

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. IV, No. 1.

January-June, 1951.

Monasticism in St Jerome's Letters and Lives of the Hermits*

FIRST BEGINNINGS—EGYPT.

THE monastic movement as it definitely took shape in the fourth century, began in Egypt and may well have been

(*). The significance of Jerome's works in ecclesiastical history has been extensively studied, but not yet thoroughly exhausted. In particular, their evidence for the early history of monasticism has not been adequately investigated. Dom E.C. Butler in his chapter on monasticism in the Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. I, does not even quote Jerome among his sources while he quotes the Letters of St. Augustine, and clearly does not take into consideration either Jerome's Lives of the Hermits or his Letters. Leonard Hughes in his "The Christian Church in the Epistles of St. Jerome" (1923) has a chapter on monasticism but he does not by any means exhaust his subject. De Labriolle in his chapter on monasticism in "Histoire de l'Eglise", published under the general editorship of Fliche and Martin (Vol. III, 1936), makes some use of Jerome's Letters, but, again, he does not exhaust their evidence.

Hence the reason for this study. In it we are summarising the picture of the monastic movement given by St. Jerome in his works. It is not pretended that Jerome's picture is complete, but it is certainly comprehensive, and, including as it does, the intimate relation of the movement to the social conditions of the fourth century and to the development of ecclesiastical organisation (aspects not usually enlarged upon by other writers on monasticism), it has a considerable value for the historian.

This article is Chapter VI of Part II of a Doctor's Thesis entitled "St. Jerome's Letters and 'Lives of the Hermits', with reference to (1) Art and Style; (2) Social and Historical Significance", presented in June 1949. For a bibliography, see Thesis introd. pages XXX-XXXII; XXXVIII-XLV; and the very good list of works quoted by De Labriolle in his Chapter on monasticism in *Histoire de l'Eglise*, published by Fliche et Martin, 1937.

Butl. — Butler, E.C., *Monasticism*, Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. 1.

C.A.H. — *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 12.

H. — *Vita Hilarionis*.

M. — *Vita Malchi*.

P. — *Vita Pauli*.

Letters are quoted in brackets by Number of letter and paragraph as in the Vienna Corpus.

connected with the persecutions as Jerome writes in P. 4. In the Decio-Valerian persecution, 250-260, many Christians tried to avoid arrest by flight. That was not easy in Italy, Spain and Gaul as all these lands were thoroughly occupied by Rome and fugitives had little chance of casting off their pursuers; but in Egypt it was different. The Roman occupation scarcely went beyond the coastline and the hinterland with its deserts afforded a sure protection. In Egypt where the valley of the Nile prolonged itself deep into the very heart of Ethiopia, the fleeing Christians were sure not only to avoid pursuit but also to settle, at least for a while, in a land which promised a fair return if properly cultivated. Hence it must have been the Egyptian hinterland that the refugees from the lands around Egypt sought, and it is no mere chance that monasticism began in Egypt. That this was the case of Paul Jerome explicitly tells us in his *Life* (P. 4). Although Decius in the beginning of his reign in 249 at once began with a determined attempt to stamp out Christianity, it was in the months of June-July 250 that the persecution reached its highest intensity (C.A.H. 12, p. 202). Hence we may fix on the year 250 as the one of the great exodus of Christians to the desert, and the Nile delta with its great theological school at Alexandria must have been singled out for a thorough purge. Although the persecution lasted only for a year and a half and died out with the death of Decius, the military anarchy that followed and the chequered events of the Gothic war made the situation too unstable for the refugees to be sure that the campaign of persecution would not be reopened as soon as the frontiers and the political stability were restored, as indeed it was reopened by Valerian in 257, and when in 260 the edicts of the persecution were revoked many might not have cared to return to their homes. The persecution had so often ended only to begin again that the edict of revocation in 260 might not have inspired much confidence that persecution might not be renewed after some time.

Eusebius in *Eccl. Hist.* 6.42 confirms this relation between the origins of monasticism and the persecutions of 250-260. But we feel that both in Jerome and in Eusebius there is some simplification of events. There is another factor which must have greatly contributed to the development of the anchorite movement. The economic conditions were not such as to entice back the refugees. Indeed, in the

second half of the third century 'anachoresis', especially of the lower classes took place in Egypt on a wide scale quite apart from Christianity and seems to have been due in part to a feeling that civilisation was doomed. It is significant that, as revealed in the '*Historia Lausiaca*' the monks, at the beginning of the fourth century seem to have been largely of the working class.

Some of the refugees, and, perhaps, others, too, would group themselves into small communities. The religious refugees were no doubt the very cream of the Christian population. While others had remained behind and tried to find some expedient by which to satisfy the imperial officers and conform in some way to the cult of the Emperor, these had preferred to give up their homes and their possessions. Christian practice with its insistence upon spiritual and moral values must have been the all-important factor in their daily life.

Such a way of life needed only a genius to organise and direct it to develop into a definite movement. According to St Athanasius this was the case with Antony. Antony went to the desert in 270, quite independently of the persecutions. The date 305 which St Athanasius gives for the founding of the first community of hermits under Antony's direction may be too late if the monastic movement is to be effectively connected with the Decio-Valerian persecution. Indeed, nothing hinders that there might have been struggling groups of ascetics, independent of and prior to that of Antony. That would agree with Jerome's contention that Antony only made monasticism famous but was not the sole originator of the idea (22. 36). The same conclusion can be reached from Sozomen's account in *Eccl. Hist.* 1. 13. Indeed, even the Life of Antony of Athanasius has a basis of agreement with such an account. For it makes clear that the first monastic group of Antony was formed at the invitation of other hermits who were already in the desert, leading an ascetic life independently of Antony. Moreover if we accept Jerome's view that monasticism was fundamentally one with the ascetic movement, as indeed it was, monasticism in its 'ascetic' form was already in existence in Alexandria before Antony himself (cf. *Athan. Vt. Ant.* 3), and the Brahmins of the lands beyond Persia were much earlier than Antony's time.

JEROME'S CHRONOLOGY OF THE BEGINNINGS

OF MONASTICISM

In reconstructing Jerome's chronology of the beginning of monasticism from the Lives of the Hermits we have to base our calculations on Hilarion. In that Life Jerome is much more reliable than in Paul, and its important events can be dated with some accuracy by the help of other sources.

We may take as a starting point the date of the death of the Emperor Julian which is mentioned in H. 34 and which happened in 363. About three years later (365-366), Hesychius finds Hilarion (H. 38). We may date that event in 365, for, immediately after, Hilarion goes to Epidaurus at the time of the great earthquake recorded both by Ammianus Marcellinus (xxvi) and by Jerome in his Chronicon, in both cases the date given being 365. From Epidaurus Hilarion voyages to Cyprus and after some months (H. 42) he settles in a desert place where he remains for two years (H. 43) after which he goes to Bucolica in Egypt (H. 43). His departure for Bucolica might have therefore been early in 368. At Bucolica he stays for five years (H. 43), roughly until 373. In H. 44 Hilarion is again in Cyprus, in Paphos, where he dies at 80 years of age (H. 44 and 11). Considering the voyage from Egypt to Cyprus and the short space of time he must have been in Cyprus before he died we may put his death late in 373 or at the beginning of 374. We prefer the latter date. Hilarion, dying at 80, must have been born in 294; since in H. 29 we are told that Antony died when Hilarion was 65 (two years after the time when Hilarion's monastery had reached its fullest development, which happened when Hilarion was 63), Antony dies in 359, which is the date given by Jerome in the Chronicon. The accounts about Antony given by Socrates, Sozomen, Rufinus and the *Vita Monachorum* all confirm that date.

In Chron. 359 Jerome tells us that Antony died 105 years old: he was therefore born in 254. At 90 years of age he went to visit Paul (P. 7), which must have been in 344. If we accept Jerome's account of Paul being 113 years old at his death which occurred soon after Antony's visit to him (P. 7), Paul would have been born in 231 and at 16 he could not have gone to the desert as Jerome relates in P. 4. since the Decio-Valerian persecution began in 349. If we shorten the age of Paul (the figure of 113 is itself extremely improbable), perhaps by ten

years, Paul would be 16 in 257 at the outbreak of the second phase of the persecution. In view of these considerations we are inclined to believe that Jerome is incorrect in giving Paul's age as 113 in P. 7, that Paul was born in 244, and that he went to the desert in 257.

The long lives of 103 for Paul and 105 for Antony in this chronology might appear improbable. But one should consider that no one of the writers on monasticism quoted above objects to Antony's age (they do not mention Paul); that at the time stories went about of the long life of Paul (P. 1); that Sôzomen in 6:34 accepts the long life of some of these hermits and explains it as a special favour of God.

In any case, both Antony and Paul must have lived to a very old age, quite close to a hundred: even if we grant that, our computations will not be affected in any considerable way.

Hence we feel that we cannot reject Jerome's broad statement that Paul went to the desert between 250-260, and that Antony became a hermit sometime later, perhaps between 270-280. The principal dates of Hilarion's life, his birth in 294, his going to the desert in 309, the setting up of his first monastic group in 331, his death in 373, we see no reason to reject.

We give hereunder Jerome's chronology in tabular form⁽¹⁾

A.D.

- 244 Birth of Paul.
- 254 Birth of Antony (90 years before death of Antony in 344, P. 7).
- 257 Paul goes to the desert (second persecution).
- 270 Antony goes to the desert (approximately, at 16 according to St. Athanasius. Vit. Ant. 2).
- 294 Birth of Hilarion (80 years before death in 373, H. 11 and 44).
- 309 Hilarion goes to the desert (at age of 15, H. 3).
- 331 Hilarion works his first miracle, 22 years after he went to the desert (H. 13).
- 331 Monks gather round Hilarion (H. 13).
- 344 Death of Paul at 103 (correction to Jerome, P. 7).
- 357 Full development of Hilarion's monastery, when Hilarion is 63 (H. 29).
- 359 Death of Antony, two years later than preceding event (H. 29).
- 361 Hilarion starts on his journeys, presumably at accession of Julian (H. 30).

(1) This chronology shows some disagreement with that given for the beginning of monasticism in general by P. de Labriolle in *Fliche et Martin*, pp. 321 sqq. De Labriolle accepts Paul's age of 113 years and does not give due importance to certain events mentioned in *Vita Hilarionis*.

- 363 News of the death of Julian when Hilarion is at Bruchium (H. 34).
- 365 Hesychius finds Hilarion, about three years later—same year as the great earthquake of 365 (H. 38).
- 365 Hilarion goes to Cyprus (H. 43).
- 367 Hilarion departs from Cyprus (H. 43).
- 367 Hilarion goes to Egypt (H. 43).
- 372 Hilarion departs from Egypt after a stay of five years (H. 43).
- 372 Hilarion goes to Cyprus a second time where he dies some time after (H. 44).
- 373 Hilarion dies in Cyprus at 80 years of age (H. 44; 11).

PALESTINE AND SYRIA

At the end of the third century the monastic movement was still practically limited to the lower valley of the Nile, but in 309 approx. Hilarion, Antony's young disciple, settled in the Palestinian desert round Gaza when he was 16 years old (H. 9). About 22 years later (H. 13) his fame began to spread far and wide so that people began to join him in his hermit life (H. 14). We may therefore date the spreading of monasticism in Palestine and Syria as from 330-331.

Jerome asserts with emphasis that before Hilarion there had been no monks in Palestine and Syria (H. 14). Hence Theodoret's account that there were hermits in Northern Syria around Nisibis about 325 may have to be qualified. We can hardly doubt Jerome's statement as he must have had a thorough knowledge of monasticism in Syria from his own association with it barely forty years later. Shortly after its introduction in Palestine by Hilarion monasticism must have spread north to Syria, as between 340-350 it was already well established around the desert of Chalcis (M. 3). The mention of Sabinianus, the Governor of Roman Mesopotamia (2), in Vita Malchi, 10, fixes the date of the events related in that Life as 359-360. As Malchus had been a monk in Syria many years before, coenobitic monasticism must have been already established there before 350. In 374, when Jerome settled as a monk in Syria monasticism was well organised all over the country.

In Palestine coenobitic monasticism was more widely spread. Hilarion himself founded many monasteries (H. 24) which he visited yearly; and although in the pagan revival under Julian some of them, if not all were destroyed (H. 33), it is inconceivable that his monks would not rebuild them, or at any rate

(2) Cf. AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 18.4.

replace them by new ones after Julian's death: of two monasteries, at least, we are certain. Hilarion's own monastery at Maiuma had already been rebuilt when Hilarion died, as in H. 46 we are told that Hilarion's corpse was eventually buried there, and the monastery built by Epiphanius at Eleutheropolis (Epp. 51; 82) (3), was still standing when Jerome was in Bethlehem. About 374, Rufinus, Jerome's former school-friend and later his bitter enemy, and Melania, a Roman lady founded monasteries on the mount of Olives in Jerusalem. Later Jerome himself and Paula founded in 386 their monasteries at Bethlehem. From Ep. 46 we can gather that there were several monasteries in Jerusalem at the close of the fourth century.

Although Hilarion took his inspiration from Antony (H. 3), and for some time lived a strictly heremitical life, the monasticism which he later developed in Palestine was modelled on the Pachomian type, as is clear from the extensive agricultural pursuits that his monks devoted themselves to (H. 26-28). Hilarion himself, from his 38th year onwards lived mostly in the company of his monks (H. 13; 15; 17; 18; 29; et passim). These facts make us reject Butler's opinion that monasticism in Palestine had always been in large measure heremitical.

IN ROME AND IN THE WEST

In Rome monasticism dates from 341. In that year Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria came to Rome at the request of the Pope and remained until 344 as he could not return to his See where the Arian party had the upper hand. In Rome he met Marcella who heard with enthusiasm of Antony and Pachomius. The result was far-reaching but not immediate. She embraced the monastic vocation (127.5), but it was many years later that she set up the first monastic association in Rome (127.5). As Marcella died in 410 (127.14), and as in 341 she was already a widow after a six months married life, we may put her birth about 323.

In discussing the beginning of monasticism in Rome and indeed in the West one should distinguish between community monasticism and the monastic vocation practised privately. In 341 community monasticism was in its infancy even in the East: hence one can hardly expect to find monasteries in the West for some time after 341. Indeed, although Marcella may be considered as the pioneer of both in Rome, the private pur-

suit of the monastic vocation was the first to take definite shape. When in 382 Jerome came to Rome there were many in the Capital who were professed monastics as can be gathered from Ep. 22, but as regards monasteries it does not seem that there were any apart from Marcella's ascetic group, and, perhaps, that of Asella.

