

MELITA THEOLOGICA.

Vol. VI, No. 2.

July-December, 1952

Notio Thomistica Satisfactionis Vicariae Jesu Christi Mediatoris

ULLO absque dubio, nulla quaestio dogmatica seorsim tractari potest; particulari modo tamen, de satisfactione vicaria Christi non potest seorsim fieri sermo, quia supponit aliquas veritates in quibus fundatur et cum quibus intime connectitur. Nam doctrina vicariae Christi satisfactionis notionem Dei et hominis naturae necnon relationes inter utrumque supponit; peccati quoque notionem eiusque consequentias, necnon Christi Salvatoris cognitionem eiusque naturas simulque suam missionem in terra praesupponit. Omnibus de istis quaestionibus, firmam habet doctrinam theologia catholica, sed pro dolor! saepe male cognita etiamque impugnata.

Revera contra vicariae Christi satisfactionis doctrinam gravissimae et fundamentales aequivocationes militant; nam obiectionibus illam impugnabant increduli, diversa systemata quoque excogitaverunt moderni quidam theologi; imo controversias inter se suscitaverunt ipsi catholici. Quare quaestionem nostram magni momenti esse, nemo est qui id negare, vel saltem in dubium revocare, audeat. Hoc enim doctrinae capite intellecto, facile patebit nexus inter unam partem tractatus de Verbo Incarnato, quam Sotoreologiam vocant, alteramve, quae iure meritoque Christologia nominatur. Neque hoc gratis asseritur; cum enim sive determinismum Wiclefii, sive optimismum Malebranchii et Leibnitzii, principiis sanae philosophiae aperte adversari neminem lateat, necessitas ipsa Incarnationis, quam divina eloquia clare testari videntur, plane intelligi nequit nisi prius ad reparationem iuris divini, quod peccato laeditur, satisfactionem condignam a Deo decretam esse constabit.

Istius enim vicariae satisfactionis Christi Mediatoris maxima indigentia ex parte hominis, prima Genesis capitula si quis attente legat de facili percipitur. Enimvero, modo tragico sacris in litteris primi hominis describitur lapsus (Gen. cap. 3, v. 1-15). Cum enim homo a Deo collocatus esset in paradiso voluptatis,

The Royal University of Malta



ut illum operaretur ac custodiret, praeceptum quoque ab eo accepit ut de omni paradisi ligno comederet, uno tamen excepto, et quidem sub mortis minatione. Homo tamen a serpente tentatus, huius suggestioni consensit; tunc statim filius Dei adoptivus esse desiit ipsiusque inimicus effectus est. Maxima fuit ruina istius transgressionis pro Adamo eiusque sobole tota, gratiam enim amittens, bona quibus prius dotatus fuit quoque perdidit; immo sublatus fuit e paradiso terrestri, communicationesque cum Deo deinceps cessarent. Dum homo statum innocentiae conservabat, Deus homini, et homo, sancta familiaritate, Deo loquebatur. Postea e contra, Deus ipsa bonitas, cum offensus esset, propter hominis nequitiam, ab incoeptate cum eo familiaritate recessit. Deus tamen, sua infinita bonitate, quamvis hominem e paradiso, eiecerit, remedium liberationis lapsae humanitatis iam cogitaverat. Nam, serpentem maledicens, pergit: "..... inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem et semen tuum et semen illius, ipsa conteret caput tuum....." (Gen. cap. 3, v. 15).

Ullo absque dubio, hic Incarnationem Redemptricem Mediatoris Jesu praenuntiatam perspicimus. Iste mediator characterem particularem induere debet; partes scilicet dissidentes, quae antea intime unitae extiterant, iterum uniendi: nam hominem offensorem Deo reconciliare debet, condignam pro offensâ satisfactionem vice hominis deferens, ad excellentiam Dei, post peccatum non amplius Eî ab homine exhibitam, iterum testificandam. "Mediator Deum inter et homines, praeter ea quae ad communem rationem mediatoris quaedam alia habeat oportet, quae pertinent ad rationem particularem huius mediationis. Haec autem mediatio non est tantummodo conjunctio partium non conjunctarum, sed partium olim dissidentium" (1).

Unio enim, adjungit cl. Friethoff, quae prius fuit inter partes istas, soluta est voluntarie, in quantum genus humanum Deum offendit offensa infinitae gravitatis.

Homo ergo per suum peccatum ex rigore justitiae incurrit obligationem satisfactionis, quae quamdiu nondum oblata tandem impedit novam unionem. Ex alia parte tamen requiritur divina gratia, qua macula culpae deletur, et cor peccatoris in

(1) S. Germanus Constpl.—P.G. 98, 315 citatus a P. Friethoff—De Alma Socia Christi Mediatoris, p. 13.

Deum convertitur (2). Unde ille, qui inter Deum offensum et hominem offensorem intermediat, Deo dare debet satisfactionem pro hominibus, qua tollitur reatus poenae, hominibus vero mereri divinam gratiam, qua restituitur amicitia pristina (3).

Hanc satisfactionem condignam, uti videbimus, praeter Christum, Deus simul et homo, nemo Deo praestare potest. Homo enim propter suum peccatum accessum non potuit habere ad Patrem, et praecise in hoc consistit actio mediativa Christi, quia ut dicit S. Paulus: "per Ipsum habemus accessum ad Patrem".

Quapropter homo suam inanitatem non amplius timet; natura ejus enim, divinae naturae strictissima unione conjuncta est omnibusque dignitatibus ornata: pristina amicitia Deum inter et homines per Christum novo foedere initur. Hoc nempe est supremum bonum ex mediatione Christi proveniens; Christi mediatio enim hominis conditionem et statum renovavit. Servus peccati extitit homo, et filius Dei adoptivus iterum effectus est, timorque ejus ob praeceptum Domini in dulcem et filialem amorem transiit, quia homo ante oculos semper habet mediatorem ac restauratorem communicationis Deum inter et homines, in Christum. Unde dicit S. Thomas: "Post Incarnationem Christi, homines coeperunt magis ad coelestem beatitudinem aspirare" (4), et hoc adhuc corroborat ex S. Augustini auctoritate: "quae major est causa adventus Domini, nisi ut ostenderet Deus dilectionem suam in nobis?" (5). Christi mediatio constituitur ex omnibus actionibus, quas Ipse, a sua conceptione usque ad mortem Crucis, pro nobis egit et passus est, quamvis omnes suae actiones compleantur in passione ac morte satisfactoria Crucis; exinde patet, satisfactionem fuisse praecipuam actionem mediativam Christi, nam per satisfactionem nos inimicos Deo reconciliavit, quod est proprium mediatoris officium.

Omnis mediatio, in actu secundo considerata, et non sub aspectu ontologico et substantiali, consistit in deferendo unum extremorum id quod pertinet ad alium extremum, nam mediator nihil aliud facit, nisi "ea quae sunt unius defert ad alte-

(2) III, 22, 3.

(3) Friethoff, op. cit. p. 13.

(4) C.G. 1. IV. c. 54.

(5) cit. in III, q. I, a. 2

rum" (6). Unde mediator, secundum ideas vigentes, nihil aliud est nisi persona, quae interponitur inter duas alias, tum ad illas reconciliandas, tum ad obtinendum ab uno aliquem favorem in alterius beneficium.

In Christo non solum inveniuntur requisita ad rationem communem mediationis, sed etiam ad ejusdem rationem ontologicam, quia non solum distat ab utroque extremo sed etiam cum utroque communicat; nam ista mediatio ontologica, ut dicit Friethoff, perpulchre inveniri videtur in Christo Mediatore, in quantum scilicet Ipse inter partes quas conjungit, Deum nempe et homines, etiam ontologice stat in medio, Ipse enim, praeter Deum, est homo, et praeter hominem, est Deus (7).

Secundum doctrinam S. Thomae, mediatio ejusque satisfactio sunt inseparabiles (loquimur de connexionione hypothetica, in libero Dei decreto fundata). Idea vero satisfactionis nihil aliud facit nisi explicare quomodo Christus suum officium mediatoris exercuerit. Studere Christo mediatori, de facto, est quaerere id quod fuit relate ad nos. Quoad nos, Christus est Salvator, quia per Crucem suam, pro nobis satisfecit et nobis gratiam iterum obtinuit. Redimendo nos a morte per satisfactionem superabundantem, Verbum Incarnatum nos Deo conjunxit, scilicet quod separatum fuit conjunxit.

Sed hoc possibile non esset, nisi Christus constitutus esset totius humanitatis caput. Per unionem hypostaticam, natura humana elevata est per Christi humanitatem usque ad divinitatem tali modo, quod sua natura humana facta est natura humana Dei. Et cum Verbum sese appropriavisset personaliter, deducitur quod Christus in summitate creationis constitutus est.

Incarnatio de facto est synthesis et complementum mirabile operis creationis. Cum, secundum divinam dispositionem, creaturae inferiores ad superiores ordinentur, Christus invenitur in summitate altitudinis ad quam tendunt omnia existentia et possibilia, unde scribit Apostolus "Placuit Deo secundum beneplacitum ejus, quod proposuit in eo, in dispensatione plenitudinis temporum, instaurare omnia in Christo, quae in coelis, et quae in terris sunt" (8).

(6) III, q. 26, a. 2.

(7) op. cit., pag. 10.

(8) Eph. 1/10.

Sed si Christus est rex omnium rerum, modo particulari tamen hominum est rex, quia Ipse missionem illos salvandi ac adducendi ad Patrem habet. Missio ejus, aliquo sensu, duplex est. Oportet in primis Dei justitiae satisfaciat pro humanitate cuius Ipse est pars, cum sit caput ipsius, et jura Creatoris per negationem amoris et inobedientiam violata, repararet oportet. Oportet quoque Ipse Christus mereatur pro hac humanitate peccatrice gratias et auxilia divina, quae illam in divinam amicitiam intrare sinant, quaeque aeternae visionis beatificae gaudii possibilitatem et capacitatem praestent.

Etenim si satisfactio Christi jura Dei restauravit, homini quoque condonationem peccati obtinuit et poenas contractas abstulit, ista condonatio et remissio peccati hominis non conciperetur, nisi per restorationem vitae divinae supernaturalis in Christo. Cum principalis poena peccati sit aeterna separatio a Deo, condonatio et restauratio non esset vera, nisi homo amicitiam Dei amissam recuperaret et capax redderetur ad fruendam Dei visionem per gratiam.

Scimus, Christum posse mereri et satisfacere pro humanitate; actus enim ejus sunt actus Dei-Hominis, unde isti accipiunt valorem infinitum et absolutum, ita ut non sit peccatum tam grave, pro quo Christus non possit satisfacere. Non existit bonum supernaturale, etiam altissimum, quod Christus mereri non valet, quia infinitas peccati est modo copiosiori compensata per infinitatem amoris Dei-Hominis, et excellentissima gratia est inferior in valore ac dignitate relate ad minimum actum charitatis a Verbo Incarnato elicitem.

Sic ergo Christo ligati sumus in nostra destinatione supernaturali. Ipse est qui nos salvos facit, et est per Ipsum quod post se nos conducit in viam salutis. Est caput nostrum, quia est caput totius corporis mystici, cuius nos membra sumus, et in quantum, cum Ipso ligati, vitam habebimus. "Ego sum vitis, vos palmites", dixit Jesus in ultima Coena; "qui manet in me et ego in eo, hic fert fructum multum, quia sine me nihil potestis facere" (Joan. 15/15).

Punctum magis discussum in nostra quaestione est ipsa natura satisfactionis vicariae, proindeque speciale examen instituere debemus. In vicaria satisfactione enim duo elementa collocare debemus, formale unum, materiale alterum, et illa inter se bene ordinare et uniuscuiusque locum relevare, deindeque illa duo elementa ad Passionem Christi referre. Cum Passio

Christi diversos aspectus habeat, non mirum est, si etiam inter ipsos catholicos diversae theoriae ad profundissimum mysterium redemptionis explicandum inveniuntur. Certissime, Protestantium aliorumque dogmatis Redemptionis deformatorem theoriis exceptis, omnes theoriae catholicae Christi Redemptionem explicantes sunt traditionales et ex S. Scriptura originem trahunt. Quamvis theoriae istae non eodem modo, mysterium amoris omnes affirmare student. Oportet tamen nos sincere confiteri, has formulas, quamvis traditionales, sensum metaphoricum habere et propterea falsam interpretationem subire posse, particulari modo, si litteraliter sumantur; nam, experientia docente, Protestantes et alii dogmatis Redemptionis deformatores his formulis abusi sunt ad eorum placita corroboranda ac defendenda.

Et contra, doctrina satisfactionis vicariae, bonam doctrinam aliarum theoriarum in se retinens ac cumulans, specialem qualitatem dotemque habet, periculosas scilicet exaggerationes aliorum systematum devitandi, et sic facilius ac melius objectiones adversariorum dogmatis Redemptionis solvit. Quamvis omnes inter catholicas theorias illa Satisfactionis Vicariae melior existimanda sit, non tamen oportet nosmetipsos deludere, dicendo doctrinam satisfactionis vicariae dogma Redemptionis totaliter explicare. Haec doctrina alias veritates supponit et compleri debet; conceptus satisfactionis enim sumptus fuit ex iudicis conceptibus relationes hominum inter se moderantibus. Simpliciter ut talis, relationes nostras cum Deo nullatenus significare potest. Hoc non obstante, si sumitur in sensu analogico et ab ea tollitur id quod de iudicio multum sapit, ineffabile dogma Redemptionis optime explicat. Jam ex hoc momentum studii huiusce dissertationis eruitur. Quaestio praesens enim nostris diebus inter magis discussas adnumerari debet. Ad hoc probandum sufficit prae oculis habere diversos articulos et libros publici juris factos haec de nostra materia, quae iure meritoque utilissima existimatur ad fructus doctrinae dogmatis Redemptionis copiose percipiendos.

Perspicuitatis causa, propositum nostrum studium in duo capita distribuimus. In priori capite, de satisfactione in communi necnon de eius divisione requisitisque verba fient. In posteriori capite vero, de natura Vicariae Christi satisfactionis tractabitur, ubi duo eius constitutiva elementa, nimirum formale et materiale, explicantur.

Notio Satisfactionis In Communi

Satisfactio, si etymon spectas, a 'satisfacere' originem ducit ac trahit, quod copulatione adverbii *satis* cum verbo *facere* conflatur. Satisfactio igitur generice sumpta et vi nominis dicit sufficientiam actionis, qua tollitur aliqua exigentia in determinato subjecto, unde sensu vulgari dicimus aliquem satisfacere, quando aliquis facit satis, id est, quod tenetur facere, puta si magistro bonam vel convenientem responsionem praebet discipulus, aut si patri vel matri filius obedientiam praestat. Sensu pressiori ac sermone profano et classico apud Latinos actionem denotabat, ratione cuius debitum contractum remittebatur et injuria alteri illata condonabatur, uti si labore indebito compensabatur damnum illatum, vel si offensor humiliter veniam rogabat. Satisfactio enim pro solutione est (9), quin tamen duae voces convertantur. Nam solvit qui creditori totam pecuniam, quam debet, numerat: satisfacit vero qui creditorem quomodo-cunque placat, v.g. cautione, pignore, vel etiam promissione, nam in Digesto legitur: "omnis pecunia exsoluta esse debet aut eo nomine satisfactum esse, satisfactum autem accipimus, quae-
madmodum voluit creditor licet non sit solutum" (10).

Satisfactio purgationem de injuria illata significare potest, sicut et etiam excusationem necnon veniae petitionem dum verbis aliquis sese reum profitetur. Sic solebant, aiunt, "in qua civitate legatus populi romani violatus esset, nisi publice satisfactum esset, ei civitati bellum indici" (11), aliis verbis "satisfacere est tantum facere quantum satis est irato ad vindictam" (12). Eandem significationem ac apud Latinos retinet satisfactio in doctrina S. Thomae, qui per satisfactionem nihil quam reparationem injuriae intelligit, nam, secundum Angelicum, "Ille proprie satisfacit pro offensa qui exhibet offenso id quod aequae vel magis diligit quam oderit offensam" (13). Haec acceptio satisfactionis etiam invenitur in Catechismo Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos: "Est autem satisfactio, rei debitae integra solutio: nam quod satis est, ei nihil videtur deesse. Quare cum de gratiae reconciliatione loquimur, idem satisfacere significat, ac alteri tantum praestare, quantum irate animo ad ulci-

(9) Digestus, 46, 3, 52.

(10) Digestus, 13, 7, 9.

(11) Cicero, Verr. II, 13.

(12) Forcellini, sub verbo *Satisfacere*.

(13) III, q. 48, a. 2.

scendam injuriam satis esse possit; atque ita satisfactio nihil aliud est, quam injuriae alteri illatae compensatio" (14).

Ex istis definitionibus clare eruitur satisfactionem supponere offensam alteri illatam et quidem iam praeteritam, pro qua integre offensor compensationem retribuere tenetur. Nihilominus tamen ex allatis definitionibus dubitare licet, utrum ista recompensatio pro offensa consistat in voluntate qua quis paratus est damna ex offensa illata reparare, an poenam quoque supponat, qua recompensatur injuria illata? Et si affirmative, quomodo?

Ante omnia adnotare juvat, quod S. Thomas, ut ipsemet expresse dicit, in sua definitione solam satisfactionem pro offensa considerat, at certum est ad mentem Divi Thomae voluntatem recompensandi pro offensa ad satisfactionis essentiam pertinere. Tota difficultas ergo circa poenam in satisfactione versatur. Verum est quod in hac definitione S. Thomas naturam recompensationis non determinat; attente inspicienti tamen videtur S. Thomas, immediate post definitionem, rationes afferendo ad probandum Christum satisfacisse pro nobis, satisfactionem semper in poena collocare. Nam dicit: "Christus autem ex caritate et obediencia patiendo maius aliquid Deo exhibuit quam exigeret recompensatio totius offensae humani generis. Primo... propter magnitudinem caritatis qua patiebatur. Secundo, propter dignitatem vitae suae, quam pro satisfactione ponebat, quae erat vita Dei et hominis. Tertio, propter generalitatem passionis et doloris assumpti (15). Ut patet, S. Thomas in tribus rationibus allatis semper poenam ponit, ni fallor verba: *patiendo; patiebatur; vitam ponebat; generalitatem passionis et doloris assumpti*; satis aperte poenam et quidem physicam demonstrant. Sed solummodo quis contra nos juste objicere posset, quod hic agitur de aliqua satisfactione particulari, nempe Christi. Possumus tamen respondere, aliquam satisfactionem non posse esse talem, nisi in quantum, in illa, omnia requisita ad satisfactionem in genere verificentur; et proinde cum S. Thomas probet quod Christus satisfacit pro nobis cum ex caritate et obediencia patiebatur, sequitur pro satisfactione generice sumpta cum caritate etiam poenam requiri.

(14) Pars II, de Poenit., p. 414, no. 259, ed. bardi, Roma 1918.

(15) III, q. 48, a. 2.

Cum hic locus forsā non totam claritatem optatam afferat, ad alia loca, ubi S. Doctor de satisfactione modo generāliori et forsā clariori sermone loquitur, recurrere malo. Et revera S. Thomas, quaerens num satisfactio sit actus iustitiae, docet iustitiae proprium esse, adaequationem rei ad rem in proportione aliqua ponere, propterea cum iam ipsum nomen satisfactionis adaequationem importet, nam adverbium *satis* nisi aequalitatem proportionis indicat; indeque concludit S. Doctor, satisfactionem formaliter esse actum iustitiae. Postea distinguendo duplicem actum iustitiae, satisfactionem ponit in illo qui est sui ad alterum. "Et quia satisfactio (pergit ipse) aequalitatem in ipso faciente exprimit, ideo dicit actum iustitiae qui est sui ad alterum, proprie loquendo..... Sed satisfacere manifeste aequalitatem in actionibus demonstrat..... Et quia adaequatio non est nisi inaequalium, ideo satisfactio inaequalitatem actionum praesupponit, quae quidem offensam constituit; et ideo habet respectum ad offensam praecedentem. Nulla autem pars iustitiae respicit offensam praecedentem, nisi iustitia vindicativa, quae aequalitatem constituit in eo qui iustum patitur indifferenter; sive sit patiens idem ac agens (ut quando aliquis sibi poenam infert); sive non sit idem ac agens, ut quando iudex alium punit, ad utrumque iustitia vindicativa se habente (16). Sed haec quaesto adhuc clarificari potest ex alio loco S. Thomae; nam scimus satisfactionem inaequalitatem actionum presupponere et simul aequalitatem in actionibus demonstrare, proindeque ad iustitiam commutativam pertinere. Ex altera parte scimus, secundum S. Thomam, contrapassum esse iustum commutativum et aequalem importare recompensationem passionis ad actionem praecedentem; quod propriissime dicitur in passionibus et actionibus injuriosis, quibus aliquis personam proximi laedit, puta si percutit, quod reperiatur (17).

Ex istis locis eruitur, easdem conditiones requiri tum pro contrapasso tum etiam pro satisfactione. Uti ipsum nomen demonstrat, contrapassum essentialiter secumportat poenam; similiter ergo et satisfactio in sua essentia poenam includere debet. Unde clare deducitur, secundum mentem Angelici Praeceptoris, poenam ad essentiam satisfactionis pertinere.

(16) Suppl., q. 12, a. 2.

(17) II—II, q. 61, a. 4.

Posito quidem hoc, quod scilicet poena ad essentiam satisfactionis pertineat, demonstrare juvat quoniam modo se habeat ista poena in satisfactione. Ad hoc, ut clarius videatur locus poenae in satisfactione, prae oculis nos habere oportet satisfactionem esse offensae recompensationem, quae offensa in se etiam reatum poenae includit, quia quando quis alium offendit, lex semper violatur. Offensor propterea satisfacere tenetur et pro offensa, seu pro reatu culpae, et pro poenae reatu, qui ex legis transgressione pullulat. Unde clare deducitur satisfactionem duos aspectus habere, nam potest quis considerare tam satisfactionem pro offensa seu pro culpa quam satisfactionem pro poena, hanc offensam seu culpam consequente; ideoque satisfactio est culpae simulque poenae debiti recompensatio, et pro compensatione utriusque debiti requiritur necessario in offensore satisfaciente et voluntarium et poena, quae sic in satisfactione se habent ad invicem: Satisfacientis voluntas ut elementum formale, et poena voluntaria ut materiale elementum.

