the homily, Sunday after Sunday, has to include in its totality, the whole divine revelation.

5. Systems or style of the homily

The homily has to express a certain connection and horizontal unity between the biblical and liturgical texts as much as possible. A vertical unity, that is between the texts from different Sundays, is not always possible.

37. DELLA TORRE, "Omelia", 942 note 36.

38. Text published in English in A. FLANNERY (ed), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (Dublin 1975) 254-270 especially p.262.

39. See B. FISCHER, "Peut-on prêcher sur un verset ou une phrase de la Bible?" *LMD* 99(1969) 88-93.

In its quality as a "communication of God's word to modern man", the homily may be delivered according to a particular style called A - B - A, or 1 - 2 - 1. This means that it may take as a point of departure a concrete fact from daily life; then expound the biblical message, and finally apply the message to the Christian living today.

As regards this system or style of the homily, G.Wainwright[40] says: "it matters little whether the preacher begins with the scriptures and moves to the present or begins with the present human context and seeks to illuminate it from the scriptures. The two approaches may be combined to produce a constant oscillation between the scriptural text and the situation of the preacher and hearers".

Another system or style of the homily, expounded by C.Traullè,[41] is expressed in a 4-point method:

– departure from a fact of actuality;

– reference to the main biblical message;

– application to actual life;

– final reference to the message from the word of God.

The homily may be concluded with a final reference to the Eucharist, but this need not be taken as a general rule. In many other cases it has to end just with a "full stop", as it forms in actual fact, part of an ongoing activity of the Word Sacrament.

Conclusion

In his discourse on the "bread of life", in John 6, particularly in vv. 35-51a, 51b-58, Christ refers to two forms of this "supernatural bread".[42] When Christ declares: "I am the bread of life" he is asserting a vital truth, realized on two complementary levels:[43]

40. *Doxology, A Systematic Theology* (Epworth Press; London 1982) 178.

41. "Propos et Questions sur la prédication", *LMD* 126(1976) 83-107, p.92.

42. See on this point YVES CONGAR, *Priest and Layman* (trans. P.J. Hepburne-Scott) (Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd; London 1967) 103-138.

43. See DOM RALPH RUSSELL, "Commentary on St. John", in *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (Nelson; London 1969) 1051 (808k).

(a) Christ is the Word which came down from heaven to be the living bread to the world (v. 33). He is the Word made flesh and his Word is the bread of life. He himself declares: "Man does not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Mt 4,4).

(b) Christ is the Word made flesh which in turn becomes the living bread in the sacrament of his Body and Blood (v. 51).

In the liturgy, the Word of God is to be delivered to man in a way that it really becomes "the Bread of life". How is this realized? I feel that this supernatural power of the "Word of God - bread of life" becomes the more effective through the mediation of the priest who delivers the homily. He is to be the dispensator of this spiritual meal, which is the Word of God, by means of his sermon.

The homily ought to convey to God's people in today's world the vitality and efficacity contained in the Word of God. In this sense, the homily is not just a continuation of God's message and its application to man, but also, and above all, the communication of God's salvific plan of salvationto those who are honestly and sincerely disposed to accept it with a clean heart and mind. In this way it becomes effective in their daily christian life.

John A Frendo O.P.
Department of Pastoral Theology
Faculty of Theology
University of Malta
Msida, Malta.

Michael Galea/Canon John Ciarlò (eds), *ST. PAUL IN MALTA: A COMPENDIUM OF PAULINE STUDIES.* (Veritas Press; Malta 1992) 132pp.