The monastic ideal, in its purely ascetic form, may have begun to spread little by little around Marcella's circle of friends between 345-350. By 352 it had already received some official recognition in Rome, since in that year Ambrose's sister Marcellina received the veil at the hands of Pope Libertius (4). As Jerome tells us that Sophronia was the second after Marcella to embrace the monastic vocation, and that after several years (127.5), that must have happened about 250, or, perhaps, a little before. But Marcella's association of ascetic ladies could have hardly taken such a definite shape as to attract public attention before 363. In 363-366 when Jerome was a student in Rome the movement was hardly noticeable at all. Jerome does not seem to have noticed it in any way, although in his circle of friends he mixed with Pammachius who was Marcella's cousin (48.4). Jerome never makes any reference to it in his letters written before he came to Rome in 382; and when he went to Rome after finishing his rhetorical studies he goes to Trier to study theology, presumably with the idea of becoming a priest, not a monk. We think that the first idea of a monastic life may have dawned upon Jerome when he was at Trier (3.5) where it is conceivable that Athanasius might have made known the monastic idea during his stay in that city as an exile in 335-338. Indeed, it is not too much to imagine the enthusiastic biographer of Antony himself living a quasi-monastic life at Trier (5). The fact that Jerome did not seek ordination when he finished his theological studies at Trier may be a clue that at that time he was already seriously entertaining the idea of embracing monasticism. When he returned to his native land in 369 he found monasticism already established in North Italy and he joined the movement in Aquileia.

In time, a small circle of aristocratic ladies in Rome gath-

(3) According to St. Epiphanius it was built in 335. P.G. 43.12.

(4) AMBROSIIUS, *De Virginitibus*, 3.1.

(5) Cf. AUGUST. *Conf.* 8.6.

ered round Marcella, and, gradually, their ascetic practices took a regular and ordered shape. One of the first to be won over to the movement must have been Albina, Marcella's widowed mother, although at first she might not have been very sympathetic and had importuned Marcella to marry again after the death of her husband. By 383 the number of ladies who had attached themselves to the movement was considerable. They mostly came from a group of families connected together by inter-marriage or close ties of friendship, and about some of them Jerome gives a few details. The rich aristocratic Paula had been happily married to the pagan Toxotius and had led the usual life of a highly born lady in Roman society, but after the death of her husband she embraced the monastic vocation and devoted her ample resources to charity. Blesilla and Julia Eustochium were two of Paula's children. Blesilla had been widowed when still very young and for a while had freely mixed with the brilliant society of the Capital, but after a severe illness she changed her way of life and embraced the monastic vocation. Eustochium had shown an inclination for asceticism since her childhood and joined Marcella's circle when hardly more than a child of fourteen: in spite of the objections of some members of her family, notably her pagan uncle Hymettus and aunt Prætextata (107.5). Titiana and her widowed daughter Furia were closely connected with Paula since Furius, Titiana's son, had been the husband of Blesilla. Paulina, Paula's grand daughter, born in 397, was later herself to become a nun in her grandmother's convent in Bethlehem.

Close friends of Marcella were Fabiola who after divorcing her husband and marrying again had made penance, embraced the monastic vocation and devoted her riches to charitable purposes. Marcellina, the sister of Ambrose of Milan, Felicitas, Principia, and perhaps, Lea, who later founded a monastic community of her own (En. 23). Asella and another Marcella may have been close relatives of Marcella.

Perhaps associated with Marcella's circle after Jerome's departure to Bethlehem (possibly about 400) was Proba, the grandmother of Demetrias (130.5; *ib.* 7). Being one of the highest aristocrats in Rome she must have known well the families of Marcella and Paula, and at the capture of Rome, was at the head of a community of nuns (130.7), among whom was,

perhaps, Juliana, the widow of her son Olybrius, and later, certainly, Demetrias, Juliana's daughter (130.6).

Of the few Roman monks mentioned by Jerome Pammachius was the cousin of Marcella (48.4) and had earlier been the husband of Paula's daughter Paulina.

Jerome mostly enlarges on this group and has only passing references to other ascetics like Melania (39.5; 45.4) who must have been in close touch with Rufinus.

For a considerable time, possibly until 385, Marcella's circle was little more than an association of ascetically-minded ladies who while continuing to live in their own homes met at Marcella's palace on the Aventine (47.3) to pray in common, read the Scripture, sing psalms, and listen to ascetic lectures. But it could hardly be called a community since those who attended did not live together under any rule. Paula and Eustochium (46.1) as well as Blesilla (Ep. 39) while taking part in Marcella's gatherings (127.5) certainly lived in their own home. The first proper monastery seems to have been founded by Lea in a house outside Rome, in the neighbourhood of Ostia (23.1). After Jerome's departure from Rome in 385 Marcella set up a proper monastery in a house in one of the suburbs which were comparatively free from the bustle of the Capital (127.8) (6). Her example was followed by several other ladies and soon many monastic establishments were set up (127.8).

In its initial stages monasticism in Rome spread mainly in its feminine form: Jerome who was in close touch with it in 282-285 has few references to monks. In 282 or thereabout two monks, Sophronius and Antimius — perhaps of Eastern origin — tried to introduce the artificial austerities not uncommon in the East such as the carrying of chains, going barefooted, keeping their hair long and the like. But such practices were so strange to Rome that they found no favour (22.28).

Although by 383 the monastic movement had already taken definite shape in Rome, Jerome was no doubt greatly instrumental for its consolidation, and from 383 onwards it was mainly under his direction or through his advice that some of the noblest aristocrats in Rome joined the movement. Immensely

(6) At the capture of Rome in 410 Marcella and her community were at the Aventine residence. When the Goths invested the Capital Marcella presumably retired within the safety of the walls.

enhanced by their personal prestige and unbounded financial resources monasticism in Rome was sure of success.

The extent to which monasticism had already spread in 363-370 in the North of Italy can easily be surmised from the correspondence which Jerome kept up from Syria whither he went after leaving the hermits with whom he had settled at Aquileia. From Syria he corresponds during 374-379 with Paul of Concordia (Ep. 10), Niceas of Aquileia (Ep. 8), Chrysogonus of Aquileia (Ep. 9), Heliodorus of Altinum (Ep. 14), Antony of Aemona (Ep. 12), all of whom are monks, and the nuns of Aemona (Ep. 11). In 1.14, written in 374 and describing events which were supposed to have happened some time before, he hints that there was a nunnery in the neighbourhood of Vercellae which is confirmed by what we know of Eusebius, Bishop of Vercellae founding monasteries at that place about the same time (Butl. p. 371). Augustine in Confes. 8.6 and in De morib. Eccl. Cath., 33 speaks of a monastery of monks founded by Ambrose in Milan. Such facts suggest to us that monasticism in the North of Italy was, at least in its consolidation, independent of and prior to that of Rome.

It is not known whether it was from Rome and in particular from Jerome's monastic circle that the monastic idea spread in the West. In 127.5 Jerome seems to suggest that before the coming of Athanasius the monastic idea was unknown to the West. At any rate, Athanasius himself, as we have seen, may have cast the seed in Gaul, at Trier, and about 360 St. Martin of Tours was greatly responsible for giving definite shape to monasticism in the North of Gaul. But from 385 onwards it is certainly from Jerome that some of the most conspicuous exponents of monasticism in the West, in Spain, Gaul, Italy, continually seek inspiration and advice, and this in spite of the fact that Jerome is all the time far away in Palestine. Such are Lucinius and his wife Theodora in Spain (Ep. 71); Geruchia (Ep. 123); Rusticus (Ep. 125), and the one who in Ep. 117 asks for a letter for his mother and sister, all four from Gaul; Paulinus from Nola (Ep. 58); Julian from Dalmatia (Ep. 118); another Rusticus and his wife Artemia (Ep. 122) and Apronius, all three probably from the West. Salvina, daughter of Gildo, king of Mauretania, and wife of Nebridius, nephew of the Empress Aelia Flaccidia, wife of Theodosius, was probably living at Constantinople when Jerome

wrote Ep. 79 to her since soon after she became one of Chrysostom's deaconesses (7).

INITIAL UNPOPULARITY OF MONASTICISM

The pursuit of a life of self-imposed sacrifice and self-denial of even the most elementary comforts of life could only appeal to a few, and indeed where there was no appeal there was either contempt or positive opposition. Not that the cult of virginity as an element of religion was new to Roman minds. Nor, for that matter, was it to the peoples of the East. The institution of the Vestal virgins was almost as old as Rome itself and the terrible punishment meted out to them if they broke their vow is a clear indication of the atmosphere of awe which surrounded the idea of religious virginity in the public mind. The priestesses of Apollo, of the Achean Juno, Diana and Minerva were virgins (123.7). But the consideration of marriage as inferior to celibacy seemed superstitious enough to a world which was still half pagan and largely materialistic. To wage war, then, on the innocent joys of a pleasant company, of a delicate table, of a fine dress and an attractive make up was, at least, positively absurd, and many saw in it a direct challenge to Roman civilisation (38.5). Add to that the worldliness of some monastics and the conspicuous affectation, indeed, even aberrations of others, and the whole movement could easily appear to an unsympathetic crowd as mere sham and hypocrisy.

Hence the attitude of reproach (127.5; *ib.* 8) and criticism (Ep. 38) which ranged from such sarcastic humour as that which greeted the noble Pammachius when he went to the Senate dressed like a monk (66.6), to such open violence as that which ensued at the funeral of Blesilla when the infuriated mob broke out in cries of 'the monks to the Tiber' (39.6). Monks and nuns frequently became the subject of public gossip (108.20); they were looked upon with suspicion (38.2); wild stories went about them of their working their own destruction by immoderate fasting and self-imposed austerities (39.6). The mob pointed at them and singled them out as 'Greeks and impostors' (38.5; 54.5); pagans and Jews fanned the spirit of unpopularity (45.4; 130.19). Hence often those who chose the monastic vocation had to battle against the opposition of their

(7) Cf. Freemantle, p. 162.

own relatives who made use even of their maids at home to overcome the devotee's resolve. So Jerome warns Furia against her servants who merely wish to sell her to their own advantage, against the snares that relatives may set for her, and against the well-meant but mistaken suggestions of her father (54.6). So Blesilla's relations spare nothing to make her abandon her purpose (38.2); Praetextata and Hymettus try hard to dissuade Eustochium from her resolve to be a nun (107.5). Indeed, down to 390 Jerome often refers to such family opposition. Even the fashionable clergy occasionally joined the common cry. The book of Helvidius against which Jerome in 383 wrote the treatise "De perpetua virginitate B. Mariae" was inspired by the campaign against celibacy; and although after 290 the storm gradually abated Jerome's books against Jovinian (written in 392) and against Vigilantius (406) show clearly that there were still after that date irreconcilable elements who felt strong enough to organise the opposition to monastic asceticism on a scientific basis.

Nor was this hostile attitude limited to Rome. The Lives of Hilarion and Malchus suggest that at least down to the principate of Julian (363) opposition was still strong in the East. Malchus in Syria had to overcome the threatening of his father and the coaxing of his mother before he could follow his vocation (M. 3). During the brief reign of Julian the enemies of monasticism in Palestine not only attacked and destroyed Hilarion's monasteries but even procured a decree of banishment against him and against his principal monk Hesy-chius (II. 33).

(To be continued)

E. COLEIRO.

Early Thomistic Controversies^{*}

v. The *Correctorium Sciendum* has been attributed to John of Parma, to Hugh of Billom, to Durandus of Aurillac, called Durandellus (1), and to Robert of Orford.

To begin with we may exclude John of Parma and Hugh of Billom. Indeed this *Correctorium* has been attributed to them on very slight evidence. Dr. Pelster, relying on the ascription of MS. Bologna, Bibl. Comm. A. 913, and on the supposition that this *Correctorium* is of a late date, ascribed it to John of Parma (2). But as we shall see later, it is not as late as Pelster believes. As Glorieux has suggested, it is quite possible that the ascription to "Johannes Parmensis" is due to a confusion with "Johannes Parisiensis", who is the author of the *Correctorium "Circa"* (3). But, even granted the correctness of this ascription, the evidence of one single manuscript, when it is contradicted by stronger evidence (as the following pages will show) is of little value.

From the fact, on the one hand, that Hugh of Billom is credited in the Stams Catalogue with the authorship of a *Correctorium*, and, on the other hand, that in 1913 only five manuscripts and all of French origin were known, Mandonnet concluded that (a) the *Correctorium "Sciendum"* belongs to a Paris Master, and (b) this Master was Hugh of Billom (4).

(*) The first part of this article appeared in Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 57-74.

- (1) He is called Durandellus, as we have seen above, to distinguish him from the other Dominican Master, Durandus de saint Polcaine, who is called by a Bologna manuscript, the "quidam latrunculus Petri de Alvernia", for having attacked some thomist tenets. (Cf. M.DE WULF, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, p. 270).
- (2) F. PELSTER, S.J., *Scholastik*, i, (1926), p. 458; *ibid.*, iii, (1928), p. 450. Dr Pelster later abandoned this position. (Cf. *Thomistische Streitschriften gegen Aegidius Romanus: Thomas von Sutton und Robert von Orford*, O.P., *Gregorianum*, xxiv, (1943), p. 157.
- (3) P. GLORIEUX, "La littérature des Correctoires", *Revue Thomiste*, ix, (1938) pp. 69-96.
- (4) P. MANDONNET, "Premieres travaux de polemique thomiste", *Revue de sciences philosophique et theologique*, viii (1913), p. 56.

Echard (5) and Card. Ehrle (6) suggested as author of this *Correctorium*, Durandellus. A note to article 8 of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", preserved in Bibliothèque Nat. lat., Paris, MS. 14550 (formerly Saint-Victor), which runs:

"Ad declarationem illius articuli, an scilicet in rebus incorruptibilibus sit nisi unum individuum in una specie, illud ad praesens ostendatur in corporalibus, quia in spiritualibus iam ostensum est....."

induced Père Echard to believe that the words "quia in spiritualibus iam ostensum est", refer to article 6 of the *II Sententiarum* of Durandellus. He also claimed that in the same article of the *II Book of the Sentences*, there is a cross reference to the *Correctorium*: "quantum ad corporalia de hoc in *Corruptorio*" (7). But according to Ehrle and Dr. Koch, the remark, "de hoc in corruptorio", is not to be found in the manuscript mentioned by Echard, nor was it met with in four other manuscripts, containing the same work of Durandellus, by Koch (8).

Card. Ehrle, basing himself on the ascription of MS. Troyes. 986. and on the evidence of Peter de Luna's Catalogue (9), attributed this *Correctorium* to Durandellus. M. Grabmann is of the same opinion (10). Yet this view cannot be accepted. We may note at the outset, that MS. Troyes is rather late, in fact it was written in 1478 (11). Further, Durandellus wrote his *Evidentiae contra Durandum*, or his work on the *Sentences*, mentioned by Echard, in 1332-34, whereas we know for certain that the *Cor-*

-
- (5) Cf. QUETIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I, 588b, II, p. 819.
 - (6) Cf. F. EHRLE, "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten funfzig Jahren nach seinem Tode", *Zeischrift fur Katolische Theologie*, Innsbruck, xxxvii (1913), pp. 289-293.
 - (7) ECHARD, *op. cit.*, I, p. 588.
 - (8) Cf. J. KOCH, *Durandus de S. Porciano*, Forschungen z. Streit um Thomas v. Aquin zu Begium des 14 Jahrh. *Beiträge*, xxvi (1927), p. 153.
 - (9) *Vaticanisches Archiv*, *Collectoriae* 469a. f. 18v: "Item Correptorium corruptorii Durandi, incipit in secundo folio: quod est *causa*, et finis in eodem: non; in penultimo folio incipit: quantum ad ambo, et finit in eodem: *materialiter*". Cited after Ehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 290.
 - (10) Cf. M. GRABMANN, "Die werke des hl. Thomas v. Aquin", *Beiträge*, xxii. (1931) p. 133.
 - (11) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature des correctoires*, p. 82.

rectorium "*Sciendum*" was written before 1309, as it is attested to by two early MSS., Avignon 260, and particularly Bruges 491 (12), which were not written later than this date. Moreover, Dr. Koch has shown that the style of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" differs considerably from that of Durandellus. The author of the *Correctorium* begins each article with: "propter... articulum sciendum", "propter hoc quod tangitur... articulo", "ad declarationem illius articuli", or other similar phrases. This is followed by an exposition of St Thomas, after which comes that of William de la Mare, beginning with: "Contra hoc dicunt illi de corruptorio". Moreover, the number of each article is given at the end of each question. On the other hand, Durandellus uses rather a different method of procedure: he invariably begins: "Supra... distinctione est... articulus contra illud quod dicit S. Thomas", which is followed by the exposition of Aquinas's doctrine, after which he writes: "Contra istam conclusionem arguit Durandus". He ends the question by: "hoc enim ostendi potest ostensive etc.", without giving the number of the question. Finally Durandellus is very brief, concise and almost pedantic, while the author of the *Correctorium* is lengthy but very clear, as may be easily seen, concludes Koch, in their different exposition of Aquinas.