His aspectibus satisfactionis distinctis, consideramus 1o.—satisfactionem pro offensa seu pro reatu culpae, et 2o.—satisfactionem pro legis transgressione seu pro reatu poenae.

I.—*Satisfactio pro offensa seu pro reatu culpae.*

Certio certius, in satisfactione pro offensa, eminet voluntas satisfacientis, nam offensa nihil aliud nisi voluntariam honoris denegationem significat, quae injuriam secumfert. Haec injuria certissime recompensari debet vero honore ex voluntate ipsius personae procedente, quae prius honorem denegabat. Nam recompensatio honoris non perficitur redditione alicuius rei ejusdem valoris ac illius ablatae, sicut fit in rebus materialibus, sed e contra obsequium offensoris magis aestimatur (18), inquantum ex recta intentione et bona voluntate procedit (19). Attamen non solum voluntarium sed etiam poena in satisfactione pro offensa concurrere debet. Etenim si diceremus poenam ad hujus satisfactionis rationem minime pertinere, admittere quoque deberemus, offenso solummodo pro injuria habita honorem exhiberi, quem similiter erga alios offensa non plexos offensor reddere tenetur, quod certo certius erroneum est. Offensor enim, praeter amoris retributionem communiter omnibus debitam, aliquid insuper amplius exhibere tenetur, quo debitum honorem subtractum personae offensae recompensat. "Recompensatio

(18) S. c. G. IV, 55 ad 20; III, q. 79, a. 5.

(19) cfr. Galtier, De Incarn. et Redemp., Parisiis, 1926, p. 394.

enim offensae, dicit S. Thomas, importat adaequationem, quam oportet esse ejus qui offendit ad eum in quem offensa commissa est. Adaequatio autem in humana justitia attenditur per subtractionem ab uno, qui plus habet justo, et additionem ad alterum, cui subtractum est aliquid" (20). Ista subtractio ab offensore, de qua loquitur S. Thomas, non potest fieri per solum voluntarium, id est non sufficit ut offensor amore personam offensam prosequi incipiat; primo, quia etiam post offensam, offensor tenetur personam offensam diligere, imo amore ferventiori; et secundo, quia diligendo personam offensam, opus bonum praestat, quod, in quantum est huiusmodi, non solum ab offensore nihil subtrahit, sed e contra eum perficit; consequenter subtractio in offensore non potest fieri nisi per opus bonum, quod simul est poenale. Audiatur S. Thomas: "Oportet, ad hoc quod recompensatio fiat, quod aliquid subtrahatur a peccante per satisfactionem, quod in honorem Dei cedat. Opus autem bonum ex hoc quod est huiusmodi, non subtrahit aliquid ab operante sed magis perficit ipsum. Unde subtractio non potest fieri per opus bonum nisi poenale sit: et ideo, ad hoc quod aliquod opus sit satisfactorium, oportet quod sit bonum, ut in honorem Dei (in casu nostro, personae offensae) sit; et poenale, ut per hoc aliquid peccatori subtrahatur" (21), et adjungit S. Thomas: "Satisfactio debet esse talis per quam aliquid subtrahamus ad honorem Dei (in casu nostro personae offensae)" (22).

Sed ut adhuc melius appareat quomodo se habeant ad invicem voluntarium et poena, satisfactionem ut est recompensatio pro legis transgressione seu pro reatu poenae consideramus.

2. — *Satisfactio pro legis transgressione seu pro reatu poenae.*

Certe in satisfactione pro legis transgressione seu pro reatu poenae, requiritur poena, nam qui contra legem agit ordinem perturbat atque pervertit; propter quod transgressor poena plecti debet a principe ordinis, unde ait S. Thomas: "Quidquid contra ordinem aliquem insurgit, consequens est ut ab eo deprimatur. Cum autem peccatum sit actus inordinatus, manifestum est quod quicumque peccat, contra aliquem ordinem agit; et ideo ab ipso ordine consequens est ut deprimatur; quae quidem

(20) Suppl. q. 15, a. 1.

(21) Suppl. q. 15, a. 1.

(22) *ibid.*, art. 3.

depressio poena est" (23). Attamen si poena non voluntarie suscipitur, sed solummodo reus vi impulsus solum materialiter poenam exsequitur, habetur mera satisfactio, quia reus non solum non assumit poenam voluntarie sed neque ipsi inflictam voluntarie acceptat; unde si poenam gerat, hoc unice facit quia vi impellitur, unde materialiter tantum satisfacit, quia non ipse facit justitiam sed justitia vindicativa fit in ipso, etiam contra suam voluntatem. Ex hoc colligitur quod poena nullum valorem in satisfactione habet nisi cum voluntate sit conjuncta; unde ut habeatur vera satisfactio pro poena, oportet ut reus vel voluntarie poenam assumat vel ipsi inflictam ex voluntate acceptet, et sic poena informatur a voluntate satisfaciens sese conformantis tum principi ordinis tum etiam ipsi ordini quem prius transgressus est, proindeque utrique satisfacit. S. Thomas, loquendo de peccatis, haec mirum in modum explicat: "Actus enim peccati facit hominem reum poenae, in quantum transgreditur ordinem divinae justitiae ad quem non redit nisi per quamdam recompensationem poenae, quae ad aequalitatem justitiae reducit, ut scilicet qui plus voluntati suae indulget quam debuit, contra mandatum Dei agens, secundum ordinem divinae justitiae, aliquid contra illud quod vellet spontaneus vel invitatus patiatur. *Quod etiam in injuriis hominibus factis observatur*, ut per recompensationem poenae reintegretur aequalitas justitiae. Unde patet quod cessante actu peccati vel injuriae illatae, adhuc remanet debitum poenae. Sed si loquamur de ablatione peccati quantum ad maculam, sic manifestum est quod macula peccati ab anima auferri non potest, nisi per hoc quod anima Deo conjungitur..... Conjungitur autem Deo homo per voluntatem. Unde macula peccati ab homine tolli non potest, nisi voluntas hominis ordinem divinae justitiae acceptet, ut scilicet vel ipse sibi poenam spontaneus assumat in recompensationem culpae praeteritae, vel etiam a Deo illatam patienter sustineat; utroque enim modo poena rationem satisfactionis habet. Poena autem satisfactoria, etsi secundum absolutam considerationem sit contra voluntatem, non tamen ut nunc, et per hoc est voluntaria; unde simpliciter est voluntaria, secundum quid autem involuntaria" (24).

(23) I—II, q. 87, a. 1.

(24) I—II, q. 87, a.

Exinde colligimus satisfactionem componi duobus elementis distinctis, voluntario nempe et poena, quae si comparentur ad invicem, voluntarium se habet ut formale elementum et poena se tenet ut elementum materiale. Nam in satisfactione oportet attendere tum ad valorem objectivum tum etiam ad illum subjectivum satisfaciens, quia objective loquendo satisfacit etiam ille qui, quamvis nolens, tamen per vim a iudice impellitur ad poenam subuendam ut in ipso fiat satisfactio iustitiae.

Attamen, ut patet, subjective haec non est satisfactio sed mera satispassio, et, ut dicit S. Thomas, non habet rationem satisfactionis sed vindicationis tantum (25). Hos duos valores optime notavit cl. Friethoff, loquendo de satisfactione Christi. "Hanc pretiosissimam recompensationem (pergit ipse), in se objective infiniti valoris, non offerunt Deo crucifigentes, sed ipsum Christus, qui omnino voluntarie ex magna caritate erga Deum et homines haec omnia sustinuit. Unde attendendum est non minus ad hoc quod ille valor, objective tam pretiosus, ex illa subjectiva dispositione adhuc augmentum sumat. Duo enim sunt: id quod exhibetur, et ipsa exhibitio. Exhibitio autem huius quod exhibetur est actus humanus: debet enim esse testificatio de excellentia divina, secus non est honor Dei, unde neque reparatio honoris laesi" (26). Haec optima reflexio cl. auctoris, absque magno conatu, satisfactioni in communi applicari potest. Nam in satisfactione duo distinguit: *id quod exhibetur*, quod est opus satisfactorium, quod nos ut elementum materiale satisfactionis consideramus, et *ipsa exhibitio quae est actus humanus*, aliis verbis voluntas satisfaciens, quod nos ut elementum formale satisfactionis reputamus. Ipse etiam emphasis ponit in reparatione honoris ab offensore erga personam injuriam et in hac totam vim satisfactionis ponit.

His omnibus visis et perpensis, concludere licet quod, tum si satisfactio consideratur tanquam recompensatio pro offensa, tum vero in quantum poena pro legis transgressione, semper duo elementa includere debet, voluntarium nempe et poenam. Voluntarium, inquam, ut elementum formale et poena ut materiale. Nam poena ex seipsa, si non voluntarie assumatur vel acceptetur, nullo modo rationem satisfactionis obtinet. Ex altera vero parte, voluntarium in satisfactionem non nisi in poena volun-

(25) S. c. G. III, q. 158.

(26) Friethoff, De Alma Socia Xti. Med., p. 56.

taria ostenditur. Unde dicimus poenam ad satisfactionis essentiam pertinere, quamvis non ut elementum formale sed ut materiale tantum; consequenter ut habeatur adaequata satisfactionis definitio, opus est in ipsa includatur quoque poena (27); unde recte definiri potest satisfactio in communi: Illatae injuriae recompensatio per voluntariam poenae perpersionem.

(sequitur)

ALANUS M. FENECH, O.P.

— 00 —

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Our readers will appreciate, no doubt, that regular subscriptions are important to the satisfactory working of our Review. They are kindly asked to note that the Annual Subscription of 2s. 6d. to MELITA THEOLOGICA may henceforth be paid at the Libreria Ecclesiastica, Ditta FRANCIS SCIORTINO, 186, Sda. Mercanti, Valletta.

(27) Galtier, op. cit., p. 397.

Devotion to Our Lady in the Early Church

IN the liturgy of the first three centuries of the Christian era we will certainly not find any clear traces of a cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary: the devotion of the early Christians was wholly centred in Christ, and only in the second century do we find unmistakable examples of the veneration of saints — the martyrs, who, it was held, passed immediately into the presence of God and could, by their death, obtain graces and blessings for others (1). The idea of venerating those who on account of their sufferings were among the elect, was certainly reinforced by the veneration of the angels, which, having had a pre-Christian origin in post-exilic Judaism, was quite easily embraced by the faithful of the sub-Apostolic age (2). Quite naturally, later on the faithful turned to implore the intercession of the Blessed Mother of God; but it is only in the 4th century that we have definite traces of devotion towards the Blessed Virgin Mary: this was due perhaps to the fact that such a devotion in earlier centuries would not have been opportune at a time when the cult of Cybele, the mother of the gods, was so popular among the pagans (3).

This does not mean that in the first three centuries of our era Our Lady was not held in special honour by the faithful: her dignity as Mother of the Lord was stressed even in the first century, and from that time the theological basis on which the devotion to the Blessed Virgin was later on reared, began to be laid down. The clause 'born of the Virgin Mary' belonged to

- (1) Certain Churches in the second century had already introduced the cult of local martyrs. From the Acts of the Martyrdom of St Polycarp, who died in Smyrna in 151, chps. XVII and XVIII, we gather that (i) the Christians clearly distinguished between the adoration due to the Son of God and the veneration given to the martyrs as disciples and imitators of the Lord; (ii) the Christians gathered the relics of their martyrs and gave them due honour; (iii) the Christians met in joy and happiness to celebrate the anniversary of the death of their martyrs.
- (2) "The host of the other good angels who follow and are made like him and the prophetic spirit, we worship and adore" (St Justin, *Apol. I*, 6). See Tixeront, *Histoire de Dogmes*, I, pages 37, 258 ss.
- (3) Mario Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, vol. II, Milano, 1946, p. 234.

the primitive redaction of the Creed (4), St Ignatius of Antioch (5), St. Justin (6), St Irenaeus (7), Origen (8), Hippoly-

-
- (4) There have been no doubts that the clause "born of the Virgin Mary" belonged to the primitive redaction of the Creed; it is found v.g. in the Creed used in the Roman rite of Baptism described in Hyppolytus' Apostolic Tradition. Cfr. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. I, Spectrum, Utrecht, pp. 24-29.
- (5) Epistle to the Ephesians: "Our God Jesus Christ was conceived by Mary according to God's dispensation of the seed of David, it is true, but also of the Holy Spirit..... And the Prince of this world was in ignorance of the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing and also of the death of the Lord—three mysteries loudly proclaimed to the world, though accomplished in the stillness of God" (chps. 18-19). Later on (chp. 20) he describes Jesus Christ, "who in the flesh was of the line of David", as "the Son of Man and the Son of God". (A.C.W. vol. I).
- (6) St Justin was the first to show the parallelism between Eve and Mary as Paul had done between Adam and Jesus. In his dialogue with the Jew Trypho he says: Christ became man by the Virgin in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent's might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin. For Eve who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death. But the Virgin Mary received faith and joy when the Angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her, that the spirit of the Lord would come upon her and the power of the highest would overshadow her; wherefore the Holy Thing begotten of her is the Son of God" Cfr. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. I, pp. 211-212.
- (7) St Irenaeus extends the parallelism between Eve and Mary. According to Irenaeus the procedure of the Redemption follows exactly the course of events of the fall of man. For every faulty step which man took, having been seduced by Satan, God exacts from him a compensation in order to make his victory over the seducer more complete. Mankind receives a new progenitor in place of Adam. But since the first woman was also implicated in the fall by her disobedience, the healing process starts also by the obedience of a woman. Giving life to the New Adam she becomes the true Eve, the true mother of the living and the *causa salutis*. In this way Mary becomes the *Advocata Hevae*. The parallelism is extended even further. St Irenaeus is so convinced that Mary is the new mother of mankind, that he calls her the womb of mankind: thus he teaches the universal motherhood of Mary. He speaks of the birth of Christ as "the pure one opening purely that

tus (9), Tertullian (10), and others all honour the miraculous motherhood of the Virgin, and though some writers (11) deny her perpetual virginity, yet their more orthodox contemporaries affirm it.

Clear traces of the honour in which the Mother of God was held in the first three centuries are found in the catacombs and in the apocryphal writings. The various frescoes, belonging to the second and third centuries, found in the catacombs and representing Our Lady with the divine Child in her arms or in a

pure womb which regenerates men unto God" (Adv. Haer. 4, 33, 11) Cfr. Quasten, Patrology, vol. I, pp. 298-299.

- (8) The historian Sozomen reports (Hist. eccl. 7, 32) that Origen first used the title *Theotokos* for Mary, although we cannot be surprised that it is not found in the wreckage of his works... Origen also teaches Mary's universal motherhood: "No one may understand the meaning of the Gospel (of St John) if he has not rested on the breast of Jesus and received Mary from Jesus to be his mother also (In Joh. 1, 6)" Cfr. Quasten, Patrology, vol. II, Spectrum Utrecht, 1953, p. 81.
- (9) Let us believe then, dear brethren, according to the tradition of the apostles, that God the Word came down from heaven (and entered) into the holy virgin Mary in order that, taking the flesh from her, and assuming also a human—by which I mean rational—soul, and becoming thus all that man is with the exception of sin, He might save fallen man and confer immortality on men who believe in His name (Contr. Noet. 17). Hippolytus follows Irenaeus in thinking that the process of Redemption followed exactly the course of events of the fall of man. Cfr. Quasten, Patrology, vol. II, p. 201.
- (10) Tertullian, in his eagerness to defend the real humanity of Christ, stresses the point that His Body is not heavenly but really born of the very substance of Mary, *ex Maria*, to such a degree that he denies the virginity of Mary *in partu* and *post partum*. For Tertullian Mary is the second Eve.
- (11) Besides Tertullian, Helvidius (refuted in 383 by St Jerome, from whom alone we have all we know about this heretic), Bonosus (bishop of Sardica, condemned by Pope Siricius in 391 or 392, and founder of a sect which lasted till the 7th century), and Jovinian (also condemned by Pope Siricius in 390 and refuted by St Jerome after his death) denied the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Mother of God. Cfr. Tixeront, Histoire des Dogmes, vol. II, Paris, 1931, pp. 243-250.

praying position with hands uplifted (12), though they are not proofs of a liturgical cult of the B.V.M., they certainly testify to the deep veneration for Our Lady in the ancient Church. The earliest apocryphal writings also testify to a deep and sincere veneration of the purity and sanctity of the Blessed Virgin, affirming her virginity *in partu* and *post partum*, and show a preoccupation with the dominant role of Our Lady in the work of our Redemption and stress the power of her intercession for humanity (13).

-
- (12) The oldest known painting of the virgin is found in the Catacombs of Priscilla and belongs to the 2nd century: the fresco represents the Virgin seated with the Infant in her arms, before her stands a young man holding a roll in his left hand, with his right hand pointing to the Virgin and a star in the sky above. Generally, the fresco is thought to represent the prophecy of Isaias. Archaeologists generally attribute to the 2nd century two frescoes representing the Annunciation, the one in the Catacomb of Priscilla, the other in the catacomb of St Peter and Marcellinus; and to the third century the frescoes representing the Virgin and Child with the Magi found in the cemeteries of Domitilla and St Peter and Marcellinus. With regard to the second type of frescoes where the Virgin is represented as an "orante", there is a very large number of possible examples, but very few can be certainly identified with the Mother of God. Cfr. Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit. X, 1982-2035; C.M. Kaufmann, *Manuale di Archeologia Cristiana*, versione dal tedesco, Roma, 1908, pp. 269-272, 322-331, 365-369; Marucchi, *Manuale di Archeologia Cristiana*, Roma, 1908, pp. 354-362; Smith-Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London 1908, *Mary St., The Virgin (in Art)*, vol. II, pp. 1148-1155; Schuster, *Liber Sacramentorum*, vol. VIII, Torino-Roma, 1932, pp. 21-22.
- (13) Among the apocryphals the most startling evidence is from the so-called "Protoevangelium" of St James which most probably was product of the middle of the second century, and certainly was in existence at the end of that century. The principal aim of the whole writing is to prove the perpetual and inviolate virginity of Mary before, in, and after the birth of Christ. The *Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* of the sixth century condemns the writing as heretical; nevertheless, the influence of this Nativity Gospel cannot be overestimated: liturgy, literature, and art all have alike been affected by it. Cfr. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. I, Spectrum, Utrecht, 1950, pp. 118-122. See also Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit. vol. I, 2555-2579.

The first signs of a cult of the Mother of God are found in the fourth century: it was a popular veneration of the Virgin which had degenerated and was denounced by St Epiphanius (†403). An obscure sect, the Collyridians, in Arabia and in Thrace, celebrated in honour of the Mother of God an annual feast, at which only women could attend. These women assembled together round a sort of throne, mounted on wheels, and to the Blessed Virgin, as to a goddess, they offered sacrificial cakes (*kollyrida tina*, hence the name by which St Epiphanius calls the sect) which they later on ate together. Though disapproving of these extravagancies, St Epiphanius did not deny due honour to the Mother of God: "Let Mary be held in honour, he wrote, let the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost be adored, but let no one adore Mary". All his writings abound with the praises of the Virgin Mother of God and he believed that there was some mysterious dispensation with regard to her death implied in the words of the Apocalypse: "And there was given to the woman two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the desert unto her place" (14).

The praises of St Epiphanius are echoed in the writings of all the great Fathers of the fourth century: St Ambrose (15) speaks of the B.V.M. as the model of all virtue, St Augustine proclaims her unique privilege of sinlessness (16), St Jerome

(14) Apoc. 12, 14.

(15) Cfr. v.g. the whole of the 2nd chapter of Book II *De Virginitate* and chaps. 5 to 7 of the *De Institutione Virginis*. In the third century already, Mary was considered to be the type and exemplar of the ascetic, who, consecrating his whole life to the practice of virtue, was worthy, like the martyrs, of the veneration and honour of his brethren. This is certainly hinted at in the 3rd century fresco in the catacomb of Priscilla which represents a *velatio virginis* where the bishop is pointing at the Virgin with the Divine Child as a model of virgin purity. Cfr. Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, vol. II, p. 234; Marucchi, *Manuale di Archeologia Cristiana*, p. 357.

(16) "Excepta itaque sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quaestionem—unde enim scimus, quid ei plus gratiae collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quae concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum?—hac ergo virgine excepta, si omnes illos sanctos et sanctas, cum hic viverent, congregare possemus et interrogare utrum essent sine peccato, quid fuisse responsuros putamus?" (*De nat. et gratia*, 36, 42 PL 44, 267).

foreshadows that notion of Mary as the mother of the human race which was to animate so powerfully the devotion of a later age (17), but it is St Ephraem, the Syrian deacon, who uses the most glowing language to honour the Blessed Mother of God (18).

These developments in the veneration of Our Lady multiplied the various means by which the faithful showed their devotion to the Blessed Mother of God. In the East, even before the Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.), we find churches dedicated in Her honour: the church itself where the Council was held was dedicated to Her Divine Maternity (19), while St Cyril of Alexandria, wrote: Hail to thee, Mary, Mother of God, in whose honour in towns and villages and in the islands were founded churches of true believers (20). In Palestine, when Juvenal was bishop of Jerusalem (425-458), the wife of a high Roman official built a magnificent church in honour of Mary on the road from Jerusalem to Betlehem. Other churches dedicated to Our Lady were built by the emperor Zeno (+491) on mount Garizim and at Cysicum, by the empress Pulcheria (+453) at Constantinople, but it was Justinian (+565) who surpassed all in his zeal of dedicating churches to the B.V.M. especially in frontier cities, for such churches much better than his fortresses (he said) would defend his domains from the onslaughts of the barbarians (21). In the West, the earliest churches dedicated to Our Lady seem to have been those of St Mary in Trastevere and St Mary Major, which were both erected be-

(17) St Jerome writing to Paula to console her for the death of her daughter Blesilla, imagines the daughter as saying: "...mater... putas esse me solam? Habeo pro te Mariam Matrem Domini" (Ep. 33, PL 22, 472).

