

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. XVI

1964

Nos. 1-2

THE MALTESE TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE*

Bibliography: E.P. ARBEZ, *Modern translations of the Old Testament*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 16(1954) 201-209, 343-347; 450-457; 17(1955) 76-87; 456-485; *The New Catholic Translation of the Old Testament*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 14(1952) 237-254. J. SCHMID, *Moderne Bibelübersetzungen* with a paragraph on the Maltese translations of the Bible by P.P. Saydon; an off-print from *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 82(1960). P.H. VOGEL and others, *Bibelübersetzungen*, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed. Bd. I, 1193-1223. A.R. HULST, *Old Testament translation problems*, Leiden, 1960; P.P. SAYDON, *History of the Maltese Bible*, Melita Theologica, 10(1957) 1-15; ID. *Philological and textual notes to the Maltese translation of the Old Testament*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23(1961) 249-257; and many recent commentaries and articles in leading periodicals.

THERE is hardly anyone in the whole island, with the exception of some political orator, who ignores the existence of a Maltese Bible. And yet that Bible exists and has begun to exist since the year 1929 attaining its full growth in the year 1959, 4 years ago. And during all this time the Maltese Bible has been read and studied by hundreds and thousands of our countrymen who have found in it rich nourishment for their spiritual life and literary equipment.

Everyone knows of the existence of a Maltese Bible, but very few, if any, can realize the immense amount of work that has gone into its production. A translation may appear to be a comparatively easy task. A fair knowledge of the language from and of the language into together with the help of a dictionary is considered to be all that is required for the work. But we all know from our personal experience that translation is not always quite so easy. We all remember the strenuous and painstaking efforts, which we, in our school days, used to do to make a satisfactory translation and the teachers' severe reprehension of our mistakes. Something more than an ordinary knowledge of two languages is required for a good translation of the Bible. In the 4th century St. Augustine complained that many Latin translations of the Bible were made by people who

* Lecture delivered at the University Theatre on May 2nd, 1963.

had only a scanty knowledge of Greek and Latin. If this is true in the case of modern spoken languages still more true it is for languages which have long ago ceased to be spoken, as it is the case of ancient Hebrew and Greek. Besides this difficulty inherent in their own nature, there are many other difficulties arising from their transmission and phonetic development. The Bible, until the 15th century, has come down to us in a manuscript form. There are hundreds and thousands of biblical manuscripts, whether complete or fragmentary, written on parchment and papyrus. Now it is a generally recognized fact that every single manuscript copy carries with it some mistake or some change, sometimes a very slight one, due to human frailty or to the desire to improve the original supposed to be defective. The original text may be either misread or misunderstood, hence it is corrected according to the copyist's linguistic standards. The fact must also be stressed that owing to the continuous development of the language, the pronunciation may change, and with the pronunciation the spelling too and the meaning may change, and so old meanings may fall into oblivion, and new meanings crop up. Thus for example, as the sound of *għbrajn*, which once existed in Hebrew, has been lost and assimilated with that of *għajjn*, the *għbrajn* has been changed into *għajjn* thus giving rise to a new word with a meaning different from that intended by the original writer. Thus in Hos. 5, 12 the word *gash*, usually translated 'moth' is in reality *gath* which means 'purulent matter'. There are then in Hebrew two different nouns: '*ash* 'pus', '*ash* 'moth', to which we may add a third one: '*ash* 'a bird's nest'. So also an initial *j* in Hebrew sometimes represents an original *w* as the verb *jalad* represents an original *walad* (Maltese *wiled*). Now it sometimes happens that the initial *j* is treated as an original *j*, while in reality it is a development of an original *w*; hence the translation is not correct. Thus the verb *jadagħ*, generally translated 'to know', sometimes stands for *wadagħ* 'to submit' and must therefore be translated accordingly. Hence in Judges 16, 9 we read in the story of Samson 'and his strength was not known' or somewhat paraphrastically 'the secret of his strength was not known'. But if we refer the verb *jadagħ* to his original form *wadagħ*, a better sense is obtained 'and his strength was not subdued'. These and many other examples show the imperative necessity of a wide and thorough knowledge of semitic languages in order to attain the writer's mind as fully as possible. Moreover, the books of the Bible were not written in that form of alphabet with which we are familiar, but in another form which is known to us from inscriptions. Similarity of form has always been a source of confusion and of misreading and mistranslations. To quote one example. In the

Song of Songs 5, 6 we read 'my soul failed as he spoke'; these are the bride's words, which are unsuitable to the context. When the bride rose up to open to her beloved, he had already turned and gone, so she could not have heard him speaking, and there was no cause for failing. Interpreters try to escape the difficulty by emending slightly the verb rendered by 'as he spoke' into 'when he ran away'. But no emendation is necessary. In the old Hebrew script the consonants *d* and *għ* were very similar in form and consequently interchangeable, the *d* having a more or less triangular form, and the *għ* having a roughly circular form. Now the Hebrew verb for 'he spoke' begins with *d*. Supposing this *d* to stand for *għ* we would obtain a verb which means 'he went away'; hence the sense is 'my soul failed as he (my beloved) went away'. And this sense which admirably fits the context, is obtained without any emendation of the text and without doing violence to the meaning of the words. Now every translator must obviously do his utmost to determine the meaning of every single word as accurately as possible and express it as clearly as possible. In many cases neither ancient versions nor modern dictionaries afford us any help, and the translator is inexorably bound to have recourse to comparative semitic philology and to all the aids of textual criticism. In order to help the translator solve his many translation problems the United Bible Societies have recently published a book entitled *Helps for translators*, Vol. I, *Old Testament Translation Problems* by A.R. Hulst (Leyden, 1960). I read the opening paragraph of the Introduction: 'Every Bible translator knows how difficult it is to deal adequately with serious problems of text and exegesis. This is especially true of problems posed by certain Old Testament passages which seem almost to defy intelligible rendering. One can obtain some help in commentaries and technical journals, but there is no place where all the principal problems have been gathered together in a single handy volume. Accordingly, the book is designed to remedy, at least in part, certain aspects of this situation and to provide practical suggestions for the solution of many textual and exegetical problems of the Old Testament'. Yet in spite of the help this book is intended to give, many translation problems are still unsolved.

In order to produce a good biblical translation two requisites are absolutely required, namely an adequate knowledge of biblical languages and a complete mastery of the language into which the Bible is being translated. The basis of a good translation is a critical edition of the text, but although there are many critical editions of the Old and New Testament, there still remain many passages for which the editions do not give the correct reading. In some cases interpreters even complain

that the text is corrupt beyond emendation. But despite these deficiencies, which fortunately are not very numerous, no serious translator can dispense with the use of a good critical edition of the biblical text.

The linguistic knowledge includes both vocabulary and grammar. The lexical knowledge is by no means restricted to printed dictionaries. The Hebrew language is expanding every day; new roots and new meanings are being daily discovered and constantly enriching the Hebrew Dictionary. A deeper study of Hebrew especially in relation to the earliest Greek version of the Bible, the comparative study of Hebrew in relation to Assyrian and Arabic, the discovery and the study of the Ugaritic tablets in 1929 and that of the Dead Sea scrolls in 1947 have yielded such a fruitful crop of new roots and meanings as to render a revision of our Hebrew Dictionaries an indispensable need. To pick out a few examples: *ahabah* means 'love'; this is the meaning given by all dictionaries, hence we read in Hos. 11, 4 of 'the bands of love' and in Cant. 3, 10 of Solomon's palanquin 'lovingly wrought'. But this word has been found in Ugarit with the meaning 'leather' corresponding to Ar. *ihabu*. Consequently the bands of love become bands of leather, and the 'palanquin worked with love' becomes 'a palanquin worked with leather'; the word 'ar or plur. 'arim is usually translated 'cities'; but in some places this meaning does not suit the context, and a different meaning seems to be required. Thus in Jer. 2, 28 and 11, 13 we read the same words 'as many as your cities are your gods'; they were even more! Now in Ugaritic the noun *gar* means 'a stone daubed with (sacrificial) blood', hence 'an object of worship', 'an idol'. Hence the sense in Jeremiah is: 'as the number of your cultic stones (that is your idols) are your gods, which makes a better sense. The same meaning must be applied to Ez. 6, 6: 'Wherever you dwell your idols (not 'cities') shall be laid waste and your high places ruined'. Hos. 11, 6: 'My sword shall rage against their idols (not 'cities')'. And Micah 5, 13: 'I will root out your Asherim (objects of worship) from among you and destroy your idols' (not 'cities'). The apparently compound word *salmawet* generally translated 'the shadow of death' is in reality one word meaning 'deep darkness'. In Is. 3, 18 we find the word *shebishim* which does not occur elsewhere and is generally translated 'caul, headbands'. Its true meaning, however, is 'sun-ornaments' made of glass or metal and worn as a pendant. In the same verse we meet the word *sabaronim*, which means 'moon-ornaments'. Both words and meanings occur in Ugaritic. Still more interesting is the appellation '*aqallaton* given to the serpent Leviathan in Is. 27, 1. The same epithet is used in Ugaritic of a creature called *ltn*, obviously the leviathan, with the meaning of the 'crooked serpent'.

Again the verb *rum* means 'to be high' but certain forms apparently related to it, are in reality related to another root *rama* 'to wish, to desire', thus in Prov. 29, 4 '*ish terumot* is not 'a man who exacts gifts' (R.S.V.), nor 'one who imposes heavy taxes' (Conf. V.) but 'a man of desires', that is 'a covetous man'.

The grammatical knowledge of Hebrew is equally important for a good translation. It is universally admitted that Hebrew lacks that variety of moods and tenses which enable the writer to express all those nuances of the action which the writer feels he must express. All these different nuances are expressed by the same verbal form, which if translated literally, misses the true meaning intended by the writer. Thus Hebrew had no special forms to express the intention of doing an action or the beginning of an action. All such modalities of action are expressed by the simple form of the imperfect *jigtol*. So in 1Kgs 6, 1 the verb *wajjiben* must be translated 'and he built'. But obviously Solomon did not build the temple in one day nor in one year; therefore the past tense must refer not to the completed action but only to its beginning, hence the sense and correct translation is 'and he began to build', so the Latin Vulgate, RSV. In the parallel passage in 2Chr. 3, 1.2 it is expressly stated that 'Solomon began to build'. In 2Kgs 9, 23 the verb *wajjanos*, which is translated 'and he fled' in RSV and other modern versions, must be translated 'and he wanted to flee' or 'he tried to flee', the imperfect being a conative imperfect denoting an effort to do something, not the action itself. As a matter-of-fact Joram did not succeed in fleeing, but he simply tried and wanted to flee. In 2Kgs 6, 4 the rendering 'they cut down trees' is not correct; the correct rendering is 'and they began to cut down trees'. Similarly in Haggai 1, 14 the correct translation is 'and they began to work' not 'and they worked'. Jer. 37, 12 it is said that Jeremiah 'went out from Jerusalem to go to the land of Benjamin'. But Jeremiah was arrested at the gate of Benjamin and was not allowed to go out of the city, so the sense is: 'Jeremiah wanted to go out of Jerusalem'. There are many other passages where grammatical considerations suggest a rendering different from the current one. In Is. 5, 4 the rendering 'Why, when I looked for it to yield grapes, why did it yield wild grapes?' is ungrammatical, for in this construction the subject of the verb 'looked for' and the infinitive 'to yield' must be the same. Grammar therefore requires this translation: 'Why, when I looked to get grapes, did it get bad grapes?' In 1Macc. 8, 30 the Greek οὗτοι καὶ οὗτοι is literally rendered 'these and those', 'les uns et les autres' even by such scholars as Abel and Dhorme. But this rendering ignores the idiomatic use of the underlying

Hebrew conjunction *waw* 'and' which in this case is 'or' not 'and'. Hence the correct rendering is 'either these or those'. In the same book of Mac-cabees 10, 72 the two imperatives ἐρώτησον καὶ μάθε ask and learn', according to Hebrew syntax are not co-ordinated but subordinated the one to the other, hence the sense is: 'Ask that you may learn' or 'Ask and so you will learn'.

So far we have limited ourselves to the Old Testament, but the New Testament too provides many good illustrations of the importance and necessity of a sound linguistic knowledge. Thus, theologians of all times have been in pains to reconcile Christ's words 'Whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication ...' (Matt. 19, 7) with the law of indissolubility of marriage proclaimed by Christ shortly before 'What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder' (Matt. 19, 6). A deeper study of the Rabbinic writings has brought to light the exact meaning of the Aramaic word *zenuth*, which is not simply fornication, but, and this is its technical meaning 'an unlawful marriage, such as a marriage contracted within forbidden degrees.' This meaning once established, all becomes clear. The sense of Christ's words is: Whosoever shall put away his wife, except in the case of an unlawful union ... The same word and meaning *zenuth* πορνεία recur in Act. 15, 20 where the Judaeo Christians are exhorted to abstain themselves from idolatry, fornication ... Now there was no need to exhort Christians to abstain from fornication, but they had to abstain from marriage within certain degrees of relationship. Again Paul is angry with the Corinthians because one of them was living with his father's wife, a widow who was not the man's mother (1Cor. 5, 1). Paul calls this act *porneia* - *zenuth*. Now if this act of immorality was a marriage of a man with his dead father's wife, which was a marriage against the Jewish and the Roman law and consequently an unlawful marriage, the whole story becomes perfectly clear, but if *porneia* were an ordinary sin of fornication, we see no reason why Paul should call this sin 'a sin that is not found even among pagans'. In Paul's days the Corinthians were notorious for their immoral life. In Matt. 6, 27 the word *belikia* is translated by Vulg. and some modern translators 'stature, height', so also a modern Maltese translation of the Gospel of Matthew. But the Greek word means also 'length of life, span of life', and this meaning is to be preferred in Matt. 6, 27 as it is actually preferred by most of modern translators and commentators. And there are hundreds of cases of words and constructions which cannot be correctly explained and translated without an adequate knowledge of the semitic substratum, of the Koine or Hellenistic linguistic usage, as well as the language of

the papyri, a study which since the time of Adolf Deissmann, that is since the beginning of the twentieth century has made enormous progress. Let us take a few examples. We read in the Gospel of Matthew 2, 11 that the three wise men offered to the babe Jesus as gifts: gold, frankincense and myrrh, χρυσὸν καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν. Now, to say the truth, the presence of gold among such aromatic substances as frankincense and myrrh is, to say the least, unfitting. Hence it may be doubted whether the wise men really offered gold. Now there exist in many museums several stone-altars found in South Arabia and consisting of a block of stone for burning aromatic substances and having on their four faces the names of aromatic substances inscribed. Among these names we find the word *dbb*, which, combined with the names of other aromatic substances, must naturally denote an aromatic substance. In fact *dabib* in Arabic means a drop of a sort of resinous substance secreted by certain plants. The noun *mrt*, denoting the myrrh, is also found inscribed on the altar blocks, together with the word *lbny* which means 'frankincense'. So the names of the gifts *dbb*, *lbny* and *mrt* correspond to three names of aromatic substances inscribed on the faces of the stone-altars. The noun *dbb* soon became confused with the noun *dbb* 'gold' and so gold found its way among the gifts presented by the wise men to the Babe Jesus. This confusion gave rise to another misunderstanding. The golden altar mentioned in Apoc. 8, 3; 9, 13 is in reality the altar of perfumes mentioned in Lk 1, 11. And so many other examples.

As a result of the revival of biblical studies among Catholics there has been in recent years an extraordinary crop of biblical translations in all the Catholic world. I limit myself to mention only a few of them.

You all know of the translation by Mgr. R. Knox, of which the O.T. was published in 1948, the N.T. in 1946, and the complete two-volume edition in 1955. Contrary to all modern translations it is made from the Latin Vulgate, but the translator kept constantly an eye on the Greek text. The translator was particularly interested in the style of his translation which he endeavoured to make as modern and English as possible, even at the cost of literality.

The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures from the original Greek and Hebrew, undertaken with the approval of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Catholic Hierarchy has given us the N.T. complete and only a few books of the O.T.

The Catholic Biblical Association of America has given us *The Holy Bible* translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources, 1941-1955.

The English Protestants, no longer satisfied with the King James Version published in 1611, have undertaken another revision, known as The Revised Standard Version, which is an authorized revision of the American Standard Version, published in 1901.

Another Protestant translation of the Bible is *The New English Bible*, which may be described as an authoritative attempt to present the meaning of the original text, as understood by the best available scholarship, in English which is as clear and natural for the modern reader as the subject matter will allow. The translation of the New Testament after 13 years of co-operative work on the original Greek text has appeared in the year 1961. The translation of the Old Testament is still in preparation.

The old French Crampon has been revised by Fr. Bonsirven and published in 1952.

The Benedictine Fathers of Maredsous in Belgium have produced a good French translation with very brief notes.

The Letouzey Bible, a commentary rather than a mere translation, begun in 1935 and completed in 1961, gives a translation based upon an accurate and critical study of the text.