Glorieux, who has in preparation a critical edition of this work, concluded from internal and external evidence that the author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" was an English Dominican (13). If this is so, John of Parma, Hugh of Billom, and Durandellus have no claim to the authorship of this *Correctorium*. There remain therefore William of Macclesfield and Robert de Torto-Collo of Orford, both English Dominicans. But so far no evidence has been brought forward in support of William of Macclesfield, except the entry in the Stams Catalogue, crediting him, rather vaguely, with the authorship of one of the *Correctoria*.

The only solid evidence at our disposal is that in favour of Robert of Orford, known also as Torto-Collo. There was already in the beginning of the fifteenth century a tradition ascribing to John of Torto-Collo a *Correctorium* in defence of St Thomas: "Aliud autem opus quod vocatur correctorium corruptorii, et in-

(12) A. DE POORTER, *Catalogue de manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Publique de la ville de Bruges*, Belgium 1934, p. 561.

(13) GLORIEUX, *La littérature*, p. 82.

cipit 'Quare detraxisti sermonibus veritatis,'" wrote Louis de Valladolid (c. 1414) "fecit Hervaeus secundum aliquos, secundum alios Joannes de Torto-Collo, in quo respondetur cuidam impugnanti aliqua dicta B. Thomae" (14). In support of Hervé's authorship there is no evidence forthcoming. As Valladolid inserted the entry just quoted under that of Durandellus, and Hervé was wrongly identified with the latter (15), it is possible that the tradition in the time of Valladolid referred to Durandellus (Durandus of Aurillac) and not to Hervé of Nedellec. Moreover, the conclusion reached by Glorieux about the nationality of the author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", also militates against Hervé, who was a Frenchman. On the other hand, we possess many proofs to corroborate the fifteenth century tradition in favour of Torto-Collo (Orford). John Bale (1552), who is independent of Valladolid, and seems to be himself the basis of Pits. Tanner, Bulaeus, and others, ascribes to Robert of Orford, a "*Protectorium Thomae Aquinatis*" (16). We may assume that he meant by *Protectorium* the *Correctorium*. It is well known that Bale on many occasions gives to a work a name other than its proper title. Stronger evidence than the external criteria is the witness of Robert of Orford himself, who in his works against Giles of Rome and Henry of Ghent declares himself to be the author of a *Responsorium ad Corruntorium*.

i. In MS. Merton College, Oxford, 276, discussing the question: "Utrum frui sit actus intellectus", where the controverted problem of the relationship between intellect and the will comes in, Robert of Orford concludes in favour of the primacy of the former, and after giving three arguments in support of Aquinas' view, he refers his reader to further arguments in the *Correctorium*, saying:

(14) H.C. SCHÆEBEN, "Die Tabulae Ludvigs von Valladolid"... *Archivum PP.* Pr. i (1931), p. 257, n. 56a.

(15) BUNDERIUS, *Index*, f. 311: "Herveus Natalis Brito, magister, qui et Duradellus, ordinis Praedicatorum": f. 122: "Durandellus, alias Herveus, ordinis Praedicatorum" Cited by ECHARD, *Script. O.P.* i, p. 336a; and Alva, *Pleytos de los libros*, p. 102, claimed Hervé was the cousin of Durandus de s. Porçaine, and for this reason he was called Durandellus to be distinguished from him. But as Echard (*id. ibid.*) has rightly remarked, Alva's claim is "merum eius mentis somnium, nullo teste, nulla veri specie adinventum".

(16) J. BALAEUS, *Scriptores illustrium maioris Britanniae*, p. 323.

f. 2: "Quia ad hoc idem ostendende sunt alie rationes in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 34."

ii. In MS. Vat. lat., 987, discussing the same question, he says:

f. 7vb: "Qualiter intellectus sit altior potentia quam voluntas, satis declaratum est *Responsorio contra Corruptorium*."

In the same manuscript he mentioned several times the same *Responsorium* (17), and in Quodlibet 12, quest. 28, expressly declares to have written it:

f. 122ra: "Sed quia non opponit se (Henricus de Gandavo) contra ea que ego scripsi circa materiam istam in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium* ideo non curavi tractare que sic recitat" (18).

It remains therefore certain that Robert of Orford wrote one of the five replies to the Franciscan Master, William de la Mare; and there are solid reasons to believe that the *Responsorium ad Corruptorium* is the *Correctorium* "Sciendum", and not the "Quare", as claimed by Ehrle and Pelster.

We have first the evidence of MS. Madrid, Bibl. Nat., VII-H. 5, the colophon of which reads:

f. 46r: (Correctorium) corruptorii fratris Guillermi de Torto Collo, anglici magistri in theologia, ordinis fratrum predicatorum" (19).

This manuscript was known to Card. Ehrle (20) through the catalogue of Marques de Alventos, who thus listed this work:

"Correctorium corporum sancti Thomae per Fr. de Tortocollo, Vol. I, Vitela" (21).

(17) ff. 17b, 18ra, 56ra, 65ra, 72vb. Quoted after Bayerschmidt, "Robert von Colletorto, Verfasser des Correctoriums 'Sciendum'?", *Divus Thomas* (Fr.), xvii (1939), pp. 311-26.

(18) Cited by PELSTER, *Thomistische Streitschriften*, p. 165.

(19) V.B. DE HEREDIA, "El correctorium corruptorii", *La Ciencia Tomista*, xviii (1926), p. 110.

(20) F. EHRLE, *Der Kampf*, p. 316.

(21) M. DE ALVENTOS, *Historia del Colegio viejo de San Bartolomé, mayor de la célebre Universidad de Salamanca*, Madrid 1770, i, p. 316.

and through the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Biblioteca Nacional, in which the title runs :

"Correctorium correctorii Thomae Aquinatis per fratrem Guillelmum de Torto-Collo, anglicum. magistrum in theologia ordinis praedicatorum. Codex pervetustus, 4o. Videtur auctor fuisse coevus Angelico Doctore" (22).

But Card. Ehrle, believing that this text was lost, and that it contained the *Correctorium* "Quare", wrongly ascribed this work to Robert of Torto-Collo. It was found and identified as the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" by Beltran de Heredia, O.P., in 1926 (23). He dated it as late thirteenth century or perhaps beginning of the fourteenth, and decided that the colophon was written by the same scribe who wrote the whole work.

The right way to clarify the issue in this complicated question, is that suggested by Dr. Pelster (24), namely a comparison of the *Correctorium* and a work certainly pertaining to Robert of Orford. This has been undertaken by P. Bayerschmidt, who through a careful examination of Robert's *Contra dicta Henrici de Gandavo* (MS. Vat. lat. 987) and the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" (MS. Staatsbibliothek, Berlin [theol. fol. 224], 468), came to the conclusion that the *Sciendum* belongs to Robert of Orford (25). He has found substantial identity between the two works in style, terminology and doctrinal content. We shall reproduce here some of the proofs brought forward by Bayerschmidt, adding some others from MS. Merton as regards the style, not however as regards the content, as none of the questions of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" partially transcribed, corresponds to the Merton manuscript.

(a) The peculiarities of style are mentioned first, because they have less weight. Even a cursory examination makes it clear that in both works, we meet with typical similarity of style and terminology.

(22) Quoted after V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

(23) Cf. V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

(24) Cf. F. PELSTER, *Scholastik*, i (1926), p. 458.

(25) Cf. PAUL VON BAYERSCHMIDT, "Robert von Colletorto, Verfasser des *Correctoriums Sciendum*?", *Divus Thomas*, (Fr.), xvii, (1939), pp. 311-326.

i. One of the peculiarities is the word *Sciendum*, which on account of its frequency Card. Ehrle has used to distinguish this *Correctorium* from the others, and which occurs constantly in MSS. Merton and Vatican. Compare :

Contra dicta Aegidii, (MS. Merton, 276), ff. 27ra, 30ra, 31rb, 38rb, 41va, 50ra, 50vb.

Contra dicta Henrici, (MS. Vat. lat. 987), ff. 1va, 1vb, 3rb, 22rb, 23ra, 33vb.

ii. Another peculiarity is the frequent use of the word *adducere*. Compare :

Correctorium "Sciendum", MS. Berlin, 468 : "alia argumenta oportuit adduxisse" (f. 183ra); "et ideo oportet alias rationes adduxisse ad eius improbationem" (f. 183vb); "unde alia argumenta oportet hic adduxisse" (f. 186ra).

Contra dicta Aegidii, MS. Merton, 276 : "Non sic est de exemplo quod frater Egidius adducit" (f. 44ra); "Sed Magister potest adduci ad oppositum" (f. 45rb); "Exemplum quod adducit de luce et colore in dyafano" (f. 45rb); "aliqua adducit ad eam probandam que videntur habere calumpniam" (f. 47rb).

Contra dicta Henrici, MS. Vat. lat. 987 : "quam adducit Magister Henricus" (f. 22 va); "nec rationem aliquam pro se adduxerit" (f. 25 vb).

iii. The *Correctorium "Sciendum"* is similar to the other works of Robert in that it is written in a very objective style and the main intention of the author is the defence of St Thomas. Compare :

Correctorium "Sciendum", MS. Madrid, VII-H. 5, art. 89 :

"Opponere contra rationes quas dant ad rationes fratris Thomae non oporteret, quia principale intentum in hoc opusculo est magis solvere quam opponere";

and again art. 109, he says :

"Non possunt negare quia quamquam sit aliquid sane dictum potest bene et male intelligi ab alio intelligente. Et quod concedunt hoc esse verum in alio modo intelligendi sufficit michi" (26).

In his *Contra dicta Aegidii*, MS. Merton, 276, Robert sometimes does not give the opinion of the Austin Bachelor, and when it is given it is sometimes left unrefuted. Thus he says :

(26) Quoted after V.B. DE HEREDIA, *op. cit.*, pp. 106, 110.

"Quod postea arguit (Aegidius) contra semetipsum est et argumento suo correspondet. De hoc non est michi curandum nisi quod errorem dicit" (f. 50 vb).

Much more important is the agreement in content between Robert's *Contra dicta Henrici* and the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*". Bayerschmidt (27) has given eight passages to show that in his work against Henry of Ghent Robert refers to the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", and not to the "*Quare*".

Comparison of direct references :

(a) *Contra dicta Henrici* (MS. Vat. lat. 987),

fol. 17vb: "Angelis datum est gratia et gloria secundum capacitatem naturalem. Rationes de hoc invenies Prima Parte, questione 316, *Responsorii ad Correctorium*, questione 21".

Now William de la Mare (article xxi) argues that Aquinas's teaching that grace and glory are given to angels according to their natural capacity is slightly or not at all different (*parum vel nihil differt*) from the proposition condemned by William of Auvergne in 1241: "quod angeli qui habuerunt meliora naturalia de necessitate habuerunt maiorem gratiam et gloriam" (28). The author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*" does not expound St Thomas's teaching on this particular point, whereas the author of "*Sciendum*", in a very clear and precise way proposes many arguments. We adduce here one or two of them.

Correctorium "*Sciendum*" (MS. Berlin, 468).

fol. 140ra: "...gratia datur angelis secundum capacitatem naturalem. Motus enim forma est. Forma autem non recipitur nisi in materia disposita. Secundum ergo quod materia est melius disposita, perfectius recipetur in ea ipsa forma. Similiter motio motoris est motus ipsius mobilis. Motus autem recipit motum secundum motum ipsius mobilis. Unde facilius movetur corpus circulariter quam angulariter. Secundum ergo maiorem dispositionem vel minorem, hoc est secundum connatum maiorem et minorem plus vel minus recipit et gratia. Cum autem angeli superiores, qui steterunt, secundum maiorem connatum conversi sunt in Deum... sequitur, quod angeli superiores in natura plus data est gratia et gloria".

(27) Cf. P. BAYERSCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-20.

(28) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *Le Correctorium* "*Quare*" pp. 93-95.

(b) *Contra dicta Henrici* (MS. vat. lat. 987),

fol. 17vb: "Item Gregorius dicit, quod in illa celesti patria licet quedam data sunt excellentius, nihil tamen possidetur singulariter. De hoc vide in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 11".

Here again the corresponding passage of St Gregory the Great is found, not in the *Correctorium* "Quare", but in "Sciendum".

Correctorium "Sciendum" (MS. Berlin, 468) "Item quod angeli sint diversarum specierum patet per Gregorium, 33 Moralium in fine, qui dicit quod lucifer fuit supremus et hic loquendo de puris naturalibus, quia non solum est ordo in angelis accidentalibus, sed etiam secundum gradus substantiales nec talis forma substantialis suscipit magis et minus".

(c) *Contra Henricum*, f. 17vb :

"Sed tunc non est anima pars speciei nec omnes anime essent unius speciei, sed essent tot species quot anime, sicut in angelis: de hoc quere in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, quaestione 12".

Here Robert refers to article 12 of the *Corruptorium*, which gives St Thomas's teaching that in immaterial things genus and difference are formed according as these things can be considered as to be determined or as already determined (29). In *Contra dicta Henrici*, says Bayerschmidt, Robert maintains that the *genus* is derived from form, and mentions for the sake of comparison, the soul as the essential form of man. In the *Correctorium* "Sciendum" the same teaching is contained :

"Quod autem in compositis ex materia et forma genus sumatur ab uno et differentia ab alio et tamen sunt una natura, patet sic: genus sumitur a materia, sed non a materia partis... et sic in diffinitione sit partis, quia ibi exprimitur altera pars".

(d) *Contra Henricum*, f. 18ra :

"Constat quod habitus virtuosi recipiunt magis et minus secundum quod recipiuntur in subiecto. Tamen per

(29) ST THOMAS, *Summa*, I, q. lxxv, a 7.

comparationem ad obiectum et secundum speciem nequaquam, quod diffuse patet in *Responsorio ad Corruptorium*, questione 61".

