

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. X

1957

No. 1

HISTORY OF THE MALTESE BIBLE

The Maltese translation of the Bible is the product of literary and religious factors and, to a certain extent, private enterprise. For many long centuries, i.e. until the closing years of the eighteenth century, the Maltese language was never used for literary purposes, the languages of education being Latin and Italian. The earlier Maltese writers found an enormous difficulty to reduce to some sort of Latin script a Semitic language which had many sounds that were absent in Romance languages. Moreover up to the beginning of the nineteenth century the education of the population was very poor. In the year 1836 there were only three Government Elementary schools: one in Valletta, the capital, another in Senglea and the third, very poorly attended, in Gozo, the sister Island, in all of which the instruction was of a meagre and wretched character¹. As there were very few who could write and read Maltese, the need of a Maltese translation of the Bible was not yet felt.

But a great change was brought about towards the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. Through the efforts of M.A. Vassalli, the first and the greatest Maltese scholar and author of a Maltese Grammar² and Dictionary³, Maltese began gradually to assert its rights as a literary language. Vassalli himself published a collection of Maltese proverbs and a translation of the story of Cyrus⁴. Moreover after the occupation of the Island by the English the Protestant Missionary Society, who used the Bible as the most powerful means for the propagation of its doctrines, needed a Maltese translation of the Bible, or at least the New Testament, which they could disseminate among the people. It was thus that the first Maltese translation of the Bible sprang up, and it was under the combined influence of the same literary and religious factors that later translations were produced.

¹ P. Debono, *A brief compendium of the History of Malta*, Malta, 1903, p. 95.

² *Mylsen Phaenico-Punicum sive Grammatica Melitensis*, Rome, 1791.

³ *Lexicon Melitense-Latino-Italum*, Rome, 1796.

⁴ For a complete biography of M.A. Vassalli see A. Cremona, *Vassalli and his Times*, Malta, 1940.

The history of the Maltese translation of the Bible falls into three periods. The first period extends from the beginning of the nineteenth century or, more precisely, from the year 1822 to the year 1847. Its characteristics are: literary development of Maltese and Protestant Missionary work. Translations: The New Testament and the Psalms. The second period extends more or less from 1847 to 1917. Its characteristics are: a greater development of Maltese and a weaker Protestant activity, and the first attempts to introduce the Bible into the teaching of the Maltese Catholics. Translations: No new translations, but only Catholic adaptations of portions of existing translations. The third period goes from about 1917 to modern times. It is characterized by a still greater literary development of the language and private enterprise. Translations: independent partial translations including the whole of the New Testament and most of the Old Testament, and a complete translation of the whole Bible from the original tongues.

FIRST PERIOD: 1822-1847

The Gospel of St John. The earliest biblical translation in Maltese is that of the Gospel of St John, *Il Vangelo di Nostro Signore Gesù Cristo secondo S. Giovanni tradotto in lingua italiana e maltese secondo la Volgata*, Londra, R. Watts, 1822. The translator's name is not given, but on information furnished by C.F. Schlien⁵, who was for a long time Director of the Malta Press of the Church Missionary Society, and George Percy Badger⁶ who spent his early years in Malta, we can beyond all doubt, ascribe the work to J. CANOLO, who has written other books in Maltese which, however, were never published.

The translation, as it is said in the title, is made from the Latin Vulgate to which it adheres rather slavishly. Thus 3,29 *hena jithenna – gaudio gaudet*; 4,47 *kien qiegħed jibda jmut – incipiebat enim mori*; 5,38 *u l-kelma tiegħu ma għandkomx tghammar fikom – et verbum eius non habetis in vobis manens*; 8,51 *meut ma jarax għal dejjem – mortem non videbit in aeternum*. Occasionally, however, the translation has been made to conform to the Italian translation printed side by side with it. These are some instances: *meta kien qorob lejn id-dar – quando era già verso casa*, Latin *iam autem eo descendente*; 6,52 *għas-saħħa tad-dinja – per la salute del mondo*, Latin *pro mundi vita*; 16,27 *hriġt mill-Missier – sono uscito dal Padre*, Latin *a Deo exivi*; 10,41 *minn kemm għal Guanni – in quanto a Giovanni*, Latin *quā Joānes*⁷. But such

⁵ *Views on the improvement of the Maltese language and its use for the purpose of education and literature*, Malta, 1838, p. 40.

⁶ *Sullo stato della pubblica educazione in Malta*, Malta, 1839, p. 13.

⁷ One may add also 1,10 *għalib – per lui*, Latin *per ipsum*. The preposition *per*

agreements with the Italian translation are neither so numerous nor so weighty as to suggest an Italian origin for the Maltese translation.

The literary merit of this translation considered in its entirety hardly rises above plain mediocrity. The translator's chief aim seems to have been that of reproducing the Latin text as faithfully and as plainly and simply as possible, without caring much for the fineries of style. Very often a slight change, such as transposition of words, substitution of a word for another, suppression of a superfluous word, addition of a particle would have greatly added to the elegance of style without impairing the accuracy of the translation. But in order not to underestimate the merit of the translation, it must, in all fairness, be recognized that the translator at times breaks the monotony of his style by giving the construction a genuinely Semitic turn, especially by the frequent use of the construct case. In this respect Canolo's translation sometimes excels that of his contemporary and better translator M.A. Vassalli. Thus 3,4 *Kif jista' jitwieled il-bniedem, u hu xiħ?* Note particularly the use of the conjunction *u* introducing a circumstantial clause. Vassalli gives the construction another form more easily intelligible, but less artistic and less vigorous: *Kif qatt bniedem jista' jitwieled, meta huwa xiħ?* Compare also 1,4 *dawl il-bnedmin*, Vass. *dawl tal-bnedmin*; 1,23 *triq il-Mulej*, Vass. *it-triq ta' Mulejna*; 3,29 *leħen il-għarus*, Vass. *-il-leħen tal-għarus*; 6,48 *jiena hu ħobż il-ħajja* which is far better than Vass. *jiena jien il-ħobż tal-ħajja*.

This Semitic or, more precisely, Arabic colour of this version is rendered deeper by the use of certain words and forms which belong rather to Arabic than to Maltese. Thus the preposition *bi* used in the sense of *fi*: 1,4 *bib* – *in ipso*; 6,54 *bikom* – *in vobis*; 8,31 *bi kliemi* – *in sermone meo*; the verb *ħad* 'he took', which drops the final *d* in the perfect tense, third person, singular, masculine and in the imperfect tense, singular and in the Imperative singular, maintains the *d* throughout the whole conjugation; so *ħad* 'he took', *jiħud* 'he takes', *ħud* 'take'. Likewise the verb *mar* 'he went', which in Maltese partakes of the nature of two classes of verbs – deaf and hollow verbs, – follows always the conjunction of deaf verbs and consequently the reduplication of *r* in all its forms; so *marr* 'he went', *imurr* 'he goes', *murr* 'go'. The plural form *benin* 'sons' is Arabic, not Maltese. So is also the compound preposition *minn baġħad* 'after', the Maltese equivalent being *imbagħad* which means

in Latin denotes the instrument or the agent, but in Italian it denotes both the agent and the person in whose favour an action is performed. The Maltese translator chose the latter sense and, accordingly, translated *għalih* instead of *bib*. Vassalli, who probably depends on Canolo, translates also *għalih* but the edition of 1847 had, correctly, *bib*.

'then'. Note also the following Arabisms: 3,11 *qabel* 'he received'; 10,33.36 *kafar, kafra* 'he blasphemed, a blasphemy'; 19,12.15 *hadu jghajitu* 'they cried'.

The Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Canolo's translation was followed, seven years later, by the Gospels and Acts translated from Latin: *Quatuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum iuxta Vulgatam Romae A.D. MDXCII editam: necnon eorumdem versio melitenses*, Londini, R. Watts, 1829. Like the preceding one it is anonymous, but it is commonly held to be the work of the great Maltese scholar M.A. VASSALLI. Besides the authority of Schlienzy and Badger, who lived in Malta in Vassalli's time, we have a stronger documentary evidence in the correspondence between the Malta Missionaries and the London Headquarters of the Missionary Society. From letters written between 1823 and 1828 it appears that M.A. Vassalli, author of the Maltese Lexicon and other literary works and the best translator in the Island, both for ability and for fame, was, during this time, engaged in a Maltese translation of the Gospels and Acts which was printed in small pica type by Watts in London soon after June 1828. The odd characters, which Vassalli had introduced in the Maltese alphabet, necessitated a font of sixteen punches, which, through the earnest solicitation of Rev. W. Jowett, were eventually secured⁸. All these circumstances together with the fact that no other Maltese version of the Gospels and Acts is known, except those made by Catholics in much later times, point unmistakably to the anonymous translation published by R. Watts in London in the year 1829 as the work achieved by the learned Vassalli under the direction of the Rev. W. Jowett for the Church Missionary Society.

Vassalli's translation combines the two chief qualities of a good translation, namely, fidelity and perspicuity of expression. The sense is always fully grasped and beautifully expressed in a clear, easy and elegant style. The Latin text is always firmly adhered to and faithfully reproduced with all its minute details and, mostly, with the same sequence of words. This constant aim at fidelity makes the translator sometimes adhere somewhat slavishly to the Latin text, thus sacrificing the exigencies of Maltese style and impairing the freshness and vigour of a genuinely Maltese construction. To quote some examples: Mt. 12,11: *Min ikun minnkom il-bniedem li jkollu nagħga, u jekk dina tiġi taqa' f'hojra nbar ta' sibte, jaqaw ma jaqbadx fiba u jerfagħha?* The awkwardness of this construction is easily removed by a very slight change: *Min*

⁸I am indebted for this information to the kindness of Mr A. Cremona and the late Rev. C.L. Dessoulavy of London who purposely searched the archives of the Church Missionary Society.

sa jkun fostkom li jkollu nagħġa u, jekk taqa' f'hoġra nbar ta' sibt, ma jaqbadhiex u jerfaġġha? So also Mk 1,26: *U r-ruħ l-imniġġsa hija u tħabbtu u tgħajjat b'leġen għali, ħarġet minnu* would be greatly improved if rendered thus: *U ħareġ minnu r-ruħ l-imniġġes, iħabbtu u jgħajjat għali*⁹.

This strict adherence to the Latin text did not prevent the translator from giving the translation a fluent, graceful and vigorous form of expression. The construction is generally skillfully built according to the strict rules of Semitic style. Viewed from this literary standpoint Vassalli's translation has seldom, if ever, been surpassed, and even now, after more than a hundred years, it is read with profit and delight by all lovers of Maltese literature.