The latest and best French translation is the so-called *Bible de Jerusalem* undertaken under the direction of the Ecole Biblique of Jerusalem, published in parts during the years 1948-1954, and later in a one-volume edition. In the words of a modern critic 'French Catholics have every right to take pride in this new edition: it represents a splendid achievement, scientific and literary, well suited to bring readers to the Bible not only among those whom their calling obliges to use the Bible, but also from a much wider circle, educated persons who will enjoy the literary excellence of the version and readers who will come to it for spiritual profit.

From Italy comes *La Sacra Bibbia* tradotta dai testi originali con note a cura del Pontificio Istituto Biblico di Roma, published in 9 volumes, 1942-1958. The high standard of the translation is guaranteed by the authority of the Biblical Institute and the scholarship of the collaborators.

Other modern Italian translations are: *La Sacra Bibbia* translated by G. Bonaccorsi and others, 1959 in 5 volumes. The translation is made from the Latin Vulgate. Again: *La Sacra Bibbia* translated by G. Alberioni and others from the original languages, 1958.

In order to assess rightly the value of a biblical translation three factors or aspects must be taken into consideration: the religious, the literary and the scientific aspect. The Bible was originally translated into the people's language in order to meet the religious requirements of the

people. This was the origin of the Aramaic Targumim or paraphrases of the Bible and of the earliest translation of the O.T. known as the 'Septuagint'. The reading of the Bible was the central part of the Jewish liturgical service, but when the Jews residing outside Palestine no longer spoke and no longer understood their own national language, they felt the need of having the Bible translated into the language of their adopted country, and it was so that the first translations of the Bible sprang up. In later times when Christianity began to spread in the West, where neither Hebrew nor Greek were understood by the common people, the Bible was again translated into Latin to satisfy the religious and spiritual needs of the rising christian communities. And so in the course of centuries, with the decadence of Latin and the rising of new languages the need was again felt of having the Scriptures rendered into the new languages. So we may say that the spread of Christianity and the development of new languages went hand in hand producing new translations and continually nourishing the spiritual life of christians. This hand-in-hand movement still continues in our times and is most strongly felt in mission lands, where the missionaries themselves do their best to have at least parts of the Scriptures rendered into the language of their converts, and we can safely say that there is no language on earth that does not boast of at least a partial translation of the Bible.

The first translations of the Bible were, from a literary and scientific point of view, a very mediocre work. The Greek version called the LXX in some books hardly rises above mediocrity. St. Augustine complains that the first Latin translations were made by persons who possessed only a scanty and inadequate knowledge of Greek and Latin. But when languages began to develop on literary lines and translations became the work of cultured persons, translations began to be dressed in a more or less literary style according to the literary efficiency of the translator. St. Jerome, a good Latin writer of the silver age has striven to give his Latin translation of the Bible a classical turn of style which everyone still admires and enjoys. This effort at literary standards is one of the guiding principles of all modern translations. Among modern Latin translations we may mention the new translation of the Psalms, which has become the official Latin translation of the Roman Church. The translation of the two small books of Canticles and Ecclesiastes by Fr. now Card. Bea combining elegance of expression with scientific accuracy may be considered as the prelude of a complete modern translation to replace Jerome's work as the official text in the Catholic Church.

All modern translators are convinced of the importance of the literary standard of the translation. No one ignores the translation by Mgr. Knox, a translation, which although sometimes too paraphrastic and is made from the Vulgate not from the original languages, has won the favour of all readers having a refined literary taste. The old English versions, the authorized and the revised, no longer satisfy the literary standards of modern times, and, besides the Revised Standard Version, which is only a revision of a revision, a new translation is being prepared, of which the New Testament has already been published. Both the French translation known as the Bible de Jerusalem and the Italian La Sacra Bibbia published by the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome were submitted to a strict examination of their literary style and diction before going to press.

Considering the third factor, that is the scientific aspect of biblical translations, we can safely say that all modern translations are the outcome of a general effort at bringing modern biblical scholarship within reach of the ordinary reader. The progress of biblical studies achieved in recent years has been enormous, the vocabulary of the Hebrew language is daily expanding, new words and new meanings are being continually discovered and new light is being incessantly shed on many obscure passages of the Bible. The Ras Shamra tablets, the Dead Sea scrolls and comparative Semitic and Hellenic philology are the chief sources of our new linguistic knowledge. And progress is so rapid that a translation is already antiquated as soon as it is published. Hence the numerous successive revisions of standard translations. Although some new renderings are simply conjectural and ready to be ousted and replaced by better translations, the fact remains that a good many new renderings and emendations of the traditional text must be definitely accepted as certainly correct. So there is hardly any respectable translator who still clings to the old meaningless rendering of Is. 53, 9 'in his death', instead of 'his burying-place', a reading which is supported by the Isaiah manuscript of the Dead Sea.

Let us now look at our Maltese translations in the light of these factors. The earliest translations were the result of protestant propaganda. The Church Missionary Society, a Protestant institution, was very active in Malta during the first half of the 19th century and it gave us the translations of the Gospel of St. John in 1822, the four Gospels and Acts in 1829, the new Testament in 1847, the Book of Common Prayer with the Psalms in 1845. These translations continue to be printed and published

by the British and Foreign Bible Society up to the present day. Although the Catholic religion is as old in Malta as the 1st century A.D., no attempt has ever been made to render the Bible into the people's language. Indeed such an attempt would have been absolutely useless since the people could not read, and education was limited to foreign languages Italian and Latin. It was the Maltese scholar M.A. Vassalli the first to give the Maltese language a literary status by writing its Grammar and Vocabulary and insisting upon the necessity of learning one's national language before any other foreign language. And it was the same Vassalli who gave us the first translation of the Gospels. It is regrettable that the Catholic approach to the Bible remained for many years very timid and indecisive. The Bible was considered to be too holy to be touched by human hands, it was the book sealed with seven seals with no one who was able or willing to open it or look therein. During the latter half of the 19th century the Catholics contented themselves with adapting protestant translations to their needs. It was not until the 20th century that the Bible began to find a more favourable reception among Catholics, but still translations remained the result of private initiative. Thus the translations by Mr. Muscat Azzopardi, by the Revd. Grima, by A.M. Galea and my own translation are all due to private enterprise. The Church has neither expressly encouraged nor discouraged such translations, although she made use of them in her teaching.

The literary value of the earliest Maltese translation is easily gauged by the fact that it was the work of a great Maltese scholar who had previously published a Grammar and a Vocabulary of the Maltese language and was deeply versed in oriental languages. The only or the greatest defect of Vassalli's translation is its rigid stylistic stiffness which makes it perhaps somewhat disagreeable to modern tastes. Vassalli was more a scholar than a man of letters, and his special capacity is reflected in his translation in which we find the application of his grammatical rules and the words registered in his Lexicon, but not the graceful flexibility of the language, the elegance of expression, the idiomatic vividness of style which characterize other literary works. And this style, robust but uncouth, is common to all the translations of that period.

In recent times a stronger effort at elegance of form was made with results sometimes very satisfactory. Mr. J. Muscat Azzopardi, though not a biblical scholar, was one of our best writers and his translation of the Gospels betrays the hand of a refined writer. But the translation of the Revd. P.P. Grima is utterly careless and defiant of the most elementary

rules of style. He was simply intent on giving the people some good religious reading and was absolutely insensible to elegance of form and style. Equally popular in form and scope are the translations by Comm. A.M. Galea who, though the most prolific popular writer, has spoilt his style through a misconception of biblical style. Popularity in its lowest degree is the standard of the translation of the Gospels by Fr. Paris O.P.

As far back as 1928 I undertook the translation of the whole Bible from the original languages. The work was completed in 1959. A revised second edition is now being prepared. As I find it most disagreeable to speak of myself and my work and on the other hand many peculiarities of my translation are completely overlooked and unappreciated by the average reader, who may find in them a cause for adverse criticism, I limit myself here to submit some stylistic and textual peculiarities of my translation in order to give some idea of its literary standard.

In the first place I have always striven to give a purely semitic turn to the Maltese construction, avoiding at the same time, as much as possible, all foreign influences. Hence I have invariably avoided all foreign words for which there is a purely Maltese-semitic equivalent; so contrary to Fr. Paris, I have always used the word *qassis* for 'priest' and never *sacerdot*, though this word is current in daily use. So too I have never used the word *re* 'king', but always *sultan*. The only allowance to foreign words was the lack of a corresponding Maltese word or the inexact correspondence of a Maltese word to the original Hebrew word. Thus the word *gbarix* does not correspond exactly to the word *tent*, hence in my revised edition the word has been changed to *tinda*, which in spite of its Italian origin, represents more accurately the meaning of the original Hebrew. So also I have used such words as *poplu* 'people', Italian *popolo*; *ligi* 'law', Ital. *legge*; *preċett* and *kmandament* 'precept' 'commandment'; *parir* 'advice' Ital. *parere*; *kamp* 'camp'; Ital. *campo*, Eng. camp, and some others.

In order to eschew as far as possible the use of words of foreign origin I have used words which, though registered in our vocabularies, are to-day obsolete, archaic, not easily comprehensible by the average reader. So *tabbaħ* 'a cook', given by Vassalli (*tebaħ* 'to cook'), Falzon, Busuttil; *ħatem*, *ħattem* 'to seal' (Vassalli, Falzon, Caruana); *susan* 'lily' (Vassalli, Falzon, Caruana, Busuttil); *deben* 'to anoint' (Vassalli, Falzon); *kies* 'cup' (Vassalli, Falzon, Busuttil). In my effort to use always a purely Maltese word I have not hesitated to form new words from existing roots; thus *emin* 'faithful' *emiēna* 'faithfulness, fidelity' from the verb *emmen*

'to trust, to believe in'; *saffel* 'to bring low' from *isfel* 'low'; *stagar* 'to hire a workman' from *aġar* 'workman's wages'; *mitraq* 'a hammer' from *mterqa* which is its feminine; *rsal*, *rsajjel* 'messenger' from *rasul* 'apostle'. All such new words are formed according to strict rules of Maltese-Arabic Grammar and have their exact equivalent in Arabic.

Owing to the lack of Maltese words expressing abstract and negative notions, every translator, I mean a serious and respectable translator, will find himself in extreme difficulties to translate such words as 'immortal', 'immortality', 'incorruption', 'perfection', 'injustice', 'justification', 'salvation', 'sincerity', 'innocence', and many others. Such words must necessarily be translated paraphrastically. If one tries to translate these words by simply transliterating them in Maltese, as 'immortali', 'immortalità', 'inkorruzjoni', etc. he will run the risk of making himself unintelligible to the common people who do not understand Italian.

Another great difficulty which faces the serious translator is this: Sometimes two words, which may be two nouns, two adjectives or two verbs are co-ordinated by the conjunction 'and'. Now it may happen that one of the two words has a Maltese equivalent, while the other has none. How is the translator to get out of the difficulty? Either by using an Italo-Maltese word for the missing Maltese word or making use of paraphrasis. Thus for example the expression 'beautiful and pleasant' is rendered *sabiħ u pjaċevoli* or *sabiħ u li joġġob*; if instead of 'pleasant' we have 'amiable', the paraphrasis would be *ta' min iħobbu*. Now all such hybrid combinations are stylistic deformities, though they may be agreeable to many writers. I have always done my best to avoid these stylistic monstrosities, but I wonder whether I have been always successful.

Other literary peculiarities are the following: The word *ġebel* means 'stones' as a collective noun. The primitive meaning 'mountain' has been occasionally preserved in a few toponomic names, thus *ġebel Ċantar*, *ġebel Majjim*, *ġebel Ghorab*, names of hills, highlands. I have invariably retained the primitive meaning, hence always *ġebel Sinaj* 'mount Sinaj' but never *il-muntanja Sinaj*. Moreover, the word *ruħ*, is feminine and used in the sense of 'soul'. But the word has in reality in Maltese and in Arabic two genders and two meanings. It is feminine when it means 'soul'; it is masculine when it means 'spirit', so *Ruħ il-Qodos* 'the Holy Spirit' is masculine. This distinction of gender and meaning has been strictly maintained.

I wonder whether such linguistic usage justifies the violent onslaught

made by some self-made critics who have accused my translation of incomprehensibility and unsuitability for the people. It is rather their limited and inadequate knowledge of Maltese the cause of the unintelligibility of a score of words in my translation. With a small effort and an adequate knowledge of the flexibility of the language and its power of shooting new forms from existing roots one will easily arrive at understanding every single word in my translation, especially in view of the fact that quite many difficult words are explained in the notes. Thus in Is. 8, 16, 17 the verb *inbattem* has in the notes as its equivalent *nissigilla*; in 18, 6 the two verbs *isajfu* and *ixittu* are explained in the notes as *igħaddu s-sajf* and *igħaddu x-xitwa*. In 41, 25 *xmiel* is 'tramuntana'. In Ps. 43, 3 *emiēna* is 'fedeltà'. In Prov. 13, 17 *emin* is 'fidil'. In the construction of sentences I have always endeavoured to follow the rules of semitic syntax. That is why my style has a strong semitic style so different from that of most Maltese writers, who are sometimes so deeply imbued in the style of foreign languages that they unconsciously shape their style after the fashion of their favourite language. This I have done every effort to avoid. One day I happened to be talking with a foreign semitic scholar who had my Maltese Bible. He told me: 'I can understand your translation better than any other book in Maltese'. And that was a great compliment to me.

The semitic style is particularly conspicuous in the poetic books in which I have endeavoured to preserve the original rhythmical structure. Under this respect the books of Job and Canticles are outstanding. I read ch 41 of the book of Job containing the description of the crocodile:

- 40, 25 Tistad int għall-kukkudrill b'sunnara,
jew b'habel tista' int torbotlu lsienu?
26 Tqeghidlu int qafla fi mnifsejh,
jew b'ganċ titqablu xedqu?
27 Sa jigilek b'xi hafna thannin
jew ikellmek bi kliem helu?
28 Sa jirtabat b'xi ftehimia mieghek,
biex tieħdu b'qaddej għal dejjem?
29 Sa tilgħab int bih bhalkieku għasfur
u torbtu għall-bnejtiet tieghek?
30 Sa jinnegozjawh l-ixirka fis-sajd,
jew jaqsmuh bejn il-merkanti?
31 Timlielu int gildu bil-vleġeġ,
u rasu bid-daqqiet tal-foxxna?

- 32 Qieghed idek fuq;
 ahseb fit-taqbida; le ma terga'!
- 41, 1 Ara kif tqarraq bih it-tama tieghu;
 malli biss jarah jintelaq.
- 2 Mhux ahrax jekk wiehed iqajjmu?
 u min hu li jista' jieqaf quddiemu?
- 3 Min habat ghalih u helisha?
 Taht is-sema kollu ma hawn hadd.
- 4 Ma noqghodx ma nghid xejn fuq gismu;
 nghid fuq il-qawwa tieghu li ma hawnx daqsha.
- 5 Min qatt fetah il-quddiem ta' libstu,
 u gol-qoxra mitnija tieghu min jista' jidhol?
- 6 Min qatt fetah il-bibien ta' halqu?
 madwar snienu hemm il-biza'.
- 7 Dahru srabat ta' tarki,
 mwahhlin bhal hatem taz-żnied.
- 8 Wahda mal-ohra marbuta,
 u nifs ma jghaddix bejniethom.
- 9 Kull wahda ma sehbitha mitbuqa,
 mghaqqdin u le ma jinfirdu.
- 10 L-ghatis tieghu jiddi bid-dawl,
 ghajnejh donnhom xfar iz-żemij.
- 11 Minn fommu johorgu ilsna ta' nar
 xrajjar ta' nar jittajjru.
- 12 Minn immifsejh johrog id-duhhan,
 bhal inhasa tbaqbaq u taghli.
- 13 Nifsu jqabbad il-gamar
 u ilsna ta' nar minn fommu johorgu.
- 14 F'ghonqu qieghda l-qawwa
 u quddiemu jaqbez il-biza'.
- 15 Il-qalba ta' lahmu maghquda
 iebsa fuq u le ma titharrek.
- 16 Qalbu iebsa bhal hagra,
 iebsa bhal hagra ta' taht tal-mithna.
- 17 Malli jqum il-qawwijin jitwerwru,
 jintilfu mibluhin bil-biza'.
- 18 Is-sejf li jilhqu le ma jzomm shih,
 anqas lanza, vlegga jew labarda.
- 19 Ghalih il-hadid bhat-tiben,
 u l-inhas bhal ghuda msewwsa.

- 20 Le ma tharrbu l-vlegga tal-qaws,
ghafien isir ghalih il-hagar imwaddab.
- 21 Tibna hi ghalih il-mazza,
u jidhak bit-tixjir tal-lanza.
- 22 Tahtu hemm xfafar ta' xaqquf,
u jifrex bhal xatba fit-tajn.
- 23 Ighalli qiegh il-bahar bhal borma,
jagħmel il-bahar bhal hwawar ibaqqu.
- 24 Ibajjad warajh il-mogħdija,
il-bahar ikun qisu sar ixjeb.
- 25 Ma hemmx fuq l-art bhalu,
magħmul li ma jibzaghx.
- 26 Fuq kull min hu mkabbar ihares;
hu sultan id-dbejjeb kburin kollha.