(18) St Ephraem invokes the Virgin with the most honourable and loving titles: Hope of all Christians; Peacemaker; after God, our only refuge, light, power, wealth, glory; ever ready to help her faithful in all material and spiritual contingencies of this world; whose intercession before God is all-powerful and ever ready to intercede for sinners. Cfr. Ricciotti, S. Efrem Siro, *Imni alla Vergine*, tradotti dal siriano, 2a ediz., Torino, 1939.

(19) Mansi, Conc. IV, 1223, 1229, 1237, 1241, 1332.

(20) *Homilia in sanctam Deiparam*, PG 77, 1034.

(21) Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, VI, 7; I, 3.

fore the year 500 (22). After the fifth century the churches dedicated to Our Lady became more common in the West (23).

In the fifth century we also find references to the veneration of various relics of the B.M.V. : at Diocesarea one could venerate the seat on which she sat when the angel Gabriel announced unto her; her house at Nazareth, transformed into a basilica, preserved her vestments; Jerusalem possessed her cincture and veil; while Constantinople celebrated in the church of Blachernes special feasts in honour of the robe Mary wore

- (22) The Church of Trastevere was already built in the 4th century and at that time it was known as the *Basilica Julii trans Tiberim regione XIII iuxta Callistum*. The first document which speaks of the church as the *basilica sanctae Mariae quae Callisti vocatur* belongs to the seventh century. Possibly it received its title of S. Maria in the 5th century as it was at this time that at Rome the tendency arose to dedicate to the saints the various urban titles which formerly were only known by the name of the founder. The choice of the dedication was surely influenced by the Greek element of the Roman population which mainly inhabited the region across the Tiber.

Santa Maria Antiqua cannot be considered as one of the oldest churches in Rome as it was erected only in the 7th century, in a hall of the Imperial palace: the importance of this deanery is due only to the fact of its site; at the time of Leo IV the title was transferred to S. Maria Nova at the other end of the Forum, as the church could no longer be used being in a state of collapse.

St. Mary Major dates from the time of Pope Liberius (†366) who changed the ancient hall of Sicinius into a Christian basilica: *In basilica Sicinina ubi ritus Christiani est conventiculus*, as Ammianus Marcellinus attests. Xystus III (†440) rebuilt it from its foundations, dedicating it to the Blessed Mother of God and adorning the triumphal arch with mosaics representing scenes from the infancy of the Lord, to commemorate the definition of the Council of Ephesus. These mosaics were restored by Pius XI in 1931 to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the Council. Worthy of note is the fact that these mosaics were influenced by the accounts of the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*, Cfr Schuster, *Libri Sacramentorum*, vol. VIII, pp. 1-20; Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, vol. II, p. 236.

- (23) In Spain, at Jerez and Toledo, there are two inscriptions commemorating the dedication of an *ecclesia s. Mariae* in 556 and 587 respectively. St Gregory the Great mentions that in Italy churches dedicated to Our Lady were also to be found in the less important cities like Ferentino and Valera. In France, St Gregory of Tours mentions churches dedicated to Her in Poitiers, Toulouse, Tours and Lyons. Cfr. Righetti, l.c., p. 237; Cath. Enc., Virgin Mary, Devotion to, vol. 15, p. 462.

when she was with child and of the shroud in which the Apostles wrapped her body when she died: both relics had been given to the emperor Marcion by Juvenal, and the robe had many times been carried in procession and preserved the imperial cities from earthquakes and pillage. Quite evidently, many of these relics were spurious, and yet their veneration shows how greatly the faithful esteemed and honoured the Blessed Mother of God (24).

Soon after the Council of Ephesus, the first pictures portraying Our Lady with the divine Child appeared; they were not portraits — St Augustine expressly says “neque novimus faciem Virginis Mariae” (25) — but they all portrayed the ideal *Theotokos* (26). The first picture of Our Lady of which we have information is the famous *Hodegetria*, ascribed to St Luke, and regarded with deepest reverence by the Greeks; it was originally sent from Jerusalem in 438 by the young empress Eudoxia to her sister-in-law Pulcheria and was later placed in the church of the *Hodegoi* erected by her. Other famous pictures of the Virgin at Constantinople were that in the church of Blachernes

(24) Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., vol. X, 2039-2040. With regard to the feasts of the Robe and the Girdle, see Smith-Cheetham, l.c., p. 1144.

(25) De Trin., 8, 5, PL 42, 949.

(26) Many of these Madonnas are attributed to St Luke: but the first mention we have of St Luke's being an artist is in the Menology of Basil II A.D. 980; actually none of the Madonnas so called of St Luke are anterior to the 5th century. They all exhibit the same hieratic type which established itself in Byzantine art. As Venturi (La Madonna nell'Arte, Milano 1900, p. 26) says: “E' il tipo di Giunone con la regolarità e la dignità delle pitture e sculture pagane, dai grandi occhi, il naso diritto, il mento ateniese; perchè al tempo stesso che nasceva l'idea della Donna eletta da Dio, nasceva anche l'idea della sua beltà, che si tentò di conformare, per quanto era possibile in quell'epoca, al tipo classico della beltà femminile”. “This type”, writes Dean Milman (History of Christianity, iii, p. 394) “gradually degenerates with the darkness of the age and the decline of the art. The countenance sweetly smiling on the child becomes sad and severe. The head is bowed with a gloomy and almost sinister expression, and the countenance gradually darkens till it assumes a black colour. At length even the sentiment of maternal affection is effaced, both the mother and the child become lifeless, the child is swathed in stiff bands, and has an expression of pain rather than of gentleness, or placid infancy”. Cfr. Righetti, Storia Liturgica, vol. II, p. 239; Smith-Cheetham, l.c., p. 1153.

and the one known as the Virgin of the Spring (27). By the sixth century, pictures of Our Lady could be found everywhere in the East: in private houses, in the cells of the monks, in the hermitages, even in prisons. In the West, these pictures of the B.V.M. were not so popular but were not rare though they did not form an object of liturgical veneration: the layout of the churches themselves precluded such veneration. The oldest known picture of Our Lady in the West is a typical Byzantine Madonna belonging to the 5th or 6th century and venerated at St Mary Major.

We have already mentioned the 2nd and 3rd century frescoes of the Catacombs: other paintings of the B.V.M. in the catacombs belong to the 4th and 5th centuries, the more important being that in the catacomb of St Agnes in Rome (28) and that in the crypt of the church of St Maximin in Provence (29).

-
- (27) The Hodegetria represents the Virgin standing and holding Our Lord on her left arm, carrying a roll in His left hand and blessing with His right. His nimbus is cruciform, Hers a plain circle. The picture seems to have been destroyed by the Turks at the capture of Constantinople in 1453.

The *Blachernitissa*, so called because preserved in the church of Blachernes built by Pulcheria in a suburb of Constantinople, represents Our Lady with arms extended as an orante.

The Virgin of the Spring, so called from the miraculous spring Leo the Thracian caused to be included within the church erected by him outside the walls of the imperial city in honour of the

B.V.M., represents Our Lady as an orante but with the divine Babe on her lap. The picture seems to have been the *Nicopoeia* which was sculptured by Dandolo in 1204 and is still preserved in St. Mark's, at Venice.

Cfr. Smith-Cheetham, l.c.

- (28) Found by P. Marchi in an arcosolium of the *Coemeterium Maius*, it represents the Blessed Virgin in the figure of an orante and with the child Jesus; on the left and right of the figure there is the Constantinian monogram turned towards the Child to show that He is the Christ.
- (29) The picture is actually not a fresco but incised in marble: an inscription above the head of the figure reads: *Maria virgo minister de templo Jerosale*. It is the only picture which refers to an incident in Mary's life told only in the Apocrypha. The feast of the Presentation originated in the East probably in the 8th century and it was only introduced in the West in 1375. Cfr. Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., vol. X, 1986-1987.

Mosaic pictures of the Madonna are of extreme rarity in the East, as the Mohammedans destroyed all the Christian mosaics they could lay hands on (30); these mosaics are more common in the West, the oldest being that in the chapel of St Venantius in St John Lateran (31). Also worthy of mention is the mosaic representing the Queen of Heaven enthroned in the centre of the apex on the cathedral of Parenzo in Istria (32).

Mention should also be made of the gilded glasses from the catacombs, and of sarcophagi (33).

- (30) As an example of mosaics from the East we can mention that in the Church of St Sophia in Constantinople representing the Holy Child standing in front of His Mother, whose face is youthful and characterised by a calm beauty. She is supported by St Paul and St John the Baptist on either hand. A mosaic in St Sophia at Salonica, representing the Ascension shows the Virgin among the Apostles: of all the figures She alone is nimbed and wears the conventional veil and purple dress. Cfr. Smith-Cheetham, l.c.
- (31) This work is due to Byzantine artists who worked in Rome during the pontificates of Pope John IV and Theodore (640-649). The upper portion of the mosaic shows a medallion bust of Christ supported by Angels; immediately below stands the figure of the Virgin with arms outstretched, as the central figure, with six apostles on each side. Earlier mosaics found in the West represent the B.V.M. in the Gospel scenes of the Annunciation, Presentation in the Temple, Nativity, Adoration of the Magi, Christ among the doctors (i.e. the mosaics of St Mary Major). Cfr. Schuster, l.c.; Smith-Cheetham, l.c.
- (32) The Virgin is throned and nimbed, supported by angels, and holding her Son in her lap, looking rather as a diminutive man than as a child. The mosaic is due to bishop Euphrasius, A.D. 535-543.
- (33) Full details about the various figures of the Virgin on gilded glasses, and sarcophagi may be found in Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., vol. X, 1982-2035; Kaufmann, *Archeologia Cristiana*, l.c.; Smith-Cheetham, l.c. As an example of gilded glasses we may mention one found in the catacomb of St Agnes, which represents the B.V.M. in the figure of an orante supported by the Apostles Peter and Paul. Among the sarcophagi, worthy of mention is that preserved in the Church of Sancta Eulgracia at Saragozza: it belongs to the 4th century and represents the Blessed Virgin supported by the Apostles Peter and Paul, while from above a hand takes hold of her right as if to take her up to heaven. The sculpture evidently depicts the Assumption as described in the apocryphal *Transitus Mariæ*. With regard to this sarcophagus, see Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., vol. I, 2990-2993.

What we have said till now is no clear evidence of any liturgical cultus of the B.V.M. : the only sure conclusion is that, from the earliest centuries, Christians had the utmost regard to Our Lady and held her in great honour.

We cannot say when it was that the first formularies in honour of the Blessed Mother of God found a place in the liturgy of the Church. But it is certain that this happened before the Council of Ephesus (431), for the antiphon *Sub tuum praesidium*, the oldest extant prayer to the Virgin, has been found in a Copt papyrus of the 3rd century (34) ; and the St Ephraem hymns in honour of Our Lady were most probably written not for private reading but for recitation during the liturgical services : their literary structure would otherwise be difficult to explain. As regards the prayer *Communicantes* of the Canon of the Mass (35), though some have held that originally it ran *Communicantes gloriosae Mariae Genitricis D.N.J.C.* and about 383, as a protest against Helvidius, the words *semper Virginis* were added, and the word *Dei* was inserted after the Council of Ephesus ; yet we have no certain proof that this prayer existed in the Roman canon before the 5th or 6th century. It is missing in the *Euchologion* of Bishop Serapion of Thumis (4th century) and in the eighth book of the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions (4th century) and in the *De Sacramentis* of St Ambrose (36), and it is only found in the oldest extant manuscripts of the Roman canon which at all events are not anterior to the sixth century.

The first hint we get of the celebration of a feast in honour of the Blessed Mother of God is in a sermon preached at Constantinople in 429 by Proclus in the presence of the patriarch Nestorius. The faithful had gathered to celebrate the praises of Our Lady—"The Virgin's festival (*partenike paneguris*) incites our tongue to-day to herald her praises"—especially the chastity of her who was "handmaid and mother, Virgin of heaven,

(34) Cfr. Mercenier, *La plus ancienne prière à la Vierge* in *Quest. lit. et paroiss.*, 1940, 33.

(35) Cfr. Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, vol. II, p. 240.

(36) Till a short while ago the authorship of the treatise was undisputed. The work seems to be a stenographic report of his preaching, which was not restricted by the laws of the *arcana*, in marked contrast to the *De Mysteriis*, Cfr. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, New York, 1950, p. 52, note 10.

he only bridge of God to man, the awful loom of the Incarnation, in which by some unspeakable way the garment of that union was woven, whereof the weaver is the Holy Ghost and the spinner the overshadowing from on high; the wool the ancient fleece of Adam; the woof the undefiled flesh from the Virgin; the weaver's shuttle the immense grace of Him who brought it about; the artificer the Word gliding through the hearing" (37). The preacher speaks especially of the mystery of the Annunciation, but the feast which was being celebrated was not that of the Annunciation, for it originated later. One must conclude that the celebration took place some day during Christmas week. In the fourth century it was the custom to commemorate all that had reference to the Incarnate Word during Christmas-tide. St John Chrysologus (+450) on the days preceding Christmas Day took as subjects for his sermons the history of St John the Baptist, and the Annunciation and Conception of Our Lady (38). St Basil, bishop of Seleucia, a few years later, preached another sermon in which he extols the praise of the Mother of God, making, however, no reference to any particular event in her life (39). Balai, a Syriac writer of the fifth century, in his hymns uses the most glowing language about the Virgin and speaks about a memorial feast of the Mother of the Lord (40). From the evidence we have, one must conclude that the first feast in honour of the B.V.M. was a commemoration of her virtues with special reference to her perpetual virginity, but with no special reference to any particular event in her life. This feast most probably originated in Antioch about 370 and was known as *Mneme tes agias Theotokou kai aeiparthenou Marias* (41) it was celebrated on the 26th or 27th December in some churches, while in others just before Christmas. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that even to-day Catholics of the Syriac rite still celebrate on the 26th or 27th December a feast *De Laudibus Deiparae* (42), and that a *Solemnitas Sacntae*

(37) *Laudatio in SS. Dei Genitricem Mariam*, PG 65, 678, 681.

(38) *Sermo CXL*, PL 52, 575 ss.

(39) *Orat. XXXIX*, PG 85, 425 ss.

(40) *Cfr. Catholic Enc.*, vol. 15, p. 461.

(41) This is A. Baumstark's conjecture. *Cfr. Cath. Enc.*, l.c.; Righetti, p. 241; *Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit.*, vol. X, 2036.

(42) *Cfr. Righetti*, l.c.

Mariae was celebrated after Epiphany in the Gallican Church in the sixth century, according to St Gregory of Tours (43).

Here a reference ought to be made to the famous *Acathistus* hymn which was sung on the Saturday of the fifth week of Lent on the occasion of a feast instituted in 626 to commemorate the relief of Constantinople from an attack by Persians and Scythians during the reign of Heraclius through the intercession of the Blessed Mother of God (44).

The first feast in honour of Our Lady commemorating a particular event in her life was, most probably, the feast of the Assumption (45). The origin of the feast is unknown but most probably it originated near the tomb of the Blessed Mother of God (45a) as a consequence of the pilgrimages the faithful made to the place: in fact, the greater part of the older feast-days originated in this manner, either near the tomb of the martyr or in the holy places of Palestine (46). From the *Liber Pontificalis* (47) we know that the Emperor Maurice (582-602) fixed the celebration of this feast for the whole Eastern Empire on the 15th August; in the West, at this time, the feast was celebrated in Gaul on the 18th January and in Rome and Spain on the

(43) De gloria martyrum, I, 4, PL 81, 710.

(44) More than a hymn, it is an Office in honour of the Mother of God which was to be recited standing, hence the name. The whole office was said on the Saturday of the 5th week of Lent, but portions of it were distributed over the first four Saturdays of Lent. When recited in its entirety, it was divided into four parts or stations, between which various psalms or canticles were sung sitting. Cfr. Cath. Enc., vol. I, p. 92.

(45) The feast has had various names; for a long time in liturgical books it was known as the *Dormitio* or *Pausatio* of the B.V.M. and these terms correspond to the Greek name of the feast—*Koimesis*. The same can be said of the terms *Depositio*, *Transitus*, *Natale* found in martyrologies and calendars. The Greeks also use sometimes, *Metastasis* or *Analepsis*, which correspond to our *Assumptio*, which term has for a long time definitely been used to indicate exactly the nature of the feast. Cfr. Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., vol. I, 2996-2997.

(45a) With regard to the tomb of the B.V.M., there are two traditions, one for Ephesus and the other for Jerusalem: the latter is more probable. Cfr. D.A.C.L., vol. I, 2995-2996.

(46) Cfr. Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit., l.c.; Righetti, p. 242.

(47) II, 508.

15th August (48); later on, the feast was in the West universally observed on the 15th August. We can say with certainty that in both East and West the feast in the sixth century had been already celebrated solemnly for a long time, and therefore we must date its origin at least to the fifth century (49). Tillemont (50) thinks that the feast of the B.V.M., for which there was a great concourse of people, mentioned in the life of S^c

- (48) St Gregory of Tours, in *De glor. mart.* I, 9, PL 81, 713, says: "Huius festivitas sacra mediante mense undecimo celebratur" (the 11th month was January, as the Gallicans commenced their year in March). Morin thinks that it was not the feast of the Assumption, but only a commemoration of the Divine Maternity of the B.V.M. It seems that the feast was derived from the Syrian feast of the 25th January, mentioned in the *Transitus Mariæ* which the Copts celebrated on the 21st, through gallic-copt monasteries founded by Cassianus at Tours. The Bobbio Sacramentary (7th century) has two Masses in honour of the Virgin in January, one *in S. Mariæ solemnitate* celebrating the Maternity of the B.V.M., and the other *in adsumptione S. Mariæ* celebrating the corporal assumption of Our Lady according to the accounts of the Apocrypha (the gospel of this Mass is that we used before the new Mass of the Assumption was introduced). The Gothic-gallican missal has only the second Mass. But one must mention a Gallican inscription of 676 which mentions the feast of the Assumption as being held on the 15th August.

As regards Rome, the Gelasian Sacramentary has a Mass on the 15th August *in adsumptione sanctæ Mariæ*: the title is undoubtedly Gallican in origin, but the Mass formulas have no reference at all to the Assumption. A century later it became the feast of the *Dormitio* or the *Natale Sanctæ Mariæ*, as the old Roman lectionary of Warzburg reads, and the resurrection of the B.M.V. (c'r. the prayer before the procession: *festivitas... in qua sancta Dei Genitrix mortem subiit temporalem nec tamen nexibus mortis deprimi potuit*).

In Spain, though the Assumption is found represented in a sarcophagus of the 4th cent. (see note 33), there certainly was no liturgical celebration at that time: no mention of such commemoration is found in the *Peregrinatio Etheriæ* which belongs to the 4th century. The first testimonies of the celebration of the feast are found in St Isidore (†636) and more clearly in St Heldephonus (†667). In Spain the feast was derived from the East in the seventh century, as it was from the beginning celebrated on the 15th August. Cfr. *Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit.*, vol. I, 2998-2999; Righetti, pp. 250-252

- (49) *Dict. Arch. Chr. Lit.*, vol. I, 2999.

- (50) *Memoires*, tom. I, p. 476; also Baumer, *Hist. du Breviare*, trad. Biron, v. I, p. 367.

Theodore (+529), who lived near Jerusalem, was actually the feast of the Assumption. A hymn of James, bishop of Sarug (523), hints that on the 15th August the Church in Syria commemorated the death of the Blessed Mother of God (51). The apocryphal *Transitus Mariæ* (52) speaks of three feasts of Our Lady one of which was celebrated on the 13th or 15th day of Ab (roughly August). After the sixth century, though there were still some doubts as regards the fact of her bodily assumption (53), the feast continued to increase in solemnity and soon became the principal feast of the B.V.M. (54).

(51) Cfr. Righetti, p. 249.

(52) Attributed to St John the Evangelist or to Melito bishop of Sardis (2nd cent.), it was written towards the end of the 4th century with the object, it seems, of counteracting a heretical composition of the same title and subject. A *Transitus Mariæ* is mentioned among the apocrypha prohibited by the Gelasian Decretum, but it is problematic whether this is to be identified with our recast *Transitus* or not. The work was very popular, as the various versions which reached us testify. The book certainly influenced the homilies of the later Fathers, but we cannot conclude that the institution of the feast of the Assumption is due to an apocryphal writing. The *Transitus Mariæ* is on the other hand, a witness to the belief of the Church in the 4th century—a belief which is also attested to by the sarcophagus of Saragozza (see note 33), which seems to have been made before the *Transitus* itself was written. Cfr. D.A.C.L., vol. I, 2993.

In the Syrian version of the *Transitus*, we find mention of three feasts of Our Lady, one on the 25th January (*de seminibus*), another on the 15th of Iyar (May) (*ad aristas*), and a third on the 13th or 15th of Ab (August) (*pro vitibus*). Cfr. Cath. Enc., vol. 15, p. 461; Righetti, p. 248.

(53) In a letter *ad Paulam* falsely attributed to St Jerome, probably belonging to the 8th century, we read: "multi dubitant utrum assumpta fuerit simul cum corpore an abierit relicto corpore..." and this is said "ne forte si venerit in manus vestras illud apocryphum de transitu eiusdem virginis dubia pro certa recipiatis". (Ep. ad Paulam, 2, PL 30, 126). Cfr. D.A.C.L., vol. I, 3000; Righetti, 250-251.

