

# MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. VIII, No. 2.

July-December, 1955.

## Dom Maurus Inguanez O.S.B.

*The Royal University Students' Theological Association* mourns the loss of Dom Maurus Inguanez O.S.B., a Maltese scholar of international reputation and a contributor to *Melita Theologica*. We feel it our duty to pay homage to the memory of such a distinguished scholar and to express our deep sense of gratitude for his help, advice and encouragement.

Dom M. Inguanez was born in Senglea (Malta) on the 21st September 1887 and was given the name Francis. He was educated in the Lyceum and matriculated in 1904. He joined the Course of Medicine but, following the example of Dom R. Azzopardi of Senglea, who had just left the medical career to join the Benedictine Order, he too left the University and entered St. Anselmo's College (Rome) as a student and a novice. After completing his theological studies Dom Maurus was entrusted with the teaching of Holy Scripture, Hebrew and Biblical Greek, but, after a short time, he was transferred to Montecassino where he remained until the place was occupied by the German troops in 1944. In Montecassino Dom Inguanez was Librarian and Curator of the Archives from 1912 to 1944. All his life-long activity became so closely associated with Montecassino, that one cannot think of Dom Inguanez without thinking at the same time of the manuscripts of that ancient seat of learning. The destruction of the abbey and its treasures was a heavy blow to Dom Inguanez who, immediately after the war, began to think of its reconstruction. He went to America to collect funds, but on his return to Malta he was seized by an illness from which he never recovered completely. In 1947 he was appointed Librarian of the R. Malta Library, a post which he held until his death on the 17th October 1955.

Dom Maurus' field of studies was paleography, medieval ecclesiastical history and the origins of religious drama. His literary activity was prodigious. The list of his published books and articles includes over 120 titles, besides many other works which were destroyed during the war, as the 4th volume of his Catalogue of the manuscripts of Montecassino, or were otherwise lost.

Dom Inguanez was also a Consultor of the Congregation of Rites, member of the Commission for the revision of the Vulgate, member

of the Pontifical Academy of Archaeology, and of many other learned societies.

The following bibliographical list has been compiled by him shortly before his death.

- 1 L'Esamerone di Sant'Ambrogio. Estrat. *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, Roma 1913.
- 2 Regesto dell'antica Badia di san Matteo de Castello o Servorum Dei. Montecassino, 1914.
- 3 Regesto di Tommaso Decano o Cartolario del Convento Cassinese (1178-1280). Montecassino, 1915.
- 4 Le pergamene del monastero dei santi Cosma e Damiano di Tagliacozzo conservate nell'archivio di Montecassino. 1915.
- 5 I sermoni sui Vangeli del vescovo latino Epifanio nei codici Cassinesi. Estrat. *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, Roma, 1916.
- 6 Cataloghi dei codici di prepositure e chiese Cassinesi nei secoli XI-XV. Siena, 1916.
- 7 Le pergamene della Badia di san Benedetto de Jumento Albo di Civitanova conservate nell'archivio di Montecassino. Estrat. *Gli Archivi Italiani*, ann. iv, fasc. iii, Roma, 1917.
- 8 San Bruno Astense. Recensione in *Bollettino Diocesano di Montecassino*, ott. — nov. 1918.
- 9 Un sermone inedito sull'Assunta di Erasmo di Montecassino (secolo XIII). Estrat. *L'Assunta*, ann. iii, n. 10, 15 ottobre 1918.
- 10 Documenti del monastero di santa Maria de Cellis conservati nell'Archivio di Montecassino. Estrat. *Bollettino della R. Deputazione Abruzzese di Storia Patria*, serie iii, ann. vii-viii, Aquila 1918.
- 11 Le bolle pontificie di santo Spirito del Morrone conservate nell'archivio di Montecassino. Siena 1918.
- 12 Carte medievali abruzzesi con firme in versi. Estrat. *Gli Archivi Italiani*, ann. vi, fasc. 2, 1919.
- 13 Versione in lingua Maltese della orazione Domenicale di Dante Alighieri. Roma 1920.
- 14 Inventario di Pomposa. Estratt. *Bollettino del Bibliofilo*, ann. ii, n. 5-8, maggio-agosto 1920.
- 15 Una revisione medievale del Psalterium juxta Hebraeos di san Girolamo Roma, 1920.
- 16 Notizie di codici di monasteri e chiese medievali. Estrat. *Gli Archivi Italiani*, ann. viii, fasc. 1, 1921.
- 17 Il Necrologio del Monastero di santa Petronilla di Piumarola. Estrat. *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, ann. xiii, vol. xiii, fasc. 54-55, 30 aprile 1922.
- 18 Carte medievali d'Isernia con firme in versi. Estrat. *Rivista Storica del Sannio*, ann. x, n. iv, Benevento 1924.
- 19 Montecassino nella storia del Rinascimento. Roma 1925.

- 20 Regesto di sant'Angelo in Formis. Montecassino 1925.
- 21 Di un codice Cassinese di Astronomia del secolo ix. Estrat. *La Meteorologia Pratica*, ann. vii, n. 6, Subiaco 1926.
- 22 Diplomi inediti dei Principi Normanni di Capua Conti di Aversa. Montecassino 1926.
- 23 Registrum sancti Angeli de Fortunula. Montecassino 1926.
- 24 Prefazione all'opera di D.A. Saba. "Montecassino e la Sardegna Medievale" Montecassino 1927.
- 25 Cappelle dedicate alla Madonna di Monserrato nell'isola di Malta. Estrat *Analecta Montserratensia*, vol. vii, 1928.
- 26 L'Opera conservatrice degli Amanuensi Cassinesi. Montecassino 1928.
- 27 Frammenti di Aratore in fogli di guardia Cassinesi del secolo XI. Estrat. *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*. Paris 1928.
- 28 Due frammenti del liber miraculorum monachorum Casinensium di Pietro Diacono. Estrat. *Studi Medievali*, nuova serie, 1929.
- 29 La Mostra Bibliografica di Montecassino. Estrat. dal vol. vi *Atti del primo congresso mondiale delle Biblioteche*, giugno 1929.
- 30 I codici nella mostra di Montecassino. *La Tribuna*, 3 agosto 1929.
- 31 Il manoscritto del "Te Deum" di Paisiello conservato a Montecassino. *Il Mattino*, 21 agosto 1929.
- 32 Cronologia degli Abati Cassinesi del secolo XIII. Estrat. *Casinensia*. Montecassino 1929.
- 33 Montecassino e la conservazione di opere di autori antichi. Estrat. *Atti primo congresso mondiale delle Biblioteche di Bibliografia*, vol. iii, Roma 1929.
- 34 Sexti Julii Frontini De Aquaeductu Urbis Romae. Montecassino 1930.
- 35 Presentazione dell'Edizione Fototipica del codice di Frontino "De Aquaeductu Urbis Romae". Estrat. *Studi Romani*. 1930.
- 36 Il racconto di due fatti dettati dal P. Tosti al Caravita cioè l'incontro del Tosti con Pellegrino Rossi e la fuga di Pio IX a Gaeta. Estrat. *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento*, ann. xvii, Roma 1930.
- 37 Diplomi Cassinesi con sigillo d'oro. Montecassino 1930.
- 38 Scriptura Beneventana. Recensione in *Il Leonardo*, giugno 1930.
- 39 L'Archivio di Montecassino (Recensione). Montecassino 1930.
- 40 I Placiti Cassinesi del secolo X con periodi in volgare. (seconda edizione). Montecassino 1930.
- 41 Due inventari medievali di codici di san Pietro Avellana e san Liberatore alla Majella. Montecassino 1930.
- 42 Glossaria Latina. *Nouvelle collection de Textes et documents*, vol. v, Paris 1931.
- 43 Documenti Cassinesi per sant'Angelo di Barrea. Aquila 1931.
- 43b Il "Dies Irae" in un codice del secolo XII. Montecassino 1931.
- 44 Versi inediti estratti da codici cassinesi. Montecassino 1931.
- 45 Vita sancti Alexii conf. Montecassino 1931.

- 46 Inventari medievali di prepositure cassinesi negli Abruzzi. *Casalbordino*, 1932.
- 47 Frammenti onciali Cassinesi delle Enarr. in Psalmos e dei Tractatus in Joannis evang. di sant'Agostino. *Miscellanea Cassinese* 11. Montecassino 1932.
- 48 Nota su un documento del IX secolo di san Martino al Volturno. *Miscellanea Cassinese* 11. Montecassino 1932.
- 49 Frammenti di un necrologio Cassinese del secolo XI. *Miscellanea Cassinese* 11. Montecassino 1932.
- 50 Un documento Cassinese del secolo XIII per il suono dell'Angelus. *Miscellanea Cassinese* 11. Montecassino 1932.
- 51 La Visione di Alberico. *Miscellanea Cassinese* 11. Montecassino 1932.
- 52 Visio Alberici. Montecassino 1932.
- 53 Inni inediti di Alberico ed il codice Cassinese 199. Roma 1932.
- 54 A proposito di un documento Cassinese dell'819. Estrat. *Convivium* 1933.
- 55 Don Luigi Tosti e Silvio Pellico. Estrat. *Nuova Antologia*, 1933.
- 56 Il materiale Romano dell'archivio di Montecassino. Estrat. *Studi Romani*, vol. ii.
- 57 Reliquie della Passione a Montecassino. *Illustrazione Vaticana*, Roma 1933.
- 58 Miniature Cassinesi del secolo XI illustranti la Vita di san Benedetto. Montecassino 1934.
- 59 Montecassino. (articolo *Enciclopedia Italiana*, Treccani, vol. xxiii, pp. 730-733). Roma 1934.
- 60 L'Abate D. Ambrogio Amelli e la sua opera. Estrat. *La Scuola Cattolica*, agosto 1934.
- 61 Il codice Cassinese n. 318: "Collectanea de re musica" del secolo XI. Roma 1934.
- 62 Replica a proposito di una recensione. *Aevum* ann. viii, fasc. 4. 1934.
- 63 I Placiti Cassinesi del secolo X con periodi in volgare (terza edizione). Montecassino 1934.
- 64 Una lettera del Beato G. Tommasi. *Pax*, ann. iii, n. 2, 1934.
- 65 Un Prefazio medievale della messa di santa Scolastica. *Pax*, ann. iv, n. 2, 1935.
- 66 Presentazione del "Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum Catalogus". Pavia 1935.
- 67 Recensione dell'opera "Malta — Origini della civiltà Mediterranea" di L. M. Ugolini. *Malta*, 20 aprile 1935.
- 68 Replica alla lettera di C. Ottaviano. *Aevum*, ann. ix, fasc. 1-2, 1935.
- 69 I codici Cassinesi 386 e 388. Estrat. *La Bibliofilia*, ann. xxxvi, disp. 6-7, 1935.
- 70 Lettere a un abate Milanese sulla musica sacra in Italia. *Nuova Antologia*, 16 luglio 1936.