In order to give some idea of the scientific standard of my Translation I should like now to submit a list of passages that are translated by me differently from current and traditional translations, and sometimes even from modern translations of the highest scientific standard:

In Gen. 2, 5 the Hebrew construction is badly involved and translations are more or less awkward. The Douay Version reads thus: 'And every plant of the field before it sprung up in the earth, and every herb of the ground before it grew: for the Lord God had not rained upon the earth; and there was not a man to till the earth. But a spring rose out of the earth, watering all the surface of the earth'. The King James Version of 1611 gives more or less the same rendering. Even the Revised Standard Version does not differ substantially from the older versions. The translation by the Catholic Biblical Association of America is slightly better: 'there was not yet any field shrub on the earth nor had the plants of the field sprung up, for the Lord God had sent no rain on the earth, and there was no man to till the soil; but a mist rose from the earth and watered all the surface of the ground'. The contradiction between the lack of rain and the irrigation of the earth by a spring or mist rising out from the ground is apparent. There was no vegetation because there was no rain, but the earth was irrigated, therefore there should have been vegetation. Modern translations are generally not very successful in removing the difficulty. But the Italian translation by the Pontifical Biblical Institute has felicitously rendered; 'nessun arbusto campestre c'era ancora sulla terra ne alcuna erba germogliava ancora per la campagna, perche il Signore Iddio non aveva fatto piovere sulla terra nè c'era uomo che colti-

vasse il suolo e dalla terra facesse salir l'onda ad irrigare la superficie del suolo'. This translation agrees with that proposed by me as far back as 1936 and has now been adopted in my revised edition.

In Gen. 3, 15 the verb *shuph* makes difficulty. The verb is twice used presumably with the same meaning. Hence all such renderings as 'she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel' (Douay and American Confraternity Version) must be ruled out as incompatible with lexical exigencies. On the other hand the rendering of the verb *shuph* as 'to crush' in both occurrences, as 'he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel' would mean that the two adversaries, the woman's seed and the devil, will destroy one another, which is against the context which foretells the victory of the woman's seed and the total defeat of the devil. The difficulty is easily solved by giving the second *shuph* the meaning of a conative imperfect. The sense would be The woman's seed will crush the serpent's head, while the serpent will try (but in vain) to crush (that is, to attack, to bite) the heel of the woman's seed. This is my revised rendering of this passage.

In Lev. 4, 13. 22. 27; 5, 2. 3. 4. 17 the Latin Vulg. and the Douay omit the verb *weashemu*. The RSV translates wrongly. Other modern translations omit also the verb *ashemu*. The omission is unjustifiable as the verb gives the reason why expiation of a sin of ignorance is necessary. The sense is: If a person commits a sin through ignorance, he is really guilty, and when he becomes aware of his sin, he will have to offer a sacrifice. And the important thing to notice is that the conjunction *waw* prefixed to the verb *ashemu* is not a copulative conjunction, but a *waw apodosi* introducing the principal clause after a subordinate clause.

In Lev. 23, 36; Numb. 29, 35; Deut. 16, 8 the liturgical term *aseret* is usually translated 'assembly, meeting, convocation'. But the real meaning is 'abstention from work, vacation'. This meaning is justified by the epegetical clause which follows the noun: 'Thou shalt do no work'.

Deut. 32, 36 the assonant expression *asur weazub* which recurs again in 1Kgs 14, 10; 21, 21; 2Kgs 9, 8; 14, 26 is generally taken to denote the whole people as divided into two opposite classes, such as slaves and freemen, those that are under age and those that are of age, protected and unprotected. I have shown elsewhere that the two assonant words denote one class of the population, the effect of the assonance being that of bringing out the fundamental meaning more emphatically. As this is that of 'powerlessness, helplessness', the meaning is: all the people even the poorest, the weakest, the most helpless of the population. This

is my translation which differs from most modern translations.

Jgs 16, 9. After Delilah's first unsuccessful attempt to discover the cause of Samson's extraordinary strength all texts and versions read 'And his strength was not known', that is the secret of his strength was not discovered. This makes good sense. But the initial *yodb* of the verb *jada* 'know' sometimes represents a primitive *waw* (cp Hebr *yalad* Malt. *wiled*). If this is the case here, instead of *yada* 'to know' we have the verb *wada* 'to subdue' and a better sense is obtained: 'And his strength was not brought to submission'.

Jgs 19, 2. Here we read the story of the levite whose wife ran away. The cause of her desertion was, according to the Hebrew text, her unfaithfulness. Many modern translators, however, adopt the LXX reading 'she became angry, she quarrelled'. So that the cause of the woman's desertion was not conjugal infidelity but only a quarrel between wife and husband, an ordinary domestic event.

In 2Kgs 9, 23 the verb *wajjanos* does not mean 'and he fled' as it is usually translated (RSV) De Vaux, Dhorme) but 'he tried to flee, he wanted to flee'. The verb is a conative imperfect, hence I have translated 'ried jahrab'. As a matter of fact King Joram was not successful in his attempt to escape, for he was killed on the spot.

IMacc. 8, 30. The Greek 'these and those' is literally rendered 'les uns et les autres' (Abel, Dhorme), 'both parties' (RSV). This rendering ignores the idiomatic use of the underlying Hebrew *waw*, which in this case means 'or', hence my translation 'wiehed jew l-iehor'.

Tob. 7, 13 The words *kai os* are generally literally translated 'and how'. But the words are the literal translation of Hebr *waken* 'and so'. The sense is: 'and so they gave her to him'.

Tob. 12, 6. The Greek text is confused and translations are more or less awkward. By retranslating the Greek into Hebrew, the following text is obtained: 'Bless God and praise him before all the living for what he has done to you. It is good to bless his name'.

Job. 6, 4. We read 'The terrors of God are arrayed against me'. This rendering is adopted by most modern translators. In 1955 Prof. G.R. Driver proposed translating 'wear me down' instead of 'are arrayed against me', a translation which I had already adopted in 1947.

Job 29, 18. Job recalling the happy days of his younger years says: 'I thought: I shall die in my nest'. The mention of the nest is here inappropriate and destroys the parallelism. The word, however, is retained by many modern translators and interpreters. Driver postulates a root *qn*

suggesting the idea of strength and translates 'I shall die in my full strength'; but this translation is unsuitable to the context unless one supposes vigour to be still fresh in old age. My translation follows the LXX: 'I shall die in my old age' which restores the parallelism with the following stich: 'I shall multiply my days as the sand'.

Cant. 1, 4. The verb *hebi'ani* is translated either as an imperative 'introduce me' or as a perfect tense 'he introduced me'. In my translation the verb is the protasis of a conditional sentence, thus 'if the king were to bring me into his chamber, we will rejoice'.

Is. 2, 16. The 'beautiful things' or 'pleasant imagery', which make no sense, have become in my translation 'beautiful ships'.

Is. 4, 5.6. Both the Hebrew text and all ancient and modern versions separate the last word of verse 5 from the first word of verse 6. In my translation the two words have been brought together so as to form an assonant combination *huppah wesukkab*, the effect of the assonance being that of emphasizing the idea of divine protection.

Is. 24, 16. The word *razi* is difficult to explain. Auvray-Steinmann translate tentatively: 'Assez! Assez!' Fischer: 'Verderben mir, Verderben mir'. Kissane with the ancient versions 'A secret, a secret have I'. Although the meaning 'secret, mystery' is common in the Qumran literature, I prefer to link up the word with Arabic *ruz* 'calamity'. Hence the meaning is 'my calamity' or 'woe to me'.

Is. 41, 14. The Hebrew text as translated by all ancient and modern versions reads thus: 'Fear not, you worm Jacob, you men of Israel'. or: 'you that are dead'. Both translations are justified by the fact that Hebr. *mete* can be referred either to the noun *metim* 'men' or to the participle *metim* 'dead'. But parallelism, which is an essential feature of Hebrew poetry, requires for 'men' or 'dead' a synonym of 'worm'. And this synonym is easily found in the Acc. *mutu* which means 'lice'; hence the correct rendering is: 'Fear not, you worm Jacob, you lice of Israel' with a perfect synonymous parallelism.

Is. 53, 9a. b. The literal rendering is that given by the Duoay Version: 'And he shall give the ungodly for his burial and the rich for his death'. The sense is beyond comprehension. The disturbing word is *bemotaw* 'in his deaths'. The verse is generally explained thus: He i.e. the Servant, the Messiah, Christ, will be destined to be buried with the wicked, but in reality he will be buried with rich and honourable people. But difficulties remain. In my translation of the book of Isaiah, published in 1951 I suspected the word *bamato* to be hidden in the word *bemotaw*, and

my suspicions came true after the publication of the Dead Sea scroll of Isaiah which reads exactly *bamato*. It has been recently shown that *bamab*, with the 3 p.s.m. suffix *bamato*, means sometimes 'funerary installation', hence 'burying-place'. Therefore my translation is: 'He was given a sepulchre with the wicked and a burying place with evil-doers'.

Is. 54, 7. The usual translation 'For a brief moment did I forsake thee, and with great mercy did I gather thee' destroys the parallelism. Parallelism is restored by giving the word *rega* the meaning 'emotion'. Hence my translation: 'With little emotion have I forsaken thee, but with great mercy will I gather thee'.

Jer, 47, 5. The word *imqam* is generally altered into *anaqim* 'the Anakim'. But the word *emeq* besides its ordinary meaning 'valley' has also in Ugaritic the meaning 'vigour'. This meaning, which occurs elsewhere in the Bible, fits here better than any emendation and has been adopted in my translation: 'the rest of their strength'.

Ez. 34, 13. 'I will pasture them on the mountains, in the valleys and in all the dwelling-places of the land'. The absurdity of this rendering is apparent. Flocks are taken to graze on mountains, in the valleys, but certainly not in inhabited places. By linking up the noun *moshab* 'dwelling place' to Arab *wasab* 'abounded with herbs', the meaning 'meadow' is easily obtained.

Dan. 10, 13. The current translation 'I remained there' or 'I was left there' disagrees with the context and cannot be correct. How could the tutelary angel of the Jews communicate his message to Daniel, if he remained with the king of Persia? And if the angel was delivered from the hands of the angel of the Persians, who tried to intercept the divine message to Daniel, how could the angel still remain there instead of continuing his way? The difficulty is avoided if instead of *notarti* 'I was left' we read *botarti* with the meaning of 'I excelled' that is 'I prevailed'. The patron-angel of the Jews prevailed over the angel of the Persians and so could carry his message to Daniel.

Os. 11, 3. 4. These two verses read so in the RSV: 'It was I who taught Ephraim to walk, I took them up in my arms; but they did not know that I healed them. I led them with cords of compassion, with the bands of love, and I became to them as one who eases the yoke on their jaws, and I bent down to them and fed them'. The difficulty is to understand what 'the cords of compassion' or 'the cords of man' and 'the bands of love' are. On the grounds of Arabic analogy the cords of compassion and the bands of love have become 'cords and bands of leather'. By reading '*ul*

'suckling' instead of 'ol 'yoke', the figure will become that of one who lifts his or her baby and takes him into his arms binding him with leather strings for greater security and bending over him to give him food.

These examples and many others are all taken from the Old Testament. But in the New Testament too recent linguistic research has shed a bright light on many an obscure and disputed passage. We have already mentioned the noun *zenuth* which does not mean 'fornication' in general but unlawful marriage. We can add other examples:

The verb *apokrinesthai* 'to answer' is very often used when no question has been asked and therefore when no answer is expected. So in Matt. 8, 8 we read that after Christ had promised to the centurion that he would heal his servant, the centurion 'answered and said'. But Christ had asked no question to the centurion, and the verb 'answered' is out of place. But the verb *apokrithe* 'he answered' is the translation of the Hebr 'anah, which means 'to answer' and 'to set speaking' and simply 'to speak, to say'. Hence the sense is simply: He (the centurion) said. All Maltese translations read incorrectly: U wiegeb.

In the same story of the healing of the centurion's servant we read the well-known words: 'Say only one word, and my servant will be healed'. All Maltese translations give the same text. But the translation is not correct. In Greek and Latin the word 'verbo, logo' is dative, not accusative of the object. Now the dative after the verb 'to say' denotes the person addressed not the words said. Hence the sense is: Say to the word or 'Say it with one word'. Moreover the verb 'to say' in Hebrew is *amar* which means also 'to command'; cp the Maltese expression '*k Alla jamar*' 'if God so commands'. There the sense is: 'Give a one-word command', or 'Just give a command'.

Matt. 26, 50. Christ's words to Judah are generally translated: 'Friend, why have you come here?' Many modern translators however give a slightly different sense to Christ's words. Christ is not asking Judah the reason of his coming to him, but he is simply expressing his astonishment at Judah's effrontery, 'Is it for this purpose, i.e. of betraying me that you are here?' It is an exclamation rather than an interrogation.

The title *vas electionis* given to Paul by God himself (Acts 9, 15) sounds strange, and still stranger is its Maltese rendering '*kejla mahtura*'. The Latin *vas* corresponds to the Greek *skeuos* which means 'a vessel' and 'an implement in general'. It is applied to the goods of the vendors in the temple, arms, sails, anchor, a ship's gear and tackle, an earthenware vessel; man too is called an earthen vessel, one's wife is one's

vessel. In this general sense Paul is called 'vessel of election' that is a chosen instrument, an instrument chosen by God to carry his name before the Gentiles and the children of Israel. Hence the orators' description of Paul as a flower-pot spreading everywhere the sweet perfume of virtues has no support in the biblical text.

I think I have succeeded in showing the difficulty of a Bible translation. I have endeavoured to bring my work abreast of modern biblical studies. Being conscious of my limited forces and the incessant progress of biblical studies I readily admit the existence of some blemishes in my translation, hence I conclude with these two verses from the Latin poet Horace:

'If you can produce something better than this,
let us know it; if not, accept and make use of my translation'.

P.P. SAYDON

DE CRITERIO REVELATIONIS DIVINAE¹

IN Concilio Vaticano Secundo quaestio mota est circa fontes Divinae Revelationis, nempe utrum unus an duo sunt fontes Divinae Revelationis? Absque dubio in IV Sessione Concilii Tridentini de fide fuit definitum; "Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, praesidentibus in ea eisdem tribus Apostolicae Sedis Legatis, hoc sibi perpetuo ante oculos proponens, ut, sublatis erroribus, puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conservetur; quod promissum *ante per Prophetas in Scripturis sanctis* (Rom. I, 3; Hebr. I, 1-2), Dominus Noster Iesus Christus, Dei Filius, proprio ore primum promulgavit, deinde per Apostolos, tamquam fontem omnis et salutaris veritatis et morum disciplinae, omni creaturae praedicari iussit (Mt. XXVIII, 19; Mc. XVI, 15); perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ab ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt: orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur".²

Ex famoso hoc textu sequi videtur duplicem esse Divinae Revelationis fontem, nempe Libros Sacros Utriusque Testamenti et Divinas Traditiones sive ad fidem sive ad mores pertinentes, quia et ipsae vel oretenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto per Apostolos dictatae, continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica fuerunt conservatae. Ita communiter intellexerunt theologi, qui post Concilium Tridentinum de hac re egerunt. Et recte quidem; nam Concilium Tridentinum contra Protes-

¹Haec *Communicatio* lecta fuit in *Secundo Symposio Internationali Theologiae Dogmaticae Fundamental*, habito in "Villa Cagnola", in Gazzada (Varese-Milano), sub Praesidentia Excellentissimi Domini Caroli Colombo, Professoris in Maiori Seminario, Venegoni Inferioris (Varese, Italia), diebus 6-11, m. Septembris, 1964.

²CONCILIUM TRIDENTINUM, Sess. IV (8 Aprilis 1546): *Decretum de canonicis Scripturis* (DENZINGER, n. 783).

tantes agebat, quorum doctrina fuit, solam Sacram Scripturam esse unicum Divinae Revelationis fontem.

Aliunde cum Libri Sacri et Divinae Traditiones nobis a *solis* Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatae sunt, dici etiam potest divinae Revelationis fontem esse unum, nempe *munus apostolicum*: cum enim Apostolis visum est aliquid esse scribendum Libros Sacros condiderunt; cum vero secundum mandatum Christi, Spiritu Sancto dictante, locuti sunt, divinas traditiones condiderunt, quae continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatae sunt. Unde, ni fallimur, dici etiam potest unum esse Divinae Revelationis fontem, nempe munus apostolicum, quod, si non *de iure*, ut nos firmiter credimus, saltem de facto, charisma inspirationis divinae in se includebat. Nam, ut emphatice affirmat S. Thomas, in suo *Commentario in Epistulam ad Galatas*, c. II, Lect. I: "Omnes actus apostolorum et motus fuerunt secundum instinctum Spiritus Sancti". Et in *Summa Theologiae*, I, qu. I, art. 2 ad 2m: "Singularia traduntur in sacra doctrina ... ad declarandam auctoritatem virorum, per quos ad nos revelatio divina processit, super quam fundatur Scriptura seu sacra doctrina". Et tandem magis explicite in art. 8 ad 2m: "Argumentari ex auctoritate est maxime proprium huius doctrinae, eo quod principia huius doctrinae per revelationem habentur et sic oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum, quibus revelatio facta est ... Auctoritatibus autem canonicae Scripturae utitur proprie et ex necessitate arguendo, auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum Ecclesiae quasi argumentando ex propriis, sed probabiliter. *Innititur enim fides nostra revelationi Apostolis et Prophetis factae, qui canonicos libros scripserunt, non autem revelationi, si qua fuit aliis doctoribus facta*".