(54) Pope Sergius (687-701) instituted a procession on the day of the Assumption. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*: "Constituit ut diebus adnuntiationis domini, dormitionis et nativitatis sanctae Dei genitricis semperque virginis Mariæ ac sancti Symeonis quod Ypapanti greci appellant, letania exeat a sancto Adriano et ad sanctam Mariam populus occurrat". In the eighth century it was one of the very few feasts with a double night vigil; in 847 Leo IV added an octave to the feast, and in 863 Pope Nicholas I, in his Instructions to the Bulgars, classes it as equal to Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. Cfr. Righetti, l.c.

The feast of the Nativity of the B.V.M. most probably began to be celebrated soon after that of the Assumption; the earliest document commemorating the fest belongs to the sixth century and it is a hymn commemorating the event as told in the apocryphal Gospel of St James (55). In the West, it was not celebrated before the seventh century, though at this time the birth of St John the Baptist was already commemorated (56). The first reference to the feast at Rome is in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which attests that Pope Sergius I (687-701) instituted a litany on the feast (57).

At this point a reference to the feast of the Immaculate Conception would not be out of place. Though the "Protoevangelium" of St. James hints at the immaculate birth of Our Lady, the feast of the Conception itself only originated in the 8th century in Palestinian Monasteries (58), the date being fixed on the 9th December, most probably in relation to the date of the birth of the Virgin—8th September (59). The oldest genuine document which speaks of this feast is the canon or hymn for the feast composed by Andrew of Crete († c. 720) (60); it was a

-
- (55) The hymn belongs to St Romanus, a great ecclesiastical lyricist of the Greek church, who was a native of Emessa in Syria, deacon of Berytus and later on at the Blachernes Church at Constantinople. He wrote his hymns between 536-556.
- (56) The fact that the Nativity of St John the Baptist was celebrated in the Roman church before that of the Virgin is easily explained, as the account of the Nativity of the Baptist is known from the Gospels, while that of the Virgin is only told in apocryphal writings. Mention of the feast of the Nativity in the West is found in the calendar of Sonnatius, bishop of Rheims (†631), and in nearly all lectionaries and calendars of the Carolingian times. Cfr. Cath. Enc., vol. 10, p. 712-713; Righetti, p. 263, 264.
- (57) See note 54.
- (58) The feast of the Conception of Our Lady may have arisen from an analogy with the Feast of St John's conception, which in the East is still celebrated on the 23rd September and dates from the 5th century. Cfr. Cath. Enc., vol. VII, p. 676.
- (59) Evidence is lacking to show why the 8th September was chosen for the commemoration of the Nativity of the B.V.M.: perhaps considering that with the birth of Mary the work of our Redemption began, it was thought convenient to celebrate the mystery at the beginning of the ecclesiastical year which, according to the *Menologium Basilianum*, began in September. Cfr. Righetti, p. 263.
- (60) He wrote liturgical hymns in the second half of the seventh century when a monk at the monastery of St Sabas near Jerusalem; later on he was archbishop of Crete. Cfr. Cath. Enc., l.c.

minor feast, in relation to the great feasts of the Nativity, Annunciation, and Assumption, and in the eighth century it was not universally celebrated in the East (61). We may note here that this Eastern feast did not actually celebrate the Immaculate Conception of Mary but the miracle narrated in the apocryphals: in fact, the feast was known to the Greeks as the Conception of St Anne the Ancestress of God (62). In the West, the first references to such a feast are from Ireland (63), but this Irish feast stands alone and outside the line of liturgical development. We must trace the development of the feast in the West from pre-Norman England (64), where it was celebrated

-
- (61) John, first monk and later bishop in the isle of Euboea about 750, in a sermon, speaking in favour of the propagation of this feast, says that it was not yet known to all the faithful. (PG 98, 1499). It was extended to the whole Eastern empire by Leo VI the Philosopher (+903). Cfr. Cath. Enc., l.c.
- (62) In celebrating the feast of Mary's conception the Greeks of old did not consider the theological distinction of the active and passive conceptions, though v.g. John of Euboea speaks also of it as an object of the celebration. "On this day, he says, is the conception of Mary the holy Mother of God whom Christ the Son of God has built Himself with the pleasure of the Father and the cooperation of the life-giving spirit" (PG 96, 1500 quoted by Righetti, p. 256, n. 105). Their object in celebrating the feast was less the purity of the conception than the holiness and heavenly mission of the person conceived; the miraculous events which preceded Mary's conception as told in the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*, may have been the reason for the celebration: even to-day the lesson of the Matins for the feast of the Conception in the Greek Church contains allusions to this apocryphal. Cfr. Cath. Enc., vol. VII, pp. 676-677.
- (63) The first traces are found in the martyrology of Tallaght, composed about 790, and in the *Feilire* or Calendar of St Aengus (c. 825), and it is called the *Inceptio* or *Conceptio Mariae Virginis* or "the great feast of the Virgin Mary". It was celebrated on the 3rd May, according to Thurston, through copt-alexandrine influence. Cfr. Righetti, p. 256; Cath. Enc., l.c.
- (64) The evidence is found in a calendar of Old Minster, Winchester: (*Conceptio S'ce Dei Genitricis Mariae*) dating from about 1300; a calendar of New Minster, Winchester, written between 1035 and 1059; a pontifical of Exeter of the 11th cent., which has a *Benedictio in Conceptione Sanctae Mariae*; and a Canterbury pontifical of the first half of the eleventh century, which has a similar benediction. Cfr. Cath. Enc., l.c.

with considerable solemnity. Partly smothered after the Norman Conquest, later it was extended to the continent, but the attempts to introduce it officially provoked contradiction and theological discussion bearing on its legitimacy and its meaning—discussions which continued for centuries and were definitely settled only in 1854. But the account of this is outside the scope of the present article.

The first certain references to the celebration of the feast of the Annunciation belong to the seventh century; these are the *Chronicon paschale* of Alexandria for the year 624 (65), a decree of the Council of Trullo (629) (66), the canons of the Council of Toledo held in 656 (67), the reference to the litany instituted by Pope Sergius already mentioned, and the seventh century manuscript of the Gelasian Sacramentary. The testimony of earlier centuries is uncertain (68).

(65) PG 92, 488.

(66) The Council proclaimed that the feast of the Annunciation could be celebrated in Lent and that on that day as on Saturdays and Sundays the Sacrifice of the Mass would be celebrated, while on all other days the Mass of the Presanctified was to be celebrated. D.A.C.L., vol. 1, 2244; Mansi, Concil. XI, 968.

(67) The Council notes that the feast is celebrated "per diversas mundi partes... et spatio remotis et terris", and decrees that as it was difficult to celebrate the feast on the 25th March on account of Lent, following the example of other churches, the feast should be transferred to the 18th December. Later on, the Roman Church on the 18th December celebrated the feast of the *Expectatio Partus* which is nothing more than a reduplication of the feast of the Annunciation. Cfr. D.A.C.L., vol. I, 2243-2244; Righetti, p. 263-264; Mansi, Concil., XI, 32-34.

(68) The three sermons of St Gregory the Wonder-worker (3rd cent.), a sermon of St Athanasius, another of St Peter Chrysologus, and two homilies of Athanasius of Sinai are not considered authentic. From the sermons of St Leo the Great we cannot infer at all that the mystery of the Annunciation was commemorated by a special feast. The council of Laodicea (4th cent.) prohibits the commemoration of martyrs in Lent and makes no mention of the Annunciation. But the *Peregrinatio Etheriae* says that on the 40th day after Easter—*die quadragesimarum post Pascha*—all went to Bethlehem to celebrate the vigil and Mass in the Grotto of the Nativity. This means that on that day there was no memory of the Ascension, which according to the *Peregrinatio* was celebrated on the same day as Pentecost, and no celebration in the church of the Imbomon (the place from where Christ ascended into heaven). Cabrol conjectures that *Etheria* is referring to a celebration of the

We have purposely omitted all mention of the feast of the Purification, because originally it was a feast of Our Lord (69) : it is only in the seventh century that the feast in the West takes on a Marian character (70). As a feast of Our Lord, it certainly dates from the 4th century in Jerusalem, as a clear reference to a commemoration of the Presentation of Our Lord in the Temple is found in the *Peregrinatio Etheriae* (395), but it became universal in the East only at the time of Justinian (71).

We can, therefore, confidently affirm that by the 7th century the position of the B.V.M. in the liturgical formulae of the Church was firmly established.

J. LUPI.

feast of the Annunciation. In the 4th century there was certainly at Nazareth a Basilica of the Annunciation, as excavations have clearly proved, and this very probably brought about a celebration of the mystery: we have already mentioned that the various holy places have had a great influence in the establishment of the various feasts of the ancient church calendar. Cfr. D.A.C.L., vol. I, 2243-2247.

- (69) Its original name still kept in the Greek Church was *Ypapante* or *Ypante* rendered in Latin as *occursus* or *obviatio* and meaning the meeting of Our Lord with Simeon and Anna in the Temple. The Gelasian Sacramentary has the three prayers of the Mass, entitled in *Purificatione S. Mariae*, but all three prayers refer to the presentation of Jesus in the Temple. Even the invitorium, antiphons, and responsories of the present-day Office remind us that it was originally a Feast of Our Lord. Cfr. Righetti, pp. 83-87.
- (70) The Marian character may have been partially imposed on the feast by Pope Sergius. The *Liber Pontificalis* is not exact in saying that this Pope instituted a letania for the feast of the *Ypapante*, as this procession already existed though we cannot say when it was first instituted; probably what Sergius did was to extend the procession of the *Ypapante* also to the three great feasts of the Virgin: this procession ended at St Mary Major's. Cfr. Righetti, l.c.
- (71) The *Peregrinatio Etheriae* speaks of the feast as the *Quadragesima de Epiphania*: it was celebrated "valde cum summo honore... nam ea die processio est in Anastase et omnes procedunt et ordine aguntur omnia cum summa laetitia ac si per Pascha". In the sixth century it was celebrated in Palestine and at Constantinople, as the monophysite patriarch of Antioch (†518) testifies. According to Niceforus (Hist. Eccl., VII, 28) it was Justin who decreed the celebration of the feast in the whole Eastern empire in 527; while Theophanes attributes this to Justinian in 542 as a thanksgiving after a pestilence: probably Justin introduced the feast and Justinian rendered it more solemn. Cfr. Righetti, l.c.

The Dark Night of the Ascent of Mount Carmel (1)

"O night that led'st me thus!
O night more winsome than the rising sun!
O night that madest us,
Lover and lov'd, as one,
Lover transform'd in lov'd, love's journey done!"
(St. John of the Cross) (2)

ST JOHN OF THE CROSS (1542-1591) is well known for his ascetic and mystic masterpieces. He is the Mystic Doctor *par excellence* of the Catholic Church. He not only wrote and spoke of mysticism, but he had himself lived a fully mystical life: he is an experienced mystic. As a mystical lover, St John of the Cross sang the loves of the mystical soul. He is the Saint, the Doctor, and the Poet of Christian Mysticism.

His major works are four: *Subida del Monte Carmelo* (Ascent of Mount Carmel); *Noche Oscura* (Dark Night); *Cantico Espiritual* (Spiritual Canticle); *Llama de Amor Viva* (Living Flame of Love). The first two works — *Ascent of Mount Carmel* and *Dark Night*—form the object and the main sources of the present article.

These two treatises, known as the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* and the *Dark Night*, are but one complete work. Traditionally, both treatises are published separately, though in reality the *Dark Night* is a continuation of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*. As a matter of fact, the Author himself, in his *Living Flame of Love*, refers to the *Dark Night* as pertaining to the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*, in the famous passage where he declares that in this work of his—*Living Flame of Love*—he does not intend to treat about certain questions concerning the passive night:

-
- (1) Quotations from the Works of St John of the Cross are taken from "*The Complete Works of Saint John of the Cross Doctor of the Church, translated and edited by E. Allison Peers from the critical edition of P. Silverio de Santa Teresa, O.C.D.*"—New Edition, revised 1953, London, Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd.
 - (2) *En una noche oscura*, stanza 5—Vol. II, p. 417, stanza 5.

“—we have treated this in the *Dark Night of the Ascent of Mount Carmel*” (3).

The plan traced out by St John of the Cross himself in the Argument of the Ascent is not in reality completed. “All the doctrine whereof I intend to treat in this *Ascent of Mount Carmel* is included in the following stanzas, and in them is also described the manner of ascending to the summit of the Mount, which is the high estate of perfection which we here call union of the soul with God” (4). In both treatises, St John of the Cross commented only on two stanzas; the third stanza is begun in Chapter XXV, Book II of the *Dark Night*. Apart from this third stanza, the number of stanzas left without comment is six. Nevertheless, this composite work presents a remarkable outline of Christian Perfection from the point at which the soul first seeks to rise from earth and soar upward towards union with God. St John of the Cross omits detailed description of the most elementary of the exercises incumbent upon all Christians, because he assumes his reader to be familiar with the elements of the spiritual life.

In many passages, St John of the Cross shows that in this work he intends to treat about that which we may call the *way to union*, or, the purification which is necessary to attain to the “*high estate of perfection which we here call union of the soul with God*”; and from the very prologue of his work, he presents this *way to union* under the figure of a *dark night*. And not only the whole journey of the soul to union is called a “*dark night*” by the Spanish Carmelite Mystic, but each part of this journey is also called “*night*”. “For a soul to attain to the state of perfection, it has ordinarily first to pass through two principal kinds of night, which spiritual persons call purgations or purifications of the soul; and here we call them nights.....” (5). “The first night or purgation is that of the sensual part of the soul, which is treated in the present stanza, and will be treated in the first part of this book. And the second is of the spiritual part; of this speaks the second stanza, which follows; and of this we shall treat likewise, in the second and third part, with

(3) *Living Flame of Love (Second Redaction)*, Stanza I, n. 25—Vol. III, p. 118, n. 25.

(4) *Ascent, Argument*—Vol. I, p. 9.

(5) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. I, n. 1—Vol. I, p. 17, n. 1.

respect to the activity of the soul; and on the fourth part, with respect to its passivity" (6).

The general division of this composite work—the *Dark Night of the Ascent of Mount Carmel*—according to the latter passage, is as follows :

Active Night of the Senses	Book I, <i>Ascent</i>
Active Night of the Spirit	Books II & III, <i>Ascent</i>
Passive Night	Books I & II, <i>Dark Night</i> .

In this composite work—the *Dark Night of the Ascent of Mount Carmel*—the Carmelite Mystic teaches the way the soul must travel in order to attain to the high estate of perfection, which he calls union of the Soul with God; and this journey of the soul to union is presented under the figure of a "dark night". Why does St John of the Cross call the journey of the soul to union with God a *dark night*? This question is the subject-matter of the present article, and, therefore, our work will consist in finding the resemblance which the Carmelite Mystic has seen between the natural dark night and the way to union with God, which is the high estate of Christian Perfection.

THE DARK NIGHT

The "dark night" is the journey made by the soul to union with God, because the soul "journeys, as it were, by night, in darkness" (7).

The Carmelite Mystic explains :

"We may say that there are three reasons for which this journey made by the soul to union with God is called night. The first has to do with the point from which the soul goes forth, for it has gradually to deprive itself of desire of all the worldly things which it possessed, by denying them to itself; which denial and deprivation are, as it were, night to all senses of man. The second reason has to do with the mean, or the road along which the soul must travel to this union—that is, faith, which is likewise as dark as night to the understanding. The third has to do with the point to which it travels—namely, God, Who, actually, is dark night to the soul in this life" (8).

The way to Christian Perfection, therefore, is mortification of desires, to walk in faith, or, according to faith (*en fe* or *segun*

(6) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. I, n. 2—Vol. I, p. 18, n. 2.

(7) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. I, n. 1—Vol. I, p. 17, n. 1.

(8) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. II, n. 1—Vol. I, p. 19, n. 1.

la fe), and communication of God. The denial of worldly desires is, as it were, night to all senses of man; faith is as dark as night to the understanding; communication of God is dark night to the soul in this life.

THE DARK NIGHT OF THE SENSES

In the following passage the Carmelite Mystic explains the nature of this mortification: "We are not treating here of the lack of things, since it implies no detachment from them of taste and desire, for it is this that leaves the soul free and void of them, although it may have them; for it is not the things of this world that either occupy the soul or cause it harm, since they enter it not, but rather the will and desire for them, for it is these that dwell within" (9).

The Saint goes on to declare these desires: this mortification implies *all voluntary* desires, which are *contrary* or *less agreeable* to the will of God (10). According to the Carmelite doctrine, the soul must be *totally* detached from worldly things in order to attain to the "high estate of perfection", which is the union of the soul with God. It is not "the lack of worldly things" that is necessary, but the total detachment from them. The soul must be free not only from those desires which may constitute a venial or mortal sin, but also from those which may constitute an imperfection (11).

Therefore, the cause of this night of the sensual part is that of the privation of the desires in *all* worldly things.

The mortification of all voluntary desires, which are contrary or less agreeable to the will of God, may be called night for the soul, "for, even as night is naught but the privation of light, and, consequently, of all objects that can be seen by means of light, whereby the visual faculty remains unoccupied and in darkness, even so likewise the mortification of desires may be called night for the soul. For, when the soul is deprived of the pleasure of its desire in all things, it remains, as it were, unoccupied and in darkness" (12).

This total deprivation or mortification is a necessity: an inescapable consequence of the true love of God. The union to-

(9) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. III, n. 4—Vol. I, p. 23, n. 4.

(10) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chaps. XI & XII—Vol. I pp. 48-56.

(11) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. XI, n. 2—Vol. I, p. 49, n. 2.

(12) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. III, n. 1—Vol. I, p. 21, n. 1.

wards which the Carmelite Mystic is directing the soul is one of perfect love, wherein the will of man must be one with God's. The soul must mortify all its desires of worldly things, because such desires constitute an impediment to the total development of the love of God and the total conformity of the human will to that of God (13).

"Charity causes emptiness in the will with respect to all things, since it obliges us to love God above them all; which cannot be unless we withdraw our attention from them all in order to set it wholly in God" (14).

Therefore, the first reason why the journey which the soul has to make to union with God may be called night is that the soul must love God truly, which love necessarily implies the mortification or denial of all affections which are not according to God, which privation is for the soul as the privation of light—*night*—is for the visual faculty.

FAITH

That the soul may attain to union with God, it must abide "alone in faith to the exclusion; not of charity, but of other knowledge acquired by the understanding" (15). Faith, the soul's star on its journey to union with God, does not exclude charity. Were it otherwise, it would destroy the first reason why the journey to union may be called night.

What kind of faith is this, according to which or in which (*segun la fe* or *en fe*) the soul journeys to union with God? As one may see from the context, according to the Carmelite doctrine, this faith is not only the theological virtue of faith, but it denotes the standard according to which the soul must proceed in the mortification of all desires.

As a matter of fact, when the Carmelite Mystic explains in what manner joy of the will is lawful in moral good (e.g. virtues), he writes: ".....humanly speaking, for their own sakes, a man may well rejoice in the possession of them, and may practise them for that which they are in themselves, and for the blessing which they bring to man in human and temporal form" (16). But since the Christian has the light of faith, where-

(13) Cf. *Ascent*, Bk I, Chaps. IV, VI & IX—Vol. I, pp. 23-28, 33-36, & 48-53.

(14) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. IV, n. 4—Vol. I, p. 81, n. 4.

(15) *Ascent*, Bk I, Chap. II, n. 3—Vol. I, p. 20, n. 3.

(16) *Ascent*, Bk III, Chap. XXVII, n. 3—Vol. I, p. 273, n. 3.

in he hopes for eternal life, without which nothing that belongs to this life and the next will be of any value to him, he must rejoice principally and solely in the possession and employment of this moral good after the second manner—namely, in that by doing these works for the love of God he will gain eternal life” (17).

Therefore, to journey in faith, or according to faith (*caminar en fe* or *segun la fe*), not only comprises the realisation of theological faith, strictly speaking, and of its higher exercise, which is infused contemplation, but also all the other virtues, as supernatural prudence and discretion and the submission to the Church’s Authority.

THE DARK NIGHT OF FAITH

In Chapter III, Book II, of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*, St John of the Cross shows “how faith is dark night to the soul. This is proved with arguments and quotations and figures from Scripture” (18). By the nature of his arguments, the Carmelite Mystic shows clearly that faith is here taken in its strict sense, that is, in the sense of theological faith.

The Carmelite Mystic explains :

“Faith, say the theologians, is a habit of the soul, certain and obscure. And the reason for its being an obscure habit is that it makes us believe truths revealed by God Himself, which transcend all natural light, and exceed all human understanding, beyond all proportion. Hence it follows that, for the soul, this excessive light of faith which is given to it is thick darkness, for it overwhelms greater things and does away with smaller things, even as the light of the sun overwhelms all other lights whatsoever, so that when it shines and disables our visual faculty they appear not to be lights at all. So that it blinds it and deprives it of the sight that has been given to it, inasmuch as its light is great beyond all proportion and transcends the faculty of vision. Even so the light of faith, by its excessive greatness, oppresses and disables that of the understanding; for the latter, of its own power, extends only to natural knowledge, although it has a faculty (19) for the supernatural, whenever Our Lord is

(17) *Ascent*, Bk III, Chap. XXVII, n. 4—Vol. I, p. 274, n. 4.

(18) Vol. I, p. 219.

(19) Here St John of the Cross refers to what the Schoolmen call “*Potentia Obedientialis*”

pleased to give it supernatural activity" (20). "Wherefore a man can know nothing by himself, save after a natural manner, which is only that which he attains by means of the senses. For this cause he must have the phantasms and the forms of the object present in themselves and in their likenesses; otherwise it cannot be, for, as philosophers say: *Ab objecto et potentia paritur notitia*. This is: From the object that is present and from the faculty, knowledge is born in the soul. Wherefore, if one should speak to a man of things which he has never been able to understand, and whose likeness he has never seen, he would have no more illumination from them whatever than if naught had been said of them to him" (21). "Even so is faith with respect to the soul; it tells us of things which we have never seen or understood, nor have we seen or understood aught that resembles them, since there is naught that resembles them at all. And thus we have no light of natural knowledge concerning them, since that which we are told of them bears no relation to any sense of ours; we know it by ear alone, believing that which we are taught, bringing our natural light into subjection and treating it as if it were not" (22).