Looking more closely into the linguistic features of the translation we notice that tenses are always rendered according to a fixed scheme, that is: *għamel* past tense, *jaġmel* present and future, *kien jaġmel* imperfect, *kien għamel* pluperfect; thus Mt. 2,9 *audissent* 'kienu semgħu', *viderant* 'kienu raw', *antecedebat* 'kienet tisboq'; 2,13 *apparuit* 'deher'; etc. The present participle is translated in a variety of ways, thus Mt. 2,3 *audiens* 'filli sema'; 2,8 *mittens* 'huwa u jibgħathom'; 2,14 *consurgens* 'hekkif qam'; 2,16 *videns* 'x'hin ra'; 2,21 *consurgens* 'malli qam'; 2,23 *veniens* 'imbagħhad mar'; 8,18 *videns* 'billi ra'. Pronominal suffixes, instead of the looser connection with the particle *ta'*, are largely made use of. So is also the construct case. The adjective takes the article when it qualifies a determinate noun. A plural subject often takes a singular verb in the feminine gender, so Mt. 21,15 *it-tfal kienet tgħajjat*; cp. also Mt. 3,5; 4,16; 8,1; 20,31; etc. The subject very often follows the verb, but in many instances, where the Latin has better preserved the Semitic construction underlying the Latin Gospels, the translator could not escape the influence of Italian with which he is deeply imbued, and has, accordingly, conformed the construction to the requirements of an utterly different language; thus Mt. 4,23 *U Gesù kien idur* would have been better translated *U kien idur Gesù*; so also the Latin *et circuibat Jesus*. Cp. also Mt. 9,25.35; 10,21; 11,7; 12,1; etc. Mk 1,25; 5,13.24; 6,18; etc. Lk 1,6.13.21.34.41.47; etc. Jn 1,29.32.40.45.46; etc. Acts 1,20; 2,7.12.26; 4,25.33; etc.

Another characteristic feature of Vassalli's translation is the exuberant richness of its vocabulary. Many old and obsolete words are constantly met with in every page, stems of words are skillfully developed into derivatives having different shades of meaning, words are even sometimes reduced to their original meaning; briefly, the translation

⁹ Vassalli seems to ignore the difference of gender and, consequently, of meaning of the word *ruħ*, which, according to Arabic usage, is masculine when it means 'spirit' and feminine when it means 'soul'.

reveals everywhere the rare competence and the high standard of scholarship of our first and best lexicographer. To pick a few examples out of many: *aġar* 'alms', *darr* 'he damaged', *dirra* 'abhorrence', *fad* 'he abounded', *ħaf* 'he was afraid', *ħan* 'he betrayed', *ħewwa* 'love', *kies* 'cup', *itka* 'he sat at table', *mana* 'he prohibited', *għarir* 'a foreigner', *qasgħa* 'a dish', *san* 'he designed', *xexxa* 'he desired', *żenbaq* 'fly', *mħawwfin* 'frightened' from the verb *ħaf* 'he was afraid', *ħawwef* 'he frightened', *baxxar* 'he gave good news' from *bxara* 'good news', *baqqa* 'he left' from *baqa* 'he remained', *ħammed* 'he made calm' from *ħemed* 'he was calm', *ġebel* 'mountain' contrary to usage which gives it the meaning 'stone', *ħaddiem* 'a servant' but commonly 'a workman', *borg* 'a tower' but in current use 'a heap (of stones)'.

It has been deemed necessary to dwell at some length on these literary points inasmuch as they exhibit the characteristic traits of Vassalli's works which began to wane away soon after his death until they almost entirely disappeared in modern literature.

The New Testament. Vassalli's translation, although published by a Protestant Society and in the interests of the Protestant Church, may, in some sense, be considered as a Catholic work inasmuch as it reproduces, as faithfully as possible, the same text which the Catholic Church reads in her teaching and in her liturgy. I pass over the reason which moved the Church Missionary Society to adopt such a translation which is only slightly different from that which is read in the English Church. But anyhow these differences were removed in the translation of the whole New Testament which appeared a few years later under the title *Il-Għaqda il-Ġdida ta' Sidna Ġesù Kristu*, Malta, 1847. In connexion with this translation two questions call for discussion: (1) Is it a fresh translation or a revised edition of Vassalli's translation? (2) Who is the author of this translation or revision and, if it is a revision, who is the translator of the Epistles and the Apocalypse which are wanting in Vassalli's edition?

A comparison between Vassalli's translation and the New Testament translation of 1847¹⁰ in the parts common to both reveals at once a close similarity, very often a verbal identity between the two to such a degree that at first sight NT seems to be but a slight revision of V. The differences are of three kinds: (i) lexical changes: obsolete words are replaced by more current ones; thus Mt. 2,2 V *xruq* – NT *lvant*, 2,6 V *mdebber* – NT *ħakem*, 5,5 V *jitgħażżew* – NT *ikunu mfarrġin*, 5,24 V *mbiba* – NT *għatja*, 14,11 V *qadaħ* – NT *dixx*, 23,14 V *lula* – NT *ħazin*,

¹⁰ For the sake of brevity these two translations will henceforth be designated by V and NT respectively.

26,3 V *qasgħa* – NT *zingħla*; Mk 2,17 V *mehmumin* – NT *morda*, 6,13 V *jdbnu* – NT *jidliku*, 13,32 V *jigħlem* – NT *jaf*; Lk. 7,14 V *xebb* – NT *zagħzugħ*, 9,21 V *taħar* NT *widdeb*, 14,2 V *mtarbag* – NT *minfuħ bl-ilma*, 16,15 V *huwa dirra* – NT *ma jinħamelx*, 21,9 V *tithawufux* – NT *tithexzghux*; Jn 4,12 V *għanem* – NT *mrieħel*, 8,56 V *theggeg* – NT *qabez bil-ferħ*, 18,16 V *bewwieba* – NT *mara tal-bieb*, 19,39 V *sabbâr* – NT *alwe*; Acts 4,15 V *milqgħa* – NT *laqqgħa*, 8,33 V *qada* – NT *għamil il-ħaqq*, 11,5 V *sehwiem* – NT *f'debwa*, 15,3 V *imdebbrin* – NT *imwasslin*, 21,34 V *fn-naxar* – NT *għewwa s-sur*, 27,24 V *ħiebek* – NT *tak*, and many others. Sometimes, however, NT has a more literary word for a more common one in V; thus V *profjeta* – NT *bassâr*, V *artal* – NT *mid-baħ*, V *perglu* (Ital. *pergamo*) – NT *manbar*, V *tiggustifika* – NT *issed-daq*. (ii) grammatical and stylistic changes, tenses being frequently translated against the rules laid down by Vassalli and sentences constructed in a different way; thus Mt. 13,26 V *kienet kibret* – NT *kiber*, 17,24 V *kien daħal* – NT *daħal*; Mk 1,22 V *kienu jistagħgħbu* – NT *stagħgħbu*; Lk. 4,42 V *kienu jzommub* – NT *zammieub*, 10,18 V *kont nara* – NT *rajt*; Jn 11,43 V *kien qal* – NT *qal*. The following grammatical forms and constructions are also worth noticing: Mt. 24,48 V *il-qaddej il-ħazin* – NT *il-qaddej ħazin*, Mk 6,9 V *libstajn* – NT *zewg ilbiesi*, Lk. 12,42 V *it-temmiegħ il-ħorr u l-mogħqal* – NT *ir-ragel tad-dar sewwa u għaqel*, Acts 15,29 V *mill-laħam il-maħnuq* – NT *mill-ħwejjeg maħnuqa*. (iii) textual changes: there are in NT words and sentences that are absent in V. Thus Mt. 5,44 NT adds *bierku lil dawk li jisħtukom*; Mt. 6,13 NT adds *għaliex tiegħek hi s-saltna u l-qawwa u s-sebħ għala dejjem*; Mt. 6,25 NT adds *jew x'tixorbu*; Mt. 20,7 NT adds *u tieħdu dak li jigi minnu*; Mt. 25,13 NT adds *li fiba bin il-bniedem jigi*; and many others.

This additional matter helps us to trace the origin of NT. In fact it is an exclusive characteristic of that form of the Greek text of the New Testament which alone held sway during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. From this current text these additions found their way into the Protestant translations where they are still religiously maintained even after the critical editions of the nineteenth century had deprived their older rival of its undeserved supremacy. NT is therefore connected with a Greek or with a Protestant source. But a close examination of the translation as well as the consideration of the circumstances under which it came out point to the English Bible as the immediate origin of NT. Even in minor details NT agrees with the Revised Version; thus Mt. 26, 40 NT *jigi...isib...igħid* 'he cometh...and findeth...and saith' against V *gie...sab...qal*; Mt. 26,50 NT *ħadub* 'they took him', V *zammieub*; Mk 10, 34 NT *isawwutub u jobzqu għalih* 'they shall scourge him and shall spit upon him', V *jobzqu għalih u jsawwutub*; Lk 7,47 NT *dnubietħa li huma*

bosta 'her sins which are many', V *bosta dnuviet*¹¹. The conclusion, therefore, which imposes itself is that NT is a revised edition of V, worked on literary and textual grounds so as to agree completely with the text read in the English Church. This conclusion is borne out by the evidence furnished by the S.P.C.K. which in a report for the year 1845 has declared that the Gospels and the Acts in Maltese have been already *revised* for publication¹².

We can now proceed further to trace the origin of the rest of NT, that is, the Epistles and the Apocalypse. It may be said at the outset that it follows very closely the Revised Version. But is it a fresh translation or rather a revision of some unpublished translation of Vassalli? Both C.F. Schlienz¹³ and G.P. Badger¹⁴ are of opinion that Vassalli translated also the rest of the New Testament, which, however, was never published. This is very doubtful. In the records of the Church Missionary Society Vassalli is always spoken of as the translator of the Gospels and the Acts and down to the month of June 1828¹⁵ not the least mention occurs of his having translated any other part of the Bible. This silence is very significant. Indeed, had Vassalli translated also the Epistles and the Apocalypse, it is hardly conceivable that this translation would have remained unpublished when the Protestant Societies were striving to their utmost to have the Scriptures translated into the Maltese tongue.

Internal evidence can hardly be invoked in favour of either view. For the translation, if it is not an original work, has been so thoroughly revised as to obliterate the work of the original translator. It bears everywhere the same literary marks that have been noticed above in the Gospels and Acts, that is, an easy and fluent style, disagreement with Vassalli's way of rendering the tenses and a strict adherence to the Revised Version in all its peculiarities¹⁶. On the other hand we notice here and there a connecting link between the translation and the Latin Vulgate which seems to betray the hand of the translator of the Gospels; thus for ex. Rom. 9,1 *is-sewwa ngħid fi Kristu* agrees with Latin 'veritatem dico in Christo' against English 'I say the truth in Christ'; 1 Cor. 16,2 *biex mbux meta nigi jsiru l-gemghat* 'ut non cum venero tunc collectae fiant', while

¹¹ One may also add the proper names which in NT follow invariably the Revised Version, whereas in V they agree with the Latin. Suffice it to mention the proper name Kafamahum which in NT is always spelt Kapamahum.

¹² On information furnished by Mr A. Cremona and the late Rev. C.L. Dessoulavy.

¹³ *Views* etc. p. 40.

¹⁴ *Sullo stato* etc. p. 132.

¹⁵ That is only a few months before Vassalli's death which occurred on the 12th January 1829.