S. Thomas concludit istam responsionem per aliquem textum ex S. Augustino desumptum, qui pariter numquam non affirmat munus propheticum et apostolicum esse divinae revelationis fontem. En verba Augustini; "Non est, inquis, credibile hoc in Petro Paulum, quod ipse Paulus fecerat, arguisse. Non nunc inquiri, quid fecerit; quid scripserit, quaero: hoc, ad quaestionem quam suscepi, maxime pertinet; ut veritas divinarum Scripturarum ad nostram fidem aedificandam memoriae commendata non a quibuslibet, sed ab ipsis Apostolis, ac per hoc in canonicum auctoritatis culmen recepta ex omni parte verax atque indubitate persistat" (Ep. LXXXII ad Hier., c. 2, n. 7: PL. XXXIII, 278).

Unde haec nova quaestio de uno vel duplici divinae revelationis fonte potest forsitan reduci ad antiquiorem quaestionem nempe num

inspiratio divina *ad scribendum* sit distincta ab inspiratione divina *ad loquendum*. Nam si aliquis tenet charisma divinum inspirationis *ad scribendum* esse realiter distinctum a charismate *ad loquendum*, tunc videtur esse affirmandum duplicem esse divinae revelationis fontem; si, e contra, utrumque est unum idemque charisma, tunc divinae revelationis fons est unus et unicus, nempe munus propheticum et munus apostolicum, quidquid enim Prophetarum et Apostolorum, ut tales, dixerunt vel scripserunt est eodem modo divinum: Libri Sacri et Divinae Traditiones non differunt inter se nisi tamquam duo modi diversi transmissionis eiusdem veritatis, quae unam et unicam habent originem, nempe Deum inspirantem, qui nobis per Prophetas et per Apostolos locutus est.

At non omnes theologi in hoc conveniunt. Plures enim sunt qui inspirationem *ad scribendum* realiter distinguunt ab inspiratione *ad loquendum*. His ultimis annis de hac re fuse egit pia memoriae P. Perrella, in suo opere *De apostolico et prophetico munere ut inspirationis et canonicitatis criterio altero pro N, altero pro V.T.*, edito in Divus Thomas (Plac.), 1932.³

Licitum sit notare P. Perrella hoc studium scripsisse contra articulum, quem ipse scripsit in eodem periodico, anno praecedenti, cuius titulus:

*De criterio Inspirationis et Canonicitatis SS. Librorum.*⁴

Sane hodie non intendo hanc tractare quaestionem, sed tantum disserere de distinctione necne inter inspirationem *ad scribendum* et inspirationem *ad loquendum*.

In citato articulo P. Perrella affirmat inspirationem *ad scribendum* realiter differre ab inspiratione *ad loquendum*, eo quod utraque inspiratio effectus penitus diversos prae se ferat. Ille quippe qui fruitur charismate *ad loquendum* recipit veritates revelatas illasque communicat aliis absque ullo errore sub adsistentia Spiritus Sancti, sicut Romanus Pontifex ex cathedra loquens annuntiat veritatem in deposito fidei contentam et ab universali Ecclesia credendam. E contra, auctor inspiratus *ad scribendum* recipit motionem efficacem in suam voluntatem ad scribendum id quod Deus vult; illuminationem in suam intelligentiam, ut concipiat exacte ea quae scribere debet et ut de illis divinitus iudicet; tandem adsistentiam divinam in facultates executivas, dum scribit, ut

³ G.M. PERRELLA, C.M., *De apostolico et prophetico munere ut inspirationis et canonicitatis criterio altero pro N, altero pro V.T.*, in *Divus Thomas*, Placentiae, XXXV (1932), pp. 49-61; 145-176.

⁴ S.M. ZARB, O.P., *De criterio inspirationis et canonicitatis SS. Librorum*, in *Divus Thomas*, Placentiae, XXXIV (1931), pp. 147-186.

illas veritates convenienter exprimat.⁵

In publica lectione habita Romae in Pontificio Instituto Biblico atque edita in *Divus Thomas* Placentiae, anno 1933, idem P. Perrella videtur aliam admittere differentiam, quia affirmat personam inspiratam *ad scribendum* non necessario esse sibi consciam de sua divina inspiratione, dum tum prophetae cum apostoli conscii fuerunt de ipsorum munere prophetico et apostolico.⁶

Contra P. Perrella duos scripsimus articulos, unum in *Angelicum; Num hagiographi sibi conscii fuerint charismatis divinae inspirationis*,⁷ alterum in *Revue Thomiste, Saint Thomas et l'Inspiration Biblique*.⁸

In his scriptis differentias inter inspirationem *ad scribendum* et inspirationem *ad loquendum* omnino reiecimus. Licitum sit hic breviter resumere quae pleniore calamo scripsimus in allatis studiis.

In primo loco refellere debemus distinctionem realem inter inspirationem *ad scribendum* et inspirationem *ad loquendum*. "Parler et écrire, scipsimus in *Revue Thomiste*, sont deux façons de s'exprimer, qui diffèrent seulement entre elles *in ratione signi*. L'homme qui écrit n'a pas moins besoin de son intelligence et de sa volonté que celui qui parle seulement; et par conséquent l'homme, qui parle ou écrit au nom de Dieu, est également instrument, et reçoit, dans l'un et l'autre cas, une motion identique. Cela semble tellement clair qu'il ne paraît pas nécessaire d'insister davantage. Dès que l'on admet que la distinction entre les deux charismes se réduit à une distinction d'ordre matériel, toutes les différences que l'on a imaginées entre ces deux manières de recevoir et de transmettre l'inspiration divine deviennent sans objet".⁹

Quantum ad conscientiam hominis inspirati, omnino credimus illos, qui a Deo electi sunt, ut ipsius essent instrumenta revelationis, conscios omnino fuisse de ipso charismate inspirationis a se ipsis recepto. Nam si ipsi nescierunt se esse inspiratos, quomodo nos possumus hoc scire? Si per alium, hunc oportet esse inspiratum; et si inspiratus non est necesse ut sibi ipsi sit conscius de sua inspiratione, itur in infinitum, quod sane est omnino absurdum. Sane Deus uti potest homine, ut voluntatem suam adimpleat, quin homo sit de hoc conscius, ut Caiphias,

⁵ Cf. PERRELLA, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-55.

⁶ G.M. PERRELLA, C.M., *Ispirazione profetica e ispirazione scritturale*, in *Divus Thomas*, Placentiae, XXXVI (1933), pp. 121-143.

⁷ S.M. ZARB, O.P., *Num Hagiographi sibi conscii fuerint charismatis divinae inspirationis*, in *Angelicum*, XI (1934), pp. 228-244.

⁸ R.P. SERAPHIN-M. ZARB, O.P., *Saint Thomas et l'inspiration biblique*, in *Revue Thomist*, N.S.T. XIX, n. 95 (1936), pp. 367-381.

⁹ *Revue Thomiste, l.c.*, p. 374.

dicens oportere unum, nempe Christum, mori pro populo, ne totus populus pereat: at Caiphas non fuit receptor charismatis inspirationis, sed ut dicit S. Thomas, fuit motus *instinctu aliquo divino*, qui certocertius est aliquid infra charisma divinae inspirationis collatae Prophetis atque Apostolis, ut ipsi constituentur organa divinae revelationis. Concludimus ergo inspirationem *ad scribendum* atque inspirationem *ad loquendum* esse unum idemque charisma atque inter se non differre nisi materialiter, ut enim vivida utamur metaphora, dicere audemus scribere est loqui manibus, atque loqui est scribere lingua.

Negata igitur distinctione inter inspirationem *ad scribendum* et inspirationem *ad loquendum*, facile est dicere unum esse divinae revelationis fontem, Deum scilicet seu veritatem primam in dicendo, Deus revelans. Haec revelatio tamen nobis non immediate communicatur, sed per Prophetas et per Apostolos, qui, si divinum oraculum *oretenus* tantum communicant, sunt organum divinae traditionis: si vero *scripto* Sacros conduunt Libros.

Est tamen differentia inter *modum transmissionis* Librorum Sacrorum et *modum transmissionis* divinarum traditionum. Nam scripta manent, sed verba volant; hinc traditiones committuntur Ecclesiae conservandae. Unde, cum quidquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur, divinae traditiones restringuntur ad obiectum infallibilitatis Ecclesiae, et sic eatenus recipiuntur, quatenus tractant de rebus fidei et morum: dum Sacra Scriptura, cum sit ipsissimum Dei verbum, nullam subit restrictionem. Alia etiam habetur differentia quoad Prophetas et Apostolos; nam, cum in Vetere Testamento nulla fuerat institutio, quae infallibilitate divina fruebatur, sicut in Novo Testamento habetur Ecclesia, hinc fit quod oracula a Prophetis *oretenus* tantum communicata, non fuerunt conservata; dum oracula *oretenus* ab Apostolis communicata, conservata fuerunt in Ecclesia. Propterea in definitione Concilii Tridentini supra allata fit tantum mentio de divinis traditionibus, "quae ab ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt." Nulla omnino fit mentio de divinis traditionibus pro Vetere Testamento, quae certo nullae sunt, quia propter carentiam organi infallibilis transmissionis omnes periere.

Sic, ni fallimur, solvitur quaestio de fontibus revelationis divinae, num nempe unus sit an duo fontes: fons est unus, veritas prima in dicendo, Deus revelans, quae tamen veritas nobis manifestatur per Prophetas et per Apostolos, qui duplici medio usi sunt, nempe loquela et

scriptura, haec Libros Sacros, illa divinas traditiones condit.

In tota ista disputatione mens nostra erat, indirecte saltem, affirmare criterium Divinae Revelationis, esse munus propheticum pro Vetere Testamento, pro Novo vero Testamento munus apostolicum. Sicut Propheta est Dei interpres, ita Apostolus est Christi legatus. Quidquid Prophetarum et Apostolorum, quae tales, dixerunt aut scripserunt, recipiendum est tamquam dictum aut scriptum a Deo. In hoc resolvitur tota quaestio de inspiratione biblica et de origine divina traditionum divinarum.

Licitum sit, antequam sermoni nostro finem faciamus, pauca dicere circa relationem huius nostrae dissertationis ad Theologiam Fundamentalem.

Neminem latet expositam doctrinam faciliter explicare originem divinam tum Sacrorum Librorum tum Divinarum Traditionum, ac proinde criterium Divinae Revelationis esse munus Propheticum pro Vetere Testamento et munus Apostolicum pro Novo Testamento. Sicut Propheta est Dei interpres, ita Apostolus est Christi Legatus: unde quidquid Prophetarum et Apostolorum dixerunt aut scripserunt, accipiendum est tamquam a Deo dictum aut scriptum.

Ex hoc fundamentali conceptu, facile est explicare naturam Inspirationis Biblicae sicut etiam originem et naturam Divinarum Traditionum. Hoc autem praestito, facile est explicare naturam Divinae Revelationis, eius possibilitatem, convenientiam, necessitatem, supposita nempe hominis elevatione ad ordinem supernaturalem, unde etiam explicationem ordinis naturalis et ordinis supernaturalis, mysterii et dogmatis, ac tandem existentiam et cognoscibilitatem divinae revelationis, per motiva credibilitatis, sive externa, ut miracula et prophetias, sive interna: et quidem interna-extrinseca, ut Ecclesiam, sublimitatem doctrinae Christianae atque puritatem ipsius moralis, per sanctitatem et caritatem; sive interna-intrinseca, ut satisfactionem omnium desideriorum hominis, quietem mentis et pacem cordis, necnon consolationem spiritualem, quae ex certitudine verae religionis et statu gratiae in animo resultat.

Probata autem existentia Divinae Revelationis seu Verae Religionis, logicus transitus postulat ut de fontibus, ubi talis Divina Revelatio invenitur, disseratur, et primo quidem de locis theologis in communi, deinde vero in speciali, scilicet de fidei regula proxima, seu de Ecclesia, de ipsius natura, constitutione, fine, membris, de ipsius proprietatibus seu dotibus et de ipsius cognoscibilitate seu de notis, et tandem de ipsius indefectibilitate tum in existendo tum in docendo seu

de magisterio Ecclesiae, deque ipsius infallibilitate eiusque obiecto. Deinde vero de regula fidei remota, nempe de S. Scriptura et de Divinis Traditionibus. Tractatus de Traditione Divina hucusque non videtur esse bene expositus. Sed, ni fallimur, in lumine eorum quae supra disputata sunt, talis tractatus novam debet habere structuram non absimilem ac illam qua traditur doctrina de Biblica Inspiratione. Tandem de organo conservationis, interpretationis et propositionis divinae Revelationis seu de Romano Pontifice, de Conciliis, de Patribus et Doctoribus Ecclesiae, de Theologis et de aliis scientiis naturalibus, praesertim de historia et de philosophia, quatenus doctrinas revelatas illustrare valeant.

Sic, ni fallimur, habetur tractatus completus Theologiae Fundamentaliss, qui, etsi iam in se ipso est verus et completus tractatus de fidei fundamentis, debet tamen simul inservire tamquam introductio seu tractatus praepedeuticus ad Theologiam Dogmaticam.

S.M. ZARB.

THE HISTORIC AND DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT
OF REVELATION
ACCORDING TO SAINT THOMAS

*God, who at sundry times and
in divers manners spoke in
times past to the fathers in the
prophets, last of all in these
days hath spoken to us by his
Son.* Heb. 1, 1-2.

IN THESE words, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews briefly recalls the long historic process whereby men received divine instructions through the ages. God in fact did not disclose to us all his secrets in a single all-embracing revelation, but, wisely adapting himself to our receptive capabilities, he imparted the knowledge of his mysteries to us gradually and progressively. In the development of divine revelation, St. Thomas distinguishes two kinds of progress, namely the historic on the one hand, and the doctrinal on the other. It is the purpose of the present study to reconstruct his thought on both of them respectively.

I. THE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF REVELATION

Revelation, one may say, started with the creation of man. The book of Genesis represents God as conversing with Adam both before and after the fall. Man in the state of original justice had, no doubt, a much more perfect natural knowledge of God than is possible to us after the loss of that state; but he also had faith in some supernatural mysteries,¹ which he could not have learned except through revelation.

Apart from the revelations granted to Adam, those made by God to others between Adam's first sin and the coming of Christ are divided by St. Thomas according to three main ages or periods, corresponding to the three different states of man's supernatural history on earth. These periods are: the time before the Law; the time under the Law; the time

¹ Cf. II Sent., d. 29, a. 3; De Ver., q. 18, a. 3; I, q. 95, a. 3; II-II, q. 5, a. 1.

of grace.²

The time before the Law.

After man's fall from original justice, there followed a period of silence on the part of God. St. Thomas recalls only the communication made to Noah at the time of the deluge.³ After that he mentions numerous others made to many different persons at various times. He also notes that the distribution of revelations over a long period of time helped to establish revealed religion on a firm basis, and that God's repeated instructions were useful and necessary to prepare man's mind to accept the high mysteries that were to be disclosed on Christ.

The first revelation before the Law, says the Holy Doctor, was made to Abraham.⁴ It ushers in the Patriarchal Period, and coincides with God's choice of a peculiar People. It was made at the time of the beginning of the Assyrian kingdom,⁵ when widespread idolatry, hitherto unheard of, had made it imperative to recall men back to the cult of the one true God. Consequently Abraham, and later Isaac and Jacob 'were instructed in a general way on the omnipotence of one God'.⁶ The main stress of these revelations was thus laid on monotheism to counteract idolatry; but St. Thomas notes also that the first promise of Christ was made to Abraham.⁷ A peculiar characteristic of the revelations to the Patriarchs is the limited number of the addressees for whom they were intended; revelation was made only 'to special persons and some families'.⁸ That made to Abraham was at the basis of the rest; for this reason St. Thomas considers it as more excellent. So before the Law we have only a few revelations, addressed only to a small group of families, and mainly stressing the oneness of God.

The time under the Law.

The latter part of the stay of the Chosen People in Egypt, their exodus, their crossing of the Red Sea, and the journey to the Promised Land are dominated by the strong personality of Moses, whom for various reasons St. Thomas considers as the greatest prophet.⁹ By means of an angel God gave him

² II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

³ Cf. In Heb., c. 1 lect. 1.

⁴ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

⁵ Ibid. ad 2, quoting ST AUGUSTINE, *De Civ. Dei*, bk. 18, c. 27: PL 41.584.

⁶ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

⁷ III, q. 4, a. 6 ad 3.

⁸ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

⁹ II-II, q. 174, a. 4; De Ver., q. 12, a. 9 ad 1; a. 14; In Is., c. 6.

the Law. He admitted him to great familiarity, and used to speak with him face to face as with a friend (Ex. 33, 11). To him God revealed the splendour of his majesty, granting him, St. Thomas says, an intuitive vision of his essence.¹⁰ By reason of the revelations he received, Moses was therefore 'most fully instructed in the knowledge of God'.¹¹

When God spoke with Moses, he meant to speak through him to the People of Israel. It was in fact through his Prophet that God led his People, instructed it, and handed down the Law to it. As far as the instruction of the people goes, 'the Old Law, says St. Thomas, which contained temporal promises, proposed little that surpassed the understanding of man's reason'.¹² In other words, although the divine essence and simplicity, and the name of God had been revealed to Moses,¹³ few strictly supernatural mysteries were handed down by the latter in the Law.