Faith is necessary in order that we may believe in supernatural mysteries, which God is pleased to reveal to us. With the aid of faith we come to know that our natural concepts do understand somehow analogically ("*analogice*") supernatural mysteries. But, without faith, we do not know of that resemblance—analogy; we do not know anything about these mysteries. Moreover, through faith this resemblance remains *inevident* for us; nevertheless, we accept this resemblance on the authority of God, Who reveals it to us. Therefore, our natural light remains obscured, blinded by the light of faith which uplifts us towards the region of *inevidence*.

To believe, or to journey in faith or according to faith, according to the doctrine of the Carmelite Mystic, means "to blind our natural light"—(*cegando nuestra luz natural*) (23). And this is the reason given by St John of the Cross why to journey in faith, or according to faith, is "*as if it were, by night, in darkness*". Night is "*privacion de luz*"—privation of light;

(20) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. III, n. 1—Vol. 1, p. 67, n. 1.

(21) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. III, n. 2—Vol. I, p. 67, n. 2.

(22) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. III, n. 3—Vol. I, p. 68, n. 3.

(23) Cf. Vol. I, p. 68, Note 3.

and faith is "privation of the natural light of the understanding"; hence, St John of the Cross teaches that faith is *dark night* to the soul.

"Faith, which is as a black and dark cloud to the soul (and likewise is night, since in the presence of faith the soul is deprived of its natural light and is blinded), can with its darkness give light and illumination to the darkness of the soul" (24).

Faith, therefore, the soul's star on its journey to union with God, is looked upon by the Carmelite Mystic from a double point of view: faith causes darkness—it blinds the natural light of understanding; but this darkness also illumines, that is, gives knowledge. "The knowledge that is of faith is acquired without the illumination of the understanding, which is rejected for faith; and its own light, if that light be not darkened, is lost" (25). Faith, therefore, has a double aspect: positive and negative. Faith is something positive, that is, it gives something: it illumines the soul (infused contemplation). Faith is something negative, that is, it denies something: it blinds the natural light of human understanding. In the Carmelite teaching, the negative aspect is a necessary consequence of the positive aspect of theological faith. In Chapter III, Book II of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* (26), the Carmelite Mystic insists on the negative aspect of faith, because his intention here is to show how faith is dark night to the soul. But, in Chapter IX, Book II of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* (27) and in many other passages in his works, he speaks of the positive aspect of faith.

In the way of faith, or according to faith, (according to the Carmelite Mystical School, whose heads are our Holy Mother St Teresa of Jesus and our Holy Father St John of the Cross, the great and successful Reformers of Carmel) there is no standstill: the soul must go always forward and onward in perfection; because there comes a stage in the spiritual life where the soul has to leave the remote means to take up the proximate means for union with God. This proximate means is a higher or superior exercise of faith—exercise, which in the beginning is a little imperfect (*contemplatio infusa initialis* or *contempla-*

(24) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. III, n. 5—Vol. I, p. 69, n. 5.

(25) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. III, n. 5—Vol. I, p. 69, n. 5.

(26) Vol. I, pp. 67-70.

(27) Vol. I, pp. 93-95.

via acquisita) (28), but, once the soul enters into it, it makes progress along the way to union with God: it reaches its zenith on the summit of the spiritual Mount of Carmel, which is, union with God. This higher exercise of faith is “*mystical contemplation*” or “*infused contemplation*”, which often is simply called *fe*—faith—by the Carmelite Mystic: “After some manner, *this dark and loving knowledge which is faith*, serves as a means to Divine union in this life; in the next life, the light of glory serves as an intermediary to the clear vision of God” (29).

The exercise of the theological virtue of faith, and especially, its higher exercise, which is infused contemplation, may be called night, because both imply necessarily the denial of any distinct forms of knowledge, which the natural understanding may acquire. Furthermore, the Carmelite Mystic distinguishes these distinct forms of knowledge, and, accordingly, shows how necessary it is for the soul to deny them to itself in order to attain to the high estate of perfection, which is union of the soul with God.

GOD IS DARK NIGHT

God is *dark night* to the soul, according to the teachings of St John of the Cross, inasmuch as He communicates Himself to—unites Himself with—the soul, which journeys to union with Him. In the teaching of the Carmelite Mystic, this communication of God is communication of knowledge and love of God to the soul. This same communication of God to the soul may be received by the soul *with delight and fruition*—the end, or *with affliction and torment*—the means, according to the stage and period of the journey—the spiritual life. It is clear that not delight and fruition cause night, but affliction and torment.

(28) The Carmelite (Discalced) Mystical Theologians speak of an “acquired contemplation” or “initial contemplation”. In the Carmelite sense, this kind of contemplation is *also* infused: God instils it into the soul. It forms the very first stage of mystical contemplation. Cf. for further information the work in the series “*Spiritualità Carmelitana* of P. Gabriele di S. M. Maddalena O.D.C.: “*La Contemplazione Acquisita*”.

(29) *Ascent*, Bk II, Chap. XXIV, n. 4—Vol. 1, p. 117, n. 4.

The Carmelite Mystic teaches that faith gives us and communicates to us God Himself, which means that faith makes us understand God as He is in Himself, yet, inevidently (30).

The communication of God to the soul in the passive night of the spirit is the "infused contemplation" (31). Infused contemplation is "Divine love and knowledge in one—that is, a loving knowledge, wherein the soul has not to use its natural acts and reasonings, for it can no longer enter into them as before" (32). Infused contemplation, in the doctrine of St John of the Cross, is a higher or superior exercise of theological faith. Hence, as faith is "dark night" to the soul, it follows that infused contemplation would be "dark night" to the soul as well.

"This dark night is an inflowing of God into the soul, which purges it from its ignorances and imperfections, habitual, natural, and spiritual, and which is called by contemplatives infused contemplation, or mystical theology. Herein God secretly teaches the soul and instructs it in perfection of love, without its doing anything, or understanding of what manner is this infused contemplation. Inasmuch as it is the loving wisdom of God, God produces striking effects in the soul, for, by purging and illuminating it, He prepares it for the union of love with God. Wherefore the same loving Wisdom that purges the blessed spirits and enlightens them is that which here purges the soul and illumines it" (33).

Therefore, "infused contemplation", or "mystical theology", shows the soul its miseries and imperfections, and, at the same time, purges the soul of them; it illumines and purges.

"For two reasons this Divine Wisdom is not only night and darkness for the soul, but is likewise affliction and torment. The first is because of the height of Divine Wisdom, which transcends the talent of the soul, and in this way is darkness to it; the second, because of its vileness and impurity, in which respect it is painful and afflictive to it, and is also dark" (34). In the light of this spiritual communication, or "infused contem-

(30) *Spiritual Canticle (Second Redaction)*, Stanza XII, especially n. 4—Vol. II, pp. 235-240, especially p. 236, n. 4.

(31) *Dark Night*, Bk II, Chap. XXIII—Vol. I, pp. 447-453.

(32) *Living Flame of Love (Second Redaction)*, Stanza III, n. 32—Vol. III, p. 160, n. 32.

(33) *Dark Night*, Bk II, Chap. V, n. I Vol. I, p. 381, n. 1.

(34) *Dark Night*, Bk II, Chap. V, n. 2—Vol. I, p. 381, n. 2.

plation", the soul comes to know that it is not serving God so perfectly as it should do" (35).

Therefore, among its afflictions and torments, the soul learns how to serve God perfectly: through "infused contemplation" of the passive night of the spirit, the soul gains knowledge of God and comes to know the standard according to which it has to serve Him to perfection.

In the beginning of the passive night of the spirit, this dark knowledge, which is "infused contemplation", causes in the soul a great and strong love of estimation (*amor aestimativus*) for God. This same love of estimation emboldens the soul to love and serve God in the best way possible to it (36). Finally, when the purification comes to its end, the soul enters to partake in the mystical banquet, that is, it attains to union with God; and, victorious in all its spiritual battles, it rests, lost in oblivion, reclined on the Beloved: all is cleared now, and the soul abandons itself to God completely, leaving all its cares forgotten among the lilies (37).

"Infused contemplation", or "communication of God", or "mystical theology", is "dark night" for the soul, because it deprives and purges the soul of all its miseries and ignorances, which God makes it understand under the mystical light of "infused contemplation". "Infused contemplation", therefore, leaves the soul unoccupied and in darkness; and it leads the soul through a "dark night", because here the soul journeys also 'as it were, by night, in darkness'.

CONCLUSION

In the works "*Ascent of Mount Carmel*" and "*Dark Night*", which are but one complete work, St John of the Cross outlines the way to the high estate of perfection, which he calls union of the soul with God.

St John of the Cross presents this way to union under the figure of a "dark night". The Saint compares the journey to union with a "dark night". The mean, adopted by the Carmelite Mystic in his comparison, is *privation*: the "dark night" is a

(35) *Dark Night*, Bk II, Chap. VI—Vol. I, pp. 384-387.

(36) *Dark Night*, Bk. II, Chap. XIII, nn. 5-8; Chap. XVI, n. 14.

(37) Cf. last stanza of the poem "*En una noche oscura*"—Vol. I, p. 10, Stanza 8; and, Vol. II, p. 418, Stanza 8.

figure (38) of the way to union inasmuch as the said dark night is *privation of light*. The journey of the soul to union with God may be looked upon from a double point of view: the positive point and the negative. The "dark night" presents the journey of the soul to union with God directly under the negative aspect.

Therefore, the way to union may be called "night", "for, even as night is naught but the privation of light, and consequently, of all objects that can be seen by means of light, whereby the visual faculty remains unoccupied and in darkness" (39), even so likewise the way to union with God is naught but the *privation of all things* contrary or less agreeable to the love of God, which is mortification of all desires of worldly things, and privation of all that is contrary or less agreeable to the "way of faith", for which privation the soul remains, as it were, "unoccupied and in darkness".

That the soul, therefore, may attain to the summit of the Spiritual Mount of Carmel, union with God, it must journey in faith and love of God, which is the positive aspect of the way to Christian Perfection—the summit of Mount Carmel.

J. G. GRECH, O.D.C.

— 00 —

(38) Some writers have made attempts to declare which kind of figure of speech is the "Dark Night" of St John of the Cross.

(39) *Ascent*, Bk. I, Chap. III, n. 1—Vol. I, p. 21, n. 1.

Un Maltese Venerato Nella Sicilia *

L Signore aveva fatto dono a P. Santo Grech di leggere nel più intimo dei cuori, in modo speciale nei cuori dei religiosi affidati alla sua direzione spirituale.

Una volta Fra Tommaso Sora, che si era incaricato di cuocere il pane nel convento, cadde vittima della lebbra. P. Santo, perciò, affidò questo incarico a Fra Rosario La Monica, finchè durasse la malattia di Fra Tommaso. Non appena ebbe dato l'ordine, P. Santo uscì dal convento, mentre l'altro, disubbidiente, non fece il minimo segno di voler dar mano alla faccenda assegnatagli. Tornato in convento, P. Santo si recò direttamente da Fra Rosario, insistendo sull'ordine dato. Come mai, però, venne a sapere della sua disubbidienza? In convento non ci si trovavano, a quell'ora, che due soli frati coadiutori e un laico che li aiutava, e tutti e tre senza dubbio non si erano affatto accorti del nuovo incarico assegnato a Fra Rosario, siccome si erano allora del tutto occupati del proprio mestiere. L'avvenimento dunque non si spiega che in questi termini: Dio, e nessun altro, deve aver fatto conoscere, con un raggio illuminante, lo stato delle cose al Suo servo fedele, P. Santo Grech.

Tanto era fedele ai suoi doveri di superiore, questo frate maltese, che nel compierli non venne mai a mancare di rispetto ad alcuno dei suoi sudditi, ancorchè non si lasciava guidare da nessun riguardo o rispetto umano. Questo lo dimostra chiaro il fatto che segue. P. Santo aveva richiamato l'attenzione del medesimo Fra Rosario La Monica al suo comportamento a tavola. Ma non avendo mostrato alcun segno di pentimento, il frate venne subito mandato via dal Superiore. Recatosi dal fratello, Fra Rosario cercò invano, con l'aiuto di validi cittadini, di ottenere il permesso di rientrare in convento. La seconda notte che si trovava ancora fuori del convento, venne qualcuno a picchiare alla porta della sua camera da letto; e subito gli apparve il grande patriarca, San Domenico, il quale, a voce quanto mai imperiosa, gli comandò di ritornare presto in convento. Il mattino seguente Fra Rosario fece il più presto

* La prima e la seconda parte di questo articolo biografico sono state pubblicate rispettivamente nel Vol. V, No. 2 (1952), pp. 86-101 e nel Vol. VI, No. 1 (1953); pp. 41-56.

possibile, e, inginocchiatosi ai piedi di P. Santo, chiese perdono. Il Superiore gli mostrò di essere a conoscenza di tutto, finanche della apparizione; e lo accolse di nuovo nel convento.

P. Santo cercava sempre di osservare le regole del convento finanche nei dettagli, sicchè in questa materia pure riuscì di servire da modello agli altri frati, suoi dipendenti. Con l'aiuto di Dio, come attestano i suoi contemporanei, compiva ogni suo dovere con la puntualità dovuta, anche se delle volte fino a poco prima si trovasse ancora molto lontano dal convento. Si racconta, fra altro, che P. Santo una volta, doveva celebrare la Messa nella sua propria chiesa a mezzogiorno, siccome era Domenica. Avviandosi, però, sull'asino verso Ciminna, assorto com'era in preghiera e con gli occhi fissi in alto, prese senza accorgersene un'altra via, che menava verso Santa Caterina. Pochi minuti prima di mezzogiorno, s'incontrò con un certo Michele Lembo, il quale, spronando i muli, si affrettava sulla via di Ciminna per ascoltare la Messa di mezzogiorno. Con un cenno del capo, P. Santo lo assicurò che sarebbe giunto in tempo per la Messa, se affrettasse ancor più il passo. Proprio mentre si suonava mezzogiorno, quel poveretto si trovò sulla soglia della chiesa di Ciminna; ed ecco (meraviglia divina) P. Santo affacciarsi sull'altare per celebrare la Messa di mezzogiorno!

Inoltre, testimoni oculari hanno dichiarato, sotto vincolo di giuramento, che P. Santo Grech, proprio come S. Vincenzo Ferreri, il Beato Martino de Porres ed altri domenicani, possedeva il dono della bilocazione. Un giorno nella stagione in cui i fichi si maturano numerosi, si radunarono, nella villa di un certo Sac. Vincenzo Bufalo, a Cazzoferrato, alcuni sacerdoti tra cui P. Santo Grech. Nel pomeriggio, ritornando a casa dopo di aver speso insieme delle ore veramente belle, quei sacerdoti incontrarono per caso un gruppo di religiosi domenicani, ai quali raccontarono, tra altro, quanto riuscì loro gradita quel giorno intero la compagnia di P. Santo. Quei religiosi rimasero sbalorditi, ben sapendo che a mezzogiorno il loro Superiore aveva pranzato con loro ed a ciascuno aveva offerto un fico.

Il Can. Co Calcagno nota che "delle vecchiette e degli anziani ricordano il dono della bilocazione che Dio ha concesso a P. Santo". Alcuni di loro affermano che proprio in quel medesimo giorno in cui si trovava da P. Bufalo a Cazzoferrato, il nostro domenicano stava pranzando appunto a mezzogiorno presso i PP. Capuccini. I padri Barone e Trapani-quest'ultimo av-

venimento l'hanno taciuto, e menzionano soltanto la bilocazione in Cazzoferrato e nel convento dei PP. Domenicani a cui apparteneva P. Santo come Superiore. E la loro affermazione si basa su molteplici testimoni. In questo senso, probabilmente, si deve interpretare i versi di Mimicu di Masi:—

Un jornu 'n campagna fu 'nvitatu
 D'amici soi pi divertimentu
 Lo corpu sutta 'a ficu appinnicatu,
 Lo spiritu comparsi a lu conventu.

Nota pure il Can. co Calcagno che a Cazzoferrato c'erano allora dei fichi bellissimi e ricercatissimi, e che "la voce popolare dice che la bilocazione avvenne in contrada di Cazzoferrato, ma indica diversi proprietari di terreno, cioè i Peonici, i Monasteri, i Grimaldi". Quanto al sacerdote Vincenzo Bufalo, si sa che nacque il 13 settembre 1742 e morì il 21 ottobre 1798.

Il medesimo canonico, mio amico, mi ha riferito altre cose, tra cui quanto segue. Un giorno P. Santo, passando con il Padre Priore davanti ad una chiesa — quella cioè dell'Addolorata, — non aveva scoperto il capo; e allora il Padre Priore glielo fece notare. P. Santo gli replicò che in quell'istante si trovava in una chiesa a Roma, ascoltando la S. Messa! (1).

Quando faceva il Superiore del convento di Ciminna, P. Santo cercò di riedificare il frontespizio della chiesa. E mentre si stava fabbricando — vale a dire, tra il 1782 e il 1790 — P. Santo venne un giorno a sapere che tra gli operai c'erano alcuni i quali non trattavano con la dovuta carità e rispetto un loro compagno, burlandosi di lui e di sua moglie, la quale si trovava dando luogo ad una amicizia cattiva. Il domenicano non solo li rimproverò per tale mancanza di carità verso il prossimo, ma non li permise addirittura di continuare a lavorare nella costruzione della sua chiesa.

Da questi particolari intorno a P. Santo Grech risulta che attestarono bene coloro i quali dicevano che questo padre domenicano, figlio di Malta, obbediva sempre ed in tutto agli ordini e ai comandi dei superiori; che agiva sempre in conformità alla

(1) Oltre a possedere questo dono della bilocazione, il P. Santo operava molti prodigi, come attesta l'iscrizione sotto la sua effigie a Ciminna: "Non defuerunt quoque mirabilia quibus eius vitae sanctitas magis eluceret". Molti di questi prodigi si trovano raccontati negli scritti di Barone e Trapani.

santa volontà di Dio; che portava il massimo rispetto verso ogni singola regola dell'Ordine e le adempiva tutte quante con la più scrupolosa esattezza; che amava molto la disciplina corporale; che si mostrava molto esigente con sè stesso, mentre op-angelo. In lui insomma tutte quante le virtù risplendevano nella portuno, anche con la serietà dovuta; che lo si vedeva sempre raccolto nella preghiera; che la sua predicazione faceva sempre un mondo di bene alle anime; che non si stancava mai nel suo ministero a pro delle anime affidate alle sue cure; che, finalmente, in virtù della sua purezza di cuore, la gente lo credeva un angelo. In lui insomma tutte quante le virtù risplendevano nella loro pienezza, in modo speciale però la carità e l'umiltà, la pazienza e la prudenza.

È questa la lode che al Padre Santo Grech rivolse la città di Ciminna, e s'accorda in tutto con quello che si scrisse di lui dimorante nella patria. Giova pure notare che a Ciminna, come anche qui a Malta, del resto, il P. Santo Grech godeva la fama di ottimo insegnante. Facile indovinarlo; chi sa se non faceva anche il direttore delle scuole domenicane di Ciminna? Credo di sè, perchè più volte, negli scritti dei padri Barone e Trapani, si fa menzione di studenti di Padre Santo; non solo, ma dopo la sua morte si scrisse tra altro queste parole, che si leggono ancor'oggi sotto il quadro ad olio nella sacrestia: *Tyrocinia ita d'u et sanctissime rexit ut praestanter vocabulum Patris ac Magistri obtineret*". Può darsi che "Tyrocinia" vuole dire "noviziati"; però, siccome il P. Santo Grech non va men-convento di Santa Zita, che la parola "Tyrocinia" allude alle scuole del convento di Ciminna.

Finalmente venne l'ora in cui la vita terrena di P. Santo doveva finire. In questo momento, Giuseppe Anzaldi voleva ispirargli coraggio, ma P. Santo gli rispose che non c'era nessun motivo per temere la morte, poichè questa altro non era se non un riposo; poi, stringendo al petto e baciando il Crocefisso, il domenicano maltese morì, tutto lieto, coi nomi di Gesù e Maria sulle labbra. La gente s'affollava alla chiesa ove fu trasportato: Mimicu di Mas' scrisse che:

"Di quantu ni chianceru cristiani — Di lacrimi s'inchin tutta la strata — Di niuru si visteru li giugali". Secondo la testimonianza di parecchi, il corpo rimase per tre giorni nella chiesa senza corrompersi e senza perdere il colore naturale; e

dalla fronte usciva del sangue con cui la gente toccava pezzi di cotone.

Secondo la giuliana del convento dei Domenicani di Valletta, P. Santo morì nel 1792, il dì 5 dicembre, all'età di 87 anni; ma nell'iscrizione posta sotto la sua effigie a Ciminna la data assegnata è quella stessa menzionata da Barone e Trapani, cioè il 18 novembre 1793, all'età di 69 anni.

Il Can.co Calcagno non riuscì a trovare niente nei registri della parrocchia riguardante la data di morte di P. Santo. Ma mi pare che sarebbe utile se si indagasse un po' su questo punto. Per quello che riguarda il mese, Mimicu di Masi mostra che P. Santo morì in tempo di pioggia e freddo:—

A fari parti non guardari imprisi
Friddu stramij e impruvisi.

Secondo l'iscrizione sumenzionata il giorno fu il 18 novembre e secondo la giuliana di Valletta, il 5 dicembre (Giuliana V. 2, f. 48).