The teaching of habits and their increase is dealt with at length only in the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" :

f. 165vb: "Ideo dupciter potest intelligi perfectio in habitibus sive in formis et per consequens duplex augmentatio. Si consideretur secundum quod participatur a subiecto, vel igitur dat speciem subiecto sicut forma substantialis, non autem accidentalis. Tamen esse speciei in quodam consistit indivisibili, quia unica differentia adveniens generi, constituit speciem et unica remota tollitur species. Et ideo nulla forma secundum quod habitus suscipit magis et minus... et ideo secundum formam substantialem, que dat speciem materie, non dicitur aliquid magis et minus... Subiectum ergo magis participare forme est magis reduci in actum illius forme, quia forma et actus sunt idem. Subiectum autem magis reduci in actum forme illius, hoc est ipsum magis subici illi forme. Et quia forme debetur agere et forme magis vincenti superat suum susceptibile, magis debetur agere. Et ita sequitur intentionem actus forme, secundum quod subiectum magis in actum illius reducitur. Ista autem intentio forme est ab agente. Quia sicut ex actione agentis est, ut habeat formam et eam participat, quod perfectius eum participet, dummodo ratio illius forme non consistit in indivisibili. Huius autem forma est caritas et anime virtutes, et ideo dicto modo augentur. Hoc est conveniens ratio augmenti in omni forma, quae augetur secundum quod habitus eius perfectio consideratur ex esse in subiecto".

Here again, therefore, Robert is referring to article 61 of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", since the author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*" treats the question in a less speculative manner; he has only this short passage on the whole problem :

"Agens enim in naturalibus intendit reducere patiens quod est in potentia suae similitudinis, quantum potest... et hoc secundum quod potentia subiecta actui quae quidem quantum de se est, ad multa se habens magis ac minus terminatur ab actu illo" (30).

Bayerschmidt gives the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*" three other passages to whose doctrine Robert of Orford refers in the "Vatican Manuscript" (31).

The following parallel passages on the theory of the Unity of Form from MS. Vat. lat. 987 and MS. Berlin, 468, show also an agreement in doctrine so close as to justify the conclusion that they are the work of one author.

MS. Vat. lat. 987

f. 19ra: "In separatione anime est generatio nove forme, non de novo inducte, sed forme partis, que vadit ad actum separata forma totius et est corruptio, quia forma partis amittit esse actu, quod habebat a forma totius, scilicet ab anima".

f. 32rb: "Nec pono aliam formam fuisse introductam in morte Christi. Absit enim, ut hoc ponere, sed eandem formam partis numero remanere, sed sub alio esse in Christo vivo et mortuo".

f. 92: "forma corporalis fuit forma partis".

MS. Berlin, 468

f. 149rb: "Non introducitur nova forma totius, sed remoto esse totius forma partis... fit forma totius, quia corpus quod fuit pars animalis, separata anima, quoddam totum in se est ab alia forma quam ab anima".

f. 161rb-va: "Cum vero obiciunt contra responsiones, quas arguunt non oportet solve, non enim dico quod alia succedit, sed quod eadem forma partis, que prius erat in habitu, iam est actu, remota forma totius. Et sic debet intelligi quod corruptio illius est generatio alterius. Corruptio enim forme totius est generatio forme partis... non enim pono aliam formam induci ut dictum est, sed formam partis resultare sicut forte est in partibus annulosis".

To sum up: we have excluded as author of the *Correctorium* "*Sciendum*", John of Parma, suggested by Dr. Pelster; Hugh of Billom, suggested by Mandonnet; Durandellus, suggested by Echard, Card. Ehrle, and Grabmann; Macclesfield, accredited as author of a *Correctorium* only by the Stams Catalogue; and Hervé of Nedellec, mentioned by Valladolid, as probable author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*". On the other hand, in favour of Robert of Orford's authorship, besides the witness of Robert himself, and the evidence of MS. Madrid, we have established important unities of style and content between this treatise and the other writings of the Dominican Master, and we have excluded Ehrle's and Pelster's supposition, that Orford is the author of the *Correctorium* "*Quare*". It remains therefore reasonably cer-

(31) BAYERSCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 316-20.

tain that Robert of Orford is the author of the *Correctorium "Sciendum"*.

(b) Other Controversial Writings

Having considered the counter attacks of the Dominicans to defend St Thomas's teaching in what we have styled "the literature of the *Correctoria*", we pass now to examine some other controversial writings written by the early followers of thomism.

In the Dominican General Chapter held in Paris in 1286, the friars were strongly recommended to give effective support to the teaching of the venerable master, friar Thomas Aquinas :

"Districtius iniungimus et mandamus, ut fratres omnes et singuli prout sciunt et possunt, efficacem dent operam ac doctrinam venerabilis magistri Thomae de Aquino, recolendae memoriae, promovendam et saltem ut est opinio defendendam" (32).

As a result of this strong recommendation many treatises were written in defence of the Dominican Master.

In addition to the problem of the Unity of Form, several other thomist tenets, such as the possibility of an eternal creation, the immediate vision of God, the distinction between essence and existence, and the relation of the faculties in the essence of the soul, were attacked by different masters. Against those, says the author of *Brevissima Chronica* :

"Suscitavit Dominus spiritum gloriosorum doctorum Ordinis Praedicatorum, qui doctrinam impugnata[m] gloriosius defensarent, fundarent et declararent" (33).

Each Province produced prominent masters, who distin-

(32) Ed. B.M. REICHART, *Acta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, (Monumenta Ord. Praed. Historica, Romae, 1899), iii, p. 235.

(33) Ed. MARTENE-DURAND, O.S.B., *Veterum Scriptorum Amplissima Collectio*, Paris, 1729, Vol. VI, p. 370.

guished themselves in the cause of thomism (34). We shall limit ourselves here to naming a few Oxford Dominicans. The part taken by the Dominican Provincial, William of Hothum, and Richard Knapwell against the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, has already been dealt with in connection with the condemnation at Oxford (35).

Among the earliest English Thomists we find William of Macclesfield. He has been divided by Pits (36) into three different persons, namely Maclefeldus (1304), Messeleclus (1304), and Manusfeldus (1320). The identification of these names has been established by Echard (37). Macclesfield is said to have studied in Paris, and became bachelor there (38). But in support of the latter view there is no evidence forthcoming. Between 1284-86 he studied for the mastership in theology at Oxford, and according to Dr. Little he became Regent Master of the Dominican studies here in 1299-30 (39). He was created Cardinal bishop of Santa Sabina on December 1303 by Pope Benedict XI. But when the news of his elevation reached England, he was already dead (40). The early Dominican Catalogues ascribe to him three

(34) On the part taken by Italian Dominicans, see T. TAURISANO, O.P., *Discepoli e Biografi di S. Tommaso*, S. Tommaso d'Aquino, (Miscellanea Storico-Artistica, Roma, 1924), pp. 111-186; M. GRABMANN, "La scuola tomistica Italiana nel secolo XIII e principio del XIV secolo": *Rivista di Filosofia-Neoscholastica*, xv, (1923), p. 145sq.; 2nd edition *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, i, (1926), pp. 332-391.

On Spanish Dominicans, see Fr. EHRLE, S.J., "Arnaldo di Villanova ed i Thomatiste", *Gregorianum*, i, (1920), pp. 475-501.

On French Dominicans see GLORIEUX's Bibliographies in *Repertoire des Maitres en Theologie de Paris*, Paris 1933.

On German Dominicans, see M. GRABMANN, "Forschungen zur ältesten Deutschen Thomisenschule des Dominicaner ordens", *Mitt. Geist.*, i, (1926), p. 392-431.

(35) See A. VELLA, "The intellectual revolution of the thirteenth century", *The Classical Journal*, Malta, 1950, No. IV, pp. 62-65.

(36) J. PITS, *De rebus Anglicis*, pp. 388, 389, 408.

(37) QUETIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores O.P.*, i, p. 493.

(38) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, "Le manuscrit d'Assise, Bibl. Comm., Date et mode de composition", *Rech. T.A.M.*, viii (1936), p. 289.

(39) LITTLE-PELSTER, *Oxford Theology and Theologians*, Oxford (1934), p. 272.

(40) "Antequam rumor ad eum perveniret, infirmatus et ad extremam horam perductus, (Cantuariae) in Domino obdormivit" (TRIVET, *Annales*, p. 404).

works: "Contra Dicta Henrici de Gondavo quibus impugnatur Thomam; item contra corruptorem Thome; item questiones de angelis" (41). Philip Wolf in his *Bibliotheca Dominicana*, as quoted by J. Bale, adds: "Super Sententias; contra Godfridum Brabantinum; quodlibeta" (42). Possible references to his commentary on the *Sentences* appear in MS. Merton College, Oxford, 103, fol. 219; and Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Ms. 300, fol. 62 (43). By *Contra corruptorem Thome* is probably meant the second recension of the *Correctorium* "Quare". It is evident that *Contra Henricum* and *Contra Godfridum Brabantinum* (de Fontaines) were controversial writings in defence of Aquinas' teaching. These two works, as well as the *Quaestiones de angelis* and the *Quodlibeta*, had not so far been identified.

Undoubtedly one of the stoutest defenders of Thomism among the Oxford group was Thomas Sutton. Sutton was probably a fellow of Merton College, Oxford (44). He became Regent-Master of the Dominican School at Oxford not later than 1298-99. His works are mostly controversial, directed against the great masters of the period, namely Henry of Ghent and William de la Mare—representatives of the older tradition—as well as against the newly-founded Franciscan School led by John Duns Scotus. The ancient list of Dominican writers, the *Stams Catalogue* attributes to him:

"Super praedicamenta; super sex principia; item complevit scriptum Thomae super perihieremeneias (45); item super priora; item de unitate formarum; item de relatione; item summam theologiae; item super psalterium" (46).

(41) Ed. MEERSSEMANN, *Catalogus Pignon...*, n. 19, p. 25; n. 18, p. 60; n. 18, p. 72.

(42) J. BALE, *Index...*, p. 502.

(43) Cf. L. MEJER, "Wilhelm von Nottingham (+1336); ein Zeuge für die Entwicklung der distinctio formalis der Universität Oxford", *Philosophia Perennis* (Festgabe J. Geyer), i, p. 256.

(44) "Quodlibeta m. Thome Sutton, socii de Merton, postmodum ordinis predicatorum" (F. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College*, p. 166).

(45) The present supplement published in the *Opera Omnia* of St Thomas does not belong to Sutton, but to Card. Cajetan.

(46) MEERSSEMANN, *Catalogus Pignon...*, n. 16, p. 60.

Besides *De unitate formarum* mentioned by the Stams Catalogue (47), he compiled two other treatises on this question, namely *Contra pluralitatem formarum*, written about 1290 against Henry of Ghent (48), and *De productione formae substantialis*, written also about 1290: this has been edited but not yet published by Dr. Callus (49). The part played by Sutton at Oxford on this problem was of such importance that William of Ockham replies to him by a special treatise: "*De pluritate formarum contra Suttonum, librum unum*" (50).

Sutton also completed the Commentary of Aquinas on *De Generatione et Corruptione* of Aristotle, preserved at Merton College, Oxford, MS. 274, ff. 92-107, reading on folio, 107:

"Hic terminatur expositio fratris Thome et incipit expositio fratris Thome de Suttonia" (51).

Between 1284-87 Sutton composed four Quodlibets, directed mainly against Henry of Ghent, whose opinions he refers to as "*opinio cuiusdam relicta in scriptis*" (Quodl. I, 3), "*propter opinionem quamdam in scriptis relictam de novo*" (Quodl. I, 16) (52). Dr. Sharp, who has recently given a short survey of Sutton's thomistic psychology, metaphysics, angelology, and natural theology pointed out that he consistently refers to Henry of Ghent in his treatment of the principle of individuation the distinction between essence and existence, the function of the species in cognition, the presence of potentiality in God, the

(47) Preserved at Vienna, MS. State library, 1536, ff. 220-225; Prague MS. Univ. libr. III, E. 6. 122v-132v; Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibl. 322, f. 11-17.

(48) Cf. E. GILSON, *La Philosophie au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1945, p. 542.

(49) Cf. Unpublished Dissertation for D. Phil., Oxford, 1934.

(50) WADDING, *Scriptores Ord. Minorum*, p. 107a.

(51) F. EHRLE, S.J., "Thomas de Sutton, sein Leben, seine Quolibet und seine Quaestiones disputatae" (Festschrift George von Hertling zum 70 Geburtstag), München 1913, p. 431.

(52) F. EHRLE, *op. cit.*, pp. 439-40; Schmaus published T. Sutton's *Quodlibets* I qq. 2, 4, 5, 7; III, q. 9; IV, qq. 1-4, *Beiträge*, xxix (1930), pp. 6-106; F. Pelster published Quodl. III, qq. 8, 9, 26, (*Opuscula et Textus*, Fasc. V, Monasterii 1928).

possibility of *scientia practica* in God, and the relation of the divine ideas to individuals (53). The *Correctorium* "Quaestione XII" against William de la Mare, which we have discussed above, was probably written by him also. F. Pelster has recently attributed to him two more works, the *Correctorium* "Quare" (54) and *Impugnaciones contra fratrem Aegidium contradicentem Thomae* (55). These attributions are hardly satisfactory, as we shall try to illustrate in some detail in one of our next articles. We have already given reasons for attributing the main part of the *Correctorium* "Quare" to Knapwell.

About 1311 Sutton crossed swords with the celebrated Franciscan, John Duns Scotus, against whom he wrote a defensive work in support of Aquinas on the first and fourth book of the *Sentences*. The former was usually ascribed to the English Dominican, Thomas Jorz. It was restored to Sutton by Pelster (56). He and Schmaus have brought forward further proofs in support of its authorship. Schmaus studied the divergences between Aquinas and Scotus on the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as given by Sutton, and showed their respective position in regard to the two great currents of Augustinianism and Aristotelianism (57). The fourth book of the *Sentences* of Sutton against Duns Scotus is preserved in Codex Rossianus lat. IX, 121, ff. 132v-160v. Pelster has made available the title of each question (58).

One of the first followers of Duns Scotus was the English Franciscan, Robert Cowton (fl. 1340), whose *Abbreviationes super Sententias* (Scoti) are quoted by Wycliffé in his *De Bene-*

-
- (53) D.E. SHARP, "Thomas of Sutton", *Rev. Néo-Scolast. Hommage à Monsieur M. de Wulff*, xxxvi (1934), pp. 32-54; *ibid.*, xxxvii (1934), pp. 88-104; 219-33.
 - (54) F. PELSTER, "Thomas v. Sutton und das *Correctorium* 'Quare detraxisti'", in *Melanges A. Pelzer*, Louvain, (1947), pp. 441-466.
 - (55) F. PELSTER, *Thomistische Streitschriften*, pp. 136-152.
 - (56) F. PELSTER, "Thomas von Sutton, ein Oxfordter Verteidiger der thomistischen Lehre", *Zeitschrift*, xlvii (1922), pp. 229-31; *Scholastik*, ii (1927), p. 127.
 - (57) M. SCHMAUS, "Der über propugnatorius des Thomas Anglicus und die Lehrunterschiede Zwischen Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus", *Beiträge*, xxix (1930).
 - (58) F. PELSTER, *Thomas von Sutton*, pp. 400-1,

dicta Incarnatione. (59). He wrote also a commentary on the four books of the *Sentences*, in which he attacked Aquinas, accusing him of contradicting himself very often, and defended the teaching of his Franciscan Master. In MS. Vat. Ottob. 1126, containing these *Sentences*, Cowton says for instance :

f. 155va. "respondebo... primo per rationem propter aliquas instantias factas contra istam rationem Subtilis Doctoris" (60).