On comparing together the revelations made to the Patriarchs and to Moses respectively, they are seen to differ mainly in two respects. In the former the scope of the divine message is restricted to a few families, and particular emphasis is made on the oneness of God; in the latter the scope is extended to envisage a whole people, while more stress is laid on the divine simplicity.

Under the Law itself many other revelations were made, but that made to Moses was the noblest of all. It was only he who beheld the divine essence; what was handed down to him was presupposed in later divine disclosures; and the prophets themselves, while receiving independent revelations, often appealed to the Law of Moses.¹⁴

After the time of Moses God raised many a prophet in Israel to serve as his mouthpiece to his people. But St. Thomas remarks that prophetic revelation was rare before the time of Samuel,¹⁵ for we read in 1 Kgs 3, 1 that 'the word of the Lord was precious in those days; there was no manifest vision'. The Holy Doctor also quotes a passage from St. Augus-

¹⁰ C.G., I, 22; I, q. 12, a. 11 ad 2; II-II, q. 174, a. 5 ad 1; In 2 Cor., c. 12, lect. 1. St. Thomas owes this doctrine to St. Augustine who, in *De Gen. ad litt.*, bk. 12 (chh. 26, 27, 28, 34: PL 34, 476 ff) and in Epistle 147 *De videndo Deo* (ch. 13; PL 34, 610) strongly presses this point.

¹¹ *De Ver.*, q. 12, a. 14 ad 1.

¹² C.G., I, 5.

¹³ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*; Cf. *De Ver.*, q. 12, a. 14c.

¹⁵ Cf. II-II, q. 174, a. 6 arg. 2, and ad 2.

tine to explain why the prophets flourished most under the monarchy.¹⁶ The Hipponese Doctor explains that as in the beginning of the Assyrian kingdom God had made promises to Abraham, so also at the time of the foundation of Rome, under whose rule those promises were to be fulfilled, God inspired prophets who, by spoken and by written word, would bear testimony to them. The Angelic Doctor further adds that at the time of the monarchy the Chosen People was free from foreign rule. Since it enjoyed liberty, and was therefore fully responsible for its deeds, that time was particularly apt for it to receive instructions from the prophets on things to do.¹⁷ Since the establishment of the monarchy, prophets almost never failed to appear inside Israel; but the scope of their activity was limited to their own people. When their utterings began to acquire importance also for the Gentiles, they began to put them down in writing.¹⁸

The time of grace. The revelations considered up to now, St. Thomas says, were ordained to that in which God spoke to us in his own Son made Man.¹⁹ Christ, the Incarnate Word, was 'full of grace and truth' (Jn. 1, 14). The time of his coming is consequently called 'the fulness of time', 'the time of grace'. In him God spoke to us in a fuller and more perfect way than he had done in the Old Testament.²⁰ In fact Christ revealed divine mysteries to us clearly and without figures; indeed he showed forth the meaning of old figures by his actual fulfillment of them. Further, Christ proclaimed to us the mystery of the blessed Trinity.²¹ During his public ministry revealed truth was fully proposed,

¹⁶ ST AUGUSTINE, *De Civ. Dei*, bk. 18, c. 27: PL41, 584.

¹⁷ 'Tunc populus non opprimebatur ab alienigenis, sed proprium regem habebat: et ideo oportebat per prophetas eum instrui de agendis, quasi libertatem habentem'. II-II, q. 174, a. 6, ad 2.

¹⁸ This meaning seems to be implied in the passage from St. Augustine quoted in II-II, q. 174, a. 6. Commenting this text, and asking himself why prophecy began to be written at the time of Isaias, CAJETAN writes: 'Quia scilicet tunc erat exordium Romanae urbis, qua imperante erat Christus venturus, et impleturus omnium prophetarum oracula, ac extensurus promissam salutem universo orbi. Decuit siquidem simul incipere scripturam et cui scriberetur. Populus Israel non egebat scriptura, habens coram Prophetas; Gentiles sub Romana Ecclesia egebant Scriptura. Et ideo simul Scriptura prophetica et Roma coeperunt. Hanc rationem non ausus essem dicere, nisi auctoritas Augustini in 18 de Civ. Dei, allata in littera, me foveret'.

¹⁹ In Heb., c. 1 lect. 1.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

and the Apostles whom he instructed announced his message not only to the Chosen People which had long awaited his coming, but also to other peoples and to the world at large.

Revelation, says the Holy Doctor, did not end with the ministry of Christ.²² In fact St. John wrote the book of the Apocalypse, which contains new revelations; in the Acts of the Apostles we read that Agabus and the daughters of Philip prophesied; from a few suggestions in St. Paul it would seem that the gift of prophecy was sufficiently common among the early Christians. In general we may say that revelation still continues inside the Church, not to increase the body of canonical revelations, but to instruct private individuals on their actions.²³

II. THE DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT OF REVELATION

From the schematic and necessarily incomplete survey of the history of revelation as we could reconstruct it from a few references in St. Thomas, the otherwise obvious fact of the historic progress of revelation is brought home again, this time to bear on the more important issue of the evolution of the doctrinal content that may have accompanied the historic development. There is no doubt that, as further revelations were made by God, men learned more and more about the godhead and salvation. At the close of canonical revelation there emerged a much clearer picture of the mysteries of the faith as a whole. The age of Christ is described as the time of grace and the fulness of time, not only because in it grace was more abundantly poured on men, but also because then too divine mysteries were proposed more fully than ever before. For this reason revelation can be considered as culminating in a supreme moment of uppermost perfection, in which all divine truths pertaining to salvation were openly preached to all. The question we are now to discuss is how, according to St. Thomas, are we to conceive the progress of the doctrinal content of revelation. Are we to say that those distant, sometimes widely separated revelations, were mere vehicles of disconnected messages, adapted indeed to the needs of the time, but lacking in unity of content or organic development? Did successive revelations, especially those of the New Testament, bring about completely new doctrines? What did they add to the knowledge derived from the first revelation? Did they alter the substance of the faith, to which they were always

²² *Ibid.*, ad 3.

²³ Cf. I, q. 1, a. 8 ad 2; I-II, q. 112, a. 5c and ad 4; II-II, q. 174, a. 6 ad 3.

ordained? In other words: do we, the recipients of the New Testament revelation, believe something very different from that which the less fortunate Old Testament Israelites believed? What is the meaning of the fulness of revelation in New Testament times?

The answer to these questions may not be altogether clear after a superficial first reading of St. Thomas, for one reason, because at his time the question was not put precisely from the point of view of revelation, but rather from that of faith. There are passages in the writings of the Holy Doctor that may seem to imply real progress in the evolution of the doctrinal content of successive revelations, while others seem to deny such progress, or at least notably to diminish it. It is the purpose of the present investigation to try to arrive at a clear picture of St. Thomas' doctrine on this important matter.

Indications of some progress.

The scheme of the three ages or periods of revelation which the Angelic Doctor proposes may suggest real progress in the subject-matter of revelation. The Holy Doctor in fact says that the faith in the deity increased according to these periods. The Patriarchs, he explains, '*fuerunt instructi in communi de omnipotentia unius Dei*'; but after them Moses '*plenius fuit instructus de simplicitate divinae essentiae*'; and at the final stage, '*tempore gratiae, ab ipso Filio Dei revelatum est mysterium Trinitatis*'.²⁴ This is in accordance with what St. Thomas says in another context, namely that in the Old Law few strictly supernatural mysteries were revealed,²⁵ which statement suggests that *more* were to come later. Besides, the Angelic Doctor often speaks of a veil of obscurity spread over Old Testament revelations, partially at least hiding their meaning. At no time on earth, he says, can man behold divine truth in itself, and so this had to be proposed to him under the veil of sensible figures; but in his less advanced state of divine knowledge, the veiled proposal of supernatural mysteries was more obscure. In the Old Law in fact neither was divine truth manifest in itself, nor the way leading to it was as yet made known.²⁶ On coming down from Mount Sinai Moses hid the brightness of his face by a veil, because, St. Thomas explains, '*nondum venerat tempus revelandi claritatem veritatis*'.²⁷ Elsewhere the Angelic

²⁴ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

²⁵ C.G., I, 5.

²⁶ I-II, q. 101, a. 3c.

²⁷ In 2 Cor., c. 3 lect. 3.

Doctor says that the Old Testament teachers of the faith received as much knowledge of it 'quantum oportebat pro tempore illo populo tradi vel nude vel in figura'.²⁸ To the prophets God revealed the plan of salvation only 'in generali'; still, later prophets 'cognoverunt quod priores non cognoverunt';²⁹ and St. Thomas repeatedly quotes St. Gregory the Great as saying that man's divine knowledge increased as time went on; wherefore towards the end of public revelation the Apostles knew some special things on God's salvific plan which the O.T. prophets had not known;³⁰ for the mystery of the redemptive Incarnation was fully disclosed only at the time of Christ. — When commenting Jn. 17, 6 St. Thomas distinguishes three kinds of knowledge of God. God, he says, can be known as the Creator, and as such he was known by the Gentiles. He can also be known as the only one to whom adoration is exclusively due, and in this manner he was known only by the Jews. But he can also be known as the Father of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, and as such, the Holy Doctor says, 'nulli erat notus, sed innotuit per Filium quando Apostoli crediderunt eum esse Filium Dei'.³¹

From these remarks, and from many others that could be quoted, one may perhaps be led to think that for the Angelic Doctor the historic progress of revelation was accompanied also by a substantial increase of the revealed doctrinal deposit, notably on the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. At the same time, however, one can find in the Holy Doctor's writings numerous other indications that seem to suggest quite the opposite.

**Indications of
no progress.**

Before we call our attention to some of the last mentioned texts, it may not be inopportune to look briefly into what St. Thomas means by the term 'Majores' or Elders, in connection with whom he often speaks of supernatural mysteries in the Old Testament. By the 'Elders' St. Thomas seems to mean the great spiritual leaders of both the Old and New Testament. One can therefore well imagine him to refer by that somewhat vague and undetermined term to the Patriarchs, the Prophets and the Apostles. On one occasion at least he defines the Elders as those 'who have the office of instructing others in the faith'.³²

²⁸ II-II, q. 1, a. 8 ad 3.

²⁹ I, q. 58, a. 1 ad 3.

³⁰ Ibid.; Cf. II-II, q. 174, a. 6c; In Eph., c. 3 lect. 1.

³¹ In Jo., c. 17, lect. 2, n. 1.

³² Cf. III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 1, Sol. 3; *ibid.* ad 3.

To the elders of the Old Testament St. Thomas sometimes ascribes the knowledge of, and the faith in, the highest mysteries ever revealed. Thus, for example, in connection with the mystery of the blessed Trinity he does not hesitate to affirm that '*ante peccatum et post, necessarium fuit a majoribus explicitam fidem de Trinitate haberi*'.³³ This statement seems to imply that, far from Christ being the first one to disclose it, the mystery of the Trinity was clearly known in the Old Testament by the Patriarchs and the Prophets; indeed even by Adam before his sin. This view of St. Thomas seems to be in conformity at least with what he, following St. Augustine, repeatedly and expressly attributes to Moses. Does not the Angelic Doctor in fact say that Moses was granted an intuitive vision of the divine essence? In that case he would undoubtedly learn this high mystery. The other prophets, one is led to think, may have learned it by less glamorous means, but not less surely, it would seem. This conclusion is confirmed by St. Thomas himself who, in very clear terms, speaks of the Trinity having been revealed to Abraham before the Law, and to Isaias under the Law.³⁴

Even on the mystery of the Incarnation, which is closely connected with that of the Trinity, one finds in the Holy Doctor's writings clear passages that seem to preclude development in the revealed data about it. From his Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard down to the Summa Theologiae St. Thomas maintains that faith in the mystery of the Incarnation was necessary both before and after man's fall from original justice. Thus he attributes to Adam himself the knowledge of this mystery, introducing only a slight distinction. He says that from the beginning Adam believed in God and in his Salvific Providence; he knew

³³ De Ver., q. 14, a. 11c; Cf. III Sent., d. 25, a. 2, q. 4, exp. text.; IV Sent., d. 6, q. 2, a. 2, Sol. 1; II-II, q. 2, a. 8.

³⁴ 'Fuerunt tamen factae visibiles apparitiones divinarum Personarum Patribus veteris Testamenti' I, q. 43, a. 7 ad 6. '(Deus dicitur videri) uno quidem modo per subiectam creaturam, visui corporali propositam, sicut creditur Abraham vidisse Deum, quando "tres vidit, et unum adoravit", Gen. 18; unum quidem adoravit, quia tres quos prius homines reputaverat, et postnodum angelos credidit, *recognovit mysterium Trinitatis*'. In Jo., c. 1 lect. 11 - '(Mysterium Trinitatis), quod revelatum est per seraphim dicentia: "Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus", etc., ut habetur Is. 6, 3.' II-II, q. 171, a. 3c - 'Videns ergo Isaias gloriam Filii, vidit et gloriam Patris; immo totius Trinitatis, quae est unus Deus sedens super solium excelsum, cui Seraphim proclamant "Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus". Non autem ita quod Isaias essentiam Trinitatis viderit, sed imaginaria visione, cum intelligentia, quaedam signa majestatis expressit'. In Jo., c. 12, lect. 7, n. 5. - For Abraham cf. also III Sent., d. 9, a. 2, Sol. 5, ad 3.

of the mystery of the Incarnation; but before his sin he knew it only in so far as it is ordained to the consummation of glory, and not in its redemptive function, or the atonement of his sin, which he did not foresee.³⁵ — Presumably speaking of the Prophets, the Holy Doctor writes: 'In secundo autem statu post peccatum ante adventum Christi quidam habebant *fidem explicitam de Redemptore*, quibus revelatio facta erat, qui majores dicebantur'.³⁶ The implication here is that also the redemptive function of the Incarnation was known before the time of Christ; and the Holy Doctor suggests that it was known with striking detail, 'non solum quantum ad incarnationem, sed etiam quantum ad *passionem* et resurrectionem, quibus humanum genus a peccato et morte liberatur'.³⁷

Thus in the writings of the Holy Doctor there seem to be two lines of thought that at first glance may seem to be overtly contradictory. For on the one hand he seems to conceive Old Testament revelations as progressively gathering momentum, until the full and perfect revelation is achieved during the ministry of Christ; on the other he admits the revelation of the greatest mysteries from the very start of human history, in a way as seemingly to leave Christ little scope for originality.

But did St. Thomas really contradict himself?

The Problem in the Middle Ages.

To answer this question we must look at the problem of the doctrinal evolution of revelation as it was felt at the time St. Thomas was writing. In the Middle Ages the problem was often formulated in terms such as these: Was the faith of those of old precisely the same as that of those who came later? Did the articles of the faith increase as time went on?

A long discussion on this matter during the Middle Ages seems to have been occasioned by a statement of St. Augustine who, writing to Optatus, affirms the unity of the faith in the Old and in the New Testaments.³⁸ Abelard may have been misled by reading into St. Augustine's text more than the author had meant, and for this reason he affirmed that all the articles of the faith had been revealed in the Old Testament, at least to

³⁵ III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2, Sol. 2; II-II, q. 2, a. 7c.

³⁶ III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2, Sol. 2.

³⁷ II-II, q. 2, a. 7c.

³⁸ 'Illa fides sana est qua credimus, nullum hominem... liberari a contagione mortis... nisi per unum mediatorem Dei et hominum Jesum Christum: cuius hominis eiusdemque Dei saluberrima fide etiam illi justi sunt salvi facti qui priusquam veniret in carnem, crediderunt in carnem venturum. Eadem enim fides est et illorum, et nostra.' S. AUG., Ep. 190, c. 2: PL 33, 858,

the Patriarchs and the Prophets. Many Scholastics would not go that far; but at the same time, the authority of St. Augustine ranked so high among them that they could not simply deny that the articles of the faith had somehow been revealed in the Old Testament too, for that would go counter to the unity of the faith under both Testaments affirmed by the Saint.³⁹ In his *Libri Sententiarum* Peter Lombard introduced a distinction that later came to be generally accepted. We find it also in St. Thomas.

**The Problem
in St. Thomas.**

Commenting III Sent. dist. XXV, the Angelic Doctor had asked: 'Utrum per successionem temporum fides profecerit'. The same question crops up again in the *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 1, a. 7, where he again enquires: 'Utrum articuli fidei secundum successionem temporum creverint'. Unfortunately these two articles of St. Thomas have been widely interpreted as dealing with the progress of dogma, and not with the development of revelation. But on looking deeply into the meaning of the Holy Doctor's words it clearly appears that this view is wrong. The Angelic Doctor's concern is, in fact, the development of the revealed deposit, or the successive revelation of the articles of the Symbol, and not our progressive understanding of the same.