- 71 Venerabile Beda nei codici e negli scrittori cassinesi medievali. *Estrat. Studia Anselmiana*, 1936.
- 72 Montecassino e l'Oriente nel medioevo. Roma 1936.
- 73 Codici del secolo VI al secolo XVIII. Montecassino 1936.
- 74 Un Dramma della Passione del secolo XII. Montecassino 1936.
- 75 L'Autografo dello "stabat" di Pargolesi a Montecassino. Roma, aprile, 1936.
- 76 Montecassino e le Celebrazioni Campane. *Osservatore Romano*, 14 ottobre 1936.
- 77 Lettere di W. E. Gladstone all'abate Luigi Tosti. *Nuova Antologia* 1937.
- 78 La Processione e la Messa di Natale a Montecassino nel Medioevo. *Pax*, ann. vii, n. 1, gennaio 1938.
- 79 Un antico rito pasquale a Montecassino. 1938.
- 80 Alberici Casinensis Flores Rhetorici. Montecassino 1938.
- 81 Recensione F. Ermini — Medio Evo Latino. 1938.
- 82 La Processione della Purificazione a Montecassino nel medioevo. *La Lucerna*, ann. ii, n. 3, marzo Malta 1938.
- 83 La Lettura ed il Canto della Passione nel medioevo. *La Lucerna*, ann. ii, n. 4, aprile Malta 1938.
- 84 Documenti volgari meridionali del secolo XIV a Montecassino. Firenze 1938.
- 85 Un Dramma della Passione del secolo XII (seconda edizione). Montecassino 1939.
- 86 Frammento di uno statuto di Pontecorvo del secolo XIII. Milano 1939.
- 87 La Croce di santo Stefano di Caiazzo. 1941.
- 88 Il monastero di S. Martino al Volturno. *Pax*, 1941.
- 89 I Necrologi Cassinesi. Roma 1941.
- 90 Catalogi Codicum Casinensium Antiqui (saec. VIII-XV). *Miscellanea Cassinese*, Montecassino 1941.
- 91 La Processione delle Palme a Montecassino nel medio evo. *Osservatore Romano*, 7-8 aprile, 1941.
- 92 Usi antichi della Diocesi Caiatina nella Settimana Santa. *Osservatore Romano*, 11 aprile 1941.
- 93 Codicum Casinensium Manuscriptorum Catalogus, vol. I, p. I. 1915; vol. I p. II. 1923; vol. II, p. I. 1928; vol. II, p. II. 1934; vol. III, p. I. 1940; vol. III, p. II. 1941.
- 94 Il "Quem quaeritis" pasquale nei codici Cassinesi. *Estrat. Studi Medievali*, vol. xiv, pp. 142-149.
- 95 I Placiti Cassinesi del secolo X con periodi in volgare (quarta edizione). Montecassino 1942.
- 96 Il "Mandatum" a Montecassino nel medioevo. *Osservatore Romano*, 11 aprile 1942.
- 97 Documenti Cassinesi dei secoli XI-XIII con volgare. Montecassino

- 1942.
- 98 Montecassino Camera Imperiale. Estrat. *Atti del V Congresso nazionale di Studi Romani*. Roma 1942.
- 99 Decima degli anni 1358-1360. *Studi e Testi*, n. 97, pp. 41-64. Città del Vaticano 1942.
- 100 Gli Uffici drammatici della santa Notte — alle origini. *Osservatore Romano*, 25 dicembre 1942.
- 101 Ioannis Argyropuli Dialectica ad Petrum de Mediois. Montecassino 1943.
- 102 Il Tesoro di Montecassino in Vaticano. Il Vaticano nel 1944.
- 103 Montecassino e la civiltà. *Osservatore Romano*, 20-21 marzo 1944.
- 104 Due lettere di Gladstone all'abate Tosti. *Osservatore Romano*, 24 settembre 1944.
- 105 Raccolta di Cimeli nel Salone Sistino. *Ecclesia*, n. 3, marzo 1925.
- 106 La Scrittura Beneventana in codici e documenti dei secoli XIV e XV. Firenze 1945.
- 107 Frammenti di codici Abruzzesi. *Miscellanea Giov. Mercati, Studi e Testi*, n. 126. Città del Vaticano 1946.
- 108 The Glorious History of Montecassino. *The Grail*, vol. 29, n. 3, pp. 76-79, march 1947.
- 109 Medieval sacred representation — Annunciation of Our Lady. *Times of Malta*, 25 march 1947.
- 110 La Prima edizione del Chronicon Casinense, Venezia 1513. Estrat. *Miscellanea Bibliografica in memoria di D. T. Accurti*. Roma 1947.
- 111 Recensione — Herbert Block Montecassino. Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages. *Traditio*, 1947.
- 112 Questa ele declaracione de l'Ave Maria. Una lauda del secolo XV in onore delle Vergine Maria. *Santa Rita*, ann. xxvi, n. 5, mejju, Malta 1949.
- 113 The original manuscript of Pergolesi's "Stabat Mater". *Times of Malta*, 23 august 1949.
- 114 Montecassino (English edition). Montecassino 1949.
- 115 Il-benedizzjoni u l-puricizzjoni tal-palm fil-Medio evo. *Lehen is-Sewwa*, 1 april 1950.
- 116 Alberico di Montecassino e Berengario. *Melita Theologica*, vol. iii, n. 1, april-june Malta 1950.
- 117 O Roma nobilis. *La Crociata*, ann. 2, n. 7, luglio Malta 1950.
- 118 Hand-list of the Incunabula in the R. Malta Library. New York 1951.
- 119 Frammenti di un codice del secolo XI contenente opere di S. Agostino. *Melita Theologica*, vol. v, n. 1, january-june Malta 1952.
- 120 Un rarissimo incunabulo della R. Malta Library. *Melita Theologica*, vol. vii, n. 2. July-december Malta 1954.

# An outline of St. John's Doctrine on the Divine Sonship of the Christian

## C. EVIDENCE FROM THE FIRST EPISTLE

1. We have so far tried to illustrate the Johannine thought on our divine sonship by adducing passages selected from the Gospel, namely, from the Prologue, where the idea appears for the first time, and from Chapter 3, where it recurs for the second and last time throughout the Fourth Gospel. St. John's view may, however, be still better brought out if we turn our attention to his First Epistle, where the argument is dealt with at length and *ex professo*.

Just to keep some kind of connection between our previous argumentation from the Gospel, we choose to take first under consideration such passages of the Epistle where John speaks of the Spirit of God. We have remarked that in Jn 3. 5, 6, 8, instead of the usually recurring phrase *gennethenai ek Theou*, the Evangelist puts *gennethenai ek tou pneumatos*. But, it is just in the First Epistle that John takes upon himself the charge of explaining in what sense Christians may be said to be "begotten of the Spirit", namely, because God gives them "of his Spirit" (85). It is, therefore, God who begets them by giving them of His Spirit, that is to say, by making them participants, in some way, of His Spirit. It is to be observed that John speaks again of the Spirit of God in Chapter 4, 2, 3, 6, where it is easy to see that the matter dealt with is only that of moral feeling and thinking, whether according to the Spirit of truth, that is, of God, or according to the spirit of falsehood (v.6). Such an interpretation is clear enough from the whole pericope (vv. 1-6), by which the Apostle takes pains in warning his beloved faithful to guard themselves against false spirits (86). The case is different in such passages as 3.24; 4.13. Here the Spirit is considered to be a gift of God, an object which may be bestowed (*edoken, dedoken*). Note also the partitive signification of the preposition *ek* with the genitive, indicating the fullness out of which something, as a part of a whole, is given (87). It is beyond our purpose to state whether the Spirit of God

---

\*The first part of this article appeared in Vol. VIII. No. 1 (1955), pp. 1-26.  
85 I 3.24; 4. 13.

86 Note the plural *ta pneumata*.

87 ZORELL, *Lexicon*, a.v. *ek*, col. 389. In 3.34 the Vulgate takes the pronoun *hōu* as an attracted genitive and translates by the accusative, "*quem dedit nobis*". The sense is evidently the same as that of a partitive genitive.

spoken of in these instances does enjoy a proper and concrete personality. What concerns us is only that it seems to be a real object, something which can be delivered by God to believers and which they can possess within themselves (88).

As a matter of fact, in the texts we are examining the divine gift of the Spirit is considered to be a principle, a pledge of certainty that we abide in God and God in us (89). Christians are conscious that God abides in them, because they are conscious of the presence of the Spirit which God has given them. The Spirit, being sensitive to the souls in which he lives, makes them know that they are in fellowship with God. True it is that the very presence of the Holy Spirit in our souls is again testified by the good effects He produces in ourselves, resulting in our good moral actions. We, however, believe, following Bonsirven (90), that John, as any other mystic and particularly St. Paul himself (91), deduces the self-assurance of his own divine filiation directly and immediately from his self-experience, from the inner feeling of the real presence of the Holy Ghost in his soul. Mystics, in fact, infer the presence of God in their souls not only from its supernatural effects, but also from the wonderful fact of their mystic experience through which they feel God really present within themselves (92). It is this experimental feeling of the Holy Spirit that John and Paul experienced within themselves and were convinced that it should have existed also in the souls of their disciples. In this sense, then, the Holy Spirit can give us the assurance of our being begotten of God in a double way: by

---

88 Elsewhere John speaks again of the Spirit as a gift which may be given and received (20.22; 7.39).

89 We shall have a better opportunity of seeing that this Johannine formula expressing mutual indwelling is intimately connected with the idea of divine childhood.

90 *Epîtres*, pp. 50f., 204. See also P. De AMBROGGI, *Le Epistole Cattoliche di Giacomo, Pietro, Giovanni e Giuda*, 2a ed., Torino-Roma, 1949, p. 219.

91 Rom. 8.14-16; Gal. 4.6.

92 A. POULAIN, *Des grâces d'oraison, traité de théologie mystique*, 10e ed., Paris, 1922, pp. 27, 30f., 44ff.; P. DESCOQS, *Praelectiones theologiae naturalis, Cours de Theodicée*, Paris, 1932, I, pp. 573-605.

empowering us to exert supernatural actions and by making us feel our union with God through His real presence in our souls (93).

The presence of the Holy Ghost within the souls of the faithful is again indicated by St. John in I 2.20,27 by the metaphorical expression *chrisma apò tou hagiou; chrisma ap'autou*. The interpretation commonly given to the characteristically Johannine word *chrisma* is that it refers to the gift of the Holy Spirit. The idea, probably suggested by the preceding *antichristoi* (v. 18), points to the anointing of old, by means of which those who were consecrated were regarded as thereby endowed with the Holy Spirit and with divine gifts (94). Precisely the same qualities or effects are attributed to this "unction" as are elsewhere predicated of the Spirit, namely the teaching of truth and the enlightenment of the mind, so that there does not seem to be any doubt as to the identity of the two terms (95). Now, Christians are said to have received (*élabète*) this *chrisma*, the Holy Ghost, and they still have it permanently, for it abides in them (*cchete, menei en hemin*). Indeed such emphatic assertions point to something really existing within the soul

93 LAW, *o.c.*, p. 297, explicitly rejects such an immediate testimony of the Spirit and recognises only that which comes through the fruits produced thereof: "It is a misconception to regard the Epistle as teaching that the Spirit bears immediate and self-evidencing testimony to the divine sonship of the believer..... It is only as an objective fact and by necessary inference that the reception of the Spirit's witness and the resultant confession of Christ give assurance that 'we are of God'." — See also p. 395.

94 Cf. I Sam. 16.13, Is. 61.1. — In the Old Testament, chiefly in Exodus, it is the act of anointing which is indicated rather than the oil used (Ex. 29.7; 30.25; 35.15; 40.8, 13). *Chrisma* translates always *mishhah* and not *shemen*; hence in the LXX *to elaion tou chrismatos* is the usual translation of *shemen hammishhah* — Cf. A. E. BROOKE, *o.c.*, p. 55.

95 Cf. Jn 14.17, 26; 16.13. — Many other different interpretations have been given to this word *chrisma*, all of which are referred to by CORNELIUS a LAPIDE, *Commentaria in Epistulas Canonicas* (Comm. in S.S., X), Neapoli, 1859, p. 675f. Baptism, Confirmation, Christianity, faith, grace, the gift of Wisdom, the inspiration of the Holy Ghost — all these have been viewed by different authors as corresponding to *chrisma*. Indeed, there could not be any objection on the part of the word "unction", so far as these gifts are considered as the fruits and effects of the Holy Ghost, who is really the "*Spiritualis unctio*".

of the Christian, being in it a permanent source of certainty and of truth (96).

But the connection of the gift of the Holy Ghost with the supernatural childhood of the Christian is still much more emphatically stated in I 3.9. John, speaking of the man begotten of God, says that he possesses within him the very "seed of God". The thought is really strong: the divine act of generation is thought of — after analogy with the physical act — as implanting a divine principle from which the new nature of the children of God is produced and which, once implanted, remains (*menet*) in them (97). Following again the commonly held opinion, regarding the interpretation of the word *sperma*, we cannot but see indicated thereby the Holy Spirit of God or, as others may have it, the "divine element" by which men are begotten of God and become His children (98).