Ma il P. M. Coniglione è d'opinione che, salvo documento in contrario, P. Santo morì nell'aprile o nel maggio 1793, perchè nel gennaio 1793, egli fu nominato superiore del convento di Ciminna e, siccome nel luglio di quello stesso anno il superiore fu P. Ludovico Gargano, è da dedursi che il Domenicano Maltese morì prima di luglio. Però, non poteva il P. Santo Gresh chiedere di essere assoito dalla sua responsabilità e così la carica fu resa vacante, divenendo necessaria allora la nomina di un altro superiore? E davvero dagli scritti di Barone a Trapani risulta che il P. Santo non era ancora Superiore quando venne l'ora della sua morte; e questo viene provato anche da quanto segue: quando il Cappuccino P. Bernardino diede opera a dipingere il venerabile Domenicano dopo la sua morte, questi, che durante la vita non consentì mai a tale affare, persisteva nel voltare il volto per impedire l'opera del pittore, fino a che non venne il Vicario Priore il quale gli comandò di non resistere più, e lui obbedì. Così appare che P. Santo non era Vicario Priore quando morì, e allora non c'è motivo per credere che il P. Gargano divenne Vicario dopo la morte del P. Santo. Si deve ritenere dunque che egli non morì nell'aprile o nel maggio, e siccome il cronista dei Domenicani della Valletta non era esatto in tutto quello che scrisse sul P. Santo mi pare che il mese menzionato nell'iscrizione di Ciminna, cioè novembre,

debba essere ritenuto come quello in cui avvenne la morte di P. Santo.

Per quello poi che riguarda l'anno, il 1793 è da preferirsi al 1792. Barone e Trapani, infatti, dicono che a Ciminna egli passava gli ultimi dieci anni della sua vita. Ora, si sa che P. Santo nel 1781 faceva il priore a Taormina. Al termine di questo priorato, nel 1783 si recò a Palermo nel convento di S. Zita, e poi dopo un po' di tempo andò a Ciminna ove rimase fino al termine della sua vita, cioè fino al 1793. Oltre a ciò, il Can.co Calcagno mi ha informato che nel registro "della Deliberazione Comunale" di Ciminna, sotto la data 29 dicembre 1792, c'è scritto: "e l'altro mandato di onze 16, 20 con dispaccio pagati al Rev. P. Grech per suo quaresimale". Ciò indica che fino al 1792 il Domenicano era ancora vivo e fu pagato per il quaresimale che predicò quell'anno.

Dopo sei mesi dalla sua morte, P. Santo apparve nel sonno al giudice Gaetano Maria Cattone e gli disse che volle che il suo corpo fosse sepolto in qualche altro luogo più adatto. Il Can.co Calcagno mi diceva per mezzo di una lettera del 22 novembre 1950, che un certo falegname, Antonin Lo Bello di nome, gli confermò questa apparizione; una tale testimonianza, data in tempi come i nostri, mostra come è ancora viva in Ciminna la tradizione sulla vita santa di P. Santo Grech. Antonin Lo Bello sentiva narrarsi questa apparizione dal suo padre, Santo, il quale nacque nel 1854 e morì nel 1931. Calcagno lo descrive avanzato negli anni, onesto e serio. Santo Lo Bello soleva dire che il suo padrino, dopo circa sei mesi dopo la morte di P. Grech, sognò tre volte di lui in una sola notte. La terza volta egli prendeva la cosa sul serio e si recò al convento per narrare ai frati quello che gli era accaduto, e l'indomani il corpo prezioso fu esumato. Antonin Lo Bello non sapeva il nome del padrino, ma disse che era un uomo detto e probabilmente un "usciere". "Usciere" in Ciminna significa "ufficiale giudiziario della prefettura", e quindi secondo me Lo Bello parla qui del giudice Cottone.

Quando fu aperta la tomba, dalla fronte usciva del sangue, come avvenne prima della sepoltura. A proposito è interessante rilevare che nel febbraio del 1953 il Calcagno sentì in una casa le quattordici quartine di Mimicu di Masi con l'aggiunta di un'altra quartina che probabilmente deve essere attribuita allo stesso autore:—

A li si misi che iddru murin
 Lu sangu di la frunti ci affacciau
 Quannu dra rintra lu pitturi scimiu
 Lu corpu a natra banna si vutau.

Foi gli si faceva un grande funerale e il P. Domenico Piazza perorò un'orazione funebre che si perse probabilmente dopo la morte di P. Piazza. Dopo tutto, il corpo del P. Grech fu collocato nella cripta della Confraternita del Nome di Gesù dove, col succedersi degli anni, il suo baratro cominciava a corrompersi e divenne per giunta inidentificabile, essendo stato messo in mezzo ad altri baratri. Ma una volta, nel 1911, Fra G. Billè, un frate laico Cappucino che prendeva cura della chiesa, vide nel sonno il Padre Ma'ta (come è ancora conosciuto P. **Santo in Ciminna**) che si lamentava perchè tutti lo dimenticavano. Fra Billè raccontò tutto a Santo Lo Bello e ad altri, ma nessuno se ne badava, tranne un certo Francesco Migliaccio col cui impegno il corpo del P. Santo fu identificato e posto sotto l'altare della cripta. Un'altra volta la devozione del popolo verso il Domenicano si accese, tanto che Antonin Lo Bello dice che "fu un successo di andare e venire delle genti colla stanza e scala piena, che io per vederlo doveti essere alzato sulle braccia di mio padre". Nello stesso anno il prezioso corpo fu posto in un'urna degna di lui e gli fu indossata una nuova tunica invece di quella che aveva prima, che soleva essere tagliuzzata dai devoti.

La devozione verso P. Santo è ancora molto viva. Nel 12 gennaio 1951, il Canonico Calcagno mi disse in una lettera che quando la gente va a visitare i sepoli nella cripta della Confraternita del Nome di Gesù spesso si sente dire: "Sapete vi è pure Padre Malta ancora intatto; è un Santo". E spesso dicono al Canonico: "Me lo fa vedere a Padre Malta? Mi hanno detto che è un santo sacerdote". Nel 23 novembre 1951, in una altra comunicazione, il Canonico mi disse: "Ogni 13 del mese ricordo le Apparizioni di Fatima, ed essendo l'ora più propizia, molte persone vogliono vedere il corpo del Santo Religioso. So li accompagno, no li lascio soli, e dopo le preghiere in suo suffragio, fo recitare per la sua glorificazione un Pater, Ave e Gloria alla SS. Trinità".

P. Santo Grech ottenne molte grazie ai suoi devoti dopo la sua morte. Barone e Trapani danno un'elenco delle grazie ottenute nel 1854, delle quali mi pare opportuno segnalare alme-

no una. In quell'anno infuriava in Sicilia un'epidemia che da "Ciminna — Memorie e Documenti" del Dr. V. Graziano trap-
 spare essere stata la cholera. Le autorità di Ciminna adottarono le precauzioni necessarie e la gente ricorse al P. Santo, tanto che la cripta dove è sepolto era coperta di lampadine d'olio accese. Soltanto tre persone soccombero all'epidemia in Ciminna e tutti i tre erano di altre parti della Sicilia. Barone e Trapani, dopo l'elenco di grazie ottenute dal P. Santo, scrivono: "Molti altri segni e prodigi possono attestare la santità di questo uomo tutto di Dio, che potrebbe parlarsene in una vita più estesa". Il popolo di Ciminna persevera fino ad oggi nella sua devozione, tanto che il Can.co Calcagno nell'11 gennaio 1951, mi comunicò:— "Conosco vecchiette che a Padre Malta si rivolgono e per lui recitano preghiere: altri amano che cotone toccasse i suoi Sacri Resti, specialmente la destra con cui benediceva. Mi dicono che nel passato facevano a gara a tagliuzzare la vecchia tunica che rivestiva il corpo del Ven. Padre Santo". In una altra comunicazione (19 marzo 1951) il Can.co dice: "Due persone che mi hanno richiesto del cotone, mi dicono a 12 e 14 del corrente mese che dopo averle passato nelle loro parti doloranti ne abbiano ricevuto delle grazie di guarigione. Una persona parlava di se e l'altra di una congiunta"; e nel 20 aprile: "Nella mia del 19 marzo le ho parlato di due grazie ricevute dal Domenicano. Il 12 del corrente mese me ne hanno comunicato un'altra, e il 15 un'altra ancora. Quest'ultima non dietro uso di cotone passato nella destra del Ven. P. Grech"; e nel 23 novembre: "Molte persone si raccomandano a Padre Santo nei loro vari bisogni e una signorina il 21 ottobre mi diceva di aver ricevuto una grazia, il che affermano altre che a Padre Santo si raccomandano". Nel 1 marzo 1951, il suddetto Canonicò mi informò: "I fedeli ne sperimentano grazie continue con l'uso del cotone che tocca le Venerate Ossa".

CONCLUSIONE

Il 25 novembre 1950, Padre M. Coniglione O.P., mi scrisse: "La tua ultima lettera aerea mi ha suscitato l'entusiasmo per affrontare la fatica di viaggio e di studio a Palermo..... perchè il Ven. Santo Grech merita di essere messo in piena luce....." E il noto storico eseguì il suo piano e faceva tutto per scoprire qualche cosa intorno al Padre Santo negli archivi di Palermo. Ma non riuscì a trovare nulla fuorchè il documento

della domanda dei primi cittadini di Ciminna, perchè il Padre Santo diventasse Superiore del Convento di S. Domenico. Padre M. Coniglione O.P., andò anche a Ciminna e il 23 novembre 1952, il Canonico M.A. Calcagno mi scrisse che "la tradizione sulle virtù di Padre Santo è stata sempre viva, ma da che è venuto Padre Coniglione vi è stato un risveglio. Il quale risveglio molto aumenterà dopo la pubblicazione di una biografia".

Questa mia fu una piccola biografia, però non credo che sia completa perchè probabilmente si può trovare altri documenti che riguardano la vita di Padre Santo Grech. Ho scritto tutto questo con l'intenzione di spingere altri a scrivere intorno al grande maltese e così mostrare a tutti le grandi virtù teologiche e morali che fanno del Padre Santo Grech O.P., un santo autentico (e non soltanto in nome ma specialmnete e soprattutto nella vita).

P. GALEA, O.P.

The International Congress of Old Testament Scholars at Copenhagen

THE International Organization of Old Testament Scholars, formed at the meeting of the Dutch Society for Old Testament Studies held in Leiden from August 30 to September 2, 1950, held its first Congress in Copenhagen from the 25th to the 28th August, 1953. The Congress was attended by over a hundred members coming from almost every country of Europe, from America, from South Africa, and from Australia. The programme included reading of papers, business meetings, short communications, a visit to the Carlsberg Breweries and a reception by Prof. Joh. Pedersen, Chairman of the Carlsberg Foundation, a reception at Christianborg by the Minister of Education, Prof. Hvidberg, who was himself a biblical scholar before taking up other duties, and an excursion to the palaces of Frederiksborg, Fredensborg, and Kronborg.

This is a brief summary of the papers.

Prof. G. R. Driver, of Oxford, led off by a very interesting paper on *Hebrew Poetic Diction*, in which he dealt with the problem of the existence of Aramaisms in the Old Testament and the way of recognizing them. He began by stating the principle that "the diction of Hebrew poetry owes much of its distinctive colouring to the Aramaic language; for, where two synonyms are in use, one in prose and the other in poetry, that used in poetry can often be traced to one or other of the Aramaic dialects". He then went on to define the term "Aramaism" and to point out the difficulty of distinguishing the Aramaic element from the genuinely Hebrew one. A test for recognizing Aramaisms is found in the existence of synonyms of which there is a very large number due to the parallelistic nature of Hebrew poetry. Poets make use of Aramaisms both to enrich their vocabulary and to give an archaistic savour to their compositions.

The next paper, *Josephgeschichte und ältere Chokma*, was by Prof. G. von Rad, of Heidelberg, who brought, or tried to bring, the story of Joseph into correlation with the early Wisdom literature of Israel. The original "Sitz im Leben" of this early Wisdom is said to be the Court, and Joseph is the personification of the ideal high Court official as represented by the maxims of the sages. Consequently, Prof. von Rad concluded,

the story of Joseph has neither a historico-political, nor a cult-aetiological nor a soterio-theological character; it is only a didactic narrative belonging to the early Wisdom literature with strong Egyptian influences.

Prof. Th. C. Vriezen, of Gröningen, spoke on *Eschatology and Prophecy*. Eschatology is the doctrine of the last things, whether it is the end of the world and the beginning of a future life or the end of present conditions and the inauguration of a new era. What was the prophets' teaching about this problem? Prof. Vriezen began by inquiring into the sense in which the word *eschatology* must be taken. Although the prophets speak both of the future in general as well as of the end of the world, it is preferable, Prof. Vriezen said, to take eschatology in a wider sense, that is to say, in the sense of the termination of the present state of things and the inauguration, within the framework of history, of a new era. It is this historical eschatology which the prophets have taught. Prof. Vriezen distinguished four periods in the prophetic teaching: (i) the pre-eschatological, or, we should say, the pre-prophetic period characterized by the expectation of a political renovation bringing back to Israel the splendour of David's age; (ii) the proto-eschatological period, or the period of Isaiah and his contemporaries; (iii) the actual-eschatological period, or the period of Deutero-Isaiah and his contemporaries; (iv) the apocalyptic period characterized by a transcendentalizing eschatology in which salvation is expected to come not in this world but either in heaven or in a new world.

Père R. de Vaux O.P., of Jerusalem, seizing the occasion of the second centenary of the publication of Astruc's *Conjectures*..... (1753), made a brief but lucid survey of Pentateuchal criticism since the time of Astruc. He challenged the classical documentary, or the Wellhausen, theory and laid down the lines of a new theory. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, according to Père de Vaux, is not to be understood in the sense that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, but in the sense that Moses is the centre of the traditions enshrined in it. The four documents of the Wellhausen school are maintained, but they are changed into traditions which originated in different places or sanctuaries, were handed down orally, and were finally put into writing at a much later date. Père de Vaux recognized his indebtedness to the Scandinavian school, which postulates a

period of oral transmission before the written composition of many of the books of the Old Testament. Père de Vaux very wisely proposed his theory not as a solution of a problem which will certainly engage the attention of critics for many years to come, but simply as *reflexions*, following in this respect the modesty of Astruc who called his theory *Conjectures*.

Prof. S. Mowinckel, of Oslo, read a paper on *The Hebrew equivalent of Taxo in Ass. Mos. ix*, in which he successfully tackled an important textual and exegetical problem in the apocryphal book *Assumptio Mosis*, which has been preserved in a Latin translation, but was, very probably, originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and translated into Greek and from Greek into Latin. In ch. 9 mention is made of a pious Levite called Taxo, who exhorts his seven children to withdraw in the desert and to be prepared to die rather than transgress the commandments of the Lord. The identity of this mysterious personage and the interpretation of the name Taxo have been, for a long time, a matter of keen discussion. Prof. Mowinckel proposed the following interpretation: Taxo is a Latinized form of Greek *tacsón*, a future participle of the verb *tasso* 'to order, to regulate'. For the dropping of final *n* cp. Platon = Plato, Zenon = Zeno. But as the Greek text is a translation of a Hebrew original, the word *tacsón* must represent a Hebrew word meaning 'Orderer'. From the fact that in the Jewish-Greek philosophy there exists a close connexion between the Hebrew *hōq*, *hūqqa* 'laws of nature' and the Greek *tácsis* 'order', Prof. Mowinckel has inferred that the Hebrew word underlying the Greek *tacsón* is *mehoqeq* which means 'commander' and 'commander's staff'; in Sir. 10, 5 it implies the idea of spiritual leadership. There is, therefore, every reason to believe that Taxo is not a proper name but a title of one who enjoyed authority among the members of his sect on account of his learning and piety.

Prof. B. Gemser, of Pretoria, dealt with a very interesting problem of Hebrew Law, *The importance of the Motive Clause in Old Testament Law*. Starting from a consideration of the fact that many of the Hebrew laws are motivated by some religious or ethical reason and comparing the Israelite law-codes with those of other neighbouring peoples, Prof. Gemser arrived at the following conclusions: the motive clause is a peculiarity of Old Testament law and does not occur in any of the law-codes of the Ancient Near-Eastern peoples. The motive of the law

may be explanatory, ethical, religious, including cultic and theological motives, and historico-religious. The reason of this peculiarity of Hebrew law must be sought in the nature of the law-collections which were intended for the people rather than for jurists. Sometimes the motive clause is phrased as a proverb, as in Ex. 23, 8, and it is well known that among certain peoples proverbs have the force of legal maxims. Therefore, Prof. Gemser concluded, the occurrence, in the Book of Covenant, of a proverb cannot be considered as a gloss but as a survival of ancient legal procedure.

Dr. I. L. Seeligmann, of Jerusalem, dealt with the problem of early Midrash exegesis, *Voraussetzungen der Midrasch-exegese*, contrasting the modern approach to the Bible with that of the ancient interpreters. Modern exegesis endeavours with all the resources at its disposal to bring back to life a world that is both distant and different from ours. On the contrary, ancient interpreters identified the world of the Bible with their own, transferring the biblical thought to their own age and in their own writings. The purpose of this paper was to demonstrate this assertion by a close examination of some aspects from the early history of the Midrash or, more correctly, by means of some considerations of the transition of the biblical thought in that of the Midrash. In Dr Seeligmann's own words, the paper was intended "to bring out the relations between the origin of Midrashic exegesis and biblical literature and thus to make a contribution to a better understanding of both".

The Midrashic material is extraordinarily great. Besides the Midrash, one has to examine the New Testament writings, the apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphic books of both Testaments, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Midrashic exegesis is rather artificial than logical. Sometimes a single literary motif is differently elaborated into different narratives. This fluidity of motifs and narratives has developed two different classes of literary devices, namely association of ideas, double meaning of words, assonance and word-plays, and adaptation i.e. the transference of a thought or narrative from its original setting to a later and different one. All these literary and exegetical factors are common to both the Bible and the Midrashic writings.

Prof. T. H. Robinson, of London, spoke on *Hebrew Poetic Form* with special reference to *The English Tradition*. Hebrew poetry differs essentially from that of Greece and that of

Rome It was Lowth who, just two hundred years ago (*De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum*, 1753), laid the foundation of metrical studies by recognizing in Hebrew poetry a rhythm of thought, which he called *parallelismus membrorum*, and a rhythm of sound or metre. For over a century there was little advance on Lowth's theory. But metrical studies took a new turn in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Prof. Robinson made a survey of the works of Ley, Budde, Sievers, and Schlögl. But English scholarship, Prof. Robinson remarked, lagged behind. Gray's important work, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (London, 1915), has not received the attention it deserved. Gray distinguished three kinds of parallelism: 'Complete parallelism', in which the second part of the line corresponds exactly to the first; 'Incomplete parallelism', in which the correspondence is only partial and incomplete; and 'Formal parallelism' or 'Numerical parallelism', as Prof. Robinson would call it, which corresponds to Lowth's 'synthetic parallelism' and is no true parallelism at all. Prof. Robinson then expressed his own views, which may or may not be universally accepted. He distinguished between sense-rhythm and sound-rhythm. Sense-rhythm consists in a certain balance of thought in the two parts of a line; sound-rhythm is the number of accents or, as they are sometimes called, sense-giving words in each part of the line. Regularity of rhythm does not necessarily imply rigidity of form; and it is most unsafe to amend the Hebrew text in order to reduce a poetic composition to a strictly rigid pattern. Prof. Robinson concluded his paper with the remark that our knowledge of Hebrew poetical forms has considerably advanced since the days of Lowth, and that recent research has at least laid a solid basis for a reasonably consistent system that will help us to read Hebrew poetry as the Hebrew poets themselves meant it to be read.

Hebrew Rhetoric was the subject of a paper by Prof. J. Muilenburg, of New York. Limiting himself to repetition as a feature of Hebrew style, Prof. Muilenburg spoke of various forms of repetition. Sometimes the verbal root is repeated to give a special energy and movement to the idea expressed by the verb, as *galgal* from *gall* 'to roll'. Sometimes a word is repeated for the sake of emphasis, as 'bad, bad' i.e. very bad (Prov. 20, 14); 'holy, holy, holy' i.e. supremely holy (Is. 6, 3), and in order to express a strong emotion more effectively, as 'My God, my God' (Ps. 22, 1), 'My son Absalom, my son, my son) (2 Sam.

18, 33). Besides this sort of repetition, which Prof. Muilenburg called 'elemental or primitive iteration', there are many other varieties of repetition; thus Jotham's fable in Jdg. 9, 8-15 is characterized by the repeated recurrence of the same type of sentences. The same phenomenon occurs in Job's apologia (ch. 31) and in Amos' oracles against the nations (chh. 1 and 2). Refrains, the repetition of the first line of a poem at its end, as in Ps. 8, the repetition of central key-words throughout a poem, as well as repetitive parallelism are other forms of stylistic repetition. Hence it is extremely precarious to delete as additional matter words and verses simply because they repeat what has already been said.

Prof. A. R. Johnson, of Cardiff, read a paper on *The primary meaning of the root "ga'al"*. The verb *ga'al* and its derivatives are generally used in the sense of 'to avenge a kinsman's blood or death, to redeem one's property or person', man and his property being linked together and vitally bound up with the tribe-group. But the basic meaning of the v. *ga'al* is said to be 'to cover', a meaning which is required by the context in Job 3, 5. This has developed another meaning, 'to protect', as in the Song of Moses, Ex. 15, 13. It follows that Yahweh, who delivered his people from Egypt and later from Babylon, is their *Protector* and Israel his *protégés*. Consequently whenever Yahweh is called the Redeemer (*go'el*) of Israel, he should rather be called their Protector.