¹⁶ It reproduces even the additional historical notes appended at the end of each of the Epistles of St Paul.

the English is 'that there be no gatherings when I come'. The translator could have written as well *ngħid is-sewwa fi Kristu and biex ma jsirux il-gemgħat meta nigi*. This adherence to Latin would at least seem to suggest that the relation of our translation to the Revised Version is due to a revision of a translation made directly from Latin. And Vassalli is the only translator of the Bible from Latin.

Summing up the results of this enquiry we may conclude: it is at least probable that Vassalli translated also the Epistles and the Apocalypse, but his translation was only published in a revised form in 1847. Arguments are drawn from the authority of C.F. Schlienz and G.P. Badger and from the Latin affinities of the translation. The contrary view is based on the lack of contemporary documentary evidence and on the literary characteristics of the translation. The former class of arguments seems to outweigh the latter.

We have so far established that the Gospels and the Acts and, probably, the Epistles and the Apocalypse published in 1847 are not an original translation but a revision of another translation. And so we pass to the second question: Who is the author of this revision? The answer will be given in the next paragraph.

X The Book of Common Prayer and Psalms. The translation of the Book of Common Prayer *Ktieb it-Talb ta' Għalenija* (Malta, R. Weiss) was published in 1845 by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Although this is not a biblical translation, it is reckoned with the translations of the Scriptures not only for the biblical matter which it contains but also because it helps us to solve literary problems in connexion with the New Testament translation of 1847. We shall first investigate the origin of the translation of the biblical portions and then inquire into the problem of the author of the translation.

All the biblical matter drawn up from the New Testament agrees verbally with the translation of 1847. The two represent really one translation. This verbal agreement extends also to the citations from the Psalms which are obviously taken from the Book of Common Prayer. It must therefore be concluded that the translation or revision of NT, although published in 1847, was already completed in 1845 and made use of in a manuscript form by the translator of BCP. This conclusion is borne out by the Reports of the S.P.C.K. in which it is recorded that in the year 1845, when the Maltese translation of the BCP was completed and printed, the Gospels and Acts in NT were already revised for publication¹⁷. It is not unlikely that the revision of NT was commenced as early as 1844 before, or simultaneously with, the translation of the BCP. All this leads

¹⁷ I owe this information to Mr A. Cremona and the late Rev. C.L. Dessoulavy.

us to suppose that both NT and BCP come from the same hand.

This supposition receives strong confirmation from the fact that both NT and BCP have the same style and both agree in translating the same words against V. Thus, for example, the word *propheta* or *prophet* is always rendered by V *profjeta*, but in NT and BCP it is invariably rendered *bassâr*. So also *iustitia* and derivatives are *ħaqq* or *sewwa* in V, *sedq* in NT and BCP; *iudicium* is *ħaqq* in V, *ghamil il-ħaqq* in NT and BCP; *idola* is *xbibat* in V, *swawar* in NT and BCP; *iniquitas* is *tagħwiġ* in V, *ħżunija* in NT and BCP. This conformity in two translations that are almost contemporary can in no way be accounted for as the effect of mere chance, but proves beyond all doubt that both versions are the work of one and the same author.

The author's name would have remained long ignored if the late Rev. C.L. Dessoulavy, who was so keenly interested in our literary problems, had not undertaken the painstaking task of scanning the archives of the C.M.S. and the S.P.C.K. Through his obliging courtesy we learn that the Bishop of Gibraltar had engaged a native (i.e. Maltese) priest, who had recently conformed to the English Church, to translate the Prayer Book into the Maltese language. So far the Report of the S.P.C.K. for the year 1844, which nowhere mentions the translator's name. But we need no more to find it out. In fact the history of our Church in that period is aware of no other name of a Catholic priest having deserted his faith but that of Rev. M.A. Camilleri of Birgu. Camilleri is therefore the translator of BCP and the reviser or translator of NT published in 1847.

The Psalms, that are printed at the end of the Book of Common Prayer, are translated directly from Hebrew. It is a servile translation marked by inconsistencies of expression, uncouthness of style, meaningless connexion of words that are due to a misconception of literality or else to an inadequate knowledge of Hebrew. Thus Ps. 50,23 the words $\text{וְשִׁם תְּרִיב וְיִשַׁע אֱלֹהִים}$ are literally rendered *u min iqiegħed triq nurib b'ħelsien Alla* which makes no sense. The Hebrew imperfect tense preceded by the conjunction וְ is retained in the translation against the rules of Hebrew Grammar. The translator prefers also those Maltese words that are most similar in sound to their Hebrew equivalents, even when such words do not convey the exact meaning of the original; thus 38,2 Hebr. תִּשְׁמְרֵנִי *t^ejassereni* 'chasten me', Maltese *tjassami*, but Maltese *jassar* means 'to enslave' not 'to punish'. Occasionally, however, the Maltese translator turns to the English text to find the meaning of a difficult word or to give a more fluent diction to an obscure and involved Hebrew construction thus Ps. 32,4b should be translated *my moisture has been changed as if by the drought of summer*, but Malt. has *l-indewwa tiegħi*

sejgħet libbiena tas-sajf in agreement with English *my moisture is like the drought of summer*. Here the Maltese translator stands self-accused, because the word *indewwa* corresponds to the word *moisture* in the sense of *damp*, but not in the sense required by the context. To the translator's credit let it be remarked that in some cases the sense is better expressed in Maltese than in English; thus Ps. 66,3 Engl. translates literally and equi vocally *thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee*, but Malt. catches the metaphorical meaning required by the context for the Hebr. verb כָּחַשׁ (*kaħax*) and translates better *jittaħtulek l-għedewwa tiegħek*, that is, *thine enemies shall be found inferior in strength to thee* or *shall be subdued unto thee*.

Later editions. The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, John, the Acts of the Apostles of the 1847 edition of the New Testament and the Psalms of the Book of Common Prayer have been revised according to popular taste and re-issued in modern dress by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

SECOND PERIOD: 1847-1917

During this period Protestant missionary activity grew weaker and no fresh translation of any book of the Bible was made. Catholics were very slow to make the Bible accessible to the people, although the Maltese language was becoming every day more pliable and more suitable for literary purposes. The first timid attempt to place the Bible into the hands of the people was made by R. TAYLOR who published in the year 1846 a poetical paraphrasis of the Psalms and Canticles, *Ktieb is-Salmi tas-Sultan David u l-Kantiċi*, Malta, 1846, pp. 432, xii. The paraphrasis is based on the Latin Vulgate, which is printed side by side with it, with occasional agreements with the translation of the Book of Common Prayer. Thus in 2,1 both BCP and Taylor read *għaliex qamu l-ġnus xewwiexa*; in 11,4 both read *bi lsienna nagħilbu* which agrees with Hebr. against Vulg. *linguam nostram magnificabimus*; 17,12 *eduxit me in latitudinem* is rendered by both versions *ħariġni f'misraħ*. These and many other verbal agreements prove most clearly that Taylor made extensive use of the translation of the Book of Common Prayer which had been published the year before.

A few years later Taylor published a translation of the Office of the Holy Week *Offizzju tal-Ġimgħa l-Kbira, Latin u Malti*, Malta, 1849, 5th reimpression 1904. The Psalms are those of the Book of Common Prayer with slight changes; the portions of the New Testament are taken over from the translation of 1847; the portions of the Old Testament that are read in the Book of Common Prayer are taken also from this translation; the rest is translated by the author. This book may rightly be considered

as a real adaptation of Protestant translations to the needs of Catholics.

Another very slight revision of the first forty Psalms of the Book of Common Prayer, accompanied with short annotations, was published in the Weekly paper *IL-Habib* (13 March 1917 and subsequent numbers).

THIRD PERIOD: 1917-

It is during this period that the Bible really became the book of the people. This was due mainly to the impulse given to Maltese literature by literary societies, to the spread of education as well as to private enterprise. Both writers with a name in the field of literature and scholars who made the Bible their special study have turned to the Bible and endeavoured to make its hidden treasures easily accessible to the masses of the people. The result was many partial and independent translations of several books of the Old and New Testament and a translation of the whole Bible which is nearing completion. We shall review them in a chronological order, conveniently starting from an even earlier date.

1895-1924. The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles translated by Jos. Muscat Azzopardi. Mr Muscat Azzopardi was one of our best writers especially as a novelist, but he was neither a biblical scholar nor a theologian. He translated the Gospel of St Matthew (Malta, 1895, pp. 228; 2nd ed. 1914, pp. lxiv, 245); the Gospel of St Mark (Malta, 1915, pp. 110); the Gospel of St Luke (Malta, 1916, pp. 310); the Gospel of St John (Malta, 1917, pp. 333); the Acts of the Apostles (Malta, 1924, pp. xxiv, 397). These translations are made from the Vulgate with notes from the Italian commentaries of Martini and Curci. In the introduction of the Gospel of St Matthew Mr Muscat Azzopardi disclaims any relation with Vassalli's translation (p. x). But in reality Muscat Azzopardi ignores only Vassalli's translation of 1829, but not the New Testament of 1847 on which he occasionally depends. Thus in Mt. 5, 44 *pro persequentibus et calumniantibus vos* Muscat Azzopardi inverts the two participles according to NT (1847) and the Revised Version against the Latin Vulgate. These agreements with NT are more numerous in the second edition of Matthew (1914) than in the first (1895), and it appears that the second edition was revised on NT. Thus in Mt. 2, 22 for *pro Herode* Muscat Azzopardi has *flok Erodi* in the first edition and *ghal Erodi* in the second edition, together with NT. Cp. also Mt. 2, 22 *secessit* - *baqa'* first, *tuarrab* second and NT; 3, 14 *prohibebat eum* - *habat jirruftab* first, *ma riedx ihallib* second and NT; 4, 8 *montem* - *gholja* first, *gebel* second and NT; 5, 9 *pacifici* - *twajba* first, *li jgibu s-sliem* second and NT. The same agreements with NT occur in the other Gospels and Acts, so Mk 6, 31 and 8, 4 *in desertum locum* - *fl imuarrab*, but in 6, 35 *uaxxi* both MAzz and NT; 7, 26 *Syrophoe-*

nissa – *Sirofeniq* MAzz and NT; 9,34 and 10,31 *novissimus* – *warrani* MAzz and NT; Lk. 1,1 *ordinare narrationem* – *jinsgu l-ghajdut*; 3,5 *erunt in directa* – *ikunu msewuija* MAzz and NT; Jn 2,9 *architriclinus* – *qas-siem* MAzz and NT; 9,7 *Siloe* – *Siloha* MAzz and NT; but in Lk. 13,4 MAzz has *Silow* and NT *Siloe*; Acts 2,11 *proselyti* – *godda fid-din* MAzz and NT; 10,9 *in superiora* – *fuq il-bejt* MAzz and NT; 27,3 *curam sui agere* – *jistahja*, and many others. It must be remarked that the translation is not always correct, and this is a further proof of dependence.