- 
- 96 Exegetes, commenting these passages, relate the problem concerning the agent of this "unction", whether he be the Father or Christ. In fact, in 2.20, *hagios* denotes rather the Father (as in Rev. 4.8; 6.10; — comp. Jn. 17.11), though it could also denote the Son. (cf. Jn. 6.69; Rev. 3.7); in 2.27, then, *autos*, refers rather to Christ (cf. v. 28, *can phanerothe*). BONSIRVEN, *Épître*, pp. 28, 142, thinks that the Apostle may have used this manner of speaking to indicate that this divine action is common to both the Father and the Son alike. Cf. also A. CHARUE, *Les Épîtres Catholiques* (La Sainte Bible, XII), Paris, 1946, p. 533.
- 97 The divine action in the human soul is viewed also by Philo as the "seed of God", *tà tou Theou spermata*, *De Ebrietate*, 8.30, ed. L. COHN, II, Berolini, 1897, p. 174; again, God is considered as *speirein en autais aretas*, *Leg. Alleg.*, III, 63, 108f., ed. cit., I, Berolini, 1896, p. 153. — Philo's thought is, however much different from that of St. John; by the divine action virtues are implanted in the soul, but nowhere it is said that this act of God begets men anew.
- 98 CHARUE, *ib.*, p. 538 and De AMBROGGI, *ib.*, p. 249 refer it to sanctifying grace. This is no doubt true; but it seems to be more consistent with the Johannine thought if it is taken as indicating directly the Holy Ghost Himself (cf. I 3.24; 4.13), who is elsewhere referred to as the source of divine begetting (Jn. 3.5, 6, 8). A. AUGUSTINOVIC, having related the different views of exegetes with regard to this Johannine expression, concludes: "*Concordes igitur ad substantiam quod attinet, in interpretando sperma Theou de illo elemento divino, quod homini regeneratione communicatur et per quod revera fit filius Dei, seu de principio divino novae vitae*" (*Critica "Determinismi" Joannei*, Hierosolymis, 1947, p. 85).

John, therefore, in this passage excellently enough explains the wonderful way in which God begets us, His children, that is, by communicating to us His Holy Spirit, which is implanted and remains within us as the acting principle of our divine begetting. In the meantime, then, he clearly states that our divine childhood is a real state, owing its origin to a real and direct act of God, by which its divine germ is infused into us.

Thus it follows naturally that, to the mind of John, Christians are truly and really children of God. In fact, he is not content with merely stating this truth in simple terms, but makes use of much stronger and more emphatic expressions, such as, *nun tekna Theou esmen* (I. 3.1.2). Indeed, this manner of speech should induce the reader of the Epistle to consider the problem more seriously. The phrases, taken by themselves as they are put here on this page, cannot afford the full significance they may give when considered with reference to the context. For it is the context, the mind of the Apostle as expressed in these passages, that can show the reason of these emphatic repetitions. In the latter instance (I 3. 1), the passage runs as follows: "Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called, and should be, the sons of God", *hina tekna Theou kletomen, kai esmen* (99). The Vulgate version fails to make the real thought of the author sufficiently clear. It is rendered better in this way: "that we should be called children of God, and so we are" (100). The parenthesis *kai esmen* is indeed awkward. And it seems to be for this reason that in some Greek manuscripts the phrase is omitted (101). Nevertheless, it is in the author's own style, as it may be seen from Jn. 1. 15, Rev. 1. 6; II Jn 2. This incidental clause, then, is by no means insignificant. A slight comparison between the two phrases *tekna Theou kaleisthai* and *tekna Theou einai* soon suggests the reason for it. The sense is not really affected whether those last two words are allowed or whether they are excluded: for, undoubtedly, according to common usage, "being called the sons of God" means becoming

99 Note the characteristic Johannine use of *hina*, meaning the same as *hoti* (cf. 1.27; 15.8, 12, 13; 17.3). Hence, not "in order that" we may be called children of God, but simply "that"; thus explaining what this great love of God towards us consists in. See M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas Biblica*, Romae, 1949, nn. 286, 290.

100 The French idiom would give: "*Et en fait, nous le sommes*" (Charue); or in Italian: "*E lo siamo in realtà!*" (De Ambroggi).

101 1175, 917-431r, 242-216, 1518, 614, 255, K.1. The accepted reading is undoubtedly genuine as it is attested by the most authoritative mss.

the sons of God (102). Only, they add to the emphasis of this noble claim; they mark a magnificent *crescendo* in the expression of the thought. The phrase "We are called children of God", although it does not lessen our dignity, might however suggest the thought that it is an insignificant title. Hence, in order to show that it is not a matter of a mere formula, John adds — with the calm and consoling assurance of a soul which day by day has had personal experience of the reality — *kai esmen*. Thus a more profound meaning is brought out: "We are not only *called* children of God, as if we were adopted in an outward way. That is not a mere empty title; it is a real fact, *we are such in reality!*"

Again, in the following verse, the kindred phrase *nun esmen* contains the same power of testifying the reality implied in our noble title of children of God. This time it is with reference to a future state that the problem is considered. John attests: *nun esmen* — it is not a privilege which will be bestowed on us in the life to come; it is now, even now, at present, that we are the children of God (103). It is a present reality, though the perfect manifestation of our noble dignity has still to come. We are already in possession of this divine filiation, but we do not have at present except its "seed".

3. It is not without reason then, that John bursts out into the ecstatic exclamation: "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the children of God; and such we are in reality". This rapturous exclamation at the beginning of the Third Chapter is prompted at the very thought of our divine begetting in the last verse of the Second: "Every one also, who doth justice is born of him" (I 2, 29). Begotten of God! The thought seems to strike John's mind with fresh astonishment. Familiar as it is, he sees in it, as it here occurs to him, new cause of wonder. It is, indeed, the surprising dignity, the sublimity beyond all understanding of this privilege, that first calls forth the Apostle's expression of amazement. If then the very thought of our divine sonship prompted such a strong and amazing exclamation, is it not right to think that something more than a mere title is thereby implied? Of course, the reason why John is so much amazed is rather the great love of God towards us, Who grants us the gift of divine childhood. The thought of our being begotten of God immediately suggests the Father's love. It is this fatherly love that explains our being begotten of God.

---

102 See CORNELIUS a LAPIDE, *o.c.*, p. 682.

103 Cf. Gal. 4.6; Rom. 8.16; — comp. v. 23.

It is indeed conceivable that, in some other way and on some other footing, we might be called children of God. We might think of being the children of God in so far as we are morally like to Him, that is, irrespectively altogether of any new divine generation. Again our being "called children of God" might be considered simply as an act of adoption, analogous to what is practised among men. Viewed in this light, it would unquestionably be an instance of fatherly love of no ordinary kind. It is as if the monarch were to admit into the royal household a vanquished and forgiven rebel to be on the same filial terms with him and enjoy the same filial privileges, as his own first-begotten. Yet this is not "the manner of love" that awakens John's admiring rapture; or, at least, not the whole of it. It is our being "begotten of God". That in such a sense and to such an extent God should have us as His very children in respect of being begotten of Him, is a love which would never have entered into man's mind to conceive.

It is not therefore the simple fact of our divine childhood, as such, which John thinks so amazing a wonder, but rather the fact that this noble dignity depends directly on the act of God Himself, Who begets us. This is again more emphatically stated in this same passage, where divine childhood is considered to be a great gift of God. It is God Himself Who gave us this wonderful title and so it cannot be a mere empty title, but implies some reality (104). A more accurate analysis of the whole expression may help to show this more easily. Really, each word used here is peculiarly adopted for this purpose. *Idete potapèn agapen dedoken hemin*: the subject is so important that John invites his readers to consider it seriously. The whole phrase then is peculiarly strong, even stronger than if simply put like this: "See, how much did God love us!" (105). Such a manner of speaking, though in itself clear and expressive, would not have brought out sufficiently the greatness of the Father's love. On the contrary, John chose another formula which, even awkward as it is, expresses more fully the reason of his amazement. The love of God is considered as a concrete, real thing, by means of the substantive *agapen*, which is moreover considered as an object given to us (*dedoken*). God, therefore, has "imparted" to us the gift of divine childhood. Truly, the force of the verb *dedoken* suggests

104 BONSIRVEN, *ib.*, p. 39, remarks: "*Ce titre leur est donné par Dieu, comme témoignage de son amour, c'est donc pas un titre vain, ils sont réellement fils de Dieu*".

105 Note the use of *idete*, which expresses admiration (Mk 13.1).

106 Some mss read *edoken*. But the perfect *dedoken* is much better attested.

that this "love" is a reality existing by itself. Again, the tense, in the perfect is no less significant: it states that the divine love, once infused into us, abides and remains within us as our own possession (106). And what kind of love is this! (107). St. John gives in some way its definition by stating what it consists in, namely, in the gift of divine filiation.

#### D. THE EFFICACY OF THE DIVINE BEGETTING

1. In order to come to a better understanding of the Johannine mind regarding our being spiritually begotten of God, we have so far made use only of those passages which contain, so to speak, some direct evidence. But far more numerous are those passages, by which John testifies indirectly or, as one may say, *a posteriori* our real relation of sonship to the Father, whereby he shows us the right way of knowing whether we are truly the children of God. The First Epistle is particularly rich in such passages. Indeed, its subject-matter seems to consist chiefly of the delineation of the ideal christian life, which naturally answers to the dignity of the christian as a child of God (108). Thus, for the Christian, a good and right moral life, consisting in the observance of the divine commandments, is the sign of his being a child of God, the test of his being begotten of God.

The knowledge-giving rule is already included in Jn. 3.7, where the action of the Spirit upon the believer is considered to be like the action of the wind. "As the tree (for example) by waving branches and rustling leaves witnesses to the power which affects it; so is everyone that hath been born of the Spirit. The believer shows by deed and word that an invisible influence has moved and inspired him." (109). But its development is a common theme of the Epistle. Our Lord, speaking to Nicodemus, contemplates the germ and first principle of the new life. St. John, writing to those who had long received the "laver of regeneration", con-

107 A description of the nature of the love God has bestowed upon us is already included in some way in *potapos*. The word (class. *podapos*) originally meaning "of what country", "what kind of" (Mt. 8.27; Lk. 1. 29, 7.38; II Pt. 3.11). refers rather to the nature and quality of this love, than to its greatness. Hence, it is also suitable enough to call the attention of the reader, thus carrying on with it the sense of "mysterious, amazing, unaccountable" (as Mk 13.1).

108 Cf. E. M. BOISMARD. *La Connaissance de Dieu dans l'Alliance Nouvelle, d'après la première lettre de Saint Jean*, RB 56 (1949) 374f.

109 WESTCOTT, *Gospel*, p. 51.

templates not the germ, but its fruits; he deals with the ideal new life issuing from the new birth (110).

It is really interesting to observe how often John speaks of the ethical conduct of the Christians in connection with their divine filiation (111) Indeed, in many of such instances he rather identifies divine sonship with men's moral affinity to God, so far as they imitate in some way the attributes of God. As we have already remarked, many times John stresses more emphatically the outward and moral behaviour of the Christians, as being the children of God. Their good actions show and testify that they are of God; their divine filiation is proved and tested by their works inasmuch as they are like those of God their Father.

Does this imply that the state of divine childhood is antecedent to external action, from which they come forth as from their source, or simply that childhood is in some way defined by such actions? The latter is quite possible and, as a matter of fact, some passages do not yield but this aspect of sonship (112). And even if sonship were to be considered not as simply consisting in a matter of character, but as preexisting or presupposed to any action, it might easily be explained as a moral and psychological predisposition, naturally manifesting itself by external actions. Such is the case, for example, when John speaks of the children of God and the children of the devil being known to be such by their actions, whether good or bad (113). Again, for clarity's sake, we may quote Jn 8.47: "He that is of God, heareth the words of God. Therefore, you hear them not, because you are not of God". In 47b the general rule, stated in 47a, is applied to the Jews. They do not hear the words of God just because they are not of Him, namely, ethically not like to Him but to the devil their father (v.44). Here the diabolic sonship of the Jews is antecedent to their wickedness, but in the sense of being a morally bad disposition and, consequently, the cause of their unbelief. The same thing, therefore, must be said of 47a: the reason

---

110 "The fourth Gospel refers principally to the new birth, to the shower of grace; the Epistle of St. John refers principally to the new life" — ALEXANDER, *The Epistles of John*, London, 1881, p. 328.