Prof. A. Dupont-Sommer, of Paris, dealt with the problem of the origins of the Aramaeans, *Sur le début de l'Histoire Araméenne*. The first mention of a people, or peoples, called Ahlamu-Aramaeans occurs in the inscriptions of Tiglatpileser I (1116-1090 B.C.). The relation between the two names is not clear. Mention of the Ahlamu occurs in the El-Amarna letters of the 14th cent. B.C. To-day, however, our documentary evidence goes further back. An inscription of about the year 2006 B.C. mentions a people called *Arami*, and another of the year 1994-1985 has a proper name *Aramu*. Both names are very probably to be identified with the Aramaeans. Mention of the Aramaeans occurs again, at least very probably, in texts from Mari (19th cent.), from Ugarit (14th cent.), and other unpublished texts. The Aramaeans, therefore, must have settled in Mesopotamia 2000 years before our era. The problem of the origin of the Aramaeans is important to Old Testament studies in view

of the relations of the Israelites with the Aramaeans. Abraham's family settled down at Aram Nahrayn (Gen. 11, 31); Bethel, Abraham's nephew, is called Aramaean (Gen. 25, 20; 28, 5); Jacob is described as the wandering Aramaean (Deut. 26, 5).

The last paper was by Prof. J. Lindblom, of Lund, who spoke on *The political background of the Shiloh oracle*. The Blessing of Jacob, which is read in Gen. 49, is a tribe poem, both epigrammatic and prophetic in character. Ruben enjoys superiority over the other tribes. Joseph is brave in war, blessed by God and consecrated to Him. Judah will have a position of superiority over all the other tribes and power over foreign nations, and will continue to exercise his power until he comes to Shiloh. All this points to the first years of David's reign or, more precisely, to the time when David was still in Hebron. At that time Ishbaal, Saul's son, reigned in Transjordan, the territory assigned to Ruben. Joseph had no king, but it had a sanctuary at Bethel, while Jerusalem, in the tribe of Judah, had not yet been made a place of cult for all Israel. Judah had a king, David, whose kingdom was to extend so as to comprise the Northern tribes represented by the name Shiloh. Prof. Lindblom's thesis is "that the poem was composed during the seven years and six months that David was king in Judah and resided in Hebron".

Two more papers, one by Prof. I. Engnell, of Uppsala, *A critical examination of current views on Hebrew prophecy*, and the other by Prof. A. Parrot, of Paris, *Autels et installations cultuelles à Mari* were not read as the speakers were unavoidably absent.

Besides the reading of these papers, some short communications were made. Prof. E. Hammershaimb, of Aarhus (Denmark), called attention to the need of a new critical edition of the Peshitta. His suggestion was unanimously accepted and a committee under the presidency of Prof. D. Winton Thomas, of Cambridge, was set up. Prof. L. Rost, of Berlin, announced the forthcoming publication of the following works: 1. a re-issue, in a new form, of Sellin's *Kommentar zum Alten Testament* (1956-1960); 2. the 6th vol. of the series *Pallästina-Literatur* compiled by P. Thomsen; 3. a Concordance to the Hebrew Bible based on Kittel's edition and prepared by Dr G. Lisowsky and Prof. Rost himself. Prof. C. E. Sander-Hansen, of Copenhagen, spoke of his plans for the publication of Coptic

biblical texts, beginning from the Sahidic fragments of the N.T. Prof. A. Gil Ulecia, of Madrid, drew the attention of all present to an important and unpublished manuscript of the Vulgate that has been found in Spain but has not been utilized in the great Benedictine edition. Père de Vaux, of Jerusalem, gave an informal but extremely instructive talk on the latest discoveries in the Herbet Qumran cave. The literary finds include: another copy of the "War of the Children of Light"; an older form of the "Manual of Discipline"; an anthology of Messianic prophecies; and other documents, some of them in a very poor condition and still awaiting decipherment. Nearly the whole edifice has been excavated in March-April 1953. The edifice was built about the year 100 B.C. as the dwelling-place of a Jewish sect, probably the Essenes. The edifice was destroyed by an earthquake and rebuilt by the same community. It was again destroyed in 66-70 A.D. It was rebuilt a third time, but not for the needs of the community. It was finally destroyed during the second Jewish War and never built again.

Père De Vaux was elected President of the next Congress, which will be held in France at Strasbourg, in 1956.

The full text of the papers may be read in the *Congress Volume*, which is the first of a series of Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*.

P. P. SAYDON.

Casus Moralis

Tamburinus, permagna negligentia sua, studio Theologiae Moralis a pluribus annis vale dixit; idcirco scientiae necessariae ad sacramentales confessiones audiendas ignarus, in sacro Tribunali omnia absolvit, censuris omnibus non exclusis ab Apostolica Sede et peccatis sibi ab Episcopo reservatis, quae ne umquam quidem advertit. Monitus de gravi sua obligatione Theologiae Morali operam navandi, aures habet sed non audit.

QUAERITUR:

1o. Quenam, in ordine ad sacramentum Poenitentiae, scire debeat confessarius, ut sine gravi culpa sese exponere possit ad confessiones sacramentales audiendas.

2o. Num censurae et peccata, ut in casu reservata, absoluta sint per Tamburini absolutionem.

3o. Num Tamburinus in aliquam poenam ecclesiasticam incurrerit.

SOLUTIO:

Ad I. — Ut sine gravi culpa sese exponere possit Confessarius ad sacramentales confessiones audiendas, principio generali, ea cognoscat oportet quae ad suum munus rite obeundum requiruntur. Munus vero Confessarii, uti patet ex Can. 888, p. I, est duplex: *judicis* et *medici*. Non defuerunt ante Codicem auctores qui istis duobus officiis alia adiunxerant, *patris* nempe et *doctoris*: haec tamen officia facile ad duo a Codice recensita rediguntur.

In specie igitur Confessarius qua Judex scire debet: (a) in qualibet materia praeceptorum divinatorum et ecclesiasticorum, quanam sint peccata mortalia et quanam venialia; (b) species peccatorum necnon circumstantias speciem mutantes; (c) obligationes et onera quae per peccata communiter contrahi solent, ut restitutiones bonorum, famae, fortunae, etc.; (d) casus reservatos, censuras, et irregularitates quae saepius occurrunt; (e) matrimonii impedimenta, modernas quasdam theorias limitationem prolis respicientes, obligationes communes et proprias statuum; (f) ea tandem quae ad essentiam huius sacramenti et quae ad validam licitamque administrationem tum ex parte ipsius ministri, tum ex parte poenitentis requiruntur.

Qua Medicum Confessarium cognoscere necesse est omnia peccatorum et tentationum remedia et modos quibus poenitens ab infirmo suo statu resurgere possit. Sciat quoque Confessarius prudenter illa insinuare juxta conditionem et circumstantias poenitentium, nec illa sub peccato imponat, sed ita efficiat ut libenter a poenitente suscipiantur. Hac in re certe opus est multa industria.

Haec omnia, ut patet, acquirere non potest Confessarius nisi operam det Theologiae Morali, neque huiusmodi scientiam supplere possunt sive *dotes* ingenii sive *experientia* sive etiam *sanus sensus*, quae tria scientiam quidem adiuvant, sed eius partes explere nequeunt, quia Theologia Moralis diversas complectitur scientias inter se dissitas et, in magna parte, legibus positivis constat. Non tamen tenetur Confessarius praedicta omnia scire exacte, resolute vel memoriter ita ut de his omnibus resolute disserere vel illa recitare possit, quod ipsis viris doctis impossibile foret. Sed sufficit illa possidere *in habitu*, ita ut, quando a poenitente peccata proponuntur, possit Confessarius de illis prudenter iudicare aut saltem dubitare.

Denique vero certum est maiorem minoremve scientiam requiri pro diversitate locorum et poenitentium: maior enim scientia requiritur ad excipiendas confessiones in magna civitate quam in parvo et remoto pago; maior in confessione doctorum v.g. medicorum, mercatorum, iudicum quam rusticorum; maior in parrocho et in poenitentiario quam in simplici confessario.

Hinc peccat Confessarius qui sine debita scientia, extra casum necessitatis, libere confessiones audit: se exponit enim periculo graviter errandi ideoque sacramento gravem iniuriam, animabus vero magnum damnum inferendi.

Peccat quoque Superior vel etiam Examinatores peccant qui ignaro sacerdoti veniam concedunt confessiones excipiendi, quia eius peccato consentiunt atque cooperantur. Peccat tandem poenitens qui de industria ineptum confessarium eligit.

Ad II. — Ante omnia nos scire oportet quod:

1o. peccata reservari solent vel *ratione sui* vel *ratione censurae*. Censurae vero aliae reservatae sunt *ab homine* et aliae *a iure*. A iure aliae *S. Sedi*, aliae *Ordinario* sive proprio sive loci, aliae *nemini* reservantur. Inter reservatas *S. Sedi* aliae *specialissimo modo*, aliae *speciali modo*, aliae tandem *simpliciter* reservatae sunt (1).

(1) Can. 2245.

2o. a) *extra periculum mortis*, a censuris ab homine reservatis illi tantum absolvere possunt qui eas inflixerunt, aut sententiam tulerunt horumque superiores, successores, aut delegati ab alterutro, et quidem etiamsi delinquens alio domicilium aut quasidomicilium transtulerit. A reservatis a iure, si nemini reservantur, quilibet Confessarius absolvere potest et in quocumque casu; si Ordinario reservantur, ipse tantum absolvere potest, vel eius Superior, successor, aut delegatus (2), canonicus poenitentiarius quilibet (3), vel tandem privilegiati uti sunt Confessarii Regulares omnes (4); si S. Sedi reservantur, ipsa S. Sedes potest absolvere omnesque alii qui ab Ea absolvendi respectivam facultatem impetraverint (5).

b) *in periculo mortis*, "omnes sacerdotes, licet ad confessiones non adprobati, valide et licite absolvunt quoslibet poenitentes a quibusvis peccatis aut censuris, quantumvis reservatis et notoriis, etiamsi praesens sit sacerdos adprobatus, salvo praescripto can. 884, 2252" (6), h.e. facta exceptione quando agitur de absolutione complicitis in peccato turpi, et, si Confessarius in periculo mortis, speciali carens facultate, absolvit a censuris ab homine vel specialissimo modo S. Sedi reservatis, tunc, pro istis censuris tantum, poenitens, postquam convalescit, tenetur recurrere, sub poena reincidentiae, ad illum qui sententiam tulit, si agitur de censura ab homine, ad S. Poenitentiarium vel ad Episcopum aliumve facultate praeditum, si de censura a iure agitur.

c) *in casu urgenti*, "si nempe censurae latae sententiae exterius servari nequeant sine periculo gravis scandali vel infamiae, aut si durum sit poenitenti in statu gravis peccati permanere per tempus necessarium ut Superior competens provideat, tunc quilibet confessarius in foro sacramentali ab eisdem, quoquo modo reservatis, absolvere potest, iniuncto onere recurrendi, sub poena reincidentiae, intra mensem saltem per epistolam et per confessarium, si id fieri possit sine gravi incommodo, reticito no-

(2) Can. 2253.

(3) Can. 401.

(4) VERMEERSCH-CREUSEN, *Epitome J.C.*, Mechliniae, 1921, III, p. 442; D. PRUMMER, *Manuale J.C.*, Ed. IV., Friburgi, 1927, p. 329; A. CORONATA, *Institutiones J.C.*, Taurini, I, p. 799, et IV, p. 164; H. NOLDIN, *De Censuris*, 1931, n. 95; "Perfice Munus", 1934, p. 31.

(5) Can. 2253, n. 1, 3.

(6) Can. 882.

mine, ac S. Poenitentiarium vel ad Episcopum aliumve Superiorem praeditum facultate et standi eius mandatis" (7).

30. Idem habe quoad peccata *ratione sui* reservata. "Unicum peccatum ratione sui reservatum Sanctae Sedi est falsa delatio, qua sacerdos innocens accusatur de crimine sollicitationis apud iudices ecclesiasticos" (8). Ab hoc igitur peccato nemo absolvere potest nisi ipsa S. Sedes et qui ab Ea delegati fuerint. Ab aliis autem peccatis quae sibi reservat Episcopus, ipse reservans absolvere potest, vel eius successor, superior. Vicarius Generalis, canonicus poenitentarius quilibet, parochi tempore praecepti paschalis, missionarii tempore missionum, Vicarii Forananei, alique delegati (9). Salvo etiam privilegio S.R.E. Cardinalium (10), Episcoporum (11) et Sacerdotum iter aerium atque maritimum ad normam can. 883 arripientium (12).

Ex dictis iam nunc clare constat Tamburinum nimis exhortitasse in absolutione danda. In sacro enim Tribunali, sine ulla sibi delegata potestate, omnia absolvit censuris omnibus non exclusis ab Ap. Sede et peccatis sibi ab Episcopo reservatis. Quid ergo de absolutionibus a Tamburino datis, suntne validae? Certum est quoad censuras quod "si confessarius, ignorans reservationem, poenitentem a censura et peccato absolvat, absolutio censurae valet, dummodo non sit censura ab homine aut censura specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicae reservata" (13). Circa autem validitatem absolutionis impertitae a confessario ignorante reservationem ab Episcopo factam, nihil habetur directe in Codice; ast si absolutio a peccato cui censura adnexa est valet, idem, saltem a pari, dicendum absolutionem a peccato ab Episcopo sibi reservato valere. Confessario insuper ignoranti aequiparatur confessarius distractus, errans, aut immemor. Atqui distractio, error, et obliviscentia non obstant valori absolutionis. Ergo neque ignorantia etsi crassa vel supina. Tamburini igitur absolutiones a censuris et a peccatis ab Episcopo sibi reservatis, exceptis excipiendis, validae dicendae sunt usque ad monitio-

(7) Can. 2254, p. 1.

(8) Can. 894.

(9) Can. 899.

(10) Can. 239, p. 1, n. 1, 2.

(11) Can. 349, p. 1, n. 1.

(12) Cfr. *Motu Proprio* Pii Papae XII, 16 Dec. 1947, in *A.A.S.*, 1948, p. 17.

(13) Can. 2247, p. 3.

nem. Monitione vero illi facta, casus mutat speciem. Per hanc monitionem Tamburinus nunc advertit quod in aliquibus casibus absolvere nequit; ast quinam sint casus isti non quaerit ut sciat. Culpabilis igitur evadit Tamburinus quia bona fides, quam supponunt Canones, amplius haberi non potest in eo. Ergo absolutiones ab eodem post monitionem iupertitae uti invalidae et nullae habendae sunt.

Ad III. — Iterum distinguendum est: ante monitionem Tamburino factam, ipse Tamburinus nullam poenam incurrit, quia poenae a Codice comminatae plenam cognitionem ac deliberationem exigunt. Dicitur enim in Can. 2338, p. 1, "Absolvere praesumentes sine debita facultate ab excommunicatione latae sententiae specialissimo vel speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservata, incurrunt ipso facto in excommunicationem Sedi Apostolicae simpliciter reservatam", et in Can. "Sacerdos, qui sine necessaria iurisdictione praesumpserit sacramentales confessiones audire, est ipso facto suspensus a divinis; qui vero a peccatis reservatis absolvere, ipso facto suspensus est ab audiendis confessionibus". Atqui quando lex habet verba: *praesumpserit, ausus fuerit, scienter, studiose, temerarie, consulto egerit* aliave similia, non solum oblivio et inadvertentia sed et ipsa ignorantia crassa vel supina excusat (14). Monitione autem facta, Tamburinus, qui *ures habet sed non audit*, non effugit poenas in praecedentibus canonibus latas. Ratio est quia nunc legem cognoscit et si Tamburinus ignorat praecise in quibus casibus absolvere nequeat, hoc ei debetur ex ignorantia affectata quae a poenis latae sententiae numquam excusat (15). Haec enim ignorantia est directe voluntaria, et proinde non tantum non imminuit peccatum sed potius illud auget, cum studiose quis eam quaerat ut liberius contra legem agat.

Concludendum est igitur Tamburinum nostrum magnum esse peccatorem et coram Deo et coram hominibus. Profanat enim sacramentum Poenitentiae, bonis privat spiritualibus poenitentes, iura laedit aliorum, etc. Tamburinus igitur, ipsemet confitens, nisi congruam diligentiam sincere proponat, absolvi non potest utpote indispositus defectu necessarij propositi emendandi suam notabilem atque mortalem negligentiam.

A. TABONE.

(14) Can. 2229, p. 2.

(15) Can. 2229, p. 1.

Short Notes

A Copy of J. Benoit's edition of the Latin Vulgate in the Library of the Royal Malta University.

The Library of the Royal University of Malta has recently acquired a copy of the 2nd edition of the Latin Vulgate, prepared by Jean Benoit, and published in the year 1541, and reprinted in 1552. A full account of the way by which the book entered into the University Library and a detailed description of its contents have been given by Prof. Fr. S. Zarb in *SCIENTIA*, 19 (1953) 134-140, 149-168. After reading those articles one is left with the impression that this edition of the Latin Bible, which is incidentally described as 'a precious acquisition' (p. 167), 'a useful document of the XVI century which deserves to be more thoroughly studied' (p. 167), 'a critical edition of the Latin Vulgate' (p. 168), 'a precious volume' incomparably superior to all the XVI century editions of the Latin Vulgate existing in the Royal Malta Library (p. 168) (1), is really one of the best 16th century critical editions of Jerome's Latin Bible and therefore a most valuable aid for the textual criticism of the Latin Vulgate.

I am afraid the panegyric tone of Prof. Zarb's description is apt to mislead the inexperienced reader into believing that this work is really a standard critical edition of the Latin Bible. But Prof. Zarb's own words show that it is not. Every student of the history of the Latin Vulgate knows only too well that most of the 16th century editions of the Vulgate, although apparently based on a critical examination of manuscripts, have very often been made to agree with the original Hebrew and Greek texts thus disfiguring Jerome's work and adding to the

(1) Prof. Zarb enumerates these editions: One of 1538 printed in Venice in taberna libraria divi Bernardini; one of 1543 printed in Zurich: Tiguri excudebat C. Froschouerus; one of 1587 printed in Venice and represents the text of Ioannes Hentinus (sic) Mechlinensis; and one of 1594 printed in Lyons: Lugduni apud Thomam Sorbron. There are some other editions of the 16th century which have escaped Prof. Zarb's attention.

ever-increasing variety of texts. This is recognized by Prof. Zarb himself, who tries to justify those early editors by the plea that 'textual criticism had not yet attained its perfection' (p. 153). But this is exactly the great defect of J. Benoît's edition, which has no value at all for the recovery of Jerome's original work. H. Hurter in his "Nomenclator Literarius" calls J. Benoît a writer of lesser authority ("minoris auctoritatis") and mentions his "Scholia in Universam Scripturam", but not his edition of the Latin Vulgate. This is admitted by Prof. Zarb (pp. 139f). And Dom H. Quentin, O.S.B., a very high authority on the history of the Latin Vulgate, writes: "Les éditions de..... Jean Benoît (1541) s'appuient sur ces faux principes et défigurent le texte hieronymien: nous ne pouvons donc que les écarter de cette étude où nous cherchons à retracer les progrès accomplis au cours des siècles par la critique du texte de la Vulgate" (2). Finally, Benoît's edition has been used neither by Wordsworth-White nor by the Benedictines in their respective editions of the Latin Bible. So I do not think Benoît's edition 'deserves to be more thoroughly studied'. At any rate, Prof. Zarb should have given at least a specimen list of variant readings, textually superior to those of other editions, in order to stimulate further study of the edition.

I should like to add a few other remarks. The edition prepared by the Dominican Albert Castellanus was published in the year 1511 not in 1506 (p. 152). The date given at the end is 'Anno Domini. M.d.xi. V. calendas Iunii'.

The order of the books of the New Testament: Gospels, Paul, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse, is that of the Paris Bible of the 13th century and is found in all the editions of the 15th century.

At the end of his article Prof. Zarb, with the same laudatory strain, says that none of the 16th century Latin Bibles existing in the Royal Malta Library can compare with Benoît's edition (p. 168). This is hardly correct. Prof. Zarb is underestimating the value of the edition prepared by J. Henkenius, which is among the editions existing in the Royal Malta Library. Our edition is that of the year 1587. The original edition

(2) *Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate*; Rome-Paris, 1922,* p. 127.

was published in 1547; it was revised by Lucas Brugensis (1574) and was the basis of both the Sixtine (1590) and the Clementine editions of the Latin Vulgate. P.P. SAYDON.

* * *

The Jeremias-Zacharias puzzle in Matthew 27,9.

In a short note in "The Journal of Theological Studies", 1952, 227f, Fr. E. Sutcliffe has tried to explain the attribution of a quotation from Zacharias to Jeremias by assuming that Matthew made use of a list of Old Testament books in which Jeremias was at the head of the prophets. Hence the words 'said by Jeremias' in Matthew 27,9 are equivalent to 'said in the prophets'.

This explanation fails to take into account certain facts which I am submitting here:—

1. The four major prophets were, most probably, written on separate scrolls with the name of the prophet on the respective scroll. Therefore each scroll was known by the name of its author. But the minor prophets were all gathered in one scroll with the title 'The Prophets'. They are mentioned collectively by Siracides in the 2nd century B.C. (49,12). In the New Testament they are never quoted by name, except in Acts 2,16 and Rom. 9,25, but always as 'the Prophet' (Mt. 2,5.15; 21,4) or 'the Prophets' (Acts 13,40) or 'the book of the Prophets' (Acts 7,42). Sometimes the quotation or reference is introduced by the formula 'it is written' (Mt. 11,10; 26,31; etc.) or 'the Scripture says' (Jn. 7,42; 19,37).

2. Zacharias is quoted three times in Matthew, namely, 21,4.5; 26,31 and 27,9, never by name.

3. Matthew refers to Isaias by name six times, and only twice as 'the Prophet'. This is inexplicable if Matthew made use of a list of books with Jeremias at the head of the Prophets.

4. Supposing Mt. 27,9 to be a conflated quotation, we have a similar quotation in Mc. 1,2.3 where Malachias and Isaias are separately quoted under the name of Isaias, Malachias having no proper name as he comes under the general appellation of the Prophets.