In his translation of the Gospels and Acts Muscat Azzopardi is not at his best. Although he tried to be elegant, he did not venture to depart from the diction of the Latin Vulgate. Hence he is generally servile, sometimes obscure and inaccurate. The Latin ablative absolute is maintained against the rules of Maltese grammar and style. Thus Mt. 13,36 *Tunc, dimissis turbis, venit domum* is translated *Mibghutin in-nies, gie d-dar*. The Maltese construction would be *Baghat in-nies u mar id-dar*. In his effort at purism he avoids all words of foreign origin and uses words which do not always convey the original meaning. Thus *sacrificium* is wrongly translated *ibatija* which means 'suffering'; *synagoga* is not *knisja* which means 'church'; the verb *scandalizare*, which is a biblico-theological term, is translated in a variety of ways which do not always reproduce the true meaning of the original Greek; thus Mt. 13,57 *jitkazaw*, which means 'to be ashamed of, to be disgusted, to be surprised at one's actions'; Mt. 11,6 *sterr* (for *smell*) which means 'to abhor'.

1924. The book of Ruth translated from Hebrew by Mgr C. Cortis, *Il Libro di Ruth trascritto e tradotto dall'Ebraico con note*, Malta, 1924, pp. lix.

This is the first attempt in recent years to go straight to the original text. But the author's knowledge of Hebrew seems to have been very inadequate, and the translation is probably made from another translation made directly from Hebrew. The transcription is very faulty. The *qames-batus* is very often written *a*, so 2,14 *wajjizbat*; see also 1,16; 3,12.15; 4,6. Note also 2,10 *wattiffol*; also 3,4.15.

The translator prefers those Maltese words which have the same radicals as the corresponding Hebrew words, although the meaning may not always be the same. Thus 1,9 קולן (qolan) 'their voice' is rendered *qawlhom* which means *their proverb or saying*; 1,20 לא תקראני 'do not read me' is not the exact equivalent of Hebr. אל תקרא לי (al tiqrenah li) 'do not call me'; 2,1 בַּיִל (bajil) is 'riches' not *hila* 'power, strength'; 2,14 קָלִי (qali) is 'roasted grain' not Malt. *qali* 'fried meat'; 2,15 לֹא תְכַלְמֵהָ (lo taklimuha) 'do not reproach her' does not correspond to Maltese *la tkellmubix* 'do not speak to her'.

1926-1932. Several books of the Old Testament and the whole of the New Testament translated by Rev. P.P. Grima. This is the list of the books translated by Grima: *The book of Lamentations* (1926); *The book of Esther* (1928); *The book of Judith and the book of Jonah* (1928); *the book of Judges* (1929); *the books of Esdra and Nehemiah* (1929); *the book of Daniel* (1929); *the Minor Prophets* (1932); *the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (1930); *the Epistles and Apocalypse* (n. d.).

These are popular translations made directly from the Latin Vulgate without any attempt at literary elegance or scientific accuracy. The translator's aim seems to have been that of giving the people good reading without caring much for the form. The following are a few inaccurate renderings: Hos. 1,4 *quiescere faciam* is *negred* 'I will destroy' not *nagħti mistrieħ* 'I will give rest'; 2,2 *uxor...vir* is *mara...żeuġ*, 'wife... husband', not *għarusa...għarus* 'bride...bridegroom'; Jn 1,4 *Dominus autem misit ventum magnum in mare* are omitted perhaps inadvertently; Rom. 1,12 *consolari* is *nifjarraġ* not *nissabbar*: 2 Cor. 1,6 is obscure, inaccurate, incomplete: it omits *pro vestra consolatione, sive exhortamur*, 2 Cor. 3,7-11 obscure in Latin, unintelligible in Maltese; Hebr. 9,2 *panis propositionis* is rendered *ħobż tal-uegħda* 'votive bread'; and others. It is to be noticed that the author writes always *tiġrif* 'falling' for *tiġrib* 'proof, temptation'.

1926-32. Several books of the Old Testament translated by Alph. M. Galea. These are the books translated by Galea: *The book of Proverbs* (1926); *The book of Ecclesiastes and the book of Wisdom* (1927); *the book of Tobit* (1927); *the book of Ecclesiasticus and the Song of Songs* (1928); *the book of Psalms* (1929); *the book of Job* (1929); *the books of Maccabees* (1929); *the book of Isaiah* (1930); *the books of Samuel* (1930); *the books of Kings* (1930); *the books of Chronicles* (1931); *the book of Ezekiel* (1931); *the book of Jeremiah* (1932); *the book of Baruch* (1932).

These too are popular translations made either from the Latin Vulgate or from some modern translation made from Hebrew. The translator is a good writer with an easy and fluent style, but the style of his translation is rather heavy, difficult, unattractive.

1939-1950. The four Gospels translated by Fr G. Paris O.P. The Gospel of St John was printed in Palermo in 1939 and reprinted in Malta in 1952. The translation is made directly from the Latin Vulgate and other modern translations, especially Martini's translation and the Douay Version. The translator, a distinguished theologian, has no claims whatever in the field of Maltese literature, hence the translation has no literary merit at all. The language is the colloquial Maltese used in towns; many Italianisms could be easily avoided and the translation would have

gained in literary value, without losing anything of its merit as a translation. So he writes *sacerdot* for *qassis*, *inferjuri* for *anqas*, *irrisponda* for *wiegeb*, *issegwini* for *tigi warajja*, *irritomaw* for *regghu lura*, *Olivet* for *Żebbug*, *multiplikazzjoni* for *taktir*, etc. No writer aiming at a composition of any literary value can afford to use such language.

1929-1952, 1954-. The Old Testament complete and the New Testament nearing completion through the efforts of the present writer. This is the first and only complete translation of the Bible from the original tongue. Of the New Testament only the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse are still in preparation, but it is hoped that they will be out by next year. The principles governing the translation are accuracy and elegance. I have constantly endeavoured to discover the exact meaning of words with the aid of modern Hebrew lexicographical studies. I have also tried to be elegant without being either servile or paraphrastic. To what extent I have been successful I leave it to competent judges to decide.*

P.P. SAYDON

* For critical reviews see C.L. Dessoulavy, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, various issues from 1930 to 1949; A. Vaccari, *Biblica* 20 (1939) 435; Edward P. Arbez, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12 (1953) 135-8 and *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16 (1954) 451 f; Carmel Sant, *Melita Theologica*, various issues from 1947 to 1957.

(Editor's Note)

THE PENTATEUCH AND CATHOLIC CRITICISM

THE CATHOLIC CRITICAL SCHOOL (1897-1906)

Pentateuchal Criticism took definite shape at the end of the eighteenth century; it became a powerful instrument in the hands of rationalists and their followers for the demolition of many of the traditional beliefs. Against these destructive tendencies Catholics arrayed themselves into two camps: some wanted to safeguard truth by adapting it to modern thinking but they soon got infected by modernism which was condemned by the Church. The others went back to uncompromisingly defensive positions; they strongly pointed out the weak points in the tenets of the new theories and refused to accept what may have been positive acquisitions.

Outside this generally defensive tendency there were others who were ready to accept what was really correct in the analysis of independent criticism. They took it upon themselves to analyse the results of the critics, to reject what was evidently false and irreconcilable with dogma, and to accept what had been proved to be correct. Among these we find Von Hügel, J.M. Lagrange, P.Vetter, F.Hummelauer, Van Hoonacker and others.

The work of these scholars will form the subject of our present study.

In 1897, five years after the publication of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* and nine years before the promulgation of the Pontifical Decree on the Pt., J.M. Lagrange and Von Hügel in their lectures to the International Scientific Congress at Freiburg launched their new methods in handling Biblical problems, at once in line with progressive science and in harmony with Tradition. Hügel justified the fundamental principle of literary criticism by showing that literary criticism, as such, is not based on a vicious circle¹.

LAGRANGE treated the whole matter in his characteristic thoroughness in his paper *Les Sources du Pentateuque*, which he supplemented by later articles. He divided his lecture into five headings in an attempt to show that the documentary theory has been substantially proved and that it could be harmonized with Catholic doctrine. The final editing of the Sacred Books, legislative evolution, the testimony of the Holy Writ, the value of Tradition, the historical worth of the documents of the Pt.,

¹ Cfr. De Hummeleaur, *In Deuteronomium*, Paris 1901, p. 138.

all were embraced within a masterly exposition impregnated by a spirit of loyalty to the Church. Lagrange never abandoned this position².

He introduced his dissertation by pointing out that it was Catholic science that through the efforts of Astruc discovered the clue which gave the start for the critical examination of the Pt.; Astruc however was modest enough not to put on a level of certainty the results of his investigations. His lead was not followed by Catholic students, who thus deprived themselves of the means to defend the Bible from the attacks of Rationalists³. The writer traced out the causes of the defensive position of the Catholics without, however, condemning it unreservedly. But he did not agree with those who were ever ready to find fault with conclusions arrived at by outsiders; on the contrary he condemned such a behaviour as harmful to the Church and to the salvation of souls in so far as it was causing estrangement between the Church and many scholars, among whom there were many who felt the force of the critics' arguments. On the other hand one should not always nod at the pleasantries of the independent school; the Catholic cause is not served by simply waiting for the independent school to destroy itself. One must remember that unlike the weak affirmations, the strong negations are being widened. Following this, Lagrange lists his ideas under five headings:

The Editing of the Sacred Books. Lagrange insists that the Sacred Books had not been written and polished up as the literary works of the Graeco-Roman world were, or as the Massoretic text would have us believe. Gn. 47 in the Massoretic text is different from that of the LXX; which difference is inexplicable without admitting a later revision of the text or even a doublet in Gn. 47,1-5 and 5b-7. The overlapping in the LXX had been polished off by the Massoretics. This was confirmed later in an article in the RB of 1906 by I. Guidi who discovered an extant Oriental history formed by the dovetailing of two still extant documents into one whole⁴. Hence the documentary theory is not impossible in itself.

² Cfr. *L'Authenticité mosaïque de la Génèse et la théorie des documents*, RB 47 (1938) 162-183; Cfr. F.M. Braun, *L'Oeuvre du Père Lagrange*, Freiburg 1943, pp. 92-97.

³ 'Cette voix ne fut pas écoutée, et la dix-huitième siècle ne sut pas défendre la Bible contre les sarcasmes de Voltaire' RB 7 (1898) 12.

⁴ 'Au lieu de la critique des sources et de l'élaboration des matériaux et des livres antérieurs nous y voyons copiés et mis bout à bout du morceaux tirés des histoires plus anciennes, sans que le lecteur soit averti de la différence de leur origine. Cette méthode qui nous paraît si défectueuse se retrouve dans toutes les littératures sémitiques.' I. Guidi, *Historiographie chez les Semites*, RB (1906) p. 509.

Legislative Evolution. Moses, the Legislator, must be distinguished from Moses the Writer. Law is by its very nature evolvent, and there is nothing against faith in this principle. Once we admit this, it would be very easy to explain away the doublets occurring in the Mosaic law. 'Depuis long temps les harmonistes donent des solution qui sont possible chacune en particulier, mais dont l'ensemble constitue une impossibilité morale. Que l'on admette une legislation qui évolue, l'apparence même de contradiction disparaît.'⁵ Lagrange put the question in these clear-cut terms: 'Moïse est-il législateur parce qu'il a posé les fondement, ou parce qu'il a couronné l'édifice?'⁶ He gave an unequivocal answer in the affirmative to the first alternative.