In 1987, Dr. Heinz Wernecke published *Die tatsächliche Romfarht des Apostels Paulus* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 127; Stuttgart 1987); in this book, which contains the author's dissertation findings, W. argues that when St. Luke wrote that Paul, shipwrecked, came ashore at *Melitē* (Acts 28,1), Luke understood *Melitē* to be Cephallenia, an island off the west coast of Greece, and not Malta. (In 1991, Dr. Warnecke, with T. Schirrmacher, published a second monograph on the subject of St. Paul and Malta: *Paulus war nie auf Malta* [Hänssler TFU; Stuttgart 1991]). W.'s 1987 book provoked responses. In Germany, Dr. Jürgen Wehnert, of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Tübingen, published a scathing criticism of W.'s book (cf. "Gestrandet: zur einer These über den Schiffsbruch des Apostels Paulus auf dem Weg nach Rom", *ZTK* 87(1990) 67-99; further: *ibid*, "...und da erführen wir, dass die Insel Kephalonia heist: zur neuesten Auslegung von APG 27-28 und ihrer Methode", *ZTK* 88(1991) 169-180). On Malta Professors Carmelo Sant, Professor Emeritus of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Malta, Paul Guillaumier, biblical scholar, and Joseph Cassar Pullicino, folklorist scholar, wrote, each from his own perspective, essays in opposition to W.'s contention that Paul was never in Malta. M. Galea and Canon J. Ciarlò have gathered into one compendium the writings of Wehnert, Sant, Guillaumier and Pullicino – adding a translation of Acts 27 and 28 and an address given by Pope John Paul II on the occasion of his visit to Malta in May, 1990. On pages 98-114 an excellent bibliography provides material useful for the study of Acts 27-28, and page 51 presents two important inscriptions (one in Greek, one in Latin) pertinent to the discussion of *prōtos*, a term used by Luke to describe Publius of Malta. Useful maps are found to round out the presentations of some of the contributors to this compendium.

The hope of *St. Paul in Malta* is to provide its reader, not only with a refutation of W.'s thesis, but also with scholarly reflection on the matter at the heart of the discussion: the journey and shipwreck of Paul, Paul's being deemed a god by his surviving the bite of the serpent, and Paul's ("our", as Acts says) stay in Malta, an occasion of healing the father of Publius and many others. Have the editors of this compendium achieved their goal?

Certainly, Wehnert's critique (newly reworked) of Warnecke's *Romfahrt* makes appear reckless the statement of A. Suhl, Professor of New Testament at the University of Münster, that "Ich kann mir nicht vorstellen, dass jetzt die Malta-Theorie noch eine Wiederbelebung erfahren wird" (Warnecke, *Romfahrt*, 14). The objections of Wehnert to W.'s thesis are very grave and, unless matched once again in equal weight,

leave this reader unwilling to consider any site but Malta as the *Melitē* Paul reached after his shipwreck. Particularly destructive to W.'s theory is the obviously tortuous way in which W. must argue that the name *Melitē* can be applied (though in the ancient world it never was) to Cephallenia. Unless W. has documentation that Cephallenia was known as *Melitē* in the ancient world, it is useless to argue that details of Acts 27-28 can apply to Cephallenia as well as to Malta.

The work of Professor Sant, done independently from the form and content of Wehnert, substantially underscores some of the severe Wehnert opposition against W.'s thesis. Sant further approaches the problem from a different perspective: whereas W. argued that Cephallenia was better qualified than Malta to be Acts' *Melitē* , and Wehnert in the main wrote against a Cephallenia-theory, Sant gathers together a number of positive reasons for saying that Malta is *Melitē*.

In the third and longest essay presented in this volume, P. Guillaumier brings still further arguments to bear against W.'s thesis. Particularly suasive for me is Guillaumier's presentation of navigational arguments from James Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, (London 1880), updated by C.J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (WUNT 49; Tübingen 1989) and Guillaumier's discussion of the Alexandria-Puteoli annona shipping route (78-79); these points support an identification of *Melitē* and Malta.

Finally, in what is admittedly a less decisive source by which to prove a Pauline visit to Malta, folklorist Joseph Cassar Pullicino has brought together, for this debate and for posterity, the many associations of Malta with the figure of St. Paul. In study of the ancient world, scholars are always wary of ignoring old, old traditions as a source of new knowledge or as support of knowledge gained elsewhere. Even if, in this particular case, the Christian victory over Islam spurred the Maltese to intensify their remembrance of St. Paul (and to create some new ones), the lingering question remains: whence all these traditions and what might be the cause of their tenacious hold on the Maltese people?