111 I 2.29; 3.9, 10; 4.7; 5.1, 18; III 11, etc.

112 Cf. I 3.8 (comp. Jn. 8.44): "He who sins, is of the devil". The sense is not that he sins *because* he is of the devil, but he is of the devil, because he sins and in as much as he sins.

113 I 3.10, 12; so St. Augustine: "*Dilectio ergo sola discernit inter filios Dei et filios diaboli ... Qui habent charitatem nati sunt ex Deo; qui non habent, non sunt nati ex Deo*", — *In Ep. Jo.*, Tract. V, 6, PL 35, 2015.

why they hear the words of God is because they are willing to yield to God's will, having already that moral affinity with God (114).

Of course, this is also some kind of divine sonship, but, it is not that kind of sonship which John attributes to Christians in 1. 12-13 and throughout the First Epistle. In 8.47a deals with those who, though being men of good will, have not yet known christian revelation (115). But christians, having received Christ by faith and having been baptised in His name, have become children of God by the direct action of God Himself, namely by having been begotten of Him. We have seen already from other Johannine passages that the divine childhood of the Christians does not merely consist in their outward likeness to God, but is an effect of the begetting of God, Who implants within them His divine "seed". Now, this inward aspect of divine childhood is to John's mind the foundation and the source of its outward aspect. Christians can perform good actions just because they are begotten of God. This seems to be the right interpretation, at least, of some passages we are about to quote. Hence, also with regard to other passages of the Epistle in which which sonship is viewed primarily in its outward aspect of likeness to God, being undoubtedly referred to the Christians, the inner aspect is not excluded but rather presupposed. Indeed, the texts in which childhood is looked at directly from the divine point of view as the source of a good Christian life are comparatively few (116). In any case, they are sufficiently suited to prove or suggest that divine childhood is considered by John as being an antecedent to good Christian behaviour — and this in a stricter sense, that is, as being really the source of good actions (117). Thus, to the Christian his morally good actions, being the effect of his generation from God, prove and testify that he is really a child of God.

We have already remarked that to John mystical inner experience can afford self-assurance of one's being a child of God or of his being begotten of God. Nor is this the only criterion. He still gives another principle or standard of judging — which may even be better

---

114 Cf. the Latin proverb "*Similis simili gaudet*".

115 Similarly, 10.16, 27; 11.52; 18.37. These passages evidently refer to those who are not yet Christians, at least, as not yet having true faith in Christ nor received Baptism. Some authors consider Baptism implicitly included in their good disposition (*totum implicitum in caritate perfecta*). In this case they may be treated as real Christians with regard to the grace of divine childhood.

116 Such as I 2.29; 3.9; 4.7; 5.1, 5, 18.

117 STEVENS, *o.c.*, p. 245: "The divine begetting is the logical *prius* of the spiritual life and of all its fruits".

and safer. It is he who practises good actions, that can rightly be said to be begotten of God (118). Certainty of being a true son of God is based on moral actions, in so far as these presuppose the intervention of a supernatural agent hidden within themselves. Those who are really the children of God show it by their way of behaving, both negatively, by keeping themselves far from sin, and positively, by embracing righteousness, especially by showing love towards their brethren (119).

2. "Whosoever is born of God, committeth not sin: for his seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (I 3.9; cf. 5. 18; 3.6). It is not an easy task to elucidate this Johanne passage. The Apostle does not only say that everyone who is begotten of God does not sin actually, but, even more, that he cannot sin (*ou dunatai hamartanein*). In the first hemistich, *hamartian ou poiei* denotes a state or condition or habit, rather than a simple action (120). It refers, of course, to actual sins, but what is meant thereby is the habitual state of the Christian. The difficulty in interpreting the second part of the verse is even greater, since even the possibility of sin is hereby excluded. No doubt, if some kind of impeccability is ever stated here, there can be no question of intrinsic and physical impossibility, by which the christian would be confirmed in the state of grace, having no more the fear of losing it

---

118 John proposes this rule of judging as an antidote to the false teaching of the Gnostics, who unjustly claimed to have true knowledge of God and fellowship with Him. They claimed to be sinless (1.8), but they did not observe the commandments (2.4-6; 9-11). May be, the expressions "begotten of God" or "being a child of God" like "knowing God", were used — and in the author's view misused — by those false teachers. John, therefore, emphasizes the point that only those who do righteousness and avoid sin can really claim to be begotten of God.

119 CORNELIUS a LAPIDE, *ib.*, p. 681, remarks on I 2.29: "*Nullum certius est argumentum quod quis natus sit ex Deo quam si factis et moribus Deum exprimat velut lineamentis*". Cf. BIOSMARD, *art cit.* RB 56 (1949) 383.

120 Cf. v. 8, *ho poion ten hamartian*. According to the Hebrew usage, *poion* in the present participle denotes not act, but habit; cf. the Latin "operarius iniquitatis". So MALDONATUS on Mt 13.41: "*Omnes qui iniquitatem exercent et, ut ita dicam, iniquitatis artem faciunt; magis enim habitus quam actus Hebraica phrasi significatur*".

again (121). This would not only be against sound christian doctrine and experience itself, but even against John's testimony in this very Epistle (122). St. Augustine, to solve the apparent contradiction, restricts the statement to the sin against charity, in which all others are included (123). But this interpretation proves to be unsatisfactory for the fact that John surely speaks of all sins in general.

A better and easier way of interpreting this passage would be to see in it the ideal state of the true Christian. "Following his usual custom, the writer states the truth absolutely without stating the modifications which become necessary as it is applied to individual cases in actual experience" (124). In other words John speaks in an absolute and general way. With his vivid consciousness of the characteristic quality of the christian life, John states of the Christian that "supremely and characteristically sinful he cannot be; that would be a contradiction in terms" (125). This is indeed true. But it is still to be remembered that the writer's purpose is not only to exhibit an ideal, but also to apply a test (126). If, therefore, the Christian — even a perfect and ideal Christian — does not sin, nor even can sin, he shows thereby that he is begotten of God. What the Apostle primarily aims at here is not to attribute some kind of impeccability to the Christian, but simply to state that such impeccability, where it occurs also in particular cases, testifies the fact that he, as a child of God, has within him the seed of God. Divine filiation asks for

- 
- 121 The Protestants of the XVI and XVII Centuries made use of this passage for the purpose of defending their doctrine on the impeccability of the Christian. Cf. Conc. Trid., *Sess. VI, De iustificatione*, can. 23, Denz. 833.
- 122 I 1.8; 2.1; 5.16.
- 123 "*Est quoddam peccatum quod non potest admittere ille qui natus est e Deo; et quo non admissio solvuntur coetera, quo admissio confirmantur coetera. Quod est hoc peccatum? Facere contra mandatum Christi, contra testamentum novum. Quod est hoc mandatum novum? Mandatum novum do vobis, ut diligatis invicem*", — In *Ep. Jo., Tract. V. 3*, PL 35, 2013.
- 124 BROOKE, *o.c.*, pp. 89-90, 131; De AMBROGGI, *o.c.*, p. 249; J. J. LIAS, *The First Epistle of St. John*, London, 1887, p. 238.
- 125 STEVENS, *o.c.*, p. 13. Father P. GALTIER (*Le Chrétien impeccable: I Jean III*, 9. *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* 4 (1947) 137-154) thinks that *hamartia* is the same as *anomia* (3.4) and concludes that *hamartia* does not denote any particular sin, but points rather to a morally bad inclination. The formula "to do wickedness" means "*commettre le péché par principe et par mépris de la foi*" (*ib.*, p. 150).
- 126 Cf. I 3.7ff.

a divine element in the Christian; such a divine element naturally excludes sin. The divine germ is considered as an active force, permanent in the soul and influencing all its actions. So far as this seed abides in the soul, it cannot produce wickedness: the good tree cannot yield bad fruit. So also the child of God. And the only reason is simply because (*hoti*) he is born of God and a divine seed remains in him (127).

3. Furthermore, the divine principle, immanent in the child of God, does not only keep him from sinning, but is also an inward source of supernaturally good actions. The moral character of the Christian is often designed by the expression "to do righteousness" or "to be righteous" (128), just as the Father, whose child he is, is righteous. The righteousness of the child of God is then made manifest by the acts of love towards his brethren and by acts of faith in Jesus Christ. For the practice of these virtues John assigns a common reason, namely, that the Christian is begotten of God (129). So love and faith and holiness are all of them effects and tests of the same reality (130). We may be allowed to remark again that these passages might lead to the conclusion that divine childhood consists in being holy and righteous. As a matter of fact this is not excluded. But what is really taught here is that this transformation of moral character is explicable only by a renewal of the moral nature, which is wrought directly by divine influence and which can be conceived only as the communication of a new life-principle (131).

Regarding the love of brethren, we consider it here only as a form of Christian righteousness and therefore as being a sure and sufficient mark of the child of God. This is clearly implied in 3. 10-40: love and hatred are the typical forms of righteousness and sin respectively. The pagan world reveals itself as a realm of hatred and of death. Christians, on the contrary, dwell in a realm of life, whose distinguishing mark is the love that exists among God's children. The decisive test of this divine childhood lies in their attitude to their fellow-men. However, this pericope deals rather with son-

127 "*C'est la cause divine qu'est rapporté tout l'effet moral*" — J. BONSIRVEN, *La Théologie des Épîtres Johanniques*, MRTh 62 (1935) 928.

128 I 2.29; 3.7.10.

129 I 2.29; 4.7; 5.1.

130 However faith, being likewise a sign of divine begetting, is not its effect, at least, in the same sense as righteousness in general.

131 "*Il ne'est pas dit qu'il devient fils de Dieu, mais seulement que la foi, l'amour, la justice du chrétien sont un signe et un effet de la génération divine dont il est l'objet*" — BONSIRVEN, art. cit., NRTh 62 (1935) 927.

ship as consisting in ethical character. There is still another passage, 4.7, which though easily admitting of the same interpretation, may somehow suggest something more. "Everyone that loveth is born of God". Love here does not seem to be the reason of the divine begetting, but its effect and its test. It is considered as having its origin in God, "charity is of God". Human love is its reflection, something of the divine nature itself. Its presence in the Christians shows that they have experienced the new birth from God and share in that higher quality, which is the very nature of God, Love, — "because God is love" (v. 8). Thus the nature of true love is manifested in those who have begun to share the very life of God, by having been begotten of Him. Indeed, the love of God is within us as a real object; and it is really this love of God, which makes us love our neighbour and God himself (132).

The righteousness of the child of God still manifests itself in his belief in Jesus Christ. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God" (133). Faith, therefore, is the sign of the birth from God. Where true faith in Jesus as God's appointed messenger to men is present, there the new birth has taken place. He does not state here whether faith is the cause and condition or the result of the divine begetting. What he wishes to emphasize is the fact that, where true faith is, the new birth is a reality and has abiding and permanent consequences. The believer has been begotten of God. So his belief is a sign of his divine childhood; it brings him assurance because it affords objective testimony that he is begotten of God. Nothing is here intimated as to the logical or chronological relation of faith to the divine begetting; it is only said that everyone who believes in Jesus has been begotten of God, and is His Son. Such faith is the unfolding mark of sonship to God.

However we cannot assert of faith what is said of love — that it is the outcome and effect of divine filiation. Indeed the tenses (*pisteuon / gegennethai*) might suggest the idea that the divine begetting is here considered as the antecedent of believing. This is, in fact, also true in some sense, namely, so far as the grace of divine sonship is considered as contributing to the increase of faith. But to regard faith itself as being strictly the outcome and result of divine

---

132 Cf. I 4.16; — comp. 17.26. In the light of Rom. 5.5, "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us", we can easily understand which is this love "which God has in us", that is, it is the Holy Ghost Himself, as even John states in I 4.13.