The reply that St. Thomas gave in the Commentary on the Sentences pays closer attention to the subjective than to the objective element of the faith. His main concern is to establish whether faith progressed or not as time went on. Faith, he says, is knowledge. The 'quantity' of knowledge may be considered both on the part of the object, and on the part of the subject's act effectively tending to that object. Now, the efficacy of the act depends on the condition of the subject. Hence that act of the intellect under the influence of the will, which constitutes faith, can grow *subjectively* by reason of the act of either the intellect or the will. On the part of the will, the greater or lesser perfection of the act is proportionate to the will's promptitude to elicit its assent, for the firmness and the certainty of the assent depend on that promptitude. Now, the will's promptitude is something entirely personal, and as such it is independent of the stage revelation may have reached. The same thing applies also to the greatness of the faith deriving from devotion, or the accompanying state of charity in the subject. Therefore,

³⁹ Cf. R.M. SCHULTES, 'La dottrina di S. Tommaso d'Aquino sull'evoluzione della rivelazione e sull'evoluzione dei dommi' in *San Tommaso d'Aquino*, Pubblicazione commemorativa del sesto centenario della Canonizzazione, a cura della Facoltà di Filosofia dell'Università Cattolica, Milano, 1923, pp. 122-146.

on the part of the will, the subjective greatness of the faith is irrespective of whether the individual lived before or after Christ. If, on the other hand, we consider the greatness of the subjective faith from the point of view of the intellect, we must say that here the greatness of the faith depends on how much the truths believed are clearly seen and deeply penetrated. But this depends on the degree of objective clarity and fulness that revelation has reached at the time. Consequently, as far as the intellect is concerned, the believer's faith *per se* progressed with time. — Turning now from the subjective to the *objective* greatness of the faith, St. Thomas says that the object of the faith neither increased nor diminished with time, but remained always the same.

The latter point, which interests us most, is more fully developed in the *Summa*. Here the Angelic Doctor introduces a distinction in the object of the faith, saying that whilst there never was any increase in the *substance* of the faith, there was however progress in its *explicitation*. The principles of the faith are compared to the principles of reason: as first principles are to reason, so the articles of the Symbol are to faith. And as in reason self-evident principles are implicitly contained in the principle of contradiction, so also all the articles of the faith are implicitly contained in a few fundamental ones. The latter form the substance of the faith; all the rest only explain or render these explicit. When one believes these basic articles of the faith, as was always the case under both Testaments, one implicitly believes all the rest. Consequently, although in later times the substance of the faith was diversified in more numerous articles, and by that became more explicit, nevertheless it remained objectively unaltered in all times. This is how the Holy Doctor summarises this doctrine: 'Sic igitur, he says, dicendum est quod, quantum ad *substantiam* articulorum fidei, *non est factum* eorum augmentum per temporum successionem; quia quaecumque posteriores crediderunt continebantur in fide praecedentium Patrum, licet implicite. Sed quantum ad *explicitationem*, crevit numerus articulorum: quia quaedam explicitate cognita sunt a posterioribus quae a prioribus non cognoscebantur explicitate'.⁴⁰

The Contemporaries of Saint Thomas.

The same doctrine had already been taught by Hugh of St. Victor. 'We doubtlessly confess, he wrote, that those who preceded as well as those who followed (Christ) had the same faith, but not the same knowledge...

⁴⁰ II-II, q. 1, a. 7c.

In time, therefore, faith increased in all to become greater, but it was not so altered as to become another. Before the Law God was believed to be the Creator, and salvation and redemption was expected from him; but the faithful in general, excepting a few by reason of their office, did not know by whom and how that salvation was to be wrought and brought about. Under the Law the person of the Redeemer was foretold, and his coming was expected. But it had not yet been made manifest who that person was to be, whether a man, or an angel, or God. This was known only to those who were singularly illuminated by the Spirit for that purpose. In the time of grace, however, both the manner of redemption and the quality of the person of the Redeemer were openly preached to, and believed by, all'.⁴¹

Similar passages can be found in St. Bonaventure, whose doctrine on this point is identical with that of St. Thomas,⁴² as well as in St. Albert the Great, on whose teaching St. Thomas' own article in III Sent., dist. 25, q. 2 shows clear signs of dependence.⁴³

Doctrinal development of revelation.

From all that has been said up to now, what can we gather on St. Thomas' views on the doctrinal evolution of the revealed deposit? Does the Holy

Doctor simply say that all posterior revelation was no more than a process of explicitation of anterior revelations? In particular, how can this be reconciled with what he had said on the Trinity, namely that at all times the elders had explicit faith in the mystery?

St. Thomas reduces the substance of all revelations to two fundamen-

⁴¹ HUGH OF ST. VICTOR, *De Sacramentis*, l. 1, pars 10, c. 6 (sub fine): PL 176, 339.

⁴² 'Credibilia multiplicari dupliciter potest intelligi: vel quantum ad novorum articulorum additionem, vel quantum ad implicitorum explicationem. Si primo modo intelligatur, sic non est concedendum fidem profecisse quantum ad credendorum multitudinem; si secundo modo, sic profecit secundum processum temporis, quia quod uno tempore credebatur implicite et quasi uno articulo, processu temporis explicatum est et quasi distinctum in multa credibilia'. ST. BONAVENTURE, In III Sent., d. 25, a. 2, q. 1c: Ed. Quaracchi t. 3, p. 546.

⁴³ 'Fides duobus modis crescit ex parte credentis; in se autem nullo modo, sive quoad creditum. Ex parte credentis quoad intellectum et quoad affectum... (Quoad intellectum crescit) revelatione quidem, quia qui ampliores revelationes accipit, lucidius creditum videt, et melius percipit...' ST. ALBERT THE GREAT, In III Sent., d. 25, a. 1c. Ibid. ad. 2: 'Non creverunt articuli (fidei) in se, sed crevit articulorum explanatio et revelatio: et hoc non est articulorum crescere, nisi per accidens: licet enim passio forte tunc alicui determinate non innotuerit, tamen erat articulus, et credebatur implicite ab eis, quando aliquis quicumque modus liberationis ab eis futurus credebatur'.

tal truths, namely God's existence and his salvific Providence.⁴⁴ From the point of view of doctrinal evolution we think that he sufficiently suggests that a distinction must be made between these two basic truths: one thing is the revelation of the mystery of God, and quite another the disclosure of the mystery of salvation. Besides, considering those to whom a divine communication is made, the Holy Doctor makes a clear-cut distinction between immediate and mediate recipients, namely the 'Majores' and the 'Minores' respectively. Further he takes cognizance of the other important fact, that the doctrinal content of a particular revelation can be proposed either clearly or obscurely. With these distinctions in mind, we can better understand the position of St. Thomas.

**Mystery of
the Trinity.**

On the mystery of God as known to man by revelation, we believe the Angelic Doctor admits no objective increase in the doctrinal deposit from Adam to Christ, but only an increase in the diffusion of the mystery.

As it will be recalled from texts already quoted, according to the Holy Doctor the mystery of the Blessed Trinity was always known not only to Adam, but also to the great spiritual leaders of Israel, like Abraham, Moses, Isaias, and others. It was always explicitly believed by them. But it is important to note that, before the coming of Christ, it was *explicitly* believed *only* by them. 'Dicendum est, says St. Thomas, quod de Deo potest multipliciter haberi notitia. Uno modo per Christum, in quantum scilicet est Pater Unigeniti et consubstantialis, et alia quae *specialiter* Christus de Deo Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto *docuit* quantum ad *unitatem essentiae* et *trinitatem personarum*: et hoc tantum est creditum, *nec in veteri testamento fuit explicite creditum nisi a majoribus tantum*'.⁴⁵ In other words, according to St. Thomas, the Elders before Christ knew the mystery of the Trinity as fully and as clearly as we do; but they did not preach it to the rest, because, as the Holy Doctor says, 'it was necessary for the human mind to get used to the things of the faith little by little'.⁴⁶ To the ordinary people the mystery was hinted at in a veiled and obscure manner.⁴⁷ Consequently their 'faith in the Trinity was hidden in that of the Elders'.⁴⁸ When Christ came on earth, he did

⁴⁴ II-II, q. 1, a. 7c.

⁴⁵ In Heb., c. 11, lect. 2; Cf. III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2, Sol. 4.

⁴⁶ III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2. Sol. 1 ad 2.

⁴⁷ 'Non fuit positum mysterium Trinitatis manifeste in veteri Testamento, sed velate, ut sapientes capere possent'. III Sent., d. 25, q. 2; a. 2, Sol. 4 ad 3.

⁴⁸ II-II, q. 2, a. 8, ad 2.

not improve on the objective knowledge of God that Old Testament leaders had, but only extended it to the ordinary faithful. In fact by means of his Apostles Christ preached the faith in the Trinity to all mankind.⁴⁹ Hence, according to the Holy Doctor, we must say that successive revelations on God, culminating in that made by Christ, did not further enrich the revealed doctrinal deposit, objectively and intrinsically considered. In the fulness of time the contents of the first revelation of God, hitherto known only, though entirely, to a few, were openly proclaimed to all.

This does not mean that thereby no development was made; it means that the progress was limited to the *subjective* knowledge of the *ordinary faithful*. The average Israelite, as opposed to the Elders, had hitherto believed explicitly only in one God, the God of his Fathers, who had shown special kindness to his people, with which he often spoke in times past, and which he ruled and protected by a special Providence. By such faith the ordinary faithful up to Christ implicitly believed all that their more instructed Elders knew or believed on God. Then, when Christ preached and taught in the streets and synagogues of Palestine, he illuminated by his doctrine the minds of his simple listeners, and clarified for them the crude concept of God which they hitherto had had. In the light of his teaching these simple people, as far as their information on God goes, were placed on a par with their greatest leaders of old. Hence, while Christ taught them nothing on God that their Elders did not know, he disclosed to them something which they still ignored.

Notwithstanding this, considering the complex of all divine self-disclosures as a whole, and taking into account, *not the subjective knowledge* therefrom deriving to the less instructed, but *the objective information* explicitly made available by God to *any man*, one must say, according to St. Thomas, that successive revelations did not intrinsically develop the objectively-revealed content of the mystery of God, but only gave the already acquired deposit more publicity; in this sense, that was later made explicit to all which long before had been explicit only to a few.

It is in this sense that statements by St. Thomas, seemingly implying an intrinsic doctrinal evolution of the mystery of God, are to be understood and interpreted. The Holy Doctor's casual remark that in the Old Testament there were 'few' strictly supernatural mysteries does not run

⁴⁹ 'Sed per Christum (fides Trinitatis) manifestata est mundo per apostolos'. II-II q. 2, a. 8 ad 2.

counter to our interpretation. It does not mean that the Trinity had not yet been revealed to anyone, but only that 'the Old Law... *proposed* few' such mysteries to the people at large. If Moses veiled his face on coming down from Mount Sinai, the reason was not that he did not know God's mystery 'most fully', but that the time had not yet come for its open proclamation *to the people*. Similarly the Holy Doctor's assertion that Moses was 'more fully' instructed than the Patriarchs on God's simplicity is naturally explained by the fact that only he beheld the divine essence face to face. In that context St. Thomas primarily intends to bring out the peculiar stress made in the revelations to the Patriarchs and to Moses respectively, namely on the oneness and omnipotence of God in the first case, and on the divine simplicity in the second. The rather vague terms used in connection with the divine knowledge of the Patriarchs in II-II, q. 171, a. 6c. must be interpreted in the light of the Holy Doctor's more explicit statements referred to above. When this is done, all apparent inconsistency disappears. It is therefore safe to say that, according to St. Thomas, Adam, Abraham, Moses, Isaias, and most probably many others, knew and explicitly believed the mystery of the Trinity, in such a way that Christ's doctrine on the subject was not original in the sense that it was disclosed by him for the first time, but only in the sense that it was preached by him openly to all.

Incarnation and Redemption

The process of the revelation of God's salvific plan is considered by the Holy Doctor to have been different from that of the Trinity. The latter, though not universally proclaimed, was nevertheless clearly revealed from the beginning; the former was revealed in the beginning only obscurely; it was rendered progressively clearer as time went on, and was made fully manifest and universally known only at the time of its fulfilment. Here indeed what had previously been implicit, at a later stage was made explicit, more or less to one and all. Wherefore successive revelations brought to light new traits of that mystery, and while these traits were in linear continuation with the central idea originally disclosed, they nevertheless considerably clarified and enriched it.

This conception, solidly founded on the data of Holy Scripture, is at the same time in sharp contrast with what has been said above of the doctrinal development of the mystery of the Trinity; and the contrast is vividly brought out by the Holy Doctor himself. In fact when, following St. Gregory the Great, the Angelic Doctor teaches that later revelations

clarified earlier ones, he affirms this exclusively of the mystery of salvation during the Old Testament, and, as it were, in opposition to that of the Trinity. In a text repeatedly referred to by St. Thomas, Gregory had said: 'Per incrementum temporum crevit scientia spiritualium Patrum. Plus namque Moyses quam Abraham, plus Prophetæ quam Moyses, plus Apostoli quam Prophetæ in omnipotentis Dei scientia eruditi sunt'.⁵⁰ Of this St. Thomas wrote: 'Dictum Gregorii est intelligendum de tempore ante Christi incarnationem, quantum ad cognitionem *huius mysterii*'.⁵¹ And, still more clearly, perhaps: 'Verbum Gregorii est intelligendum de his quæ pertinent ad mysterium Incarnationis, de quibus aliqui posteriores *expressiores* revelationes acceperunt quam Moyses; *non autem quantum ad cognitionem Divinitatis*, de qua *plenissime* Moyses fuit instructus'.⁵² In fact, comparing Moses with a later prophet, David, the Angelic Doctor thinks that 'Moses' vision excelled more in the knowledge of the godhead; but David knew and expressed more fully the mystery of Christ's Incarnation'.⁵³

It is to be noted that for St. Thomas the 'more express' revelations on Christ concern the *same* mystery. The original revelation of God's salvific Providence was vague and undetermined. It became more and more determined as further details were disclosed. But these details, whilst tracing out a progressively clearer picture of God's plan, did not alter its substance. God's salvific Providence, revealed and believed from the very start, included in fact 'omnia quæ temporaliter a Deo dispensantur ad hominum salutem', because, as St. Thomas further explains, 'in fide redemptionis humanæ implicite continetur et incarnatio Christi, et ejus passio, et omnia huiusmodi'.⁵⁴ And this explains why the substance of the faith in salvation remained unaltered in all times.

Furthermore, one notes that, according to St. Thomas, in the knowledge of the mystery of salvation there was not as great a difference between the 'Majores' and the 'Minores' of the Old Testament as there was in their respective knowledge of God. The mystery of salvation was objectively obscure even to the Elders, and it was the less clear, the farther they were from its actual fulfilment. Its revelation 'was not yet complete'

⁵⁰ ST. GREGORY THE GREAT, *In Ezech.* hom 16, c. 12: PL 76, 980. St. Thomas refers to this passage many times, quoting it only *ad sensum*.

⁵¹ II-II, q. 174, a. 6 ad 1.

⁵² De Ver., q. 12, a. 14 ad 1.

⁵³ II-II, q. 174, a. 4 ad 1.

⁵⁴ II-II, q. 1, a. 7c.

in the Old Testament; and consequently the process of clarification continued even with regards to the Elders.⁵⁵ As time went on, however, the prophets learned a good deal on what was to be accomplished in Christ, notably on the Incarnation, the passion and resurrection.⁵⁶ But the information they received was gradual and never entirely full. In fact the Old Testament is compared by St. Paul to the state of childhood,⁵⁷ for 'as much knowledge of the faith was given to the Fathers, who were instructors in the faith, as was necessary to give to the people at that time, either openly or in figures'.⁵⁸

Another limitation of the revealed knowledge passed on to the faithful in general is suggested by the last remark, namely that in the Old Testament divine truth was proposed to them either openly or in figures. St. Thomas says that the ordinary faithful were then taught clearly that God is one, and that he is the Creator of everything; but the Incarnation and the atonement were at once hinted at and hidden from them under the veil of figures.⁵⁹ Both before and after the Law Christ's passion was signified and pre-figured by the sacrifices. The Elders, says St. Thomas, knew what these meant, even explicitly. But the rest had only a veiled knowledge.⁶⁰ Finally, as the time of Christ approached, the mystery of redemption was more clearly understood,⁶¹ until full clarity was attained in New Testament times. The mystery of Christ, St. Paul writes, 'in other generations was not known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit' (Eph. 3, 5). For, as St. Thomas points out, 'those who were nearer to Christ, either before him, like John the Baptist, or after him, like the Apostles, knew the mysteries of the faith more fully'.⁶² Thus successive revelations rendered explicit what had originally been implicit in the mystery of salvation. The last clarification was made by Christ himself who, by his passion, death and resurrection fulfilled what the prophets had seen less clearly and from a distance.

Conclusion. To conclude, therefore, we may say that St. Thomas considers the nucleus of the revealed deposit to consist

⁵⁵ III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2 Sol. 1.

⁵⁶ II-II, q. 2, a. 7c.

⁵⁷ Gal. 3, 24ff; 4 - Cf. II-II, q. 1, a. 7 ad 2.

⁵⁸ II-II, q. 1, a. 7 ad 3.

⁵⁹ Cf. In Heb., c. 11 lect. 2.

⁶⁰ II-II, q. 2, a. 7c; III Sent., d. 25, q. 2, a. 2 Sol. 2.