Thomas Sutton replied to Cowton's criticisms in the first three books of the *Sentences*, explaining and reconciling the texts wherever the Friars Minor "imponunt communi doctori, quantum ad hoc quod contradicat sibi ipsi" (61), and further in his *Quaestiones Disputatae*, preserved at Erfurt, MS. Amplon. 369, he derides the title of Subtle Doctor given by Cowton to Duns Scotus, saying :

f. 29va: "Patet igitur quod totum dictum istorum, qui tam subtiliter putant nova invenire, non est nisi fictitium puerile" (62).

According to Père Mandonnet (63), Thomas Sutton probably is also the author of *Concordantia dictorum Thomae*. Because Sutton speaks in the first person this treatise has wrongly been assumed to be a work of Aquinas himself. It is published amongst *Opuscula Spuria* of St Thomas (64).

Another English Dominican Master who wielded a weighty, incisive, and effective pen when he thought that thomist principles should be asserted or thomist tenets defended, was Robert of Orford, who as we have already seen, wrote the *Correctorium*

(59) *Johannis Wycliffe De Benedicta Incarnatione*, ed. E. Harris, Wyclif Society 1886, p. 57.

(60) Cited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

(61) MS. Magdalen College, Oxford, 99, f. 180va. This same text is preserved in the Vatican, Rossianus lat. IX, 121, ff. 1r-132v; and Todi, Municipal library, 12. The Prologue and the titles of these manuscripts are edited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, pp. 395-400.

(62) Cited by Pelster, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

(63) P. MANDONNET, "Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste", *Rev. S.P.T.*, vii, (1913), p. 255; F. Pelster concluded its authenticity in *Gregorianum*, iv, (1923), pp. 72-105.

(64) *S. Thomae Aquinatis opuscula omnia genuina necnon spuria melioris notae debito ordine collecta*, cura et studio P. Mandonnet, Paris 1927, V. pp. 444-74.

"*Sciendum*". Robert has been styled by the bibliographers "acer-
rimus defensor doctrinae Angelici Doctoris" (65). His main works
were directed against two famous Paris Masters, Henry of Ghent
and Giles of Rome—in Bulaeus's words "tunc temporis celeberrimi
in Academia professores" (66). With these treatises Robert
contributed greatly to the victory of Thomism, and as Férret has
rightly pointed out, "son ardeur le mettait au premier rang des
défenseurs" (67).

Henry of Ghent was one of the Parisian Masters who were
consulted by Stephen Tempier in the condemnation of March
7, 1277 (68). When he was still Bachelor of Arts he commented
on certain Aristotelian books (69), but later he changed his views,
and looked askance at the New Learning, as destructive of
dogma, and not in harmony with St Augustine. His chief theological
work is the fifteen *Quodlibets* (70) disputed at Paris between
1276 and 1291-2 (71). In these *Quodlibets* he attacked various
thomist tenets, and made a point, whenever he discussed one of
the condemned articles, of recalling its condemnation (72).

In his *Contra dicta Henrici de Gandavo*, Robert of Orford

-
- (65) Cf. A. ALTAMURA, *Bibliotheca Dominicana*, p. 69; A. Lusitanus, *Bibliotheca Fratrum Praedicatorum*, p. 216.
- (66) G. E. BULEAUS, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, iii, p. 709.
- (67) P. FERET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, ii, p. 167.
- (68) *Quodlibet* II, q. 9 (ed. Venetiis 1613, p. 60v, in relation to proposition 204, of the syllabus of 1277: "angelum esse in loco per suam actionem", he says: "in hoc enim concordabant omnes magistri Theologiae congregati super hoc, quorum ego eram unus, unanimiter concedentes...")
- (69) Cf. JEAN PAULUS, *Henri de Gand*, *Essai sur les tendances de sa Métaphysique*, Paris 1938, pp. xviii-xix.
- (70) "Excellit quidem in suis *Quodlibetis* Henricus a Gandavo. Excellit S. Thomas praesertim in *Secunda-Secundae*", said the mystic Johannes Gerson (1363-1429). Quoted after Lajard, *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xx, p. 203.
- (71) Cf. P. GLORIEUX, *La littérature quodlibétique*, i, pp. 176-199.
- (72) *Quodl.* ii, q. 8, p. 55v, concerning the principle of individuation: "inter erroneos articulos nuper ab Episcopo Parisiensi damnatos est illa positio..." and *Quodl.* ii, q. 9, p. 59v: "Si enim sic esset in situ, vel in loco ipsa substantia eius per naturalem dependentiam ad situm et locum: esset ratio essendi ipsum in loco, quod erroneum est: secundum quod bene dicit unus articulus ab Episcopo damnatus talis: Quod substantiae separatae nusquam sunt secundum substantiam, error est, si intelligatur ita, quod substantia non sit in loco".

replied to fourteen of these Quodlibets. Three important questions of these replies, preserved at the Vatican, MS. Vat. lat. 987, have been printed; they are: the question concerning the distinction between *esse* and *essentia* by Grabmann (73); the question relating to the oneness of "esse" in Christ by Hocedez (74); and a third one on original sin by Martin (75).

Giles of Rome, who according to the testimony of William Tocco (76) was for three years a pupil of St Thomas, was present at the condemnation of 1277, still reading for the Mastership in theology. Whilst bachelor he had advanced in his lectures and in his writings some thomist tenets which did not please the Bishop of Paris, Stephen Tempier, and the masters of the University of Paris. Giles consequently was asked to withdraw these propositions, but he not only refused to acquiesce in this demand, but the more strongly maintained them (77). For this reason Giles was compelled to leave the University. Afterwards, however, the Austin Friar, to obtain the chair of Theology in the University of Paris, changed his views and became an opponent of Aquinas. His strongest criticisms are to be found in his Commentary on the first Book of the *Sentences*. Against these views Robert of Orford wrote his *Reprobationes dictorum fratris Aegidii in I Sententiarum*. The name *reprobationes* stands for a refutation set up in literary form to restore the sound teaching of Aquinas, twisted by Giles of Rome. A copy of this treatise is pre-

-
- (73) Cf. M. GRABMANN, *Doctrina S. Thomae de distinctione reali inter essentiam et esse ex documentis ineditis saeculi XIII*, *Acta Hebdomadae Thomisticae*, 1924, p. 157-9.
- (74) E. HOCEDÉZ, S.J., *Quaestio de unico esse in Christo* (Textus et documenta, Univ. Gregoriana, Series Theologica, 14), 1933, pp. 95-100).
- (75) Cf. R. MARTIN, O.P., *La controverse sur le Péché Originel au début du XIV^e siècle* (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, X, 1930, pp. 13-19).
- (76) *Acta Sanctorum*, die 7 Martii, c. VII, n. 41, p. 670b: "Quidam Magister Eremitarum Frater Aegidius, qui postmodum fuit Archiepiscopus Bituricensis, qui tredecim (?) annis istum Magistrum audiverat". The *tredecim* is probably a mistake for *tribus*, i.e. during the three years of the second regency of Aquinas in Paris.
- (77) Cf. H. DENIFLE, O.P., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I, n. 522.

served in Merton College, Oxford, MS. 276 (78). Up to the XVII Distinction Robert of Orford found 64 points of difference between Aquinas and Giles. He not only refuted the latter when St Thomas was directly attacked, but also when a different interpretation is given, such as in the problem : "Whether the *quaestio quid est* presupposes the *quaestio quia est*", in which thesis Giles claims to be interpreting Aristotle and St Augustine.

It would seem that the Dominican Masters' defensive works had a great influence on Giles of Rome since later the Austin Master, especially in his Commentary on the III Book of the *Sentences*, practically agreed with the Angelic Doctor on every debatable question. E. Richeldi, who made a special study on this book, has shown that the references made by Giles in this work, under *scripta communia dicta communia, ut communiter dicitur*, are always to the teaching of St Thomas, and whole passages are cited from Aquinas (79).

A. VELLA.

(78) We have transcribed this early XIV century manuscript, and we hope to publish it when any opportunity is offered to us.

(79) Cf. E. RICHELDI, *La Cristologia di Egidio Romano*, (Modena, Tip. Pontificia Arcivescovile, 1938).

Religious worship in the Book of Amos*

IN this section we intend to give a systematic account of the religious life of Amos' contemporaries based on the information examined in the preceding section and any other external data. We shall classify the evidence under various headings: the Deity to whom they directed their worship; the places whither they went; the personnel of the sanctuaries; the installation, and finally the cult itself.

a) *Their God.* Was he *Yahwe* or *Ba'al*? The reform of Jeroboam was a simple schism and not apostasy. In fact when the Omrides introduced *Ba'alism*, it was *Yahwism* which they supplanted; *Ba'alism* itself was displaced by *Yahwism* 1 Kg 12, 28; 1 Kg 17, 18; 2 Kg 13, 2.6. No one could fail to see to what dangers was *Yahwism* exposed through the representation of *Yahwe* by a Bull (1). The bull featured prominently in Oriental rites (2): it was the symbol of fertility and strength. In Israel the bull was considered as the pedestal of God and not as the deity itself. The breach was opened for all sorts of religious syncretism.

The text does not show us clearly what did the contemporaries of Amos worship. In 2, 4 Amos blames the Judahites that they were deceived by their idols, *their lies*, which expression is in harmony with the previous word *wayyete'um*. Their fathers in the desert, if Amos is referring to them, did not worship the bull but *Yahwe* under the symbol of the bull Ex 32, 4, 5. Their idols deceived them in so far as they led to the contamination of *Yahwism*. In 2, 7 we read *to violate my holy name* and *near the altar* implying that they practised these things in "honour" of *Yahwe*. In 4, 4.5 there is not the slightest hint that the offerings are brought to any god other than *Yahwe*. The same is applicable to 5, 21-25 where God is rejecting their offerings, their assemblies and their songs. Nothing definite could be drawn from

(*) The first part of this article appeared in Vol. III No. 2, pp 75-92.

(1) R.P.R. DE VAUX, *Le Schisme religieux de Jeroboam Ier* in *Angelicum* 20 (1943) 82. W.F. ALBRIGHT, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore, 1946, p. 229.

(2) S. COOK, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, London 1930, p. 26.

v. 26; if our reading and explanation are right, it would harmonise with this interpretation. The idols of 7, 9 may be simply images of Yahwe; so also with the gods of Dan and Beersheba. In 9, 1 Amos saw Yahwe standing on the altar, most probably at Bethel.

The expression *He eloheka* would incline one to believe that the object of worship was an idol. It may be explained otherwise: These idols were installed as symbols of Yahwe; or simply as pedestals on which the invisible God stood as He was believed to do on the Cherubim of Solomon 1 Sam 4, 4; 2 Kg 19, 15; Ps 79, 2; 98, 1; Is 37, 16. Later on these idols came to be considered as the embodiment of Yahwe, and hence the worshipper's attention was drawn to them. Hos 8, 5-6 does not imply that the golden bull did not represent Yahwe, but that Yahwe could not be represented by any material body; for Hosea such things were nonsense and ridiculous, were it not for the tragic consequences entailed, a further approach to paganism.

We may conclude, therefore, that in the 8th century religion in Israel, in theory, was Yahwism but practically it was heathenism.

b) *Places of Worship*. Five places are enumerated in our texts: Samaria, Bethel, Gilgal, Dan and Beersheba; besides these there were many others scattered throughout Palestine 2 Kg 23, 4-19; 2 Chr 3, 3-7. We have already briefly traced the history of these sanctuaries; Bethel seems to have enjoyed special position: it was under royal protection and was considered as the sanctuary of the realm, much as Jerusalem was in Judah. This preeminence may mean some tendency towards centralisation without the destruction of the local sanctuaries. In order that the prestige of Jerusalem as the city of David might be effectively neutralised there was the absolute necessity of a city enjoying more or less similar preeminence above the others, without however irritating the decentralizing tendencies of the populace. From 4, 4.5 it seems that the same ritual was carried on, perhaps with various degrees of solemnity, in all the sanctuaries.

In 7, 9 these places are called *bamoth* which is used as a synonym of *miqdash* which we have already explained above. Here we may give Vincent's definition of these *bamoth* (3): "the

(3) R.P.L.—H. VINCENT, *La Notion Biblique du haut-lieu* RB 55 (1948) 445.

word *bamoth* indicates a hill or mountain as a sojourn of predilection for the deity and consequently a normal place of worship; finally it became a familiar designation of the cult installation itself. Since the pagan populace of Chanaan had introduced in them idolatrous and licentious elements and rites the *bamah* was repressed severely in practice although in principle quite compatible with Yahwe worship".

c) *The Personnel*. In 1 Kg 12, 31 we read that Jeroboam I established a new priesthood in Bethel, whose members were not of the tribe of Levi. The writer of Kg 13, 33 sadly remarks that everyone who wished to have the imposition of hands was made a priest of the high-places. These priests were called *kohane habamoth*. Amaziah is called *kohen bethel*. In 2 Kg 23, 5 (Cfr Hosea 10, 5; Soph 1, 4) the writer calls them *Kemarim* to distinguish them from the priests of Jerusalem who were of Levite stock. Amaziah is called here *kohen* which makes one believe that he was of Levite descendancy; if this is so then there were also Levite priests who were not faithful to Jerusalem; in fact we read in 2 Kg 23, 9 that the *kehanim* were recalled to Jerusalem and the *kemarim* were simply suppressed by Josiah 2 Kg 23, 5 (4).

d) *The Installation*. We have already hinted at the nature of the buildings on these *bamoth*. Now we shall describe them in more detail taking into account what other writers have to tell us on the subject.

In 2, 7 there is a reference to an *altar*; so also in 9, 1; 3, 14 where the *horned altar* of Bethel is mentioned. This altar may be considered as the central part of the building erected on these high places. We explained above the sacredness and the import of these horns attached to the altars Ex 27, 2; Lv 4, 7. This altar formed the most important part of the temple which was a more or less impressive building. Around this temple were clustered the homes of the priests attached to it and of those who had some interest therein: 1 Kg 9, 31; 13, 32; 2 Kg 17, 29-32; 23, 19.

Within these temples there were enshrined the idols or images. In the Pt the Israelites are ordered to destroy, besides the altars, the raised stones, to cut down the *asherim* Ex 24, 13

(4) W.O.E. OESTERLY—Th. H. ROBINSON, *A History of Israel*, Vol. I 1945, p. 421.

and the *hammim* Lv 26, 30. That these objects were still found here at the time of Amos and even later is confirmed by Chr 34, 4 where there is a complete description of the *bamolh*: *and they (the officers of Josiah) broke down before him the altars of ba'alim and demolished the idols that had been set upon them; and he cut down the groves and the graven things and broke them into pieces and strewed the fragments upon the graves...* We may hence reconstruct this picture (5): on these sites, more or less high, there was a temple with a horned altar, a common liturgical object in the Ancient East, for sacrifices and libations; raised stones *massebah* and the sacred trees *asherah*, buildings for the personnel addicted to the service. The *masseboth* were either commemorative stones or at times representations of the local deity; the *asherah* represented goddesses. The *hammim* was an altar for incense (6).

e) *Ritual*. To these sanctuaries there was a large concourse of people; it seems, however, that the most popular, hence the most frequented, were Bethel, Gilgal, Dan and Beersheba. We cannot say how the number of these pilgrimages was regulated, whether, that is, they were restricted to the three main feasts of the Pass Over, of the Weeps and of the Booths. From 4, 4-5 it seems clear that these pilgrimages were quite frequent and hence probably more than three a year.