133 I 5.1; — comp. 2.23, 24; 4.2f., 15.

begetting (134), would be against John's testimony clearly stated in Jn 1. 12. Here faith in the Word Incarnate is the *conditio sine qua non* of the divine childhood on the part of man, as the act of begetting is its condition on the part of God. Faith is, then, in this sense, the foundation and root of filiation (135). We must, however, be careful not to interpret the act of faith as being a mere condition preceding one's becoming a child of God, as if the latter were the next step after faith. On the contrary, the complete coordination of receiving Christ (believing in Christ) and being begotten of God shows that they are two inseparable aspects of the same event or process. Thus, as man by being begotten of God becomes a child of God, so by receiving Christ by a true and active faith he is already and *ipso facto* a child of God (136). Similarly, in I 5.1, parallel to Jn 1. 12, to believe and to be born of God form one kindred and inseparable idea (137). A slight difference, however, still exists in that here faith is simply viewed as a test and a sign of the divine begetting — which is a natural consequence of the very fact that the ideas of faith and divine begetting are inseparable from each other.

Therefore, the righteousness of the Christians — showing itself in love towards the brethren as well as in faith in Jesus — is the test of their being begotten of God. But, while love is the test of filiation as its consequence and effect, faith is its test as its condition and as a reality necessarily connected with it (138).

- 134 So. R. LAW, *o.c.*, p. 270: "Belief is the outcome; therefore the test of life. The truth is not that our abiding in God and God's abiding in us are the result of our belief in Christ, but conversely, that the confession is the result of the abiding".
- 135 Such as the Council of Trent teaches, *Sess. VI, De iustificatione*, cap. 6, Denz. 798; cap. 8, Denz. 801.
- 136 The doctrine of Baptism in connection with divine begetting (3.5) is not against this interpretation, since where true faith is, there is also, as they say, the implicit desire of Baptism. Of course, there is no question here of the old Protestants' "saving faith". John always views faith in connection with love and, consequently, it implies the life of grace. Cf. BONSIRVEN, *Epîtres*, p. 234 and AUGUSTINO-VIC, *o.c.*, p. 82f.
- 137 "How closely the divine begetting from God and faith — the divine and human factors in salvation — are coordinated by John is apparent from the parallelism of this verse (I 5.4), where to the statement that what is born of God overcomes the world, he adds that faith is the power that overcomes the world" — STEVENS, *o.c.*, p. 245f.
- 138 J. CHAINE, *Les Epîtres Catholiques*, Paris, 1939, p. 188; BOISMARD, *art. cit.*, RB56 (1949) 472.

We may add a word about the tenses of the verb *gennethenai* as used in connection with this last view of divine childhood manifesting itself in righteousness. The fact that, wherever it occurs, it is always in the perfect, thereby considered as a past event, might be, in some sense, a confirmation of what we have said of the divine begetting as an antecedent to a morally good conduct. In the Gospel the aorist prevails, though also the perfect is used (139), in the Epistle the divine begetting is always referred to in the perfect tense (140). An important difference is stated between the fact of the birth (aorist) and the state which follows as the abiding result of the begetting (perfect). The perfect denotes at once the past completion of the action and its abiding results (141). "Is begotten" is a good translation, yet "has been begotten" would be less ambiguous making it clear that divine begetting is the antecedent, not the accompaniment or consequence, of the action associated with the sentence. The tenses, therefore, suggest in each case the divine begetting as the necessary antecedent to human activity.

Thus one's embracing righteousness — loving and believing — and the keeping oneself far from sin are considered as the result and the proof of an active principle already imparted by a divine begetting, not as the condition or the means of its attainment. It is not because we embrace righteousness, that we are the children of God. On the contrary, if we believe and love, it is because we have already received within us the divine life principle, the *sperma Theou*, which is radically incapable of producing effects contrary to its nature.

4. Brotherly love is still looked at by John from another point of view. The Christian must love his fellow-Christian just because he is his own brother, being like him begotten of God and the child of God. The general rule is clearly stated in I 5:1: "Every one that loveth him who begot, loveth him also who is born of him". The child's love for its parent naturally carries with it love for his

---

139 Aorist: 1.13; 3.3, 5, 7; perfect: 3.4bis, 8.

140 I 2.29; 3.9bis; 4.7; 5.1bis, 4.18. — On I 5.18 WESTCOTT, *Gospel*, p. 50, remarks: "The true interpretation depends upon the contrast between the one historic Son of God (*ho gennethês*, opposed to the evil one) and the sons of God, who live in virtue of their new birth (*ho gegennemênos*)".

141 Cf. E. RAGON, *Grammaire Grecque*, 18me ed., Paris, 1911, p. 162: "Le parfait indique proprement l'état qui résulte actuellement d'un fait passé". See also ZERWICK, *o.c.*, n. 209. Hence it may easily be taken as having the same meaning of a present, such as Jn 11.27; 20.29; 16.27; Lk 20.6.

brothers and sisters (142). So when, or as soon as, we love God, we love also the children of God, in accordance with the law that love for him who begets has, as its necessary consequence, love for those whom he has begotten (143). Thus the duty of loving the brethren is deduced from the natural law of affection. It is indeed unnatural to love the Father, the Begetter, and not to love also in the meantime His children, begotten of Him. John draws the analogy from family life, thus indicating the deep reason of our love for the brethren, that is because in the begotten there is something which comes from the Father and which belongs to the Father. As in family life the children love one another because they are sons of the same father, having all received from him the same nature, so in the family of the children of God, fraternal love is based on the fact that they all have within themselves the life-giving seed of the same divine Father (144).

5. Still in connection with the state of divine childhood, John infers other consequences regarding the attitude of the children of God both towards the world and towards the Father.

The world, viewed by St. John in his usual contemptuous way, does not know us because it knew not Him (I 3.1). The relative pronoun *auton*, though much nearer to "the Father", on account of the verb in the past tense (*egno*) must be referred to Christ. The thought that by the exceeding love of the Father, we are children of God recalls to John's mind Jesus Christ, the natural Son of God. The world did not know Jesus, even "his own received him not" (I. 11), they rejected Him and despised Him. We, too, are in an analogous position, being the children of God. If the world did not recognise Him, who is the natural Son of God, there is no

---

142 BROOKE, *o.c.*, p. 127f. interprets I 5.1 as referring literally to natural family life, thus stating a rule, the application of which to God and to the faithful is understood. The context, however, shows rather that the words *gennesanta* and *gegennemenon* refer directly, and literally to God and to the faithful. It is likewise against the context to refer *tôn gegennemenon* to Christ, as St. Augustine does, *In Ep. Jo., Tract. X. 2*, PL 35,2055.

143 So B. WEISS, *Die drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes*, Göttingen, 1899, p. 135.

144 The same thought is also easily suggested by the expression "to love the children of God" in the following verse: *Ta tekna tou Theou*, instead of the expected *tous adelphous*, puts stress on the idea of filiation as the reason why they must love the brethren. Such passages as I 4.20-21; 4.11-12 contain also the same idea. Cf. Bonsirven's remark on I 4.11 (*Epîtres*, p. 232).

wonder if it does not know us and despises us. The world rejected Christ, because it refused to see in Him the Father, whose Son He is. For the same reason, the world despises also the children of God, having refused to know the Father Who begot them and His true Son Jesus Christ (145). Yet, our being God's children is not a matter of opinion, dependent on the world's vote, but a matter of fact, flowing from the amazing kind of love which the Father has bestowed upon us.

Hence, notwithstanding this antagonism between the world and the children of God, the latter, in virtue of their divine begetting, gain victory over the world and its followers. "Whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world" (5.4). Victory over the world is due to the divine begetting. Everyone who is born of God has within himself a power strong enough to overcome the resistance of all the powers of the world. It is the "seed" of the divine begetting, which gives us strength to conquer our enemies (16. 33). As Jesus, the Son of God, scored victory over the world (146), so whosoever becomes a child of God shares also in His victory in a permanent and habitual way (147). Again, in 4.4, the children of God are said to gain victory over false prophets. Yet, it is not by their own power that they triumph. It is because they are "of God" and, consequently, they have God living and acting in them. God is greater and stronger than the adversary. This is, of course, obvious by itself. But John puts it down just to show that it is by the very power of Him who abides within them that they gain the victory (148).

6. With regard to the Father, who begets them, Christians must show a true filial attitude. This naturally implies that they would have deep confidence in Him and that they love Him without being afraid of Him. "Fear is not in charity: but perfect charity casteth out fear" (4. 18). Evidently John deals here with perfect filial love as distinguished from the so called servile love.

- 
- 145 16.3, "And these things will they do to you; because they have not known the Father, nor me".
- 146 The present, *nika*, denotes permanent victory. The neuter *pan to gegennomenon*, undoubtedly for the masculine as in Jn 6.36, 39; 17. 2,24, may rightly be regarded as putting some stress on the power of the divine begetting. "The statement is made in its most abstract form, which emphasizes the power of the new birth, rather than its possession by each individual" — BROOKE, *ib.*, p. 130.
- 147 "Il possède en sa nature de régénéré, dans 'la semence de Dieu', qui est en lui, la force de repousser les assauts des ennemis de Dieu" — BONSIRVEN, *Epîtres*, p. 252.
- 148 Hence St. Augustine rightly concludes: "Noli te extollere, vide qui in te vincit" — *In Ep. Jo. Tract.* VII, 2, PL 35, 2030.

Christians are not slaves who serve their Lord for fear of punishment. They are the children of God: so they love Him and serve Him as their Father and because He is their Father, not because they are afraid of being punished by Him. But this perfect love towards the Father is based on the state of their divine childhood.

Filial love then reaches its highest point of perfection when the children of God show an unlimited trust in their Father (4, 17). Even the thought of the terrible Day of Judgement must not deter them. Being the children of God, they must have confidential approach to Him as to their real Father.

Indeed, it is not said clearly and explicitly in these passages (4. 17-18) that the reason of their perfect love to the Father and of their absolute trust in Him is because they are begotten of Him and are His children. But this is naturally included in the highest degree of love as dealt with here, which is indeed that kind of love practised by children. It is then implied in the assertion: "Because as he is, we also are in this world". The reason indicated is the fact that we are like Him. *Ekeinos* evidently refers to Christ, Who will appear as Judge on the Day of Judgement (I 2.28). We are therefore like to Jesus Christ: As He is, so also we are. Our state of being is analogous to that of Jesus, the only difference being that He is in heaven and we are still in this world (149). Our likeness to Him consists, no doubt, in being holy and loving the Father like Him. But, this is not all that our likeness to Christ, the natural Son of God, implies. Assimilation to the Son of God carries also with it our real participation in His divine Sonship (150). The Johannine thought included in this passage may thus be reproduced by a paraphrase: "Our love towards God is really made perfect by our absolute confidence in Christ on the Day of Judgement; and we must have this perfect love and confidence, because, as he is the Son of God, so also we are the children of God".

FR. DONATUS, O.F.M. Cap.

(to be continued)

---

149 Our likeness to Christ is not because we are in this world as He was in this world. If so, no confidence could ever follow thereby. Moreover, the verb *estin* points to the present state of Jesus. Oecumenius indicates the holiness of Christ's conduct in this world and explains the present tense with reference to Christ as being *kata antichronian* (*Comm. in Ep. S. Jo.*, PG 119, 669). But, it should be said that the comparison is simply based on the radical meaning of the verb *einai*, which indicates a state; *en to kosmo touto* refers only to men, who are still in this world, and not to Christ.

150 The same idea is also implied, though in a different way, in I 2.28 "Abide in him, and when he shall appear, we may have confidence".

# A Commentary on Can. 506, §§ 2, 3, 4.

## INTERPRETATION OF § 3.

a) "The ordinary confessors of that monastery".

This prohibition includes only ordinary confessors (1). It follows that the duty of tellers can be performed by extraordinary confessors, additional and special confessors, etc.

This prohibition, which emanates from the decree above-mentioned, issued by the Holy Congregation of the Religious on the 27th August 1910, was justly reproduced in the Code of Canon Law. As a matter of fact, it is well known that one of the principal characteristics of the Codex is the precise and clear-cut distinction made between the internal and the external forum.

b) "Should not be appointed to act as tellers".

That is, those who accompany the President at the Chapter and, according to the norms of §2, act as tellers, may not be ordinary confessors (2). There are no regular tellers, male or female, besides the priests that accompany the President.

As these tellers are not *de gremio collegii*, one may have his serious doubts as to whether they are required to take the oath

---

\* The first part of this article appeared in Vol. VIII, No. 1 (1955), pp. 36-39.