5. Conclusion: it is very likely that Matthew wrote simply 'what has been said by the Prophet', as in 21,4, and that an early copyist inserted the name of Jeremias on the ground of a certain affinity of the quotation to Jeremias.

P.P. SAYDON.

“Respondit et dixit” in the Vulgate.

The verb *respondere* is very often used in the Vulgate where no question has been asked and no answer is expected. Thus, limiting ourselves to the Gospels, Mt. 11, 25 ‘At that time Jesus answered and said’, but no question had been put to him; cp also Mt. 12, 38; 15, 15; 17, 4; 19, 27; 22, 1; Mc. 9, 4. 37; 10, 24; Lk. 3, 16; Jn. 2, 18; 5, 17; 10, 32. In all these cases the translation ‘and he answered’ does not fit in with the context.

The verb *respondit*, whether it is used alone or is followed by *et dixit*, is a literal translation of the Greek *apekrithe*, which is the literal equivalent of the Hebrew verb ‘ana(j). Therefore the real meaning underlying the Greek *apekrithe* and the Latin *respondit* must be sought in the Hebrew verb ‘ana(j). Now this verb means primarily ‘to express one’s mind by words, to communicate one’s thoughts’; hence ‘to begin to speak, to address (an audience), to answer’. These various meanings have been preserved and must be recognised in the Vulgate. Thus Mt. 12, 38 ‘Tunc responderunt... dicentes’ Malt. *qabzu qalulu*. Mt. 15, 15 ‘Respondens autem Petrus dixit ei’ *qabez qal Pietru*; so also Mt. 17, 4; 19, 27; Mc. 9, 5; Mt. 22, 1 ‘Et respondens Jesus dixit iterum’ *rega Gesu qabad ikellimhom*. Mc. 10, 24 ‘At Jesus rursus respondens ait illis’ *U rega Gesu qabad ighidilhom*. Sometimes, however, the particular shade of meaning inherent in the verb *respondit* is so faint that it can hardly be recognized, and the verb may be translated simply ‘he spoke’ or ‘he said’. Thus Mt. 11, 25 ‘In illo tempore respondens Jesus dixit’ *Tkellem Gesu u qal* or simply *qal Gesu*. Mc. 9, 37 ‘Respondit illi Joannes dicens’ *Qal Gwanni*. Lk. 3, 16 ‘Respondit Joannes dicens’ *Qal Gwanni*. Jn. 2, 18 ‘Responderunt Judaei et dixerunt’ *Qalulu l-Lhud* or *qabdu jghidulu l-Lhud*. Jn. 5, 17, 18 ‘Jesus autem respondit eis’ *Mela qullhom Gesu*. Jn. 10, 32 ‘Respondit eis Jesus’ *Qallhom Gesu* or even *stagsichom Gesu*.

This biblical use of the verb *respondere* is generally recognized by all modern translators of the New Testament.

P. P. SAYDON.

Book Reviews

TIBURTIUS GALLUS, S.J., *Interpretatio Mariologica Protoevangelii Posttridentina usque ad definitionem dogmaticam Immaculatae Conceptionis*. Pars prior: *Aetas aurea Exegesis Catholicae a Concilio Tridentino (1545) usque ad annum 1660*. Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma, 1953, pp. xvi + 286.

Hoc opus simul cum altera parte mox edenda et alijs ab ipso Gallus (*Interpretatio mariologica Protoevangelii (Gen. 3, 15) tempore postpatristico usque ad Concilium Tridentinum*, cf. *Mel. Theol.* III, 1950, 51-53) et ab alijs iam editis (Fr. Drewniak, *Die mariologische Deutung von Gen. 3, 15 in der Väterzeit*, Breslau, 1934; V.G. Bertelli, *L'interpretazione mariologica del Protoevangelo (Gen. 3, 15) negli esegeti e teologi dopo la Bolla 'Ineffabilis Deus' di Pio IX (1854-1948)* in "Mariatum", 13[1951]257-291) tractationem completam efficiunt historiae interpretationis, et praesertim interpretationis mariologicae, Gen. 3, 15. Notum est quam acriter de vero sensu Protoevangelii interpretes et theologi Catholici disputarint et disputent. Sunt qui sensum mariologicum literalem totis viribus defendant, dum alii sensum typicum praeferunt; alii explicite, formaliter, perspicue Mariam in muliere vel in semine promissam vident, alii nonnisi implicite, virtualiter, obscure eam praedicatam putant. Neque desunt qui verba Gen. 3, 15 ad Mariam nullo modo referri posse affirmant. Diversas sententias earumque argumenta vide apud P.F. Ceuppens, *De Mariologia biblica*, Romae, 1948, pp. 5-23. Cum tamen Pius IX in Bulla *Ineffabilis Deus* et Pius XII in Bulla *Munificentissimus Deus* verbis Gen. 3, 15 utantur ad doctrinam de Immaculata Conceptione B. Virginis eiusdemque Assumptione confirmandam, nemo non videt quanti momenti sit totam traditionem Catholicam de vera et genuina interpretatione Gen. 3, 15 inquirere et argumenta perpendere quibus doctrina Catholica fulcitur.

Quod opus P. Gallus aliique collatis viribus aggressi sunt. In libro, quem prae oculis habemus, P. Gallus doctrinam theologorum a Concilio Tridentino usque ad annum 1660 investigandam sibi proposuit, ulteriore investigatione in aliud tempus dilata.

A. 184 theologos, maxima ex parte Catholicos, ut testimonium in sensum Gen. 3, 15 dicant, in ius vocat. Plerique, obli-vione iamdiu obruti, ad vitam revocantur et se in iudicio testes nobilissimae causae sistunt. Verba eorum accuratissime referuntur, plerumque nullo verbo auctoris addito. En conclusio huius inquisitionis: A Concilio Tridentino usque ad annum 1592 afferuntur testimonia 48 theologorum, ex quibus 38 sunt Catho-lici. Praevalet interpretatio Christologica innixa lectione 'ipse conteret' in margine Vulgatae introducta. Sed 21 theologi, inter quos sufficit memorasse P. Canisium, L. Brugensem, B. a Medina, S. C. Borromeum, A. Salmeronem, S. R. Bellarminum, sensum mariologicum etiam agnoscunt, quem significatum vo-lunt non verbis 'ipsa conteret' sed 'inimicitias ponam'. Maria vicit diabolum per Christum cuius Mater erat. In altera perio-do, quae usque ad annum 1660 producitur, A. 136 interpretes recenset, ex quibus 114 Catholici sunt. 83 stant pro sensu ma-riologico quem fundatum putant verbis 'inimicitias ponam'. Semen mulieris est Christus. Victoria Mariae in diabolum ver-bo 'conteret' expressa non est nisi consequentia inimicitiae mu-lieris in diabolum. Ergo sive legitur 'ipse' sive 'ipsa', verum semper erit Mariam contrivisse caput serpentis adiuvante suo Filio quem genuit.

Summi momenti sunt hae conclusiones, cum luculenter os-tendant quam firma, quam clara, quam divulgata in Ecclesia saec. 16 et 17 fuerit interpretatio mariologica Gen. 3, 15. Sed testimonia interpretum et theologorum rectius aestimarentur si quid eorum argumenta valeret A. perpendisset. Aliqui enim simpliciter asserunt mulierem esse Mariam victricem diaboli, nullo tamen allato argumento. Alii loquuntur de sensu literali, de sensu allegorico, typico et mystico. Plerique ad auctoritatem Patrum et theologorum antiquorum provocant, nullo novo ar-gumento allato. Unus alterve anceps haeret, et in quamnam partem propendat non apparet. Etsi longe maior pars theologo-rum sensum mariologicum tuetur, eorum ratio argumentationis non semper clara apparet. Aliqui totam vim argumenti ponunt in contritione capitis serpentis, idem putantes esse 'caput ser-pentis' et peccatum originale. Alii inimicitias inter mulierem et serpentem potius efferunt sed, nullo nexu, addunt contritio-nem capitis serpentis ab 'ipso' Christo factam vel ab 'ipsa' Vir-gine. Quae omnia, etsi minima videntur, non parum lucis con-clusioni attulissent. Sed lector potest ipse textus singulos per-

currere et iudicium sibi efformare, non de doctrina theologorum quae ubique clara est, sed de eorum ratione argumentandi et de valore eorum argumentorum.

Ceterum opus P. Gallus est non solum pretiosum additamentum ad studia mariana sed etiam monumentum praeclarum laboris et patientiae sollertis auctoris cui omnes grati esse debemus.

Munda typographica, quorum haud parvus est numerus, facile a legentibus corriguntur. P.P. SAYDON.

R.P. DOM PROSPER GUERANGER, Abbé de Solesmes, "L'Année Liturgique". Edition nouvelle, revue et mise à jour par les moines de Solesmes. Six volumes in 16° : I. L'Avent et Noël, 1948, pp. xxix+855 ; II. Septuagésime, Carême et Passion, 1949, pp. 1024 ; III. Le temps pascal, 1950, pp. 1033 ; IV. Le temps après la Pentecôte, 1e partie, 1951, pp. 861 ; V. Le temps après la Pentecôte, 2e partie, 1952, pp. 970 ; VI. printing. Desclée et Cie, Tournai.

Towards the end of 1841, under the auspices of the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. A. Affre, Dom Guéranger, abbot of Solesmes, published his first volume of the "Année Liturgique". When he died in 1875, he had only published nine volumes, but the work was continued by another monk of Solesmes, Dom Lucian Fromage, who between 1878 and 1900 published the last six volumes, while in 1904 another Benedictine, Dom R. Biron, added a general index to the whole work.

Dom Guéranger's aim in writing the "Année Liturgique" was to "servir d'interprète à la sainte Eglise, de mettre les fidèles à portée de la suivre dans sa prière de chaque saison mystique, et même de chaque jour et de chaque heure".

The whole work is divided into five sections. The first section deals with Advent and Christmas-tide and includes also the feasts of the saints from the 30th November to the 2nd February. This section is found in volume One of the present edition, which corresponds to vols. 1, 2, 3 of the former editions. The second section treats of the period between Septuagesima Sunday and Holy Saturday and deals also with the saints' feasts from the 3rd February to the 5th April: this is the second volume of the present edition and corresponds to vols 4, 5, 6 of the former editions. Section three deals with Pascha-tide and

the feasts of the saints from the 11th April to the 31st May: this section forms part of the third volume of the present edition, corresponding to the 7th, 8th, and 9th volumes of the former editions. The fourth section deals with the feasts of the Blessed Trinity, Corpus Christi, and the Sacred Heart; whilst the fifth section is concerned with the whole period of the liturgical year after Pentecost. The fourth section and part of the fifth section up till the Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost, together with the feasts of the saints from the 2nd June to the 13th August, are found in the fourth volume of the present edition, while the fifth volume deals with the remaining period of the liturgical year. In the former editions the plan was slightly different: vols 10 and 11 treated of the Proper of the Season after Pentecost, while vols 12 to 15 dealt with the Proper of the Saints from June to November.

The plan which Dom Guéranger follows is generally the following: each period of the liturgical year (Advent, Christmas-tide, Septuagesima, Lent, Paschaltide), is preceded by a historical introduction followed by two others, one on the mystical meaning of the season, and another giving practical directions on how to "live" the liturgy of the period. Then he gives a short historical (where necessary) and ascetical commentary on the Office and Mass of the Proper of the Season. He follows the same plan in the Proper of the Saints, summarizing their lives from the lessons of the Breviary and indicating the mind of the Church as shown by her prayers and customs for the various feasts.

During these last fifty years, the Church has suppressed some feasts and added many others: this has entailed the re-writing of some chapters and the introduction of others. Besides, such has been the progress in the study of liturgical history, that many of Dom Guéranger's statements had to be brought up to date: this has been done, not by revising Dom Guéranger's text, but by adding footnotes. The monks who have revised the work have also preferred giving us the life of each saint, basing themselves on the latest studies in hagiography, to merely reproducing a summary of the lessons of the Breviary. Moreover, in the new edition all Latin texts have been omitted, leaving alone the French rendering, which avoids not only "les inconvénients d'une froide traduction", but also "la pesanteur d'une paraphrase lourde et affadie".

The texts of various prayers, formulas, etc., quoted from Latin, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Gothic, Armenian, and other Liturgies have been replaced, at the end of each volume, by a shorter collection of liturgical texts, selected from the various liturgies and translated into French.

How really conscientious has been the work of the Solesmes monks in bringing up to date Dom Guéranger's "Année Liturgique" can be gauged from the fact that not only have the latest Offices introduced in the Breviary been commented upon (v.g., the new Mass and Office for the Feast of the Assumption of Our Lady), but also have the corrections in the new Proprium Romanum been taken into consideration. As an example we may mention that in the Proprium Romanum the feast of St Felix II on the 29th July has been suppressed, since he was an antipope, and replaced by the feasts of St Martha, as for the Universal Church, together with a commemoration of the Martyrs Felix (without the addition "II Pope"), Simplicius, Faustinus, and Beatrix. The commentators mention that Felix II acted as Pope during the exile of Liberius and had to flee at his return, and that later on he was confused with a Martyr named Felix; but they still say that the Church keeps the memory of the martyrdom of Pope Felix II on that date. Actually, in the new 1952 typical edition of the Missale Romanum, the corrections introduced in the Proprium Romanum have not been inserted, and so we still have in the Missal the anomaly of celebrating, on the 29th July, the feast of a Pope and Martyr who was no Pope at all (Felix II), when actually we ought to celebrate the martyrdom of a St Felix with whom the other has been confused; another similar anomaly is that of celebrating the feast of St Anacletus, Pope and Martyr, twice during the year, on the 13th July and on the 17th April, on which latter date the memory of St Anacletus (under his abbreviated name Cletus), is celebrated together with that of Pope Marcellinus. There is also a third anomaly, in our Missals, which has been corrected in the Proprium Romanum and which has not been allowed to go unnoticed by the monks who revised Abbot Guéranger's work: it is the celebration of the memory of Pope Alexander I, Martyr, on the 3rd May, on which date we ought to celebrate instead the memory of another St Alexander, a martyr of the 5th or 6th century, whilst the memory of the martyred Pope is now celebrated in Rome on the 26th October.

The spiritual good which has been done, during these last decades, to numberless souls by Dom Guéranger's work—which, by the way, has been translated into various languages — is not yet exhausted; and, as in the past, we are certain that both clergy and laity using the "Année Liturgique" as a manual of meditation will derive from it that which St Paul heartily desired for the Colossians, when he exhorted them: "In your hearts let the peace of Christ stand supreme..... let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, so that with all wisdom ye teach and admonish one another, and in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles sing in your hearts to God by His grace".

J. LUPI.

* * *

MARIO RIGHETTI, "Storia Liturgica", in 4 volumi, editrice Ancora, Milano. — Vol. I. Introduzione Generale, in 8°, pp. xvi+585, con 202 illustrazioni, 2a ediz., 1950; Vol. II. L'anno ecclesiastico — Il Breviario, in 8°, pp. xii+642, con 81 illustrazioni, 1946; Vol. III. L'Eucaristia, Sacrificio e Sacramento, in 8°, pp. xx+568, con 82 illustrazioni, 1949; Vol. IV. I Sacramenti—I Sacramentali — Indici, in 8°, pp. xvi+576, 1953.

Accingendosi a questa opera, di cui l'ultimo volume uscì in luce verso la metà del luglio scorso, l'abate Mario Righetti, J.U.D., abate mitrato della Pont. Collegiata di N.S. del Rimedio, Consultore della S.C. dei Riti, docente di Liturgia nel Seminario Teologico di Genova, non aveva altra intenzione che di fare un semplice Manuale, succinto, metodico, nel quale ogni punto di qualche importanza avesse bensì il suo richiamo, ma senza attardamenti in sviluppi, in ipotesi e in discussioni che avrebbero troppo appesantito il libro. Ma man mano che l'Autore svolgeva la sua trattazione, la materia — quanto mai abbondante — si è ingrossata tanto che i quattro volumi sono stati appena sufficienti per indicare e risolvere nei loro punti più importanti tutta la complessità dei problemi e degli indagini che formano il campo vastissimo della storia liturgica. Lo abate Righetti di proposito si è limitato alla parte storica della liturgia: non ha trattato la parte rubricale, benchè abbia spesso fattovi richiamo per illuminare e coordinare il passato col presente; e ha eliminato inoltre ogni diretto spunto ascetico, trattando però la materia "con la trepida riverenza del credente".

In un così breve ragguaglio è impossibile indicare tutti i pregi di questa opera che, con le sue più che sufficienti referenze bibliografiche, è di un ottimo aiuto per quelli che vogliono approfondire lo studio di quei ministeri sacri — Messa, Breviario, Sacramenti — che il sacerdote è tenuto a conoscere, a vivere, a trattare, a spiegare ai fedeli. Vorremo segnalare però dal primo volume tutta quella parte che tratta degli elementi d'indole generale (formule, libri, gesti, edifici, vestiario, vasi, ecc.) che entrano nelle molteplici espressioni rituali della liturgia romana, a cui sono consacrati tutti interi i tre ultimi volumi dell'opera; eccetto che in ciascuno di questi tre volumi in appendice si trova un *excursus* sulla liturgia ambrosiana dovuto alla penna del rev.mo cau. prof. Pietro Borella, ceremoniere del Duomo di Milano e fra i più valorosi studiosi che conoscono a fondo e illustrano la veneranda liturgia della Chiesa milanese.

Ottima è la trattazione, nel volume secondo, dell'anno liturgico e della storia del Breviario; però sarebbe stato desiderabile una più ampia trattazione delle feste dei santi. Nel terzo volume l'Autore ha cercato di dare una trattazione storico-liturgica sulla Messa la più completa e aggiornata che oggidi si possa desiderare, tenendo conto dei migliori commenti antichi e di tutta la vasta letteratura moderna sulla Messa. Tratta anche abbastanza ampiamente della Comunione 'extra Missam' e del culto della Eucaristia 'extra Missam'. Si può dire con sicurezza che l'Autore è riuscito nel suo compito, però non ha potuto usufruire dell'opera dello Jungmann 'Missarum Solemnia' (Herder Verlag, Vienna, 1948) che senza dubbio costituisce una pietra miliare nella storia liturgica. Non c'è dubbio che l'Autore, in una seconda edizione dei volumi secondo e terzo, che sta già curando, siccome la prima edizione di questi volumi si può dire esaurita, terrà certamente conto dell'apporto considerevole che l'opera dello Jungmann ha dato alla soluzione dei problemi storici, esegetici, teologici, e rituali connessi con la celebrazione eucaristica.

Il quarto volume tratta dei Sacramenti e dei principali Sacramentali (professione religiosa, benedizione degli abati, "velatio virginum", consacrazione dei re, dedizione delle chiese, benedizione delle campane, dell'acqua, contro i temporali, esorcismi, e ordalie): è un settore della storia liturgica che è stato finora studiato molto meno di tanti altri settori, e perciò il lavoro che il Righetti ha dovuto affrontare è stato più duro a cau-

sa dei molti problemi oscuri e difficili che attendono ancora luce e soluzione sicura. Si possono segnalare in modo speciale le trattazioni del Battesimo, della Penitenza e dell'Ordine. Le illustrazioni, inserite per una maggior intelligenza del testo e anche per dare una più eletta veste alla materia, sono in numero molto minore nel secondo e nel terzo volume, e mancano del tutto nell'ultimo volume: forse l'Autore ne troverà rimedio in una futura seconda edizione. Tutta l'opera viene chiusa con quattro indici: un indice delle citazioni bibliche e un altro delle formule, e due indici generali, uno onomastico e l'altro analitico, la cui compilazione è stata affidata ai chierici del Seminario di Tradate.

J. LUPI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are pleased to acknowledge receipt of the first two volumes (1951-1953) — all published to-date — of the "**Australian Biblical Review**", which is issued bi-annually by the Department of Semitic Studies of the University of Melbourne. The Review contains very interesting and scholarly articles on the Hebrew text of the O.T., Biblical Theology, History of Jewish Exegesis and Palestinian Archaeology. This is a list of the articles:

Vol. I, Nos. 1-2, March-June, 1951.

- | | |
|---|----------|
| Prof. M.D. GOLDMAN, The Isaiah Mss of the Dead Sea Scrolls | pp. 1-22 |
| S.B. GUREWICZ, The Mediaeval Jewish Exegesis of the O.T. | 23-43 |
| Prof. J.D.A. MACNICOL, Word and Deed in the N.T. | 45-56 |
| Prof. M.D. GOLDMAN, Lexicographical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Bible | 58-67 |
| * * * | |

Vol. I, Nos. 3-4, September-December, 1951.

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| Prof. E.C. BURLEIGH, The influence of Hebrew Wisdom Literature upon early Christian doctrine | pp. 76-87 |
| J.A. THOMPSON, Thirty years of Palestinian Archaeology | 89-111 |
| Fr. Dr. H.D. MORRIS, The Concept of Inspiration in the Roman Catholic Church in modern times | 113-133 |
| Prof. M.D. GOLDMAN, Lexicographical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Bible (2) | 135-142 |
| * * * | |

Vol. II, Nos. 1-2, April-July, 1952.

- | | |
|---|----------|
| Prof. M.D. GOLDMAN, Humour in the Hebrew Bible | pp. 2-11 |
| Fr. C.G. NALTY, The Roman Catholic Concept of the mystical body of Christ | 13-28 |
| S.B. GUREWICZ, Prophecy in Israel | 30-41 |
| Prof. M.D. GOLDMAN, "Was Jeremiah married?" | 43-47 |
| Id. Lexicographical Notes on Exegesis (3) | 49-50 |
| * * * | |

Vol. II, Nos. 3-4, September-December, 1952.

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| Prof. Hector MACLEAN, Biblical Interpretation | pp. 74-82 |
| Rev. Dr. LEON MORRIS, The Biblical Idea of Atonement | 84-95 |

(continued on cover).