In these sanctuaries all kinds of sacrifices and tithes were offered; processions were held accompanied by music. The sacrifices were: *animal sacrifice* 4, 4; 5, 25; *burnt-offerings* 5, 22; *meal-offerings* 5, 22; *thanksgiving offerings* 4, 5; *voluntary-offerings* 4, 5; the nature of each of these sacrifices has been described above. Further on we shall study them in the light of Mosaic Legislation. Tithes were also brought to these sanctuaries; these, according to Mosaic Law, were to be offered every third year Dt 26, 12; 14, 22-29. Amos ironically invites these overzealous worshippers to bring them every third day; hence it is difficult to define exactly when and how frequently they were brought; it won't be wrong to suppose that this happened more than once every three years. The purpose of the tithes was to

(5) R.P.L.—H. VINCENT, *ibid* p. 250.

(6) W.F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 2 (1946) p. 215. INGHAULT, *Le sens du mot hammam in Melanges... Dusand* t. II, 1939, p. 795-802.

support priests, the sanctuary service and the poor Lv 27, 30-33; Nm 18, 21-22; Dt 14, 22-29.

The feasts held in these sanctuaries were noisy ones 5. 23; Jud 9, 27; 1 Kg 18, 26-28; Is 28, 7; they were deeply contaminated with Canaanite ritual. Processions were held 5, 26; Is 46, 9; 45, 20; Jer 10, 5 in which the idols were carried along the streets. Philo of Byblos refers to the Phoenician *naos zugophroumenos* (7). The solemnity was enlivened by music and song 5, 23; 1 Kg 18, 26-28; Is 28, 7.

In 2, 7 we have a reference to ritual prostitution. This was a characteristic mark of the Ashtarte cult, which led to all sorts of legalized immoral practices (8). In spite of all efforts of all good Yahwists to keep it away from the right religion of God. Dt 23, 17-18; 1 Kg 22, 47; Ezek 16, 16, it penetrated deeply into the ritual of Israel, so far as to take a firm hold even in the temple of Jerusalem itself 2 Kg 23, 7; 1 Kg 15, 12; Hos 4, 14. No wonder then that Amos refers to it.

In the preceding paragraphs we outlined with the help of the data found in the book of Amos and elsewhere a picture of the religious life of the Israelites in the 8th century B.C. It is clear that Amos did not share in any way the idea of God which his contemporaries nursed in their minds and cherished in their hearts: the conception of an Almighty God which dominated the preaching of the prophets could in no way square with the popular idea of a god reduced to the level of a Phoenician Ba'al with whom they tried to strike a bargain of a give-and-take business type. It was natural that the prophet's views on the nature and efficacy of external religious practices would not harmonize with those of the people. We must remember, however, that the main purpose of Amos' preaching was to restore a sound moral life within his people, to recall them back to Yahwism, the religion of their fathers in its true form and spirit and not to correct their ritual, which after all was but one way of expressing that interior spiritual life which the prophet wants to recreate. One therefore should not expect a wholesale condemnation or approbation of a cult as such, at least directly: in fact the passages dealing with this subject are but parts of a larger context within which they

(7) S.A. COOK, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, 1930, p. 161.

(8) J.-F. CHARLES, *Le milieu biblique t. III* 1936, p. 283.

form an organic whole with other questions of no minor importance. Moreover one should take into account the rhetorical style of the prophet who uses scathing language so as to oppress, so to say, the mind of the hearers with the main point of his sermon, leaving the rest in the background.

With these premisses we may now answer this question: Did Amos approve religious external practices? All those ⁽⁹⁾ who explain 5, 25 in a way as to imply the non-existence of sacrifice in the desert, give a negative answer; the rest ¹⁰⁾ distinguishing between external worship as such and external worship as in fact practised by the contemporaries of Amos maintain that Amos did not condemn cult as such but he rejected it in the form and spirit in which it was practised in the 8th century. An examination of the text would show us the sound basis of the second alternative; one must not forget that the prophet was a preacher and not a legislator.

In 2, 4 Amos is blaming Judah for its crimes, including their unfaithfulness to Yahwe and his commandments. As it was explained above, this text by itself does not *necessarily* mean a written law, but that considered, within the larger historical context of the 8th century, it may be considered as referring to a written law, which most naturally referred also to religious worship. Hence this text would rather incline one to state with some confidence that Amos was indirectly approving worship as it was prescribed in Judah. He approves it as a matter of principle.

In 3, 14 God is expressing his anger against the misdirected zeal of the people. His decision to wipe out the *bamoth* does not necessarily mean that He condemned cult as such; it would rather mean that since these places afforded the opportunity for the practice of this hypocrite worship they were only worthy of destruction. One may press further the argument and state: since the Mosaic Legislation regarding the centralization of wor-

(9) R.S. CRIPPS, *The Book of Amos*, London 1929, p. 341.

N. SCHMIDT, *On the Text and Interpretation of Amos*, 5, 26-27 in JBLit 13 (1894) 1-15.

A. WEISER, *Die Prophetie des Amos*, 1929 in *Beihette zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentalische Wissenschaft* No. 53, p. 266ff.

E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, Leipzig 1929. 212-215.

M-J. LAGRANGE, *La Nouvelle Histoire d'Israel et le Prophete Osee* RB 1 (1892) 222.

ship was in force at least in principle, all these sanctuaries even if they were the scenes of rightful worship, were illegal and schismatical and hence worthy of destruction. The Books of Kings and Chronicles several times condemned them 1 Kg 15, 14; 22, 44; 2 Kg 12, 13; 15, 4; 2 Ch 20, 23 etc., without in any way implying a condemnation of cult as such, as the reforms carried out by Ezechiah and Josiah plainly show 2 Ch 29, 3-31; 2 Kg 22, 3-23, 24; 2 Ch 34, 29-34, 29-35, 19. In the Book of Amos himself Jerusalem holds a special place in Judah and Israel, 2. All this can be clearly applied to 7, 9.16.

4, 4.5 and 5, 21-27 may lead us to believe that Amos is rejecting ritual as such, since sacrifice held such a prominent place in all oriental rituals. We have seen above, however, that 4, 4.5 forms but a part of an invective against *the cows of Samaria*, who notwithstanding their coming and going to the principal *bamoth* would not escape destruction. The phrase *ki ken'ahabta bene israel* means that Israel wanted to go on with ritual and at the same time lead an immoral life. We have also here but two strophes standing in opposition to one another.

In 5, 21-27 the problem is more complicated; the wording is much stronger and the anger of Yahwe falls upon sacrifices, festivals, meetings, singings and processions. The text, however, is by no means decisive against ritual as such; the context would throw much light thereon. Verse 18 is an introduction directed against those who, peacefully and enthusiastically, were eagerly waiting for the *great day of Yahwe*. Against such self-complacency the prophet retorts that *the day of Yahwe* will be a day of sorrow, a day of punishment, of weeping and torments. The people may have conceived the festivals as a kind of "miniature Lord's day", for which God Himself descended for his worshippers' merry-making and that by such gorgeous ritual they were ensuring Yahwe's favour against any misfortune on that terrible day. The prophet warns them in strong terms that far from being a foretaste of a joyful advent of the Lord, Yahwe was by no means pleased with these sacrifices and festivals because He prefers righteousness and justice to these noisy empty external practices. V 24, embedded right in the middle of the passage, is the basis of the whole section: put away your sacrifices that righteousness would flow easily as a mighty stream. The interpretation of v 25 given above harmonizes perfectly with the context. Sacrifice is not condemned as such; the main point of the pro-

phet is the lack of any connection between their daily conduct and their religious practices. V 26 might be a return to the subject of the noisy processions and festivals; Israel is contaminated by idolatrous worship, which would be the climax of her sins.

In 8, 14 the prophet is evidently condemning idolatry, whether it were under the form of the images of Yahwe or idolatry pure and simple.

The examination of these texts by themselves and in their contexts shows us that they are not decisive for an outright rejection of ritual as such. Amos was too deeply absorbed by the moral life of the people to pass a judgment on, or to give any prescription of a liturgical nature. The difficulty presented by 5, 25 which seems to do away with sacrifice is lessened and loses much of its force when one tries to put oneself in the place of Amos in opposition to his hearers engrossed in their gross religious ideas. They believed strongly that in olden days, beginning with the Patriarchal period, sacrifice was offered by their forefathers; it would have been a tactical mistake for the prophet to condemn sacrifice as such; they would have retorted: we are following in the footsteps of our fathers who were undoubtedly the friends of God who approved of their acts. A bare *no* from Amos would be against all Israelite traditions and all that oriental monuments have to offer us about the general use of sacrifice in all oriental eastern rites (11); they would have attacked him as an unorthodox innovator. There is not the slightest evidence for such a protest; Amaziah simply accuses him of preaching against the safety of the State, without in any way implying that he is introducing anything new; moreover this priest of Bethel wanted to hush up the matter by inducing Amos to cross over the border into Judah. If Amos was really an innovator it would have been much easier for Amaziah to awaken popular anger against the prophet, about which the prophet does not in any way speak. It seems that the opponents of Amos shared his views at least theoretically but did not follow them in practice.

Hosea 6, 4-6, Isaiah 1, 10-17 and Jeremiah 7, 21 have some-

(10) U. TOUZARD, Van Hoonacker, Tobac.

P. VETTER, *Die Zeugnisse der vorexilischen Propheten über den Pentateuch I Amos in Theol. Quartalschrift* 81 (1899) 512-552.

W.F. ALBRIGHT, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 239.

D.B. MACDONALD, *Old Testament Notes in JBibLit* 18 (1899)

(11) R.S. CRIPPS, *ibid.* p. 340.

thing in common with Amos; they are more outspoken, but their spirit is his. They condemn sacrifice unaccompanied by right conduct. Dennefeld (12) considers Jeremiah 7, 21 as a rhetorical exaggeration; the prophet is emphasising his point without qualifying it in any way. That in these passages there is not an absolute rejection of worship external practices is proved by Is 1, 15 which reads: "*And when you stretch forth your hands, I will turn away my eyes from you: and when you multiply your prayers I will not hear: for your hands are full of blood.*" Evidently we cannot conclude that God rejects his faithful's prayers.

As a conclusion we may state that Amos is not rejecting external worship as such, but he is firmly opposed to any religious cult which is not the expression of an inner spiritual life expressed through right conduct in daily life.

WORSHIP IN AMOS AND IN MOSAIC LEGISLATION (13)

So far we have seen the outward form of worship as it is presented in the Book of Amos and the nature of this worship and Amos' stand with respect to it. It remains for us to study the relation between it and the Mosaic Law. The problem to be solved may be formulated thus: do we find in Amos enough evidence to state whether in the 8th century B.C. Mosaic Law existed or not? We have already seen that the evidence in the prophet's book does not in any way entitle us to affirm that Amos condemned external religious practices in principle; hence there is not any rejection of Mosaic worship. It is possible, therefore, that in the 8th century there existed some code of Law which agreed in its principles and outward form with that prescribed in the Pt and which was at least tacitly approved by the prophets. We shall pass in review all evidence which may have any relation with such laws and tradition. Since legislation and narratives are closely knit in the Pt we shall first consider the historical contacts and then the legislative ones.

Historical Contacts:

Amos did not narrate history for its own sake, but he uses it to illustrate or press home his arguments. One meets only short notices. He refers to the Book of the Sinai Covenant (3, 2; Ex 24); to the duration of the desert

(12) L. DENNEFELD, *Lés Grands Prophetes*, Paris 1946 p. 266.

(13) Cfr. P. VETTER, *ibid.* 512-522.

wanderings (2, 10; 5, 25; Dt 1, 3ff; 2, 7; 4, 44-5,6); to the deliverance from Egypt 4, 10; 3, 1.9.7.; Ex 7, 14-12; Dt. 7, 15; 28, 27.60; to the Amorites as a general designation of the inhabitants of Chanaan 2, 9; Gn 48, 22; Nm 13, 33; Dt 1, 7.19.20. 27-28; and he has also a reference to the destruction of Sodoma and Gomorrha 4, 11; Gn 19, 24-25; Dt 29, 22-23.

All these notices may have been drawn out of an oral tradition; what is important is that in so small a book there are so many historical references which taken together would lead one to believe that in the 8th century there was a historical tradition, oral or written, which agreed substantially with that in the Pentateuch (14).

Legislative contacts:

The centralization of worship: One of the most important prescriptions in the Pt is that requiring only one place of worship: the centralization of worship in that place which Yahwe would have selected. Did Amos know of such law? Nowack answers in the negative, because in 7, 9 *bama* and *miqdash* are used as synonyms. The weakness of this argument is that Amos was not a juridical writer making fine distinctions between one term and another, but a preacher using words according to the effect that these would produce in the hearts of his hearers. Further, Amos did not foretell their destruction because they were illegal places of worship—at least he does not say so—but because they were the places of a hypocritical religious life. In 1, 2 Jerusalem holds a prominent position as a place of worship; it cannot be definitely stated that Amos is insisting on the centralization of worship. It would not be rash to hold that at the time of Amos the law was in existence, but it was not seriously enforced on account of several difficulties in the way. Its history may be divided in various stages (15):

a) *The Judges period*: Regular sacrifices were offered in Silo; extraordinary ones even outside this national sanctuary: Gedeon Ju 6, 11-24; 6, 25-32; the parents of Samson 6, 25-32; a sacrifice was offered in Bethel because it was the place of a theophany 20, 26-28; 21, 24. The law therefore was interpreted

(14) J. ROBERTSON, *Amos in International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Vol. I, p. 121.

(15) Cfr. L.H. VINCENT, *La Notion du haut-lieu* RB 50 (1948) 245ff. P. VETTER, *ibid.* p. 526.

in such a way as to prescribe that ordinary sacrifices be offered near the Ark of the Covenant and extraordinary ones in those places sanctified by Yahwe's apparitions.

b) *The first Days of the Monarchy* : A second stage was inaugurated with the capture of the Ark 1 Sam 4, 11. It was clear that Yahwe had not yet chosen his place of predilection; hence Samuel offered sacrifices in Mispha, Rama, Gilgal and Bethlehem; so also did David and Solomon. The tribes offered their sacrifices each in his own country.

c) *The Monarchy period* : The third stage began when Solomon built his temple; henceforth there was no doubt whatever as to the place chosen by Yahwe. The people however were not so easy to be weaned from the *bamoth*, where their forefathers in the preceding century had worshipped God. The strife between the *bamoth* and the temple of Jerusalem began. Asa and Josaphat, kings of Judah, fought against them 2 Chr 14, 2; 17, 6. In the Northern Kingdom things took a different course; here it was the policy of the civil authority to strengthen its position by raising an insurmountable barrier between the two states. It has been seen already how Jeroboam I established Bethel and Dan and other minor shrines 2 Kg 12, 26 to keep the people away from Jerusalem. Now, had the prophets preached or insisted that Jerusalem was the only and exclusive place of worship their preaching would have been rendered impossible and impracticable; they would have sacrificed their main purpose of the moral regeneration of the people. Thus the fact that prophet Elias raised an altar on Mount Carmel 2 Kg 18, 30 does not mean that Deuteronomistic legislation was still unknown.

d) *The Destruction of Samaria* : The fourth and final stage was reached when the schismatical city of Samaria was destroyed. The political barrier was destroyed and hence the prophets could press home with more eagerness 2 Kg 18, 4; Ch 30, 14; 31, 1 the reform which culminated with that of Josiah 34.3-35.19.