1 By "ordinary" confessor is meant the one appointed in accordance with the rule given in canon 520, §1. If there are several confessors of this type, they are all included.

2 This prescription which insists on the nomination of *comites Praesidis* is very old; it is to be found in the chapter *Quia propter de electione*" in 6° (Cf, for example, PELLIZZARIUS, *De Monialibus*, c. x, q. 7.) though there are customs and constitutions to the contrary, (*Bouix, De Reg.*, II, 391; and also in virtue of the decree of the Congregation for Religious, Aug. 27th. 1910, as to which of these officials exercise the duty of scrutineers: "Emi Patres S.C. Negotiis Sod. Rel. praepositae; in Plenario Coetu, ad Vaticanum habito die 26 mensis augusti 1910, quaestioni, saepe agitatae si et quot sacerdotes sociare debeat Episcopus vel Praelatus Regularis qui praest Monialium Capitulo ad eligendam Abbatissim vel Priorissam Monasterii coacto, re mature perpensa responderunt: In electionibus Abbatissae aut Priorissae, sive Monasterium subiiciatur Episcopo, sive Praelato Regulari, singula vota Monialium in urna clausa colligantur et a Praelato Praeside cum duobus sacerdotibus scrutatoribus aperiuntur; quod si gravi de causa, vota oretenus dantur, id fiat coram Praelato, adsistentibus tamen sacerdotibus scrutatoribus. Sacerdotes, de quibus agitur, sint maturae aetatis et probatae virtutis. Attamen uti scrutatores aut socii Episcopi vel Praelati non admittantur ipsi Monialium Confessarii ordinarii" (A.A.S. II, 1910, p. 732).

prescribed in § 1 of Can. 171. Indeed, they must observe all the other conditions prescribed by that canon, (8).

#### INTERPRETATION OF §4.

a) "*In religious congregations of women*".

This paragraph includes all the Congregations of women, whether *iuris pontificii* or *iuris dioecesani*, whether they are exempt from the jurisdiction of the Ordinary of the place and subject to male Religious, or whether they are not so exempt (4).

On the contrary, it does not include *Religiones virorum*, not even the Congregations of men *iuris dioecesani*, which in this matter enjoy preference over any Congregation of women *iuris pontificii*.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Ordinary of the place may for various reasons preside over Congregations of men *iuris pontificii*, such as in cases where the constitutions attribute this right to the Ordinary of the place, the Congregations themselves are in duty bound to offer such presidency at elections, but the Ordinary of the place is not thereby compelled to exercise such presidency at an election.

- 3 The text of the Code does not contemplate scrutineers who are not members of the Chapter. It has exempted from the oath the President, who is not a member of the Chapter as well; but it is not to be argued from the absence of any provisions in the law that the rule that prescribes the oath in the case of scrutineers who are members of the Chapter, is not to be applied by analogy to those who are not; because the exception favours expressly only the President. Though, as there are no clear provisions in the law, it is with great reluctance that we dare to propose the existence of a strict obligation.
- 4 This legislation covering the congregation is derived from the application of the practical jurisprudence approved for the first time by the *Concilium Tridentinum* Sess. XXV, c. 7 and from the constitution of Gregory XV on the assistance to be given by the Ordinary of the place during the elections of NUNS. This jurisprudence was solemnly confirmed by the Constitution *Conditae* for congregations *iuris dioecesani* (c. I. §9) as also for those that are *iuris pontificii* (c. I. §1.) But in virtue of the Constitution *Conditae*, the Ordinary presided not only over the election of Superiors General, but also over the other elections that followed during the same Chapter; during elections that were held at Congregations *iuris dioecesani* the Ordinary used to preside *iure proprio* and confirm the same elections according to the dictates of his conscience; on the contrary, he used to preside over Congregations *iuris pontificii* as a delegate of the Holy See. But, ever since the constitution *Conditae* the jurisprudence on the intervention of the Ordinary of the place in Congregations *iuris pontificii*, has become gradually restricted to the election of the Superior General. (Cf. Bastien: *Directoire canonique* n. 303).

## b) "At the election of the Superior General".

The right and the duty of the local Ordinary to preside over Chapters General are limited to Chapters at which the Mother Superior is elected; as a matter of fact, they are limited to the actual election of the Mother Superior (5).

The election of the Superior General is usually held at the beginning of the Chapter, and in that case the ordinary is immediately invited. As soon as the election of the Superior is completed, the Ordinary must withdraw, because his office is thus completed; and all subsequent elections — such as the election of Sister Councillors, of the procurator of the Secretary General, of the Provincials etc. as also all the other questions with which the same Chapter has to deal — these will be presided over either by the new Mother Superior or by the Sister whom the constitutions will have chosen as President.

## c) "Will preside the Ordinary of the place where the Chapters are being held, either by himself or by his delegate".

The Code in general has nothing to say about the delegations which were formerly attributed by right to the Ordinary, so that we think that nowadays he presides over the Chapter General of the above-mentioned institutions not as delegate of the Holy See, but only as Ordinary (6).

5 In this regard, therefore, the Constitution *Conditae* is to be amended also with reference to Congregations *iuris dioecesiani*. The jurisdiction of the Ordinary of the place does not extend, as formerly, to all the elections, but has been limited to the election of the Superior General.

6 Cf. VERMEERSCH: l.c. BASTIEN; l.c. The Ordinary does not, therefore, act as delegate of the Apostolic See while presiding over the elections at Congregations *iuris pontificii*, as prescribed by the constitution "Conditae" (c. II, 1.) but as Ordinary true and proper. Besides, as, according to common law, the Ordinary is the one and only President, all powers that are attributed by right to the President of the elections fall also within his competence, without any exceptions; such as the power to receive the votes, annotate them, verify whether the number corresponds to that of the electors, break the parity of the votes according to can. 101 §1 (1); except for a formal derogation of the constitution to common right. CHELODI, *Jus de Personis* n. 253, not. 3 unreasonably holds, against the opinion expressed by VERMEERSCH (*Epit.*, 1, 483), that the right of breaking the parity of votes according to the norm of can. 101 §1 (1) is to be exercised by the President only when he happens to be a member of the Chapter.

From the term used by the Code (*suo voto paritatem dirimat*) one cannot infer that the President should have an active voice in the Chapter; on the contrary the word *votum* is used to eliminate such a possibility. Ordinarily the Code uses the term *suffragium*, when it intends to signify the exercise of an effective vote.

Therefore the right to preside over the said Chapters conceded by the law is not to be considered merely as an honour, but implies the duty of directing the elections with efficiency.

The Ordinary must preside at the election, either personally or through his delegate (7).

He may, however, be accompanied by a few ecclesiastics, who may not interfere in any way in the business of the Chapter General. It is necessary that the Superiors take measures to advise the Ordinary in time of the convocation of the Chapter, and, if necessary, even wait for him, so that he may exercise his right and carry out his duties (8).

The Ordinary who has the right of presiding over the election in Congregations *iuris pontificii*, as also in Congregations *iuris dioecesani*, is the Ordinary of the diocese in which these elections are held, and not that of the locality in which the mother-house is established (9).

---

7 As a matter of fact, as, according to law, the Ordinary of the place is the only President of the election, no election can be held without his intervention. An election made in the absence of the Ordinary seems, according to the same law, to be null and void, and not simply rescindible. As a matter of fact the chapter in this case would find itself without a President. The President is imposed by canon law, and seems to be essential.

8 The Ordinary may not take with him the scrutineers; cf. JARDI, *El derecho de las Relig.*, n. 195. The scrutineers are to be chosen from among the Nuns. To the Ordinary is conceded only the right of presidency, and there is no reason why nuns who are not impeded by papal closure should not exercise the office of scrutineers. Finally, in virtue of a general rule in the law, which is still valid, the scrutineers must be chosen from among the members of the Chapter. Cf. FANFANI, *De iure Relig.*, n. 100; VERMEERSCH, *Epit.* n. 579; CREUSEN, *Religieux et Religieuses*, n. 62. It should also be noted that there may be neither more nor less than two scrutineers.

9 Cf. S. Cong. De Relig 2.7.21 to 2; BASTIEN, 1.c.n. 277; JARDI, 1.c.n. 183. So far as regards Congregations *iuris pontificii* this has already been established in the constitution *Conditae* c.II, 1: "However, at the Chapters that are held during female Congregations for the assignment of duties, the bishop of the diocese where such chapters are held, will preside, either in person or through a representative, as a delegate of the Holy See". As regards Congregations *iuris dioecesani*, all jurisprudence has denied the pretensions of the Ordinaries of the places where the mother-convent is established. Usages and constitutions that are contrary to this clear prescription made by the law have no value whatsoever according to the norms of cc.5.6.489.

d) "*If there is question of diocesan Congregations*".

In Congregations *iuris pontificii* the Ordinary who presides has no other right besides that of presiding at the election till the Superior General is elected. When the election is completed, and the elected nun has accepted, the Ordinary will thus have accomplished his duty without having to confirm or annul the election. This is conceded to the Ordinary only in the case of Congregations *iuris dioecesani* (10).

e) "*He may at will confirm or annul the election*".

As will be seen, this is not a simple publication or proclamation of the election, but a regular confirmation, which consists in the declaration that the requirements of Canon Law and of the constitutions have been observed, and that therefore the election is canonical. Without this act the election is substantially incomplete, because the election constitutes only a part of such an act.

The Codex attributes to the diocesan Ordinary the right to annul, that is, to deny his consent to, the election: now the two terms "confirm" and "annul" are correlative. If an election is annulled, it must be held anew. It may happen, however, that, according to the provisions of the law (Can. 178 and 181. §2), the election will be left to him. On the contrary, the Ordinary can never elect the Superior General himself directly, instead of the Chapter.

It is logical to leave the election to the Ordinary when three scrutines do not produce a majority. The Codex, in Can. 101, §1. n. 1st., gives this right to the Ordinary, and he may exercise such right if he considers it necessary.

The Superior who has the right to confirm the election is the Ordinary of the diocese in which the election is held and at which he has the right to preside (11)

f) "*As he in conscience sees fit*".

There are some authors who interpret these words according to the rules of the law that applies to the confirmation. "The Superior", states §2 of can. 171, who has ascertained that the person

10 Cf. Const. *Conditae*, c.1. §9: "peractam electionem confirmare vel rescindere integrum est pro conscientiae Officio". Contrary to what has been prescribed for the election of the *Antistita* of nuns and of the Superior General of any congregation *iuris pontificii*, the Ordinary has no right to confirm the election. On the other hand, for Congregations *iuris dioecesani* the Code prescribes that the election of the Superior General must be confirmed by the Ordinary of the place.

11 S.C. De Religiosis, 2.7.1921, AAS., XIII, p. 481 sq.

elected is qualified, and that the election has been conducted according to the rules of the law, cannot withhold confirmation" (12).

Others on the other hand, departing from the phrase "As he in conscience sees fit", attribute to the Ordinary the right to confirm or to deny confirmation if his conscience thus dictates. And he is free to act accordingly as long as in his opinion, the Superior is governing the community, even though there may be others more capable than she (13). This opinion we also share.

R. GAUCI, *O.F.M. Conv.*

---

12 Cf. CREUSEN, *Religieux et Religieuses* n. 64.

13 Cf. FANFANI, *De iure Relig.* 109B; VERMEERSCH, *Epit.* 1, n. 579, CHELODI, *De Personis*, n. 253; BASTIEN, *o.c.*, n. 300.

# Casus Moralis

Titius, Melitensis, in America Septentrionali migratus, matrimonium contrahit cum Caja Melitae sita. Matrimonio ita celebrato, auctoritas civilis localis licentiam Cajae denegat in Americam migrandi. Titius vero, prolem habere cupiens, proprium semen, nova methodo scientifica elaboratum et sigillatum, uxori suae mittit, quod, medico interveniente, in vaginam ejusdem uxoris mittitur et prolis concipitur. Tribus postea annis a nuptiis transactis, Titius uxori suae scribit atque intimat quod si ipsa infra duos menses in Americam non pergeret illam relinqueret et matrimonium civile in America contraheret. Et ita factum est.