The Testimony of the Bible. The learned speaker in meeting the objections raised against him on the force of the Biblical evidence in favour of Mosaic Authorship, proved that in his view there was nothing definite or conclusive on the subject because the statements referring to it do not cover the whole Pt., and moreover, the writer had not in mind the solving of literary problems.

The Value of Tradition. 'Moïse est le législateur d'Israel, le mosaïsme est a la base de toute l'histoire du peuple de Dieu, voilà la tradition historique; Moïse a rédigé le Pt. que nous possédons, voilà la tradition littéraire.'⁷ The value of the historical tradition is beyond question; that of the literary one is doubtful. The early Fathers erroneously followed the Jewish opinion that Esdras was inspired to recover the whole Pt. No less did the Jews believe in the inspiration of the LXX translators. Hebrew traditions, therefore, cannot be accepted at their face value⁸. One must remember that the historical tradition itself is being attacked.

Historical Value. 'On tient à l'authenticité pour établir la veracité.'⁹ This is the reason of many who defend a strict authenticity of the Pt. They subordinate the accessory to the essential. A documentary theory as such does not necessarily imply the historical disparagement of the Pt. He admitted then with radical modifications the documentary theory, defending the historicity and antiquity of E as being older than J, the latter being contemporaneous with the Exodus; D is at the end of the whole evolutionary process¹⁰. Lagrange would not accept the plea that Moses may have written a duplicate (D) of his own laws¹¹. P is post-exilic. This does not in any way prejudice its veracity guaranteed by

⁵ RB 7 (1898) p. 19.

⁶ Ibid. p. 137.

⁷ Ibid. p. 24.

⁸ Ibid. p. 27.

⁹ Ibid. p. 28.

¹⁰ Cfr. Ibid. p. 29ff.

¹¹ 'Est-il vraisemblable puisque la Loi été donnée par Dieu au Sinai que Dieu la transforme au bout de quarante ans pour l'immobiliser ensuite pendant des siècles.' Lagrange, *La Methode Historique*, p. 176.

Inspiration and the other documents. As to the different points of view exhibited by the single documents, he asks whether God did really want to inform us about them, or rather He used them as a means to mediate more important information¹².

Lagrange thus made a determined attempt to open a middle way between the views of the critics and the traditional viewpoint. We described his opinions at length on account of their novelty and intrinsic value.

Lagrange welcomed the commentary of F. HUMMELAUER on Num. (1899) and Dt. (1901)¹³. He congratulated the commentator for his courage in admitting publicly and in writing the need of thorough critical discussion of the whole Pt. by some Catholic critics. 'Aegre ferimus, writes Hummelauer, uti alii faciunt, nondum repertum esse virum catholicum qui totum Pentateuchum critice discutiens plenam et solidam, neque solum negativam totius textus rationem reddiderit'¹⁴. Indeed, Hummelauer was not satisfied with words alone; he himself applied critical methods to Num. and to Dt. In the latter he went definitely adrift from the traditional course.

Even a superficial reading of his definite statements in the introduction to his work¹⁵ would convince one of Hummelauer's attempt to reconcile tradition with the new criticism. He supports his theory with an impressive array of historical facts and hypotheses based on history; not all of these hypotheses are invulnerable, nor can one unreservedly accept his conclusions therefrom. Lagrange, recognising the merit of Hummelauer in attempting to give a reasonable solution to the problem of Dt. in particular, and of the Pt. in general, remarks: 'mais il y lieu de tenir compte aussi de l'observation du Sauver: le vin nouveau fait éclater les veilles autres: Les conclusions de la critique moderne... ne doivent pas être adaptées à des lambeaux d'anciens systems; faut voir ce que exigent les principes et leur donner satisfaction, mais en les considérant en eux-mêmes, non tels qu'ils se reflètent dans des fragments de systemes après qu'on a tout brisé'¹⁶. In other words, Lagrange is not satisfied with Hummelauer since the latter did not prove himself consistent with his own principles throughout his system. Notwithstanding his weak points, Hummelauer had the merit of applying courageously and unhesitatingly critical methods to the exegesis of the Pt.

F.E. GIGOT (1901) welcomed the documentary theory in his *Introduction*

¹² RB (1898) p. 30.

¹³ RB (1899) p. 609ff and (1901) p. 609ff.

¹⁴ Vide note 12.

¹⁵ F. De Hummelauer, *In Deuteronomium*, Paris 1901, p. 61-107.

¹⁶ RB (1901) p. 614.

to the *Study of the Old Testament* (New York) with slight modifications. He pointed out the inadequate arguments brought against the critics with the consequent distrust in them on the part of the faithful. 'Smart writing on the critics is comparatively easy, but if their conclusions are to be effectively replied it must be someone who will go into the details of the case with the same diligence which has been employed on the other side'¹⁷. Notwithstanding disagreement on the points of detail there is amongst the critics a sufficient degree of unanimity as to command respect. 'Men, Gigot remarks, do not debate on points of agreement, but on points of difference'¹⁸. He goes on to apply the documentary theory to the books of the O.T. His views may be summed up thus: (a) The term Hexateuch is justifiable on account of the common subject-matter of the Pt. and Joshua; (b) The documentary theory may be harmonised with the data of Revelation (in fact some Catholics, e.g. Hoberg, have already admitted it with modifications); (c) It is antecedently probable due to the methods of historiography among Orientals; (d) One is struck by the unanimity among the critics; (e) It must be stated that with regards to a certain number of facts appealed to, and of inference admitted by the advocates of the recent theories respecting the authorship of Genesis-Joshua, even some Catholic scholars whose traditional views are well known have already made admissions, which may perhaps be regarded as an omen of complete endorsement, at no distant date, of the other positions already regarded as certain, or nearly so, by other no less orthodox writers. In view of the importance which thus attaches to the main results held as certain by contemporary critics, they will be briefly set forth in connexion with the literary structure of each separate book of the Hexateuch¹⁹.

VETTER in 1903 put the final editing of the Pt. at the time of Esdras. The history from Adam to Abraham originated at the time of the Judges. Legal dispositions go back to Moses. These laws were expanded and collected into one whole by the priests; Dt. was written at the end of the Judges' epoch; chronology and songs are mosaic. The Pt. as such was first composed when the Temple of Solomon was constructed²⁰.

VAN HOONACKER²¹, in the early years of this century according to a

¹⁷ F. E. Gigot, *Introduction etc.*, p. 45.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 45.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 138-140.

²⁰ Cfr. M. Hetzenhauer, *Introductio in librum Genesis*, Viennae 1910, p. 8.

²¹ J. Coppens, *De compositione litteraria et de origine mosaica Hexateuchi disquisitio historico-critica: een historichkritisch onderzoek van Professor Van Hoonacker naar het ontstaan van de Hexateuch op grond van verspreide nagelaten aantekeningen samengesteld en ingelied.*

posthumous work published by J. Coppens, tried to tackle the Pentateuchal problem. He presented objectively the difficulties and tried to give thereto an original solution. There is no sufficient evidence in Holy Scripture for the establishment of Mosaic authenticity of the Hexateuch; the Catholic scholar therefore is not bound to defend Mosaic authenticity at all costs. Van Hoonacker admits the existence of JEDP without accepting Wellhausen's interpretation of this phenomenon: D is Josiah's lawbook which forms his whole reformation; P is older than D, but later than J and E; these two were combined into one whole composition of P and that of D; P was joined to JE before D; JEP was united with D not earlier than the Exilic period.

To conclude we may state that Catholic scholars who set out to apply the new methods in this period were few in number, even if we include Hommel Bickel, R. Clarke and Baumgartel. But even these did not go through it with that thoroughness as one would have it. Hummelauer tried to find a middle way between the rights of criticism and those of Tradition with some success, and Van Hoonacker accepted the analysis into the four documents and rejected the datings giving an explanation of his own; Hügel approved of the critical principles adopted by critics in analysing the documents; Lagrange picked up the question in lectures and in book-reviews; others lamented that Catholic criticism is still in its infancy. Not a single writer took it upon himself to submit the Pt. to a rigid analytical investigation to explain its origin in such a way as to satisfy all the data furnished by the books themselves and by Tradition. They all stopped at outlining fundamental principles, and, excepting in part Hummelauer, they did not try to apply them to the whole Pt. As Lagrange clearly remarked in another context, their solutions at times satisfy particular sections but by no means do they explain the whole work²². A new period was to be ushered in with the issue of the Pontifical Decree in 1906.

C. SANT

²² RB (1893) p. 19.

NOTIO ET EFFECTUS CENSURAE AB HOMINE

I. STATUS QUAESTIONIS

1. 'Censura est poena qua homo baptizatus, delinquens et contumax, quibusdam bonis spiritualibus vel spiritualibus adnexis privatur, donec, a contumacia recedens, absolvatur' (can. 2241). Unde censura est species quaedam poenae ecclesiasticae. Poena vero ecclesiastica ratione auctoris dividitur in poenam *a jure*, 'si poena determinata in ipsa lege statuat, sive latae sententiae sit sive ferendae' et in poenam *ab homine*, 'si feratur per modum praecepti peculiaris vel per sententiam iudicalem condemnatoriam, etsi in iure statuta' (can. 2217, § 1 n. 3°).

Nostra hic tantum interest disserere de notione censurae ab homine eiusque effectibus. Quaestio non est parvi momenti, nam ex recte tradita notione censurae ab homine pendet recta explicatio et applicatio eiusdem praecipui effectus, qui est reservatio.

2. Notio ante Codicem communissima

Ante Codicem nomine censurae ab homine venire solebat censura etiam latae sententiae, comminata seu constituta per praeceptum particulare, sive declarata fuerit sive non, necnon censura inflicta per praeceptum vel per sententiam iudicalem condemnatoriam. Unde tres erant modi censurae ab homine, scilicet:

- (i) censura statuta a Superiore per modum praecepti peculiaris. Etiam ipso facto contracta et nondum declarata, talis censura dicebatur esse ab homine;
- (ii) censura ferendae sententiae in iure statuta et inflicta seu irrogata per modum praecepti extraiudicialis;
- (iii) censura ferendae sententiae in iure statuta et inflicta seu irrogata per modum sententiae iudicialis condemnatoriae.

3. Terminologia Codicis

In Codice confusionem quandam parit vel saltem parere videtur usus verborum non sibi constans. Etenim:

(a) In can. 2245, § 2 Codex supponit omnem censuram ab homine esse reservatam; tamen in § 4 eiusdem canonis statuitur non omnem censuram praecipuo latem reservari. Iamvero iuxta communioem ante Codicem sententiam, uti iam innuimus, censura praecepto particulari lata seu statuta considerabatur censura ab homine (i.e. etiam sine inflictione seu irrogatione).

(b) Codex diversis in locis mentionem facit de praecepto peculiari; nullibi vero de praecepto communi vel per modum seu ad instar legis. Quod tamen supponi videtur a legislatore.