Amos preached during the third stage when this particular law was practically disregarded in Judah and held impracticable in Israel. If Amos therefore does not inveigh against this open disregard of such an important law it does not mean that he did not know of it or that it was non-existent; 1. 2 and 4. 4 on the other hand suggest that the prophet had at the back of his mind the idea of a central shrine.

Other Laws:

2, 8 is a condemnation of those who would keep the pledged garments of the poor to use them at night near the altar of the Lord; Ex 22, 25-26; Dt 24, 12.13 prescribed that such pledges be returned to their owners at nightfall. This law is found in all the four classical documents JEPD as outlined by the critics. Word-similarity, however, is missing and the wording and the general construction of the prophet's saying lays emphasis not on the fact that it is a transgression of a particular law but on the deep contrast that there is between one's relations with God and those with one's neighbours in need. It remains true, however, that the contents of the law and those of the prophet's saying are identical.

4, 4 refers to the tithes. There is good reason to suppose that here we have an exaggeration of an actual time-limit. Dt 14, 28. 29 prescribes that every third year tithes should be offered; this year is called the tithe year in Dt 26, 12. The time of three days would be an exaggerated ironical representation of the three-year time limit prescribed by the law.

In 2, 11.12 there is mentioned the Nazarite institution corresponding to Nm 6, 1-22 attributed to P. Amos restricts this institution to young people; the Pt includes all those who make a vow without any age limit.

8, 5 mentions the *Sabbath* and *Newmoon-days*; both of them are days of rest. The repose of the Sabbath is found in all the four documents. Newmoon days as a feast day and a day of rest is mentioned several times in historical and prophetic works; in the Pt, only P records it as a rest-day and insists on the sacrifice service. The prophet is referring to actual practice which might have had a legal basis.

5, 21-27 is of special importance. *Asera* recurs in D and P as a technical term. In P it indicates the 8th day of the feast of the Tabernacles; in Dt the 7th day of the Unleavened Bread; in Kg 10, 20 and Joel 1, 14; 2, 15 this technical meaning is impossible. It is impossible to decide which meaning Amos intended, the stricter or the wider one. 5, 22.25 together with 4, 4.5 gives a list of offerings brought to the sanctuaries. *Zebah* 4, 4; 5, 25; *'ola* 5, 22; *minha* 5, 22.25; *selem* 5, 22; *thoda* 4, 5. This order agrees with the one given in Lv 1-3. The dispositions with respect to the *selem* 4, 5 are identical with those in Lv 7, 11-21 though the prophet is speaking only of the *nedaboth* and not of the *neder*.

In 4, 4.5 the prophet is ironically exaggerating with respect to the tithes but not with regard to the daily sacrifice which was prescribed by P in Ex 29, 38-40; Lv 6, 1-6; Nm 28, 3-7. It might be objected that Amos is deriding their rich sacrifices of leavened bread which were prohibited by law; it does not seem probable, because the prophet mentions other sacrifices which he considers as one whole. Moreover daily sacrifice was in use in Jerusalem in the 8th century. In Bethel and Gilgal it may be that it was not in use. The use of leavened Bread was prohibited in JE Ex 23, 18 and P Lv 2, 11.

In 7, 10ff Amaziah is represented as a man of property in Bethel contrary to all legal prescriptions Nm 18, 20.23.24; 26, 62; Dt 10, 9; 12, 12; 18, 1.2; Nm 35, 1-8 (P). The tribe of Levi as such would possess the priest-cities; the individual priest would possess nothing of his own.

One may note here some verbal similarities. The phrase *to violate my holy name* in 2, 7 recurs most frequently in P in the laws against immorality Lv 18, 17; 19, 29; 3, 14; 22, 2-32. *I am he who led you out of the land of Egypt* is very close to Dt 29, 14; 8, 2. This expression by itself has nothing special about it, but it seems to be a peculiarity of Dt. It is more likely that Amos is writing under the influence of Dt than that he is drawing on a common source to both. Amos 4, 6-9; 5, 11; 9, 14 echo Dt 28. The expression *bassidafon u bayyeraqon* in 4, 9 corresponds to Dt 28, 22 joined with the *hiphil* of *nakah*. This *hiphil* recurs in Dt 28, 30.39; 5, 11b. Amos perhaps is quoting Dt. Amos 4, 11 recalls Dt 29, 23 without being a strict quotation; the word *Elohim* is absent in Amos in such context and in Dt there are grouped together no less than the names of four cities.

One may therefore conclude: in Amos we do not meet with a complete description of the Mosaic ritual, but only hints and references according to the context and subject matter in hand, since the purpose of the prophet was not instruction in the Law but the correction of morals. Although it is remarkable that in Amos not everything regarding cult agrees with Mosaic prescriptions there is no item which is substantially missing in the Pt. These legal contacts coupled with historical reminiscences some of which are practically verbal quotations, prove that much of the Pt legislation was in force even in the schismatical Kingdom of Israel. This presupposes a written code of Law containing all the four classical documents JEDP as traced by the Critics;

hence in Amos there is no evidence for the post-exilic origin of Pt in its actual literary form; nor for the absence of D in the Northern Kingdom in the 8th cent. Amos knew P in its main outline 2, 7; 5, 12; 7, 4; 4, 5; 5, 22; Lv. 1-3; 7, 11-21; Dt is the prototype for 2, 10; 4, 6-9; 5, 11; 9, 14. The differences are, at least partially, explained by the fact that religion in the Northern Kingdom was but the hand-maid of politics and it should not be expected to find all Mosaic prescriptions scrupulously observed in all their details, which was not even the case in the Davidic Jerusalem.

Summing up our results we may draw the following conclusions: The religious life of the people of the Northern Kingdom of Israel in the 8th cent. as pictured in the Book of Amos and other contemporary records reflected the social conditions of the time; the rich ritual was due to the spell of material prosperity under the rule of *Jerobo'am II*. This ritual indulged in with all pomp and solemnity in the principal sanctuaries of Bethel, Gilgal and Dan was rotten from within, being in sharp contrast to the morally corrupt daily conduct of the people. It is true that their religion was based on the worship of Yahwe, but God, the God of their fathers, was reduced to the level of the Phœnician Ba'al being represented by the bull and probably by other images. The prophet did not mean to condemn outrightly external worship; he was deeply angered however by its hypocrisy. It was but a screen for immorality and the cause of the moral rottenness of the people. The worship in Israel, presupposed in the preaching of the prophet, is, generally speaking, in harmony with Mosaic Law; minor differences are due to the tendency of keeping away as much as possible from Jerusalem and to the fact that law by its very nature tends to modify itself according to circumstances, without losing its special character. In the Book of Amos, therefore, one does not meet any evidence for the post-exilic origin of the Mosaic prescriptions with respect to worship in any part of the Pt.

Quaestiones Morales

CASUS MORALIS

Alinda a pluribus annis non audet ad confessionem accedere, quia maritus alternis diebus actum conjugalem exercere vult: ipsa autem diebus menstruationis debitum reddere non vult; immo abhinc tres annos fluxus sanguinis extraordinarios ad decem dies et ultra patiebatur et tempore fluxus rarissime copulae consentiebat.

QUAERITUR:

Primo: Quanam causa requiritur ut diebus menstruationis copula licite petatur vel reddatur?

Secundo: Quomodo peccat uxor marito serio petenti negans copulam diebus menstruationis? Estne perpendenda frequentia cycli menstruationis et congressuum maritalium?

Tertio: Peccatne maritus petens vel exigens copulam tempore fluxus extraordinarii sanguinis in uxore?

Quarto: Peccatne uxor, si tempore fluxus extraordinarii i) debitum negat; ii) debitum petit; iii) debitum reddit?

RESPONDEO AD PRIMUM:

Actus conjugalis in se licitus et honestus est, quia est medium a Deo ordinatum ad legitimam propagationem generis humani, sicut cibus et potus ad conservationem suiipsius. Ratione autem alicujus circumstantiae, concubitus maritalis potest evadere aut graviter aut leviter illicitus. Hinc quaeritur num copula illicita dicenda sit tempore menstruationis; et, si affirmative, quaeritur utrum graviter an leviter illicita.

Plures auctores dicunt eam esse peccatum veniale ob indecentiam, nisi excuset aliqua causa rationalis. Haec ratio, scilicet indecentiae, merito a recentioribus moralistis reiicitur quia, aiunt, peculiaris indecentia, et quidem sub culpa vetita, non exsistit. Quid sane ipsa copula in se spectata indecentius?

Ideo non desunt auctores qui tenent, ratione temporis menstruationis, nullam causam requiri ut licite copula haberi possit. Hinc iuxta eosdem auctores, diebus menstruationis, copula licite petitur et licite redditur.

Hodie tamen plurimi theologi admittunt, teste scientia physiologica, inane prorsus esse quod veteres timebant, scilicet pro-

tem hoc tempore conceptam nasci infirmam: immo ob quasdam rationes copula, tempore menstruationis, aliquando consulenda est.

Sed, tempore menstruationis, concubitus, ut hodie tenet communissima et probabilior sententia, est culpa levis. Et ratio est, tum quia tempore fluxus sanguinis concubitus nocere potest paribus genitalibus feminae et inde, si concipiat, postea periculum aliquod abortus adducere potest, tum quia quaedam intemperantia est non expectare tempus opportunum brevi adfuturum.

Quidquid sit, speculative loquendo, in praxi non est dammandus nec etiam de culpa levi, si compars petit, aut a fortiori reddit debitum: adest semper quaedam causa rationalis, quae petitionem, et a fortiori redditionem, debiti cohonestat.

RESPONDEO AD SECUNDUM:

Non conveniunt theologi utrum uxor peccet graviter necne, si, remoto omnino periculo incontinentiae, viro serio petenti semel denegat debitum. Communissima sententia theologorum tenet obligationem reddendi debitum, licet per se sit gravis, admittere tamen parvitatem materiae. Ita Prümmer: "si mulier una alterave vice denegat viro debitum conjugale, remittens illud ad aliud sibi conveniens tempus, non est peccatum mortale, saltem si vir non est in proximo periculo incontinentiae aut inde exardescit magna ira". Veermersh asserit: "ut adsit gravis culpa, remoto periculo incontinentiae, requiritur ut uxor pluries debitum deneget". Hinc a fortiori, si uxor marito serio petenti negat copulam diebus menstruationis, per se non peccat, secluso semper et omnino periculo incontinentiae, dummodo vir frui possit iure suo alio tempore. Quid vero si uxor laborat frequentia cycli menstruationis in eodem mense, et vir, remoto periculo incontinentiae, serio petat debitum tempore menstruationis? Nobis videtur uxor graviter peccare posse si pluries denegat: et ratio est, quia vir non tenetur sese abstinere a congressu maritali per longum tempus — requiritur tamen ex parte viri aliqua causa proportionata, etsi non sit gravis.

RESPONDEO AD TERTIUM:

Si extraordinarii fluxus sanguinis non proveniunt ex morbo, iuxta communissimam sententiam theologorum levis causa excusare potest ab omni culpa si vir petit et exigit copulam. Si vero proveniunt ex morbo et diuturni vel perpetui sunt, utrum

vir peccet an non, petens vel exigens debitum, iudicandum est, uti ait Cappello, secundum principia generalia de usu matrimonii qui infirmis permittitur vel prohibetur. Videndum est, aliis verbis, utrum vir petat rationabiliter an non. Hinc, si damnum uxori obfuturum non est grave, ordinarie copula licita dicenda erit, et ideo vir non peccat, eo quod secus vir perpetuo abstinere deberet, quod est ipsi grave incommodum, et ordinarie grave incontinentiae periculum ei afferetur, quae duplex ratio levi nocumento uxoris certe praevalet. Ita Cappellman: "Medicina Pastoralis", p. 148, Editio latina.

RESPONDEO AD QUARTUM:

i) Si uxor debitum denegans virum exponit proximo periculo incontinentiae, et ipse serio petat, uxor certe graviter peccat, etiamsi semel denegat, dummodo malum exinde ei obfuturum non sit grave et proportionatum. Si vero hoc periculum incontinentiae abest ex parte viri, non videtur graviter peccare uxor si aliquando debitum denegat.

ii) Uxor tempore fluxus extraordinarii potest et licite petere, quia in casu utitur iure suo, nisi in reddendo sese exponat in proximo periculo vitae; quo in casu, ut licite petat, requiritur, uti causa, periculum proximum incontinentiae sive propriae sive viri, aut alia causa aequivalens.

iii) A fortiori excusatur uxor si simpliciter reddit debitum, quia in casu cohonestatur semper aliqua causa proportionata, scilicet petitione ex parte viri ob periculum incontinentiae.

C. BONNICI.

BOOK CHRONICLE

SOME RECENT COMMENTARIES ON THE BIBLE

IT is well over two years since my last bulletin of recent Catholic commentaries and translations of the Bible has been published (*Mel. Theol.* Vol. II, No. 1, April 1949, 70-2) and one naturally expects a plentiful crop of publications to have come out during this period. The largest output comes from France, but the contribution of other countries though perhaps less voluminous, is by no means inferior either in exegetical importance or biblical scholarship.

The Catholic Biblical Association of America, which gave us the *Book of Genesis* in 1948, has now given us *The Book of Psalms and the Canticles of the Roman Breviary* (1950, vi 302). The title is the same as that of the new Latin translation of the Psalms *Liber Psalmorum cum canticis Breviarii Romani* (Rome, 1945). The English translation agrees substantially with the Latin without, however, following it slavishly. In fact it disagrees with it in not a few cases.

The French Commentary **La Sainte Bible** is nearing completion. Volumes III, IV and XI 1st part have been published during the period under review. Vol. III contains: *Josue* by A. Gelin; *Judges* and *Ruth* by R. Tamisier; *Samuel* and *Kings* by A. Médebielle. Each commentary utilizes all the available historical evidence derived from newly discovered documents, inscriptions and excavations. Problems of literary criticism are briefly, but clearly and fairly, discussed, and special consideration is given to the doctrinal contents of each book. A. Gelin rightly rejects the Wellhausenian theory which attaches Josue to the Pentateuch. The Israelites' occupation of Palestine is dated, with many modern scholars, in the XIII century B.C. Josue as well as Judges, Samuel and Kings are a compilation of earlier documents which, however, cannot be always distinguished. The Law-book found in the temple during Josias' reign was Deuteronomy. Volume IV contains: *Paralipomena* by L. Machal; *Esdras-Nehemias* by A. Médebielle; *Tobias* by A. Clamer; *Judith* and *Esther* by L. Soubigou; *Job* by E. Robin. The historical value of Paralipomena is upheld, and the priestly character of

the narrative is attributed to the particular scope of the writer. The writer's scope and the literary genre chosen by him account also for the differences between Samuel-Kings and Paralipomena. Médebielle defends the traditional order of Esdras-Nehemias, as well as the actual order of the text. Tobias is translated from the Greek text of the Codex Sinaiticus. The narrative is not strictly historical, but is rather an elaboration of a historical nucleus, although it is not always possible to distinguish the historical elements from its purely literary embellishments. Judith may be an amplification of a historical event, but the commentator is very reserved in expressing his view. Nabuchodonosor is identified with Artaxerxes III and the story is dated in 353-351 B.C. Esther, however, is strictly historical and was written before the overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. A much discussed question is the place of the deuterocanonical sections, which in Greek are distributed throughout the book in their proper context, while in the Vulgate they are relegated to the end of the book. Soubigou follows the Latin arrangement, owing perhaps to the Vulgate text which is printed along with the French translation. The integrity of the book of Job is maintained, but the speeches of Elihu are, perhaps, a later addition. The book seems to have been written towards the close of the 6th century or the beginning of the 5th. The analysis of the doctrinal contents is too brief and inadequate. Volume XI, part 1 contains the *Acts of the Apostles* by J. Renié. As the Greek text of Acts has come down to us in two main forms represented by the Old Uncials and by the so-called "Western" text respectively, Renié has followed an eclectic form of text critically reconstructed from the various families of texts. The commentary is sound and comprehensive and, though perhaps a little lengthy, rich in philological and historical information.