Matrimonio civili celebrato, Titius in morbum contagiosum incidit, quod cum notum sit Cajae uxori, ipsa Caja Titio conjugii valedicit et aliud matrimonium promittit Sempronio Titii consobrino (cugino) cum quo jam in publico et notorio concubinato vivit.

## QUAERITUR:

1. Quid requiratur ut matrimonium inter sponso in diversis regionibus sitos, valide et licite celebrari possit.
2. Quid de natura et licitate foecundationis artificialis dicendum.
3. Utrum Caja, omnibus consideratis, aliud matrimonium cum Sempronio contrahere possit.

## SOLUTIO:

Ad. I. — Ad quodcumque matrimonium valide contrahendum “necesse est ut contrahentes praesentes sint sive per se ipsi sive per procuratorem” (1), non autem per epistolam uti ante Codicem. Sed ut matrimonium per procuratorem valide et licite celebrari possit, quaedam conditiones in Canone 1089 recensitae observari debent; et sunt sequentes:—

a) *Ad validitatem*: 1) ut procurator speciale mandatum acceperit ad contrahendum cum determinata persona et quidem subscriptum a mandante *et* vel a paroco aut Ordinario loci in quo mandatum fit, vel a sacerdote ab alterutro delegato, vel a duobus saltem testibus. Et si mandans scribere nesciat, id in ipso mandato adnotetur et alius testis addatur qui scripturam ipse quoque subsignet; secus mandatum irritum est.

---

1 Can. 1088, §1.

2) Ut mandans mandatum non revocaverit ante contractum matrimonium, neque in amentiam inciderit. Secus matrimonium invalidum est, licet sive procurator sive alia pars contrahens haec ignoraverit.

3) Ut procurator per se munere suo fungatur. Igitur nulla est delegatio a procuratore, vel de consensu mandantis, alteri facta.

4) Appositio diei, mensis et anni, *probabilius* ad validitatem mandati requiritur (2).

b) *Ad licitatem*: 1) Ut ex justa causa fit, ut in casu nostro.

2) Ut de authenticitate mandati constet.

3) Et-si tempus suppetat, licentia Ordinarii habita sit (3).

4) Ut serventur statuta dioecesana si quae insuper hac de re existant; quae in nostra dioecesi nulla habentur.

Iis igitur omnibus servatis, matrimonium inter Titium et Cajam ita celebratum, nil vetat quominus validum et licitum sit. Sicut alii contractus, valet etiam matrimonium per procuratorem initum quod anglice '*by proxy*' audit. Notandum tamen quod leges civiles aliquando matrimonium per procuratorem non admittunt, ita v.g. Status foederati Americae Septentrionalis, saltem quoad suos cives. Quoad extraneos actualiter residentes in istis locis, sententia data a Iudice foederali Lowell, die 29 Junii 1924, validitatem matrimonii inter duos lusitano agnoscebat (4).

Ad II. — Saeculo elapso ad finem vertente, Spallanzani, sacerdos Mutinensis, in scientiis naturalibus celeberrimus et in Papiensi Universitate professor, publici juris fecit novam theoriam, quod scilicet animalia possunt foecundari absque carnali maris et feminae commixtione, supplente artificiali methodo, qua per syphunculum masculinum semen in foeminea organa introducatur, dixitque se rem in cane expertum esse. Deinde medici hanc praxim applicaverunt humanae generationi et quidem cum felici exitu. Hodie nemo negat prolem exinde haberi posse.

Modus tamen hujusmodi foecundationis varius recensetur h.e. :—

1) vel semen ex masturbatione ope syphunculi a medico colligitur et immittitur in vaginam usque ad collum uteri;

2) vel vir coit in alio vase, extra naturale, et semen colligitur uti supra et introducitur in cavitatem vaginae;

2 Affirmat F. CAPPELLO, *De Sacramentis*, 1947, ed. V, vol. V, n. 619.

3 Can. 1091.

4 WOYWOOD-SMITH, *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, New York, 1948, vol. I, n. 1092.

3) vel facta normali cōpula, assumitur semen et melius introdu-  
citur in vaginae cavitatem.

Liceitas vero foecundationis respicere tantum potest semen pro-  
prij mariti et non aliorum, uti patet. In casu, foecundatio artificialis  
vel supplet naturam vel adjuvat. Si supplet, foecundatio artificialis est  
omnino illicita uti patet ex responsione S. Officii 25 Martii 1897, ex  
claris verbis Encyclicae *Casti Connubii*, 31 Dec. 1930 et ex allocutione  
Papae Pii XII, 29 Sept. 1949, occasione congressus medicorum catholi-  
corum et tandem ex allocutione ejusdem Pontificis 29 Dec. 1951 ad  
obstetrices habita. Si vero *adjuvat*, foecundatio licita est sive in se,  
sive in modo, verificatis verificandis.

Ex dictis sequitur quod primus et secundus modi foecundationis  
artificialis supra recensiti sunt omnino illiciti, et ratio est quia copula  
matrimonialis proprie dicta non habetur; tertius modus non videtur  
reprehensione dignus quia copula naturali modo peragitur. Casus hic  
esset v.g. si vir intra vas vix posset seminare propter arctitudinem  
vaginae. Notandum tandem quod si semen sumitur ex pollutione invo-  
luntaria vel immediate ex epididymo videtur saltem quod licita etiam  
evaderet foecundatio artificialis.

Ad. III. — Si matrimonium inter Titium et Cajam invalide, praeser-  
tim propter omissas condiciones in procuratore requisitas, contractum  
fuit, nullitas matrimonii coram tribunali ecclesiastico probata, nil vetat  
quominus Caja aliud matrimonium contrahere possit. Si valide, novum  
matrimonium evaderet aliquantulum difficile, at non omnino impossi-  
bile. Etenim matrimonium Cajae cum Titio consummatum non fuit,  
quamvis ab eo prolis nata sit (5). Ut consummatum dicatur requiritur  
copula matrimonialis ad quam ordinatur ipsum matrimonium et qua  
conjuges fiunt una caro (6). Nequidem dicendum esset matrimonium  
consummatum cum maritus semen ad os vaginae tantum apponeret etsi  
exinde, forsan, prolis nasceretur; a fortiori matrimonium consumma-  
tum dicendum non est per foecundationem artificialem quamvis AUER  
sententiam contrariam teneat (7). Ratio quam affert idem auctor, quod  
nempe foecundatio artificialis ignota adhuc erat codificantibus, falsa  
est.

5 Haec pars casus est potius theoretica quam practica, praesertim quia  
spermatozoïda in 10° et 15° gradu caloris C. posita vix ultra 72 horas  
suam capacitatem generativam conservant. Sed quod hodie nobis  
videtur improbable, tractu temporis, evadere potest probabilissimum.

6 Can. 1015 §1.

7 AUER, S., S.J., *De Virtute Castitatis ejusque laesionibus*, Oeniponte,  
1920, n. 136.

Cum igitur matrimonium de quo in casu consummatum non fuerit, per dispensationem R. Pontificis ex justa causa concedendam, utraque parte rogante vel alterutra, etsi altera sit invita, dissolvi potest(8). Ergo Caja potest dispensationem a suo matrimonio rato a R. Pontifice petere, quam dispensationem Pontifex concedere solet justa causa interveniente. Qualis autem justa sit causa, prudentiae ejusdem R. Pontificis remittitur. Doctores plures hujusmodi causas enumerant quarum praecipuae sunt: 1) animorum dissociatio, quin affulgeat futurae reconciliationis spes; 2) timor probabilis magni scandali futuri, discordiarum et rixarum inter consanguineos; 3) probabilis suspicio impotentiae cum periculo incontinentiae; 4) divortium civile ab altera parte obtentum cum periculo incontinentiae alterius **partis innocentis**; 5) semiplena probatio defectus consensus aut alterius impedimenti; 6) morbus contagiosus superveniens; 7) periculum perversionis, ut si qua cum heretico contraxerit; 8) si quis aliud matrimonium equidem nullum deinde inierit a quo se aliter liberare nequeat e.g. matrimonium civile; 9) tandem mutuus consensus. Uti patet diversae ex hisce causis in nostro casu verificantur ideoque dispensatio facilius obtineri potest.

Sed "data a Sancta Sede dispensatio super matrimonio rato et non consummato — ait Canon 1053 — secumfert semper dispensationem ab impedimento proveniente ex adulterio cum promissione vel attentatione matrimonii, si qua opus sit, minime vero ab impedimento de quo in can. 1075, nn. 2, 3." h.e. quando non agitur de machinatione mortis sive unius sive utriusque partis. Clarius: per dispensationem super rato cessat impedimentum criminis primae speciei tantum, scilicet quando habetur adulterium cum promissione vel attentatione matrimonii; alia impedimenta non cessant si quae sunt. Ergo Caja antequam ad novas nuptias transeat, aliam dispensationem obtinere debet ab impedimento affinitatis in 2<sup>o</sup> gradu lineae collateralis. Titius enim et Sempronius de quo in casu consobrini sunt (9). Impedimentum Publicae Honestatis per publicum vel notorium concubinatum in casu nostro non tenet, quia hoc impedimentum "dirimit in primo et secundo gradu lineae rectae inter virum et consanguineas mulieris, ac vice versa" (10), et non inter ipsos sponso.

A. TABONE.

8 Can. 1119.

9 Cfr. Can. 1077 cum can. 97.

10 Can. 1078.

# SHORT NOTES

## GLEANINGS FROM THE GOSPELS IN MALTESE

*u, mingħajr ma għarafha, wildet iben. Matt. 1, 25.*

This is not a literal rendering. The literal rendering would be: *u ma għarafhiex sakemm wildet iben*, which would seem to imply that Joseph had carnal relations with Mary after the birth of Jesus. This, however, is not the sense necessarily conveyed by the Greek conjunction *heos* or Hebrew-Aramaic *ghad* (sakemm). Sometimes the conjunction *ghad* denotes a point of time inclusive of further duration. Thus in Ps. 110, 1 we read: "Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies your footstool". This does not mean that the Messiah was to depart from the right of the Lord when the enemies had been subjected to him. So also in Matt. 1, 25 the conjunction *ghad, heos, sakemm* does not necessarily exclude further duration of the action expressed by the verb *ma għarafhiex*. That this further duration must necessarily be included is proved by other theological arguments, not by the context. I have preferred a free rendering expressing exactly the sense in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding. The same rendering is given by P. Joüon (*L'Evangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*), *La Sacra Bibbia a cura del Pontificio Istituto Biblico*, P. Benoit (*L'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu in Bible de Jerusalem*).

\* \* \*

### SCANDALUM.

The Greek word *scandalum* occurs only in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. In the New Testament it is always used in a religious and moral sense, 'occasion of fall, action or person inducing one to sin'. In Maltese I have retained the original meaning 'tfixkil' as far as possible, but in some cases where the rendering 'tfixkil' was not clear enough, I have translated 'skandlu', cp. Matt. 18, 7; Luke 17, 1, or 'tigrif' cp. Matt. 18, 8. 9; Mk. 9, 43. 45.

\* \* \*

### INCREPARE.

This Latin verb generally means 'to reproach, to rebuke', in Maltese '(anfar'. But the underlying Hebrew verb *gaghar* or its Aramaic equivalent means 'to address a person with a loud voice', hence 'to command with a loud voice'. The idea of 'a loud voice' inherent in the Hebrew verb is best reproduced in Maltese by the verb 'għajjat ma'. But the verb 'increpare' does not always reproduce the exact meaning intended by the Evangelist. In Matt.

\* *Cont. from vol. VIII, 1, p. 40.42.*

17, 17 'increpavit illum Jesus' = *amar Gesù a-xitan bil-herra*; so also Luke 4, 35; 9, 42; 8, 24 *amar bil-qawwa*; 9.22 *amarhom shih*. But in some cases the meaning 'canfar, ghajjat ma' suits the context better, so Matt. 19, 13; 20, 31; Luke 18, 15. 39; 19, 39.