⁶¹ II-II, q. 1, a. 7c; q. 2, a. 7c.

⁶² II-II, q. 1, a. 7 ad 4.

in the two basic truths of the Trinity and the Redemptive Incarnation. In the history of revelation a development was made with regards to both, but in a different way. At the final stage of canonical revelation, Christ's teaching on God did not further elaborate the intrinsic doctrinal contents of the mystery of the Trinity so as to render them more explicit than they had been to the Fathers of old, but only extrinsically contributed to their widespread promulgation. By contrast with this, on the mystery of salvation Christ brought about an intrinsic doctrinal development, both by his teaching and by the events of his life. By the latter especially, he filled in the last details in the revelation of God's salvific plan, rendering fully explicit what had remained more or less implicit until its actual fulfilment in himself.

Alongside these supernatural mysteries proposed to our faith, revelation often included also instructions pertaining to moral behaviour. Of these the Angelic Doctor says that revelation did not develop in a linear way, but adapted itself to the conditions of particular times, and had for its directive principle that which was expedient to the salvation of the elect.⁶³

C. CASSAR

⁶³ II-II, q. 174, a. 6c.

DE AMORE HOMINIS ERGA DEUM ET SEMETIPSUM
IN LUCE DOCTRINAE 'TOTIUS ET PARTIS'
APUD SANCTUM THOMAM

OBIECTUM formale voluntatis humanae – secundum Philosophiam Scholasticam – est *bonum ab intellectu apprehensum*. Ex consideratione huius obiecti dynamicam activitatem spiritualem volitionis in homine penitus intelligere conemur.

Agimus de natura obiecti voluntatis hominis: de natura boni.

Et quaerimus primo: "Estne bonum, ut voluntatis specificativum, mere et exclusive proprium, nempe, mere bonum concupiscentiae? nonne datur etiam bonum alterius, vel bonum benevolentiae? Sed, potestne bonum benevolentiae esse prorsus alienum et totaliter disiunctum a bono concupiscentiae quod videtur esse fons omnium appetituum?"

Difficile est affirmative respondere – en problema!

Animadvertere licet quaestionem analogam esse cognitionis, scilicet, "An et quomodo ens potest cognoscere aliquid quin sit cognitio sui?" similiter enim quaeritur: "An et quomodo appetitus entis potest inclinari ad aliquid quod non est bonum proprium?"

Licet difficultatem aggredi psychologicę, sed hoc non quidem satis esset et inde multo melius est solutionem metaphysicam proferre quae continetur in scriptis S. Thomae de natura "totius et partis". Hanc doctrinam breviter exponere conamur secundum interpretationem Patris Rousselot in thesi "Pour l'Histoire du Problème de l'Amour au Moyen Age"¹ proposita.

Cum Deus, uti Ens Supremum, sit fundamentum totius metaphysicae, quaestio profundius tractatur si in relatione ad Deum consideratur, et utendo iisdem verbis a Philosophia Mediaevali selectis, sic, cum P. Rousselot quaestionem ponimus: "Utrum homo naturaliter diligit Deum plus quam semetipsum?"

PRINCIPIA

Doctrina Sancti Thomae voluntatis humanae fundatur in notione appe-

¹"Pour l'Histoire du Probleme de l'Amour au Moyen Age" a P. Pierre Rousselot, S. J., Munster, 1908.

titus qui invenitur in omnibus creaturis licet modo diverso, et qui, inclinando creaturas ad Creatorem suum, simul eas perfecit. Hoc optime explicatur in De Ver. q. 22, a. 1 ubi Thomas dicit:

Quod autem dirigitur vel inclinatur in aliquid ab aliquo, in id inclinatur quod est intentum ab eo qui inclinat vel dirigit ... Unde cum omnia naturalia, naturali quadam inclinatione, sint inclinata in fines suos a primo motore, qui est Deus, oportet quod illud in quod unumquodque naturaliter inclinatur, sit id quod est volitum vel intentum a Deo. Deus autem cum non habeat alium suae voluntatis finem nisi seipsum, et ipse sit ipsa essentia bonitatis: oportet quod omnia alia sint inclinata naturaliter in bonum.

At notandum est hanc doctrinam appetitus, quae ipsam naturam entis spectat, Sanctum Thomam velle analogice intelligi et ratione participationis. Ita enim eam explicat in Contra Gentiles:

Propter hoc igitur tendit (creatura) ad proprium bonum

quia tendit ad divinam similitudinem et non e converso,²

et hoc iterum monstratur in eo quod, cum creatio sit actus amoris vel bonitatis divinae, ipsum esse creaturae est participatio divinae bonitatis, nam:

in quantum aliqua desiderant esse, desiderant Dei similitudinem et Deum implicite, dum sola rationalis natura potest per quamdam viam resolutionis, ipsum Deum explicite appetere.

Finis ultimus et unicus, unificans in se totalitatem Bonitatis, est Deus; itaque si amor proprius et amor alterius possint aliquatenus conciliari, hoc videtur possibile esse in amore Dei.

Traditio Christiana semper tenebat Deum esse amandum propter se ipsum et super omnia, tamen habemus S. Augustinum definientem voluntatem humanam ut appetitum beatitudinis ... et sic, in difficultatibus hujus generis capti, magis nitimur ad solutionem quaestionis:

Utrum homo naturaliter diligat Deum plus quam semetipsum?

CONCEPTUS PHYSICUS AMORIS

In primis P. Rousselot distinguit apud Mediaevales duos conceptus amoris: conceptus physicus et conceptus estaticus. P. Rousselot explicans primum conceptum argumenta firma putat se invenire ad difficultates evadendas et solutionem illustrandam. Conceptio physica vel naturalis significat omnes amores reales aut posibles fundari in necessaria inclinatione omnium entium naturalium ad proprium eorum bo-

²III C.G. 24.

num. Hoc iam antea explicavimus in notione Thomistica appetitus sed P. Rousselot pergit et demonstrat quomodo ex hoc sequatur ut amor Dei et amor proprius in intima et profunda identitate congruant, et quomodo haec identitas manifestetur in duplicem expressionem ejusdem appetitus qui est profundissimus et maxime naturalis et quidem ipsa natura:

Tous les phénomènes d'amour étant pour lui (Thomas) l'expression d'une même réalité naturelle (la volonté, l'appétit) il faut nécessairement leur trouver un fond commun réel et permanent, il y a un objet unique qui spécifie l'amour.

S. Thomas, duce Aristotele, hoc vindicavit per id principium fundamentale quod statuit unitatem plus quam individualitatem esse principium, regulam et finem ultimum amoris et propter hoc amor concupiscentiae et amor benevolentiae in unum reducuntur.

Sed cur et quomodo amor proprius et amor Dei per hoc principium in perfecta continuitate reducuntur?

S. Augustinus dicit: "Ultimus finis est beatitudo quam omnes appetunt"; sed nunc quaerimus: ubi invenienda sit haec beatitudo? et Thomas respondit:

Finis ultimus cujuslibet facientis, in quantum est faciens, est ipsemet; utimur enim factis a nobis propter nos; et si aliquid aliquando propter alium faciat, hoc refertur in bonum suum, vel utile vel delectabile, vel honestum.³ Unumquodque, ceteris paribus, plus se amat quam aliquid aliud; cujus signum est quod quando aliquid est alicui propinquius magis naturaliter amatur.⁴ Dicit enim Dionysius "amor est virtus unitiva". Unicuique autem ad seipsum est unitas, quae est potior unione ad alium. Unde sicut unitas est principium amoris, ita amor quo quis diligit seipsum, est forma et radix amicitiae. In hoc etiam amicitiam habemus ad alios, quod ad eos nos habeamus sicut ad nos ipsos.⁵

et per hunc tramitem P. Rousselot interpretat haec Aristotelis dicta:

Amicabilia quae sunt ad alterum venerunt ex amicabilibus quae sunt ad seipsum⁶

et Divus Thomas in Lib. 9 Eth. 1, 4 ita loquitur:

Virtuosus se habet ad amicum sicut ad seipsum, quia amicus secundum affectum amici est quasi alius ipse, quod, scilicet, homo afficitur

³ III C.G. 17, 7.

⁴ I C.G. 102, 2.

⁵ 2a2ae q. 25, a. 4; 3d. 28 q. 1, a. 6.

⁶ Eth. Nic. IX, 4.

ad amicum sicut ad se ipsum ... et pro tanto, dicitur amor vis concreta: quia alium aggregat sibi, habens se ad eum sicut ad seipsum.

Sed his dictis videtur ipsa difficultas fortius nunc urgeri: "An et quomodo ergo potest homo naturaliter diligere Deum plus quam semetipsum?" Et responsum est in eo quod secundum Thomam homo tendit ad bonum Dei tam "spontanee, naturaliter et directe" quam ad suum bonum proprium, aliis verbis, homo amando se ipsum simul diligit Deum super omnia, et hoc, fortasse, melius intelligetur in analysi a P. Rousselot facta principii Sancti Thomae de Toto et Parte.

DE TOTO ET PARTE

Hanc doctrinam optime exponit Doctor Angelicus in Quodl. I, q. I, a. 8 — en citatio:

Diligere Deum super omnia plus quam se ipsum est naturale non solum angelo et homini, sed etiam cuilibet creaturae, secundum quod potest amare aut sensibiliter aut naturaliter. Inclinationes enim naturales maxime cognosci possunt in his quae naturaliter agunt absque deliberatione; sic enim agit unum quodque in natura, sicut aptum natum est agi. Videmus autem quod unaquaeque pars naturali quadam inclinatione operatur ad bonum totius, etiam cum detrimento aut periculo proprio: ut patet cum aliquis manu exponit gladio ad defensionem capitis, ex quo dependet salus totius corporis: Unde naturale est ut quaelibet pars suo modo plus amet totum quam se ipsam. Unde, et secundum hanc naturalem inclinationem et secundum politicam virtutem, bonus civis mortis periculo se exponit pro bono civili ... Bonum partis est propter bonum totius ... Manifestum est autem quod Deus est bonum commune totius universi et omnium partium ejus; unde quaelibet natura suo modo naturaliter plus amat Deum quam se ipsam; insensibilia quidem naturaliter, bruta vero animalia sensitive, creatura vero rationalis per intellectualem amorem, quae dilectio dicitur.

Sed notat P. Rousselot exempla manus et capitis vel civis et boni communis non debere nos ita decipere ut censeamus principium unitatis tantum in casibus partium juxtapositarum posse applicari. De facto Thomas in casibus compositionis sine distinctione spatiali idem tenet; dixit enim:

Homo singularis est minus dignus quam natura communis: quia divinius est bonum gentis quam bonum unius hominis.⁷

⁷ 3d. 18 q. 1, a. 6 sol. 1.

Individuum, uti individuum, est membrum speciei et est ergo pro specie – et hoc P. Rousselot exprimit ne conceptio unitatis quocumque modo ad unitatem egoisticam et restrictam individui restringatur.

(Conceptio unitatis uti applicata in explicatione peccati originalis et Redemptionis nos adjuvabit ad hanc notionem complectendam.)⁸

P. Rousselot tenet quod si pars totius consideratur sicut a toto separata, manet debilis et imcompleta et non potest cognosci ut revera id quod est, scilicet, pars totius, et hoc affirmatur de omnibus naturalibus et maxime elucet in hac citatione Divi Thomae:

unumquodque ... secundum naturam hoc ipsum quod est, *alterius est*⁹ et in hoc sensu pars est totius, est pro toto, et appetit totum plus quam se, et hac ratione dicit Thomas:

pars autem, id quod est, totius est; unde et quodlibet bonum partis est ordinabile in bonum totius;

et consequenter asserit P. Rousselot non posse appetitum naturalem alicujus partis considerari disjunctum vel separatum ab appetitu totali, multo minus ut contra illum. Praeterea dicit P. Rousselot – id quod est verum secundum Thomam de partibus, multo magis verum ei esse de participationibus, id est, de entibus cujus esse est esse participatum.

In illis quorum unum est tota ratio existendi et bonitatis alii, magis diligitur naturaliter tale alterum quam ipsum, sicut dictum est quod unaquaeque pars diligit naturaliter totum plus quam se, et quodlibet singulare naturaliter diligit plus bonum suae speciei, quam bonum suum singulare. Deus autem non solum est bonum unius speciei, sed est ipsum universale bonum simpliciter. Unde unumquodque suo modo naturaliter diligit Deum plus quam seipsum¹⁰.

Et hoc enuntiatum principium solum Deo, dicit Rousselot, convenire, quia in illo solo est tota ratio existendi. Sed secundum S. Thomam Deus non est totalitas entium universi cum sit Ens infinitum et separatum quem omnia entia participant et imitant, et inde de omnibus singulis creaturis dicendum "hoc ipsum quod est, alterius est" et "quia igitur bonum universale est ipse Deus et sub hoc bono continetur etiam angelus et homo et omnis creatura, quia omnis creatura naturaliter secundum id quod est, Dei est, sequitur quod naturali dilectione etiam angelus et homo plus et principaliter diligit Deum quam seipsum" et addit Thomas: "alioquin, si naturaliter plus seipsum diligeret quam Deum, sequeretur quod naturalis dilectio esset perversa; et quod non perficeretur per cari-

⁸ 1a2ae q. 81, a. 1c.

⁹ 1, q. 60, a. 5c.

¹⁰ 1 q. 60, a. 5 ad 1.

tatem sed destrueretur.”¹¹

Haec doctrina totius et partis non videtur esse merum exemplum, ut dicit Dominus Gilson in libro suo celeberrimo “The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy” nec tantum metaphora ut describit P.M. D’Arcy in opere suo notissimo “The Mind and Heart of Love”. P. Rousselot responderet forsitan iterum dicendo: “quod est verum secundum Thomam de partibus multo magis verum esse de participationibus. P. Rousselot instaret affirmando Deum esse totum bonum et hominem participare hanc bonitatem; et amando se, ut participationem, hominem revera Deum amare plus quam se – uti pars appetendo suum bonum, appetit id ut pars totius et simul appetit bonum totius plus quam suum bonum.

“Manifestum est autem” dicit S. Thomas, “quod bonum partis est propter bonum totius; unde naturali appetitu vel amore unaquaeque res particularis amat bonum suum propter bonum commune totius universi, quod est Deus.”¹²

Verumtamen Pater Rousselot per hanc explicationem, licet difficilem, tenet amorem proprium et amorem Dei esse duas expressiones ejusdem appetitus, in perfecta continuitate convenientes, et non duo phenomena omnino diversa, vel peius, opposita.

Amor meus naturalis constituit me uti partem totalitatis quae me circumdat vel uti participationem entis Superioris qui me facit existere. Sic quando desidero florem ad olfactandum vel fructum ad gustandum, vel vinum ad bibendum, meipsum desidero et volo in realitate, sed simul et eodem modo in hanc delectationem quaerendam, id quod realiter et magis intime amo est Deus.

S. Thomas docet omne creatum in omni appetitione semper Deum desiderare magis profunde quam objectum quod appetit et attingit, etiamque in peccatis voluntatem peccatoris inconscie ad Deum tendere.¹³

CONFLICTUS

Sed si revera res sic se habent, cur experimur conflictum inter amorem proprium et amorem Dei?

Traditio Christiana statim responsum profert dicendo “Sed iste naturalis amor Dei pervertitur ab hominibus per peccatum.” Sed P. Rousselot aliam solutionem quaerit apud S. Thomam fundatam in structura metaphysica hominis.

Spatium tantum permittit ut modo brevissimo delineatur solutio hujus

¹¹ 1 q. 60, a. 5c.

¹² 1a2ae q. 109, a. 3c.

¹³ De Malo q. 16, a. 3 ad 1; q. 8, a. 2. Cp. 2d.5 q. 1, a. 2 ad 5.

problematis.

Bonum individuale entis spiritualis est maxime affine ad Summum Bonum immo vero, cum Summo Bono identicum, quia spiritus in suo ordine perfecte actuatur. Sic ens spirituale appetit suum bonum spirituale sub ratione summo bono maxime propinqua, scilicet spirituali – quod implicat spiritum perfecte intelligere in quo suum bonum revera consistat nam non impeditur a materia in sua operatione.

Ens tamen sensitivum appetit bonum sensitivum et simul Summum Bonum, sed sub ratione Summo Bono aliena, seu ratione appetitus sensitivi.

In homine, igitur, conflictus est possibilis propter naturam compositionis ejus: spiritus cum materia; bonum enim sensibile potest esse aliquando incompatibile cum acquisitione altioris perfectionis et liber est homo ad utrumvis eligendum. Sed "spiritus", inquit P. Rousselot, "est, de facto, ipse homo, sensu magis intimo et vero quam corpus";¹⁴ ergo bonum sensibile subijcere debere bono spirituali, id est, ipsi Deo; et homo sacrificando sensibilia bono suo spirituali, simul amat bonum suum revera proprium et ipsum Deum super omnia.