The **Bible de Jerusalem** is going ahead rapidly. Since my last notice in 1949 the number of fascicles has increased from four to twenty. Other parts are expected to come out very soon, and the whole work, consisting of forty parts will be completed in 1952. The books published during the last two years are the following: *Leviticus* and *Deuteronomy* by H. Cazelles; *Josue* by F.-M. Abel O.P.; *Kinas* by R. de Vaux O.P.; *Job* by Lar-cher O.P.; *Psalms* by R. Tournay O.P. and R. Schwab; *Ecclesiastes* by R. Pautrel S.J.; *Wisdom* by E. Osty; *Isaïe* by P.

Auvray and J. Steinmann; *Ezekiel* by P. Auvray; *Matthew* by P. Benoit O.P.; *Corinthians* by E. Osty; *Philippians*, *Philemon*, *Colossians*, *Ephesians* by P. Benoit O.P.; *Hebrews* by C. Spicq O.P.; *the Apocalypse* by Boismard O.P. All these parts maintain the same standard of scholarship and production, and the same disposition. A brief introduction deals with the main questions of authorship, composition, sources; the notes are divided into two groups, textual notes justifying the selection of particular readings and explanatory notes helping the reader to understand the text.

The general critical tendency of these commentaries is that of combining, as far as possible, the results of modern literary criticism with the generally accepted traditional truths. Thus the Mosaic authorship of **Deuteronomy** is maintained, but only in the sense that Moses has drawn the main lines which were later developed by the addition of the oral interpretation of the Mosaic Law during the monarchy, especially after the fall of the Northern kingdom. Josias' reform was carried out on the ground of Deuteronomy. A second edition, incorporating further additions, was made after the disastrous events of 589-588 (pp. 13-15). **Kings** was written after the discovery of the Law-book in 621 and probably before Josias' death in 609. A second edition, on deuteronomic lines, was made during the exile after 562 and later revised and enlarged by extensive retouches (pp. 15-17). The unity of authorship of **Job** is maintained except for Elihu's speeches which are said to be added by an inspired writer (pp. 10-13). David is the principal author of the **Psalms** in the sense that he is "le plus notable et le plus éminent" (p. 16). But we cannot even approximately determine the number of psalms written by the king-poet. The psalms are classified according to their literary genre (pp. 16-33; 57-59). The unity of authorship of **Isaias** is upheld with certain restrictions. Chapters 40-66 and some chapters of Part I (1-39), i.e. chapters 13; 14; 24-27; 33-35, are attributed to the prophet's disciples, not only his immediate disciples, but also those that were in any way connected with the "Isaian school of thought". The theory of a Trito-Isaias is rejected, but chapters 56-66 are attributed partly to the exilic Isaian school, partly to postexilic disciples (pp. 12-17). This explanation agrees, to a certain extent, with that proposed by E. Kissane, who believes that the book of Isaias is the work of an unknown editor who collected Isaias' genuine prophecies from tra-

dition and arranged them in their present form (*The Book of Isaiah*, 2 vols, Dublin, 1941-1943) **Ezekiel's** ministry, which is commonly placed in the exile, partly before and partly after the destruction of Jerusalem, is divided into two periods, a Jerosolimitan ministry and an exilic ministry. Consequently many of his oracles are said to have been delivered in Jerusalem (pp. 13-15; see also the author's *Ezéchiél* published in the series *Témoins de Dieu*, 1947).

The Italian translation which is being published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome under the general editorship of Father A. Vaccari S.J. made no progress during the last two years, but the poetical books have passed into a second edition in two parts (1949/50, pp. 347, 309) which is almost a reprint of the first edition which appeared in 1925.

Mgr Garofalo's Italian Bible has been enriched by two commentaries, *Kings* by the editor (1951), and the *Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians* by Mgr V. Jacono (1951). The general lay-out of the series is: introduction, the Latin text of the Valgate and an Italian translation from the original languages on opposite pages (the Epistles of St Paul are in Latin and Greek besides the Italian translation), a double set of footnotes, textual and exegetical. The general tendency of the series is that of a well-balanced scholarship. Problems of literary criticism are clearly set and discussed, and the commentator's views, though sometimes very reservedly expressed, are never those of an uncritical conservatism; see for example Rinaldi's explanation of the origin of the book of Daniel (pp. 8-15).

In a previous bulletin I announced the forthcoming publication of an English Commentary on the whole Bible in one volume (*Mel. Theol.* Vol. I, No. 4, Nov. 1948, 63f). Now I am glad to bring to our readers' knowledge the news that the book will be published towards the close of this year or the beginning of next year. Further information will be given as soon as it becomes available.

Before closing this brief survey of biblical translations I wish to add a few words on my own Maltese translation. The parts so far published cover the historical and the poetical books. *Isaiah* will be out shortly. The remaining prophets will be published during the next year. It is hoped that the Old Testament will be completed in the year 1952 or, perhaps, in the spring of 1953.

1st June, 1951.

P.P. SAYDON.

BOOK REVIEWS

P. HEINISCH, **TEOLOGIA DEL VECCHIO TESTAMENTO**; translated by Prof. D. Pintonello; Torino—Roma, 1950, pp. xix+447.

U. HOLZMEISTER S.J., **STORIA DEI TEMPI DEL NUOVO TESTAMENTO**; translated by Dr. C. Zedda; Torino—Roma, 1950, pp. 238.

J. BONSIIVEN, S.J., **IL GIUDAISMO PALESTINESE AL TEMPO DI GESU' CRISTO**; translated from French by G. Marigliano; Torino—Roma, 1950, pp. 187.

These are subsidiary volumes of the Italian Commentary on the Bible which is being published under the general editorship of Mgr S. Garofalo (see *Mel. Th.* Vol. I, 4, pp. 64, 65 and Vol. II, I, p. 72).

The first, a translation of a book originally published in German (*Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bonn, 1940, pp. xviii+384), gives students of Theology who cannot read German an opportunity to become acquainted with a work which fills a wide gap in biblical studies. While there has been in recent years an intense revival of interest in Biblical Theology among non-Catholic scholars, especially as regards the right method of exposition, Catholics had still to refer to M. Hetzenauer *Theologia Biblica*, 1908, which is both out of date and inadequate. Therefore Prof. Heinisch's work cannot but be most welcome to students of Theology and Holy Scripture, especially after the recent instruction by the Pontifical Commission for Biblical Studies recommending an adequate exposition of the doctrinal contents of the books of the O. and N. Testament (AAS, 42, 1950, 499).

A Theology of the O.T. is not an easy book to write. As the history of revelation is inseparably bound up with the religious history of Israel, the theologian of the O.T. runs the risk either of writing a history of religion or revelation, or making his treatment of the matter to fit into the familiar schemes of systematic theology irrespective of the progressive development of revelation. Prof. Heinisch tries to avoid both extremes by distinguishing the Theology of the O.T. from the history of the Religion of Israel and tracing as far as possible the development of the several religious truths within the usual schemes of theological treatises.

The book is divided into five parts preceded by an introduction. Part I (pp. 31-38) deals with the existence of God and his attributes, and the foreshadowing of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. Part II (pp. 139-190) deals with the spiritual beings, the world and man. Part III (pp. 191-306) is taken up by questions of Moral Theology, such as, religious-moral duties, divine worship, sin and its consequences. Part IV (pp. 307-327) is a short treatise on the beyond. Part V (pp. 329-411) is entirely devoted to the Messias, his person and mission.

From this bare summary of the contents one can easily estimate both the vast range and the importance of the subjects dealt with. The treatment is lucid, methodic and based upon a sound exegesis of the relevant biblical texts. An outstanding feature of this work is the reference to the religious beliefs of the ancient Near East compared with those of the Jewish people. Prof. Heinisch recognizes the existence of religious parallels, but is decidedly against any derivation of any of the religious truths of Israel from heathen sources. Thus, though there may have been some monotheizing trends in the ancient Near East during the second millennium B.C., a possibility which Heinisch is not ready to admit, Israelite monotheism can in no way be considered to be the result of any natural theological development (pp. 56-59). Likewise the messianic hope of Israel, though probably influenced by foreign literatures in its literary form, is directly referred to revelation, and any relation to similar hopes of a coming age of bliss cherished by heathen peoples is positively rejected (pp. 400-408).

There are a few points which call for some remarks. It is sadly disappointing that the covenant or election doctrine, which is the central concept of the O.T., has received so little attention. God has chosen Israel for a special mission, this divine election carried with it the privilege to receive and the duty to treasure God's revelation. In course of time God gave through the prophets a fuller revelation of Himself and his character, and Israel became bound to reflect God's character in all their life and to make it manifest to all the peoples (H.H. Rowley, *The biblical doctrine of election*, London, 1950). Moreover, the gradual development of revelation is not always apparent, and the thread of argument is sometimes lost amidst the mass of biblical texts and references. Thus we are told that the messianic age will come after the judgement of the heathen nations and the pu-

nishment of Israel; we are also given a glimpse of that blissful age, but we fail to see clearly the relation between the Messiah and God's plan of redemption, nor can we follow up the development of the messianic idea from its origin down to the close of O.T. revelation.

Some of the author's statements are highly controversial. Thus the mariological interpretation of Gen. 3, 15 is rejected (p. 375). Isaias predicts the virgin birth of the Messiah in 7, 14 (p. 377). But is the prophet really predicting the virgin birth of Emmanuel or rather the survival of the Davidic dynasty through a child who will be born of a virgin? And can the virgin birth of Emmanuel be proved from Isaias' text without any reference to Matt 1, 20? The author rightly rejects the literal messianic interpretation of Dan. 9, 24-27, but has the typico-messianic interpretation any solid basis? (p. 382).

There are a number of misprints, especially in proper names and foreign words. In p. 5, line 16 read PEDERSEN instead of PETERSEN; p. 43 note, and p. 308 line 5 read ALFRINK; p. 69 note read LANGDON; p. 359 line 22 read AALDERS; etc. P. 5 line 30 read *The Theology of* instead of *The Theologie on*; and many others which the reader will correct by himself. A mischievous imp has escaped the attentive eye of the proof-reader in p. 142, line 17 where *Giacobbe* stands for *Giobbe*.

Professors and students, especially those who cannot read German, will certainly find this book an invaluable help in their theological and scriptural studies, and will be grateful to the editor of *La Sacra Bibbia* for the happy idea of including among the subsidiary volumes this excellent work.

The other work is a translation of Holzmeister's *Historia aetatis Novi Testamenti*, first published in 1932 for the private use of the author's students, and later in 1938, in a revised and enlarged edition, for the use of more advanced scholars. It narrates the history of the Jews from the time of Herod the Great, or more precisely from the year 63 B.C., to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D., thus providing the political and religious background to the Gospel story.

The book falls naturally into two main parts dealing with Jewish political history and religious life respectively. Each part is subdivided into chapters, which are further subdivided into shorter unnumbered chapters and consecutively enumerated paragraphs. This elaborate system of division has the advantage of

rendering the treatment more lucid and the logical connection between the several parts more distinct.

The book is marked throughout by the author's firsthand information, his sober judgement and comprehensive treatment. The Italian translation makes very easy and enjoyable reading and in a certain way makes up for the more austere form of the Latin edition. Although the author is always extremely moderate in expressing his views, there are some statements that are open to controversy. Thus it is not quite certain that the title "highpriest" in John 18, 19 is given to Anna (p. 155); some interpreters refer it to Caiphas. Likewise Josephus' chronology of the siege of Jerusalem is made to conform to the Jewish calendar in spite of his calling the months with Macedonian names (pp. 123-132). It is not quite sure, however, that Josephus is following the Jewish calendar in the *Jewish War*; see for ex. F.-M. Abel O.P. *Topographie du siège de Jérusalem en 70*, *Revue biblique*, 1949, pp. 238-258.

Misprints are fewer than in the preceding work. P. 4, line 17 read SWETE for SWEETE; p. 127, line 23 *Ed-gis* should be *el-gis*; in the same page the numeration of notes 12 and 13 should be inverted.

The third work is a translation of an article *Judaïsme* published in the *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement*, tome IV, 1143-1285, which reproduces substantially Bonsirven's earlier publication *Les idées juives au temps de Notre-Seigneur* (Paris, Bloud & Gay, 1934).

The book deals with Judaism from a religious and theological point of view and may be described as a theology of the Jews at the time of Jesus Christ. This is a summary of its contents: God, his existence and his attributes; angelology; the chosen people and their duties towards God; the Law; ethics in general; divine worship; man's moral duties; individual and universal eschatology; messianism.

This work is neither a popular exposition of Jewish Theology nor a compilation of other theological works on Judaism. The author has the rare advantage of being able to use the Rabbinic writings at first hand, and thus to present an authentic picture of Jewish belief and practice which are only imperfectly known through the Gospels. Another merit of this book is the impartial use of all the sources. Unlike some Jewish authors Father Bonsirven does not limit his investigation to Rabbinic

sources exclusively, nor, on the other hand, does he follow the New Testament writings and the Apocarypha as his primary sources and using the Rabbinic writings only as corroborative evidence. Father Bonsirven makes a very judicious use of all the sources, New Testament, Apocarypha, Talmud, Mishna, Targum, supplementing, corroborating, illustrating the one by the other and thus presenting a true picture of Judaism which it is rare to find in other books.

4th June, 1951.

P. P. SAYDON.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BIBLICA (Vol. 32 : 1952) : Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus.

CHEST-PIECE—Vol. 1, No. 5 (December, 1950).

GREGORIANUM—Vol. XXXII, 1 (1951).

LITURGY—Vol. XX, 2. (April, 1951).

RIVISTA DEL CLERO ITALIANO — Gennaio-Giugno, 1951 (6 issues).

SALESIANUM—Anno XIII, N. 1 (1951).

SCIENTIA—Vol. XVII, 2 (April-June, 1951).

SCRIPTURE—Vol. IV, 9 (January, 1951).

SCUOLA (LA) CATTOLICA — Anno LXXIX, Fasc. 1, 2, 3 (Gennaio-Febbraio; Marzo-Aprile; Maggio-Giugno, 1951).