There is another consideration proposed in this compendium for its reader. It is not only Dr. Warnecke who challenged the identification of *Melitē* as Malta; so have certain strains of modern biblical scholarship when they claim that some (and to some biblical scholars, practically all) of Acts 27-28,11 is unhistorical or historically unproveable. Here we are dealing, not with the limited argument about tides and trade-routes and the meaning of Publius as *prōtos* of Malta and the reasonableness of Phoinix as a Cretan port and the presence or absence of snakes on Malta and whether or not Maltese merit the name *barbaroi*, but with the historical reliability of the entire Lucan work (Gospel and Acts) and particularly with the role Lucan theology played in Luke's presentation of sources or in

his creating stories and speeches. In this matter of biblical exegesis, both Wehnert and Guillaumier have further contributions to make. Wehnert is sceptical of Pauline speech on the sea, miracle and conversions on Malta; whatever value his arguments be against Warnecke, in the bigger world of biblical scholarship Wehnert represents only a certain kind of scholar, and is correctly challenged by Guillaumier (69-72). A particular value of Guillaumier's essay, for this reader, is his presentation of the history of biblical criticism whereby he touches upon essential problems in this criticism: Lucan authorship of Acts and of the "we" passages (of which Acts 27-28,11 form a part), the historicity of speeches and miracles, the creative literary freedom of authors, and the question of literary genre, or how Luke may have been influenced in his telling his story by literary (and unhistorical) devices used by authors of Luke's time.

But as to the larger theme (that Luke, as hellenistic author, created some or all of Acts 27-28,11 and had/did not have sources, whether himself or others) – this theme will continue to occupy scholars beyond the good contributions offered in this compendium.

Obvious as is the pain Dr. Warnecke has caused all these writers in his honest presentation of his research (to say Paul was never in Malta affects not only intellects), this volume he has unwittingly caused to be printed is very valuable to everyone, and is a great contribution to the understanding we all seek in this matter. It was unwarrantedly premature, I repeat, to assert that the "Malta-theory" will not experience a resurgence; history has too often been on the side of this theory.

John J. Kilgallen, S.J.
Pontifical Biblical Institute
Rome

Melita Theologica Supplementary Series, 1

Veterum Exempla

Vincent Borg (ed)

CONTENTS

Price: Lm2.00 ($10)
Can be ordered from:
Faculty of Theology,
University of Malta,
Msida, Malta.

Mission Statement

To promote and facilitate travel for students and youths, on a not-for-profit basis, for them to enhance their personal development through the experience of travel.

NSTS Student and Youth Travel

But what are the facts?

If you had travelled to Zurich as a student in the summer of 1986 your return airfare would have cost you Lm104. This summer it still costs Lm104. Or what about London? At this summer's level of Lm86 during the shoulder months, it's Lm2 less expensive than six years ago and Lm22 less expensive than the lowest fare you can legitimately get on the market this summer. Rome is Lm28 less! And that's not taking into consideration the fact that these services give you better conditions, including full freedom and flexibility, unlike normal ones do. By the way, flying to Zurich this summer would have cost you a neat Lm115 on the least expensive normal fare.

And that's just part of the story! We can talk of subventions, subsidies and bursaries given to students directly or through student associations. For example AIESEC and IAESTE trainees and ISEP exchange students each benefitted from subsidies of between Lm20 and Lm40 on the already low cost flight tickets. Not to mention the support given to officials of your student associations such as KSU, Law Students' Society, UESA and others, travelling to conferences and meetings by way of extensively subsidied or, many a time, complete free travel.

The reason? Simple! Because NSTS was set up by University students and is today still student-directed with full-time professional staff managing its operations. This has made it possible for NSTS to pursue service development, nationally and internationally, and to develop other lines of income generating activities (like attracting special interest travel and conference handling) to financially support you, the young travelling student.

NSTS Student and Youth Travel: more than you imagine!

Excellence through service!

220 St Paul Street Valletta VLT 07 Tel: 24 49 83