(c) *Ferre* censuram per se et communiter significat *comminari* censuram, i.e. censuram tamquam sanctionem legi vel praecepto adnectere.

His praemissis statim apparet difficultas quam praebent verba can. 2217, § 1 n. 3^o: 'si *feratur* per modum praecepti peculiaris'. Etenim si verbum 'ferre' in illo canone idem significat ac 'comminari', tunc:

(i) admittenda est contradictio in can. 2245; et

(ii) praeceptum particulare aequiparatur iuri seu legi.

E contra si verbum *ferre* in citato canone significat 'infligere' tantum, tunc fatendum erit Codicem mutationem invexisse in notionem censurae ab homine.

Quaecumque interpretatio adhibeatur, quidam textus tamquam non accurate redacti habendi sunt.

II. SOLUTIO QUAESTIONIS

Tres sunt a canonistis propugnati modi solutionis.

1. Prima solutio, vestigia premens iuris veteris, iuxta quod censura latae sententiae praecepto peculiari adnexa, etiam post delictum prorsus occultum contracta, inter censuras ab homine recensebatur, apparentem contradictionem can. 2245 solvere conatur, sustinendo in § 4 illius canonis agi non de praecepto particulari sed de praecepto communi, quod etiam in antiquo iure a pluribus auctoribus legi assimilabatur, ita ut censura lata per praeceptum commune tamquam a iure haberetur¹.

Critica. Immerito talis explicatio profertur, nam ubi lex non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus. Codex enim in can. 2245, § 4 mentionem facit de praecepto absque ulla distinctione; en ipsa verba: 'Censura latae sententiae non est reservata, nisi in lege vel praecepto id expresse dicatur;...' Praeterea Codex nullibi sermonem facit de praecepto communi. Item haec solutio explicare non valet cur can. 2244, § 2 et § 3 censura latae sententiae et censura ab homine opponantur.

2. Collison² aliam proponit solutionem, scilicet, Codicem mutationem introduxisse non in notionem censurae ab homine sed in disciplinam, eo sensu quod, contra fere unanimem doctorum ante Codicem sententiam,

¹ P.J. Creusen S.J., qui hanc explicationem, cum quibusdam aliis canonistis, primo tempore proferebat, suam sententiam postea mutavit in favorem tertiae sententiae, infra tradendae, quae hodie dici potest communis. Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, III, ed. 4a et 5a, nn. 406, 442.

² Cf. P.J. Collison, C.S.S.R., *Non omnis censura ab homine est reservata*, Lovanii, 1936.

censura latae sententiae per praeceptum comminata, etsi sit ab homine, amplius non reservatur.

Critica. Haec solutio non explicat alios canones; immo novas crearet, si admitteretur, difficultates, nimirum:

(i) admittendum esset in can. 2244, § 2 et § 3 non agi de omnibus censuris latae sententiae neque de omnibus censuris ab homine respective; quod satis mirum esset;

(ii) deberet hoc modo intelligi can. 2245, § 2, scilicet: si censura ab homine reservatur, tunc... Quae interpretatio est omnio arbitraria.

3. Tertia solutio, proposita a Cappello³, Michiels⁴, Tabera⁵ et aliis admittit mutationem notionis poenae ab homine introductam esse a Codice. Iuxta hanc solutionem, verbum 'feratur' (can. 2217, § 1 n. 3^o) idem est seu significat ac 'infligatur' seu 'irrogatur', quod probatur ex eo quod idem verbum adhibetur pro 'per modum praecepti' et 'per sententiam condemnatoriam'. Atqui relate ad sententiam condemnatoriam verbum illud non potest aliud significare quam 'infligere'. Ergo eadem significatio applicanda est etiam relate ad praeceptum, ne duplex significatio unius eiusdemque verbi in eadem phrasi admittatur. Sequitur igitur poenas latae sententiae, contra ac in iure veteri, numquam esse ab homine, ideoque notionem poenae ab homine revera mutatam esse.

Meritum huius solutionis. Hoc modo optime explicatur can. 2244, §§ 2 et 3, quibus censurae latae sententiae opponuntur censuris ab homine. In iure antiquo hae non poterant opponi, propterea quod censura latae sententiae in praecepto particulari contenta seu praecepto particulari adnexa erat ab homine. Item disparet contradictio ex can. 2245, nam dum omnis censura ab homine (sensu novo explicata) est reservata, censura latae sententiae non reservatur, nisi in praecepto id expresse dicatur. Meritum igitur huius solutionis est quod nullam in citatis Codicis locis contradictionem admittit et plures textus sat bene explicat. Quapropter nos ei adhaeremus.

III. CONCLUSIO

Ut clarius notionem censurae ab homine tradamus, haec ex P. Cappello mutuamur:

'Proinde etiam per praecepta poenae possunt constitui sive latae sive ferendae sententiae. Quae poenae statutae per praeceptum, sive generale sive particulare, habendae sunt tamquam a iure, antequam irrogentur;

³ Cf. *Nouvelle Rev. Theol.*, 1920, 525.

⁴ Cf. *De Reservatione Censurae*, etc., in *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.* 1927, 180, n. 613 ss.

⁵ Cf. *Ilustracion del Clero*, 1931, 195 ss, 227 ss.

post factam irrogationem, si sint latae sententiae, manent tamquam a iure; si, contra, sint ferendae sententiae, ex inflictione seu applicatione actu facta, fiunt ab homine.

'Praeter censuram latam per sententiam iudiciale[m] condemnatoriam, quae semper et necessario est ab homine, ut censura inflict[a] per praeceptum dicenda sit ab homine, istae condiciones practice requiruntur: (a) praeceptum debet esse particulare, scil. respiciens certam ac determinatam personam; (b) censura debet actu infligi vel applicari; (c) debet respicere delictum praeteritum seu iam commissum et quidem cum comminatione talis censurae, secus desset contumacia'⁶.

IV. EFFECTUS CENSURAE AB HOMINE

Tradita notione censurae ab homine, eius effectus iam possumus enumerare, qui diversis in locis a Codice statuuntur. Qui effectus sunt modus multiplicationis et praecipue reservatio.

1. Multiplicatio

Aliter ac censura a iure, censura ab homine multiplicatur 'si plura praecepta vel plures sententiae vel plures distinctae partes eiusdem praecepti aut sententiae suam quaeque censuram infligant' (can. 2244, § 3).

2. Reservatio

Censura ab homine, proprio et vero sensu dicta, iuxta notionem supra expositam, est semper et necessario reservata ex ipsa sua natura. Sane can. 2245, § 2 manifeste distinguit inter censuram ab homine latam per sententiam iudiciale[m] condemnatoriam et censuram inflictam per praeceptum, et utramque esse reservatam claris verbis statuit: 'Censura ab homine est reservata ei qui censuram infligit (i.e. ad modum praecepti particularis, scripto vel coram duobus testibus; cf. can. 2225) aut sententiam tulit (i.e. per sententiam iudiciale[m]), eiusve Superiori competenti vel successori aut delegato'.

Et quidem reservatio vim suam retinet etiam extra territorium Superioris censuram infligentis, affirmante can. 2247, § 2: 'censura vero ab homine est ubique locorum reservata ita ut censuratus nullibi absolvi sine debit[is] facultatibus possit'.

Extra mortis periculum absolutionem concedere potest ille dumtaxat 'cui censura reservata est ad normam can. 2245, § 2; ipse autem potest absolutionem concedere, etiamsi reus alio domicilium vel quasi-domicilium transtulerit' (can. 2253, 2^o). Immo extra mortis periculum reservatio ita urget ut si confessarius, ignorans reservationem, poenitentem ab ea absolvat, invalide agit. Sub hoc respectu censura ab homine aequiparatur

⁶ *Tractatus Canonico-Moralis De Censuris*, ed. 4a, n. 6.

censurae specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatae (cf. Can. 2247, § 3). In periculo autem mortis omnes sacerdotes, licet ad confessiones non adprobati, valide et licite absolvunt etiam a censura ab homine (cf. can. 882). Tamen in hisce circumstantiis absolutus tenetur, si et quando convaluerit, obligatione recurrendi, sub poena reincidentiae in censuram, ad illum qui censuram tulit (i.e. irrogavit vel infixit) eiusque mandatis parendi (can. 2252).

V. PRACTICA APPLICATIO

Quare, in praxi, si Superior (e.g. Episcopus) imponit subdito (e.g. Caio sacerdote) praeceptum peculiare cum adnexa censura latae sententiae (e.g. prohibitionem frequentandi aliquam domum suspectam sub poena suspensionis ipso facto incurrenda); talis censura, iuxta expositionem supra breviter traditam, aequiparatur censurae a iure non vero censurae ab homine. Unde si subditus sciens et volens praeceptum Superioris violat, censura quam incurrit, aliter ac in iure veteri, non erit reservata, nisi Superior eam comminando cum praeceptum imponeret sibi expressis verbis eam reservaverit.

C. MUSCAT

CASUS CANONICO-MORALIS

DE POENITENTIA

Titius, confessarius, propter aliquod delictum occultum, ab Ordinario sui loci, per sex menses, ab audiendis confessionibus secreto suspenditur. Dum uno mane Titius sacristiam ingreditur ad litandum, ei puer quidam occurrit ad confessionem apud illum faciendam. Titius corde dicit: 'Puer hic valde probabiliter peccata mortalia non habet. Ei dabo benedictionem et salvus ero'. Et ita facit. Sed ecce Caius qui eodem momento quo Titius benedictionem puero impertit, in sacristiam ingreditur et ad eundem Titium accedit eique genuflexus peccata mortalia confitetur. Confessarius poenitentem cum sola benedictione mittere non audens, de more Caium absolvit.

QUAERITUR

- I. Quaenam materia sufficiens, libera, et necessaria dicenda sit in Sacramento Poenitentiae?
- II. Quid de modo agendi Titii quoad puerum de quo in casu?
- III. Num bene se gesserit Titius cum Caio?

SOLUTIO

Ad I. Moralistae, quoad Poenitentiae Sacramentum, distinguunt inter materiam proximam et materiam remotam¹. *Proxima*, quae in numerum trium poenitentis actuum refertur², in accusatione peccatorum a poenitente peracta consistit. Haec autem accusatio existentiam supponit peccatorum in ipso poenitente qui se accusat. Peccata vero quae nondum sunt per claves Ecclesiae directe remissa (Can. 901), constituunt materiam confessionis remotam. Haec remota materia adhuc distinguitur in *sufficientem, liberam et necessariam* (Can. 902). Peccata post baptismum commissa sunt materia sufficiens, sed libera, quando vel sunt mortalia iam directe potestate clavium remissa, vel sunt venialia sive remissa sive adhuc numquam remissa. Materia autem Sacramenti Poenitentiae necessaria sunt tantum peccata mortalia adhuc numquam directe per claves Ecclesiae remissa³.