\* \* \*

#### EVANGELIUM

This word is generally used in the Gospels in its etymological meaning 'good tidings'. The meaning of 'written documents containing the good tidings' does not occur in the Gospels but in later literature. Hence I have always translated 'bxara', except in Marc 8, 35 and 10, 29 where the word 'Evangelju' seems to sound better. The verb 'evangelizare' is accordingly rendered 'xandar il-bxara' or by a similar expression.

\* \* \*

*porro unum est necessarium.* Luke. 10. 41.

This is the Vulgate reading supported by the majority of the Latin texts. But the best Greek authorities have: 'few things are needed, or only one'. This is the reading adopted in the Maltese version.

P. P. SAYDON.

## Book Reviews

*L'Attente du Messie*, Desclee de Brouwer 1954, pp. 188.

This is a collection of papers by Catholic Professors of the Benelux countries read during the 4th meeting of the 'Journées Bibliques' of Louvain in 1-3 September 1952. The main theme is: "Messianism considered as the central point of all the history and revelation of the Old and New Testament."

The first paper, *L'Etude du Messianisme, problèmes et méthode*, by Fr. B. Rigaux O.F.M. traces the main lines of the development of the study of Messianism during the last 50 years. The traditional exegetical method which endeavoured to explain in a literal sense whatever had or seemed to have any relation with the Messiah has been to a large extent modified by means of more pliable hermeneutical principles: 1. Messianic prophecies must be studied in relation to the historical circumstances in which they have been delivered. 2. The relations between the Old and New Testament must be viewed in the light of the literal, plenary and typical sense. He concludes by making three remarks: (i) The study of Messianism has now been placed on a sound basis owing to a more profound knowledge of its constituent elements. (ii) One must absolutely determine the relation between prediction and fulfilment in order to evaluate properly the full import of messianic prophecy. (iii) Messianism is not a merely speculative problem: it is a living issue, a living force directing and determining the course of all our life.

In the second essay, *Les origines du Messianisme, le dernier essai de synthèse historique*, Prof. Coppens of Louvain reviews a book by the Norwegian scholar Sigmund Mowinckel '*Han som kommer*' ('He who comes': very strangely *han* is twice spelt wrongly *ham*, p. 31 and p. 41). Mowinckel begins by defining the terms of the problem. The Messiah, he says, is a political and eschatological figure. By eschatology he means the transformation of the world or the return to its original condition in the last days. Messianism, so defined, sprang up during the exile or rather after the downfall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Is. 7, 14-17 and 9, 5f are not really messianic; 11, 1-9 is hardly so. Nor are the prophecies concerning the Suffering Servant in Isaiah really messianic because they have no eschatological colour. The expression 'Son of Man' is neither eschatological nor messianic, though adapted by the Jews to the Messiah. These are the main lines of Mowinckel's exposition of Messianism, to which Prof. Coppens subjoins the following remarks: 1. Mowinckel's definitions of Messianism and eschatology are too rigid. Messianism is not necessarily eschatological, and eschatology does not necessarily refer to the last times. Eschatology may also mean a stage in the historical evolution of mankind marking the beginning of a new era. The advent of the Messiah was in reality an important stage in the history of man and the beginning of a new era. 2. Mowinckel's definition of Messianism does not hold good

when confronted with certain prophetic texts and royal psalms that are certainly pre-exilic. 3. Before the rise of eschatology, as understood by Mowinckel, there were in Israel aspirations for better times, which may be called 'soteriology' and which go back to the beginning of man's history (Gen. 3, 15). 4. The belief in the regality of Yahweh, which is pre-exilic, must be taken into due consideration. 5. Messianism is not the starting-point of eschatology, but only a stage or a parenthesis in its development. 6. A complete synthesis of Israel's hopes must extend over these points: pre-messianic soteriology of Israel; royal historical Messianism; different soteriological trends in post-exilic times. 7. One must not expect to find a mathematical equation between prophecy and its fulfilment.

In the third paper, *La prophétie d'Emmanuel*, Prof. Coppens defends the traditional messianic interpretation of Is. 7, 14 with special reference to an article by J. J. Stamm, *La Phosphétie d'Emmanuel*, in *Rev. Théol. Philos.* (1944, pp. 1-27), who denies the literal messianic and christological meaning of the passage.

The fourth paper, *Le Serviteur de Jahvé figure royale ou prophétique?*, by Fr. V. de Leeuw O.F.M. Cap. brings out the royal and messianic character of the Servant of Yahweh in the second part of the book of Isaiah.

The fifth paper, *Le Messianisme royal dans le Nouveau Testament*, by A. Descamps of Louvain deals with the royal Messianism in the New Testament. Of the messianic titles of Jesus, Descamps selects only two: 'Son of David' and 'King', and examines all their occurrences in the Gospel and in the Apostolic predication and writings. The Jews, or at least some of them, acknowledged Jesus as a descendant of David and as the Messiah, but Christ rejected their acclamations in so far as they were the expression of their temporal expectations and endeavoured to raise up and to spiritualize their aspirations. Similarly Christ did not reject the regality altogether, but only that temporal regality which the Jews were expecting.

J. Gilbert of Malines writes on the prophetic character of the Messiah (*Prophétisme et Attente d'un Messie Prophète dans l'Ancien Judaïsme*), tracing the development of prophetism from its origin down to New Testament times. Though Christ appeared as a prophet of the older times, acting and speaking in the name of God and communicating God's message to the people, he was not universally recognized as the Messiah — prophet whom the Jews had been long expecting. There were in the time of Christ two opposite currents about the Messiah, the Phariseean current with its veneration for the Law and disregard of the prophet's teaching, and the popular current which kept to the traditional view of the high authority of the prophet. The phariseean current is traced back to Hellenistic times which mark the decline of prophetism and the rise of Pharisaism and of a special class of doctors of the Law, the Scribes, who considered the Law to be the only source of divine revelation. It is interesting to note that the sectarian documents of the New Alliance describe the Messiah as a king-priest and as a prophet who has received from God all the knowledge about the last things. Christ was conscious of realizing

the expectations of his contemporaries which he raised to a higher and more spiritual level.

'The miracles of the Fourth Gospel as works of God and proofs of the messianic mission of Christ' is the subject of a paper by L. Cerfaux of Louvain. Christ's miracles are called by St. John 'wonders' and 'works'; they are, in fact, wonderful deeds revealing the divine power of Christ. Their purpose is to excite faith in Christ which finds its expression in the acknowledgement of Christ's divinity.

J. Coppens comes in again with a paper on the Christology of St. Paul according to some recent publications by L. Cerfaux (*La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul*, Paris, 1942; 2nd ed. 1948; *Le Christ dans la Théologie de saint Paul*, Paris, 1951). Cerfaux distinguishes three stages in the theological development of Paul: first, primitive theology which he learnt from the first Christian community of Jerusalem; second, mystical theology, the fruit of his personal experience and meditation; third, apocalyptic theology, the result of a more profound speculation of the Christian message. In the first stage of his preaching Paul presents Christ as the 'author of salvation', 'the glorious Messiah' and 'the Son of God'. In the second stage his knowledge of the divine filiation of Christ becomes more profound. In the third stage Christ is the true image of God, identified with the Suffering Servant and represented as sitting at the right hand of God the Father, having received a name which is above all other names.

Prof. R. de Langhe of Louvain closes this series of papers. The subject of his paper, *Judaïsme ou Hellenisme en rapport avec le Nouveau Testament*, lies outside the field of Messianism. It is universally admitted that the NT cannot be fully understood without an adequate knowledge of its Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds. Fortunately, this is being investigated in all its various branches and many results have been definitely acquired. De Langhe illustrates the importance of the study of Jewish and Hellenistic sources for the right interpretation of the NT by many examples drawn from the language of the N.T. and the recently discovered documents of the Dead Sea. De Langhe minimizes the Hellenistic influence on Paul's mind and, following W.C. van Unnik of Utrecht, retains that Paul spent his younger years in Jerusalem where he received a purely Jewish education, and it is therefore in the light of Jewish thought that St. Paul must be read and understood.

Readers will certainly regret the omission of an extremely interesting paper in Dutch by J. van der Ploeg O.P. on the relation between prediction and fulfilment. Van der Ploeg maintains that we are not to expect an exact correspondence between the two, and the fulfilment always surpasses the bare outline of the prediction.

Although certain aspects of Messianism, such as the priestly character of the Messiah, have not been dealt with, these papers are an important contribution to the study of Messianism. The wish has been expressed that we may have a complete exposition of the doctrine of biblical Messianism. May this wish become soon an accomplished fact.

P. P. SAYDON.

E. F. SUTCLIFFE S.J., *Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testaments*; Thomas Nelson and Sons, n.d. but published 1955, pp. viii+175.

The existence of suffering, especially the suffering of the innocent, is one of the most perplexing and contradictory problems in the life of man. Man was created to be happy, and yet suffering is the lot of the greater part of mankind. This calls for an explanation, and man has from very early times tried to pierce the mystery and to discover the ultimate reason of man's suffering on earth. This is the purpose of this book. After having briefly stated the problem, the author examines some of the ancient religious systems, especially that of Babylon, and their solutions of the problem. He then passes on to the Old Testament. Man was created in a state of innocence and happiness, but he disobeyed God's commandment, and sin with all its consequences entered into the world. As all men form one large family, the consequences of sin, among which is suffering, became, in force of the law of corporate solidarity, the common heritage of mankind. The doctrine of corporate personality and collective responsibility, together with its implications, is fully discussed. But together with collective responsibility the Hebrews knew also of personal responsibility and retribution. All this however, does not provide an adequate solution of the problem. Man sometimes suffers when there is no personal and no national guilt to expiate. Other elements have to be brought in for the solution, and these are: vicarious suffering; the Servant of the Lord has suffered for the sins of all men; suffering as a test of virtue, as in the case of Job; suffering as the result of the performance of one's mission, as in the case of Jeremiah. Suffering is also viewed in the light of future life and especially in relation to the sufferings of Christ with whom all Christians form one mystic body sharing the joys and the sufferings of the Head.

It will thus be seen that the problem is a very complex one and the solution must necessarily be a complex one too. The sufferings of Job are not those of Jeremiah nor those of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53; nor are the sufferings of a martyr those involved in a national calamity or modern war. There is a progressive development in the doctrine of suffering culminating in the final retribution in heaven.

This complex problem is considered in all its aspects. The discussion is always clear, convincing, plain, free of all the trammels of an ostentatious erudition. The author likes to enlarge upon certain points of detail, but the main point is never lost sight of.

The reader regrets the absence of a foreword explaining the object of the book, its origin and limits. Certain chapters are very loosely connected, and one gets the impression that the book has grown from lectures delivered on different occasions. But on the whole the book makes very easy and pleasant reading and is an important contribution to Old Testament theology.

P. P. SAYDON.

## PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following :

*Analecta Tertii Ordinis Regularis S. Francisci* — Vol. VI, (1955).

*Australasian Catholic Record* — Vol. 32, nos. 3, 4 (1955).

*Biblica: Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* — Vol. 36, Fasc. 3, 4  
(1955).

*Carmelus* — Vol. II, no. 2 (1955).

*Catholic Biblical Quarterly* — Vol. XVII, nos. 3, 4 (1955).

*Cistercium* — Nov.-Dec. 1955. (2 copies).

*Irish Theological Quarterly* — Vol. XXII, nos. 3, 4 (1955).

*Liturgy* — Vol. XXV, nos. 2, 3, 4 (1955).

*Lucerna* — Vol. II, no. 4, 5, 6 (1955).

*Miscellanea Comillas* — Vol. XXIV (1955).

*Relations* — XVe année, nos. 177-182 (1955).

*Rivista del Clero Italiano* — Anno 36°, Fasc. vii-xii (1955).

*Salesianum* — Anno XVII, no. 3, 4 (1955).

*Scientia* — Vol. XXI, nos. 3, 4 (1955).

*Scripture* — Vol. VII, nos. 3, 4 (1955).

*Scuola (La) Cattolica* — Anno LXXXIII, Fasc. 4, 5, 6 (1955).

*The Church Teaches*, ed. by Jesuit Fathers of St. Mary's College,  
Kansas, U.S.A. — Herder: 1955. (A Review of this book will  
appear in the next issue of *Melita Theologica*).

*Theology Digest* — Vol. III, nos. 3, 4 (1955).