¹ Cfr Tanquerey-Cimetier, *Synopsis Theologiae Moralis* (Ed. 12, 1936), t. In. 75, p. 49

² Est sententia communior contra nonnullos antiquiores theologos, qui putarunt materiam proximam haberi in *impositione manus* sacerdotis absolventis, et contra Scotistas aliosque, qui docent totam essentiam Sacramenti in *absolutione* tamquam materia et forma consistere. (Cfr Tanquerey-Cimetier, l. c., nn. 76-79).

³ Cfr Roberti-Palazzini, *Dizionario di Teologia Morale*, II Ed., 1957, sub voce *Penitenza*, p. 1062.

Ad II. His positis, puer de quo in casu, videtur per se non teneri ad confessionem faciendam, cum iuxta expositionem casus, peccata mortalia saltem probabiliter non habeat. Peccata enim venialia, si quae habet, sunt materia sufficiens et libera, minime vero necessaria. Unde puer poterat confessionem non facere, ac proinde et Titius sacerdos certior factus ex ipsa confessione de hac pueri conditione morali, poterat ei dicere ipsum absolutionem non indigere, illaque non data benedictionem tantum ei dare. Id enim saepe accidit cum pueris qui vel peccata sufficientia non habent vel sufficienter dispositi non sunt⁴. Haec simplex benedictio in tribunali Poenitentiae danda quibusdam in adiunctis ab Auctoribus vocatur dissimulatio, quae essentialiter distinguitur a simulatione⁵, ut infra dicemus.

Simulatio, quae consistit in signo sacramentali ferendo simul cum intentione non administrandi Sacramentum, licet alii putent illud revera administrari, est actio intrinsece mala, ac proinde numquam licita, nec ad salvandam quidem vitam. Dissimulatio, e contra, permitti potest ob motivum grave, uti esset fama poenitentis, immo etiam aliquando et ipsius confessarii. Sed in praxi, quid est quod distinguit in Sacramento Poenitentiae dissimulationem a simulatione? Videtur distinctionem poni debere in signo sacramentali ponendo *cum* vel *sine* intentione administrandi Sacramentum. Hoc autem postulat determinationem huius signi, quod idem esse videtur in simulatione quam in dissimulatione. Signum vero in Sacramento Poenitentiae est illa actio externa, qua confessarius intellegitur dare absolutionem poenitenti, quibusdam determinatis verbis et signo crucis utendo. Unde ille dicitur simulare absolutionem qui huiusmodi actionem ponit *frngendo* se ministrare sacramentum; dum qui simpliciter *occultat* veram collationem aut denegationem absolutionis, Sacramentum tantummodo dissimulat. Aliis verbis, in simulatione habetur deceptio omnium, non excluso poenitente; in dissimulatione habetur occultatio veritatis quoad omnes praeterquam poenitentem, idque ob graves rationes.

Ad casum quod attinet, si Titius absolutionem denegasset sub praetextu materiae liberae, de quo tamen certiores fecisset ipsum puerum, tunc simplex benedictio a Titio impertita non esset simulatio, sed tantum dissimulatio, quamvis forsan puer jus habuisset ad absolutionem, si adfuisset materia sufficiens. Et quidem, etiamsi Titius revera simulasset absolutionem, decipiendo etiam poenitentem, nihilominus ipse

⁴ Tanqueray-Cimetier, l. c., n. 526, p. 283sq.; Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, Ed. VI, 1953, Marietti, vol. II, n. 551, p. 563.

⁵ *Dizionario di Teologia Morale*, sub voce *Simulazione (sotto l'aspetto giuridico)*, p. 1351; Prümmer, *Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, Herder & Co., Ed. 8, t. iii, nn. 81-83, p. 66sq.; Cappello, op. cit. Vol. I, n. 66sq., p. 59.

certe non incidisset in excommunicationem speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatam ad normam canonis 2322, 1^o, cum haec provisio sese referat ad illos qui ad ordinem sacerdotalem non sunt promoti.

Ad III. Notandum est imprimis non agi de suspensione *censura*, cum suspensio in casu lata sit per modum poenae vindicativae seu ad praefinitum tempus, i.e. ad sex menses. Censura enim infligi nequit ad tempus determinatum: nam absolutio a censura non potest denegari cum primum delinquens a contumacia recesserit (Can. 2248 § 2; cf. etiam Can. 2298 n. 2). Ea autem quae habentur sub Tit. VIII Libri V Codicis Juris Canonici (cc. 2241-2285) sese referunt ad poenas medicinales seu censuras, non vero ad poenas vindicativas, nisi expresse id dicatur in ipsis canonibus (Cf. cc. 18-20). Unde applicari non posse videtur casui nostro praescriptum canonis 2284, qui de suspensione *censura* potius agit. Similiter dici debere videtur de applicatione canonis 2261 quoad legitimam petitionem fidelium a suspenso occulto⁶.

Quodsi tamen cuidam applicari posse videatur praescriptam canonis 2284, eo quod poena suspensionis in casu aequiparanda sit censurae, tunc certe excludere debemus sententiam condemnatoriam vel declaratoriam, cum casus clare demonstret Episcopum hanc poenam infixisse Titio confessario per modum praecepti⁷; ideoque ex hoc capite absolutio in casu esset ad summum illicita, minime vero invalida. Potestne tamen dici hanc absolutionem fuisse invalidam ex capite revocationis ipsius potestatis jurisdictionis? Ex ipso facto limitationis poenae ad aliquod tempus praefinitum arguere possumus Episcopum in casu non declarasse se revocare ipsam jurisdictionis potestatem, idque multo minus *expresse* ut vult memoratus canon 2284. Nam quod aufertur per suspensionem ad tempus praefinitum ab audiendis confessionibus, non est *per se* ipsa potestas jurisdictionis, sed eius exercitium; ac proinde actus positi ab

⁶ Ubi Codex voluit poenam canonicam sub omni aspectu intelligere, hoc fecit expresse, ut e.g. in can. 985, n. 7. Cfr Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum*, t. VII, Romae, 1937, n. 326, p. 338, et n. 329, p. 341. Ceteroquin et ipse can. 2284 expresse suspensionem, de qua agit, *censuram* vocat.

⁷ M. Conte a Coronata (*Institutiones Juris Canonici*, Vol. IV, Ed. III, Marietti, 1948) ter repetit sequens principium: 'Effectus poenae inflictae seu irrogatae aut declaratae per praeceptum iidem sunt ac effectus poenae inflictae seu declaratae per sententiam condemnatoriam vel declaratoriam' (l.c., n. 1693, p. 89). Idem principium ipse Auctor affirmat de excommunicatione (n. 1780, p. 215), et de suspensione (n. 1816, p. 258). Attamen, logice aequiparatio praecepti cum sententia aliquali restrictione delimitanda est. Ad hoc enim ut effectus sint iidem, praeceptum publice notificetur oportet. Scribit Cappello, in *Periodica*, XIX (1930), p. 38*: 'Si praeceptum, quo infligitur poena, publicetur e.g. in *Commentario ufficiali* S. Sedis vel in ephemeride ufficiali dioecesana, illud sententiae aequivalet, perspectu fine seu notorietate, ideoque eosdem ac sententia parit effectus iuridicos.' Cfr etiam Roberti, *De Delictis et Poenis*, n. 263, p. 301.

huiusmodi suspenso, nisi accesserit sententia condemnatoria vel declaratoria, non essent invalidi, sed ad summum, iuxta iam dicta, illiciti. Diversa esset conclusio, ubi aliunde nota esset Episcopi voluntas, qua Ipse *expresse* declarasset se per suspensionem ab audiendis confessionibus semper intendere revocationem potestatis iurisdictionis⁸. Id enim nullo modo esset contra Jus Commune, licet forsán logicae non omnino consonum quando agitur de suspensione ad tempus praefinitum seu ad beneplacitum eiusdem Episcopi⁹.

Attamen, cum nos teneamus canonem 2284 non debere applicari in casu, eo quod agitur de poena vindicativa, quaestio solummodo reduci potest et debet ad applicationem canonis 209, seu ad suppletionem iurisdictionis in errore communi aut in dubio positivo et probabili sive iuris sive facti. Controversiae autem inter Canonistas ac Moralistas hac in re, nedum validum, verum etiam licitum faciunt actum a Titio positum in audienda confessione atque danda absolutione Caio poenitenti saltem ex dubio positivo et probabili¹⁰.

A. BUONTEMPO

⁸ Ad rem quod atinet Mons. Prof. C. Bonnici die 3a Decembris, 1956, sequens quaesitum quod ipse Archiepiscopo fecit, coram sacerdotibus in Ecclesia Concathedrali congregatis, legit: 'Num Excellentia Vestra, cum aliquem Confessarium ab audiendis confessionibus ob delictum occultum suspendas, etiam tantum ad tempus, *expresse* intendas ipsam potestatem iurisdictionis revocare'.

Resp. Affirmative. Cfr Can. 2284.

(Editor's Note)

⁹ In canone 2284 Codex evidenter loquitur de *censura* suspensionis, quae, uti iam diximus, non potest per se infligi ad tempus seu ad beneplacitum Superioris, quia id esset contra ipsam censurae naturam. Censura enim auferrí debet eo ipso ac cessat in ipso suspenso contumacia (can. 2284, § 2). In hoc autem consisteret illogicitas revocationis ipsius potestatis iurisdictionis, quam Superior in ipso actu revocationis intenderet instaurare post praefinitum tempus. Sed si cogitas de suspensione uti poena vindicativa (Can. 2298, n. 2), tunc quid prohibet quominus Superior per illam intendat revocare ipsam iurisdictionis potestatem? Canon enim 2229 divisionem tradit suspensionis censurae, non vero poenae vindicativae; et quidem haec divisio vim habet potius directivam interpretandi voluntatem eius qui suspensionem infligit; quae voluntas, si aliunde expressa habeatur, nulla alia indiget interpretatione praesumptiva.

¹⁰ Si Auctores deberemus citare, qui locuti sunt de iurisdictione suppleta, de qua in canone 209, non sufficeret spatium, quo uti possumus pro tota casus solutione. Sed sufficeret hic repetere quod habetur in *Dizionario di Teologia Morale*, scilicet: 'Come si è detto, questa interpretazione (i.e. eorum qui tenent sufficere errorem communem de iure, non tantum de facto) è oggi certa. Ma anche se si volesse retinere dubbia questa interpretazione, in forza dello stesso canone 209, che si applica anche nel dubbio positivo e probabile di diritto, è certo che la Chiesa supplisce la giurisdizione nell'errore comune non solo di fatto, ma anche di diritto' (op. cit., sub voce *Giurisdizione Supplita*, p. 628).

SHORT NOTES

GLEANINGS

Philological Notes on Romans

Emiena 3,3 'fidelity'; the root occurs in the verb *emmen* 'to believe'. The first form *emen* 'to be loyal' does not occur in Maltese. The noun *emiēna* has been formed from it and corresponds to Arabic أَمَانَةٌ (*amana*) 'loyalty, fidelity'.

Għelm 4,10; 11,33. It is used with two different meanings; in 4,10 it means 'a mark', a well known meaning. But in 11,33 it means 'science, doctrine' and is derived from the root *gh-l-m* which occurs in the verb *ghallem* 'to teach', i.e. 'to communicate learning'. The first form *ghalem*, which is not used in Maltese, means 'to learn, to know'.

Imwaqqat 5,6 'appointed (time)'; a denominative verb from the noun *waqt* 'while'. It corresponds to Arabic وَقَّطَ (*waqqat*) 'to appoint a time'.

Xeba, seventh form *xteba*, noun *xehwa* 7,7.8; 13,9 'to covet', Lat. 'concupiscere'. It differs from *xtieq* as much as 'to covet' differs from 'to desire'. In 7,7.8 the word *xewqa* instead of *xehwa* would not have reproduced the sense intended by Paul. Equally unsuitable would have been the verb *la tixtieqx* instead of *la tixtibix* in 7,7. Cp. also 13,9.

Tibnija 8,15.23; 9,24 'adoption'. Related to *iben* 'a son', derived from *benā* 'to build', *ibenna* 'to adopt as a son'.

Miqjul 9,12; the past participle of the verb *qal*. This form, although formed according to rule, does not occur in Maltese, but its use in 9,12 has been unavoidable.

Naqas 11,12 'deficiency' from the verb *naqas* 'to diminish'.

Siefla 12,16 'humble'; from *isfel* 'down, low'.

Għira and *għejra*; the two words are apparently an etymological and a phonetic spelling respectively of the same word. The spelling *għejra* is condemned as a mistake in Maltese orthography. This is why the spelling *għira* is generally preferred in this Letter. But the two words have different meaning in Arabic, and in 1,29 the correct spelling *għejra* 'jealousy' is used.

P.P. SAYDON

BOOK REVIEWS

KILIAN J. HEALY O. Carm., *Methods of Prayer in the Directory of the Carmelite Reform of Touraine*. Rome, Institutum Carmelitanum, 1956. pp. xvi - 184.

One of the most important and influential reforms of the Carmelites, after the departure of the discalced, was that undertaken in the French province of Touraine in the seventeenth century. Its importance is due to the fact that the reform not only influenced monastic discipline but also the interior life of the Order. The official Directory of this reform is the *Directoire des novices* (1650-1651). The book we are reviewing limits itself to the study of the fourth volume of the *Directoires*, that which deals with prayer, entitled *Méthode claire et facile pour bien faire oraison mentale et pour s'exercer avec fruit en la presence de Dieu*. The author, after treating of the various causes which brought about the Touraine reform, concludes the first part of his treatise by showing that the reform was not just a mere return to common life but a return to the primitive spirit of the Order that once animated the hermits of Carmel. In this first section of the treatise the author also discusses the composition of the *Directoires* and concludes that it is the work of three Carmelites: the doctrine of the *Directoires* was systematically gathered by Fr Bernard of St Magdalen who was the disciple of Br John of St Samson, the soul of the Touraine reform; but it was Fr Mark of the Nativity of the B.V.M. who completed and edited the work - it is very difficult, says Fr Healy, to say how much of the *Directoires* is due to the authorship of each.

The second section of the treatise discusses the various ways of prayer described in the *Méthode*. Firstly meditation which in the Touraine reform consisted of three parts, i.e. preparation, meditation itself and affections; its purpose is to lead to an affective conversation with God, and it is the method which a novice ought to use when beginning the art of mental prayer; it requires the use of the three faculties, memory, intellect and will. Secondly mixed prayer, which consists of internal thoughts orally expressed. This method of prayer differs only accidentally from methodical meditation for both tend to lead the soul to more affective prayer. Affective prayer, known in the *Méthode* as Aspirative prayer or the Exercise of the Presence of God, is the third kind of prayer dealt with. Aspirative prayer is the central prayer to which the other ways converge. It presupposes meditation and proceeds from it. It presupposes imaginary and intellectual presence of God. It is the distinctive prayer of the *Méthode* because more than meditation it

expresses the particular spirit of the Touraine reform which consists in continual affective conversation and union with God; it is the only way to live the spirit of Carmel.

The third section of the treatise discusses the sources of the *Méthode*. The author concludes that the similarity of teaching on the fundamental point of meditation and the exercise of the presence of God does not allow us to conclude that the *Philothea* of St Francis of Sales was definitely a source of the *Méthode*. 'It is quite probable', says Fr Healy, 'that both works depend on a mutual source, i.e. St Ignatius, his disciples, Granada and St Teresa.' 'Yet we do feel', he continues, 'that the teaching of St Francis on resolutions in meditations is more strongly emphasized than in other earlier methods. In this point especially we see a likeness of the *Philothea* with the *Méthode*.' The *Méthode* is not a compilation of the methods of prayer of other spiritual writers, but its methods of prayer represent the essential elements of mental prayer taken from the great spiritual writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including the great Carmelite writers. The elements were studied, weighed, judged and examined by the authors of the *Méthode* and after mature consideration organized into a plan of prayer that was considered suitable to obtain the contemplative purpose of the Order, i.e. continual and intimate occupation and conversation with God.

J.L.

New Testament Abstracts. A record of Current Periodical Literature issued by the Jesuits of Weston College, Weston 93, Mass., U.S.A. Editor J.J. Collins, vol.I, No. 2, Winter 1957.

We welcome the publication of this new periodical, the first number of which appeared in the Fall (or autumn) of the year 1956, as a most valuable help to all those that are interested in NT studies. It contains summaries of the most important articles bearing on the NT and related fields appearing in a large number of periodicals. The number under review contains summaries of one hundred and nine articles and press-opinions about sixteen books. The summaries are distributed under the following headings: Inspiration, texts, versions, canon; Gospels (general); Synoptic Gospels; Gospel of St John; Characters of the Gospels; Acts of the Apostles; Epistles of St Paul; Catholic Epistles; Apocalypse; Biblical Theology; Archaeology; Dead Sea Scrolls; Intertestamental Studies; Rabbinical Literatures; Apocrypha. As many NT articles appear in periodicals which are not directly concerned with the NT and very few scholars are fortunate enough to be living in places where they can

enjoy the benefits of a fully equipped library, this publication will certainly prove an inestimable boon to all students of the NT.

I dare make one or two suggestions. There are many monographs on the NT published in collections under the title of *Abhandlungen*, *Beiträge*, *Mélanges*, *Analecta* etc. and articles scattered in *Festschriften* and in the Proceedings of the meetings of biblical societies. May not these monographs and articles be summarized? Moreover Scandinavian and Dutch periodicals such as the *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok*, *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, *Studia Theologica cura ordinum theologorum Scandinavicum edita*, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* are sadly missing; perhaps very few of the collaborators and readers can read these languages.

Readers of *Melita Theologica* will be interested to learn that the Rev. C. Sant and the reviewer are among the collaborators of this periodical.

The periodical will appear three times each year and the annual subscription is three dollars.

P.P. SAYDON

GUIDO MENEGAZZI, *Method and Foundations of Social Science*, Bari, 1957

This contribution of Professor Guido Menegazzi, Director of the Institute of Economics and Finance of the University of Bari, is of considerable interest to anyone well versed in the social sciences. It could hardly, however, be recommended to students for the writer presupposes an adequate knowledge of the current methods used in the various sciences, and his main purpose is, in fact, 'to seek, according to a new method, the essence and order of the social principles, motives and values, then to pass on to the wider syntheses and lastly to indicate the laws of the subjective vital equilibria and of the objective confirmations in the establishment of the vital course of society'.

To my mind this work suffers from two defects, viz. the translation and lack of lucidity in parts. The translation is sometimes too literal and this presumably makes the work less intelligible than in the original Italian. It is also too heavy at times. The second defect is due to the fact that the writer summarises too much in a limited space. As a matter of fact most of what he writes in Part I is contained much more extensively in the three volumes of his other work *Corso di Scienza Sociale*.

By far Parts 2 and 3 are the more interesting and contain some sound and original ideas. His application of the new method to the social sciences is a clear vindication of Christian Philosophy. It is a method which takes full account of man's nature, as manifest in Revelation,

and his high destiny. There is an intimate link between Sociology and Christian Philosophy and the former has been fruitless for a long time because it has been divorced from the latter. Thus man was regarded as the object, not the subject of social sciences, with no special purpose of his own and blindly subjected to economic and sociological laws, which were in no way related to the natural law. The new method, if it were universally accepted, promises a new approach which could certainly save humanity from a catastrophe.

It is a pity that in a book in which so many terms are used one does not find an analytical index. The diagrams are helpful though they might have been clearer. Nevertheless, one feels confident that, in spite of some defects, the book will be read with great profit by many social scientists.

R. CIRILLO

The Malta Directory and Trade Index – 1957, pp. 400

Malta Publicity Services Ltd., Valletta.

The Malta Publicity Services Ltd. have issued the 1957 Malta Directory and Trade Index, an annual general and trade reference book whose first number was published last year. It is a comprehensive publication which will be welcomed by all interested in Malta's trade and which will prove indispensable for up-to-date general and commercial information about Malta. As the Minister of Industry and Commerce has said in presenting it, this number 'appears in every way a worthy successor to its first edition'. It is both attractive in its format and comprehensive in its information.

The Directory has three sections, of which the first one is entitled 'Background'. It begins by a short informative essay on the history of the Maltese National Colours, followed by a rapid review of Malta's Constitutional Development under British Rule. The Economy of Malta is briefly discussed by Dudley Seers, the associate of Dr Balogh for the Interim Report on the Economic Problem in Malta. As one would expect there is nothing new here, but one cannot help regretting some equivocal and suggestive expressions on page 14, where we are told that whether Malta can support European living standards without subsidy from abroad depends, among other things, on *what happens to fertility* (human fertility of course, as the context postulates). An extensive extract from the Prime Minister's statement for the year 1957-58 covers the next ten pages and is followed by short essays on Medicine, Education, Commercial Law and Labour Legislation in Malta. Several other items ranging

from the new Automatic Telephone Exchange to the History of Banking in Malta are dealt with. Next comes an outline of Malta's Industries. A Tourist Supplement including information on Hotels ends the first section.

Section II, consisting of a Trade Index, is the central and most important part of the Directory. It is excellently done on a light green paper, with an alphabetical and a classified list of firms, with headings printed on black stripes or bands for easy and pleasant reference. The section presents an exhaustive picture of Trade in Malta, featuring almost three thousand separate firms.

Section III is a Year Book, giving all sorts of general reference information which cannot be described without listing all headings. Much concentrated information on exports, imports, duties, restrictions etc. is of particular importance to the purpose of the Directory. Other minor information may not always be perfectly faultless, as in such publications it can hardly ever be. By way of a constructive observation one might point out the inadequacy and incorrectness of the classification and description of publications, where one can see periodicals of the same kind listed under separate and widely different headings. A thorough revision of these classifications is needed in future editions.

From the foregoing brief account one may get an idea of this year's Directory. It is undoubtedly an important publication very successfully produced, and it will surely serve not only for general information and trade reference but also to publicise abroad Malta's industrial activities and attract tourists and businessmen alike.

C. CASSAR