"Cum in homine", dicit Thomas, "sit duplex natura, scilicet, intellectiva quae principalior est, et sensitiva quae minor est, ille vere seipsum diligit, qui se amat ad bonum rationis; qui autem se amat ad bonum sensualitatis contra bonum rationis magis se odit quam amat, proprie loquendo, secundum illud Psalm. X, 6: "Qui diligit iniquitatem odit animam suam" et secundum hoc amor verus sui ipsius amittitur per peccatum contrarium, sicut et amor Dei".¹⁵

CONCLUSIO

Et concludit P. Rousselot iterum asserendo hominem diligentem, secundum naturam, bonum spirituale super omnia (materialia) nil aliud facere quam diligere se ipsum, cum spiritus, sensu magis intimo et vero quam corpus, sit ipsemet, et simul diligere Deum super omnia, cum bonum spirituale et bonum Dei inter se convenient. Et sic, hic dictus conflictus inter spiritum et materiam est naturalis et consulto datur ut in ordine naturali virtus revera spiritualis in homine manifestetur.

Existencia hominis, unitas personalis et bonitas eius totaliter a Deo,

¹⁴ "L'esprit, en effet, est l'homme même, plus intimement, plus vraiment que le corps" o.c. p. 21.

¹⁵ De Caritate a. 12 ad 6; Cp. 2a2ae q. 25, a. 7; et 3d. 29 q. 1, a. 5 ad 3: "quod aliquis vitam propriam corporalem propter amicum ponit, non contingit ex hoc quod aliquis amicum plus quam se ipsum diligit, sed quia in se plus diligit quis bonum virtutis quam bonum corporale."

creatore et conservatore dependent, et sic consiliari videntur hae duae veritates:

- quod homo *realiter* se amat solum quando Deum plus amat
- quod nullus homo potest Deum amare quin seipsum amet.

ARTHUR G. VELLA, S.J.

LINKS BETWEEN THE THREE MAIN DIVISIONS
OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS (2)
CHRONOLOGY

SCATTERED throughout the book of Genesis there are twenty-four chronological data, more or less explicit. We are attempting to compare them with one another in the accompanying conspectus to reconstruct the chronology in the whole book:

Remarks:

(3) This datum is embedded in a context assigned to A, and hence at this stage it cannot be attributed to other sources without violating our own principles of subject matter examination.

(4) These verses 16, 3.2 are a reduplication of the report about Hagar's relation with 'Abram'. One of them is probably an interpolation. It is very likely that the second one is the later insertion, for its style is discordant with that of its context: note the lack of dialogue:

16, 2

And Sarai said unto Abram,
Behold now, Yahweh hath restrained me from bearing; go in, I pray thee, unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her.

16, 3

... and Sarai Abram's wife took Hagar the Egyptian, her handmaid, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to Abram her husband to be his wife.

The liveliness of 16, 2 is kept throughout the whole section up to v. 14. Hence 16, 3, i.e. the chronological datum, does not belong to A but to some other source.

(5) 16, 16. Ishmael is born when Abraham was 86, in strict harmony with v. 3; therefore v. 3 belongs to C, to which this section dealing with circumcision belongs.

(6) 17, 1. 24. 25, as an integral part of the covenant and circumcision

This is the concluding extract from the Rev. Fr. C. Sant's thesis for his doctorate in Theology: 'The Literary Structure of the Book of Genesis'. The other extracts are to be found in *Melita Theologica* Vol. XI, pp. 1-13; Vol. XII, pp. 14-27; Vol. XIV, pp. 62-74; Vol. XV, pp. 41-49.

	ABRAHAM	SARAH	ISHMAEL	ISAAC	ESAU	JACOB	JOSEPH	MANASSE	EPHRAIM	DATA	REMARKS	SOURCE
1	0									Abraham is born.		
2	10	0								Sarah is born 17,17.		
3	75	65								Thare dies 11,32; 12,4.		?
4	85	75								Abraham marries Hagar 16,3.	Duplicate // with 16,2	
5	86	76	0							Ishmael is born 16,16.		C
6	99	89	13							Covenant of Circumcision 17,1.24.25.		C
7	100	90	14	0						Birth of Isaac 21,5.	Connected with 17.	C
8	137	127	51	37						Death of Sarah 23,1.		C
9	140		54	40						Isaac marries Rebekah 25,20.		C
10	160		74	60	0	0				Esau and Jacob born 25,26.	Doubtful as to source.	
11	175		89	75	15	15				Abraham dies 25,7.		C
12			114	100	40	40				Esau marries his first wives (26,34) Judith and Basemath.	Doubtful.	
13			137	123	63	63				Ishmael dies 25,17.		C
14				138	78	78				Jacob migrates into Haran (31,38.41) Isaac is old and blind nearing death; Esau marries Makelath.		B
15				145	85	85				Jacob marries Leah and Rachel 29,18.27.		
16				152	92	92	0			Joseph is born 30,25; 31,41.		
17				158	98	98	6			Jacob returns from Haran 31,38.41.		B
18				169	109	109	17			Joseph betrayed by his brothers 37,2. – (It may be that his brethren may have plotted against Joseph later).	Doubtful.	C
19				180	120	120	28			Isaac dies 35,28 – Joseph interprets dreams to prisoners.	It seems to be an interpolation.	?
20					122	122	30			Joseph stands before Pharao 41,46. Year of Plenty begins.	Cfr. 41,45b // 46b.	
21					129	129	37	0	0	Ephraim and Manasseh born 41,50.	General reference with no definite date.	R
22					130	130	38	2	2	Second year of famine – Joseph recognises his brethren (45,6). His father comes into Egypt (47,9).	Indirect reference.	R
23					?	147	55	19	19	Jacob blesses Manasseh and Ephraim (48,20) and his own sons (49,1) – dies 47,28.	This seems to be a later addition cfr. 47,28 // 29.	
24							110	73	73	Joseph dies 50,22.25.		?

account is a C datum.

(8) 23, 1 again is an introduction to the narrative of Sarah's death and her burial and of the purchase of a family tomb at Machpelah. This section has been attributed to C.

(9) 25, 20. '... and Isaac was 40 years old when he took Rebekah the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian of Paddan-Aram'. This is a duplicate of 24, 67 and this last name unquestionably connects this verse with C. 'Laban the Syrian' and 'Bethuel the Syrian', the former occurring only once and the latter appearing also in 28, 5 in C, confirm our conclusion.

(10) 25, 26. This is a short note about Isaac's age when his sons were born. Its source is doubtful so far.

(11) 25, 7 gives us the age of Abraham when he died. It is a part of the section dealing with Abraham's death and burial, which is assigned to C. Note here the good relations between Isaac and Ishmael, cfr. 17, 1 ff.

(12) 26, 34. Esau marries Judith and Basemath, his first wives, at the age of 40 years. These wives proved to be 'a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah' v. 35; this corresponds exactly with 27, 46: 28, 1b 'Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan' and 28, 8 '... and Esau saw that the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac his father; and Esau went unto Ishmael, and took unto wives ...' The sequence is excellent. That 26, 34 is not a sequence to what precedes it, that is, to the story of Isaac's dealings with his neighbours is evident; another section is introduced. In 27, 1, however, another narrative begins leading to the fraud of Jacob against his father and his brother. This fraud was the cause of the alienation between Jacob and Esau; finally it led to their total separation through Jacob's flight into Mesopotamia. According to 27, 44.45 Jacob sought safety, not a wife, in Haran. Here we are faced with two motives for Jacob's sojourn in Syria: safety and marriage. The former belongs to one tradition, the other to another tradition, which threads were merged into one. Now 28, 1-9, with which the chronological datum in 26, 34, is ultimately connected, forms part of C. It may be remarked here that there is no contradiction: both motives may have lead Jacob to sojourn in Syria, but one tradition mentions the first and the other stresses the second without excluding the other¹. In fact even according to the source, according to which Jacob fled in safety, he married Rachel and Leah.

Isaac in 27, 1 is represented as nearing his death and practically

¹Cfr. *Melita Theologica*. Vol. xii, p. 14.

blind: '... when Isaac was blind, and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see ...'; the whole section 33, 1 ff. dealing with the meeting of Esau and Jacob, on the latter's return from Mesopotamia creates to the impression that Isaac was already dead, so much so, that the interest is mainly shifted on to Jacob and his family. On the other hand in 28, 1 ff. the patriarch is not, at least explicitly, referred to as a decrepit man. If Esau was 40 years of age when he took Canaanites unto wives, some time must have passed before they proved to be a nuisance to their mother-in-law. Isaac, therefore, had already surpassed his hundredth year and Jacob his 40th, but it seems unlikely that he had reached his 50th. By combining other data directly or indirectly concerned with chronology we arrive at the figure of 78 years of age for Jacob and 138 for Isaac. Now we know from 35, 28 that Isaac died at the age of 180 years, i.e., he remained on his deathbed 42 years, according to the combined narrative. The figure 138 is arrived at thus: Joseph was born in the 14th year of Jacob's sojourn in Syria; he was the son of Rachel, who bore him just at the end of Jacob's 14 years' service for his wives (30, 25; 31, 38, 41) 'And in this manner have I served thee in thy house twenty years, 14 for thy daughters, and six for thy flocks ...'. But Joseph was 30 years when he stood before Pharaoh 41, 46; Jacob entered Egypt at the age of 130 years (47, 9) in the 2nd year of the famine, when Joseph was 38 (7) years of age; hence Jacob must have been 92 years of age at Joseph's birth, that is, 14 years after his arrival in Mesopotamia, where he entered at the age of 78 years, whereas his father Isaac was 138 years of age. Therefore, Jacob was comparatively old when he got married, although this contrasts sharply with the laughter of Abraham in 17 when God announced to him the birth of Isaac in his old age of 100 years, Sarah being 90 years. Hence there is some gap somewhere in the chronology; if we consider only the data in C we find that the age of Jacob at his departure cannot be surmised for lack of data. But this does not mean that the chronology in C is confused; it means that the data of the document outside C joined with those of the latter do not yield very likely solutions in the absence of other documents. All difficulties would disappear if the clear data of C be separated from the more general and indirect data of the other source.

(13) 25, 17. This is another datum in a C section, a general summing up of a patriarch's age, as a conclusion to his biography.

(14) 31, 38.41 has already been discussed.

(15) 29, 18.27. After seven years service Jacob is given Leah, instead of Rachel, in marriage; Rachel was given in marriage after a week

in return for a seven years service.

(17) 31, 38.41. Jacob returns into Canaan six years after the birth of Joseph, that is, after a 20 years service with Laban.

(18) 37, 2. It is just a note on Joseph's age 'These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph being seventeen years old ...'. This chapter is concerned with Joseph's betrayal into the hands of the merchants. This note seems to be a continuation of 37, 1, itself the sequence to chapter 36 dealing with Esau's generations. It is symmetrical with the position of Isaac's generations in 25, 19 immediately after Ishmael's generations. We incline hence to assign this datum to C.

(19) 35, 28. This information about Isaac is the usual age-summing up before the report of some one's death. This verse is part of tradition C. The pathetic note 'and Esau and Jacob his sons buried him' is remarkable for its reflection on the peaceful relations of the twins.

(20) 41, 46. Joseph stands before Pharaoh at the age of 30 years; 41, 45. 46a seems to be a duplicate of 46b:

41, 45-46a. And Joseph went over the land of Egypt. And Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh king of Egypt.

41, 46b. And Joseph went out from the presence of Pharaoh, and went throughout all the land of Egypt.

This short notice about Joseph's age, then, seems to be a later insertion in relation to its context, where dates otherwise do not occur. It might be due to the writer of what has been termed 'the third element'.

(21) 41, 50. 'And unto Joseph were born two sons before the year of famine came ...'. Again as with Jacob's marriages and his sons' births here we have dates in relation with some event, and not with the father's age. This notice belongs to tradition R.

(22) 45, 6. What has been said just now with respect to the preceding datum, applies with equal force to this case. It has been ascribed to tradition R.

(23) 47, 28. The ever-recurring closing formula characteristic of C, reappears to sum up the age of Jacob, now approaching his death. Its misplacement or rather its secondary character relatively to its context appears from its following verse about the blessing of Joseph: 'And when he saw that the day of his death drew nigh ...'.

(24) 50, 22. 25. Joseph dies at the age of 110 years. This is the only explicit chronological datum outside C or 'the third element'.

²Cfr. DE VAUX, *Les Patriarches hebreux et les decouvertes modernes*, RB55 (1948) 326.

This brief study of the single chronological data helps us to reconstruct more or less exactly the sequence of events in the course of 355 years from the birth of Abraham to the death of Joseph. We meet, however, some slight inconsistencies with regard to Jacob's flight into Mesopotamia through what seems to be additional material or due to the conflation of two different sources each with its own system of time reckoning. In fact a glance at the chronological conspectus would show that the data may be divided into two large groups: the one giving exact datings in relation to the age of the persons concerned; the other, starting with some outstanding important event in the life of the patriarch, takes it as a point of departure. Data no. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 18. 19. 20. 22. 23. 24. belong to the first class; the rest are included in the second. The contents of the first class form integral parts of C and the 'third element' of Joseph's history except in those cases where they are discordant with their context; the latter, however, betray strong connections both of substance and of literary style with those in the larger sections of C. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that this chronological annotation is artificial; the sojourn in Canaan amounts to 215 years exactly half the number of the years of the sojourn in Egypt.² It is highly probable, therefore, that they belong to this thread. This is confirmed by the fact that 48, 3-4 is included in C. The other data mostly belong to B and to R. A is very sparing in time annotation. This leads to the conclusion that C in 11-36 links with the 'third element' in 37-50, and in B 11-36 is one with R in 37-50.

It remains to find a link between A in Gen. 11-36, and J in Joseph's history; the oath scene in 47, 29-31 resembles closely the scene in 24, 2 ff:

Ch. 24

2. And Abraham said unto his servant, who was ruler over all he had: Put I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh: and I will make thee swear by Yahweh, ... that thou shalt not take a wife ...

Ch. 47

29ff. And he called his son Joseph and said unto him, If now I find grace in thy sight, put, I pray thee thy hand under my thigh, and deal kindly and truly with me; bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt: but when I sleep with my fathers, thou shalt carry me out of Egypt and bury me in their burying place ...

Moreover time reckoning in J is missing no less than in A. Finally it

is highly probable that such a rich narrative as A, would have included in it Joseph's history, which meant so much for the Hebrews.

The final result of this investigation in the chronology and genealogy of Genesis is that the eight or nine threads disentangled in the previous analysis may be grouped into three main lines thus:

1 - 50	1 - 11	12 - 36	37 - 50
A	A'	A	J
B		B	R
C	C'	C	'Third Element'

GENERAL CONCLUSION: THE COMPILATION OF GENESIS

We do not propose to discuss the date at which Genesis was most probably compiled; it is beyond our scope. But we intend here to give just a hint as to a line of approach for a likely solution of this question. We must first of all base all our discussions on the historical fact of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt from the time of the settlement of Jacob and his family until the Exodus under the strong leadership of Moses.³ Therefore, if Genesis was written before or immediately after the exodus from Egypt one most probably would find some vestiges of Egyptian influence with respect both to the contents of the work and to its literary features. Moreover it would also reflect the political conditions and ideals of the Hebrews on the eve of the Exodus, and hence in which the writer must have interested himself. Finally by comparing together the three main strands one would be enabled to discover their order in being committed to writing. Through such an investigation the dating of the work would be less difficult.

The last fourteen chapters of Genesis are set against an Egyptian background; the rest of Genesis most often refer to Egypt.⁴ 'In the course of our demonstration, it will be proved by numerous examples from language and subject matter that the Egyptian environment is most strikingly reflected in the Joseph and Exodus narratives not merely in single words, expressions, and idioms, but in the use of whole sentences, formulae, standing phrases, stylistic forms and so forth'. Yahuda then gives numerous examples to support his thesis, not only with reference to these last chapters but also to the rest of Genesis. Such an

³ J.M. LAGRANCE, RB (1938) p. 177.

⁴ A.J. YAHUDA, *The Language of the Pentateuch in its relation to Egyptian*, London 1933, vol. I, p. xxxiv.

influence on Hebrew tradition was but natural, when one remembers that the Hebrew community was founded, stabilised and set on its forward march towards national maturity in an Egyptian atmosphere, and hence their language, and traditional stories must have had received an Egyptian stamp.

In Genesis we note that the references to Egypt are numerous: Abraham goes to Egypt (12, 10 ff.); Isaac would have gone there if he was not stopped by God Himself (26, 1-2); Jacob went to settle there for good after his son Joseph had been installed as viceroy (37-50). The interest in Egypt is beyond question and it increases in volume and extent in the Joseph narrative, which is studded with references to Egyptian life and institution which betray a strong familiarity with them on the part of the writer and the people to whom they were written. We contended in a former chapter that the purpose of the compiler of Genesis was the recording of the Promise, as a means to incite the people to undertake the arduous enterprise of shaking off their Egyptian bondage; now this highly practical end could not give rise to Genesis after the Exodus. The Hebrews in the desert looked forward to Canaan and turned their thoughts on the future; in Egypt, on the other hand, they looked back and yearned for the freedom which their forefathers enjoyed in Palestine (50, 24). Genesis is a retrospective work, whereby the writer attempted to enthuse his readers: 'God will visit you after my death, and will make you go up out of this land, to the land which he swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ... God will visit you, carry my bones with you out of this place' (50, 24-25). Such words would work like magic on an oppressed community, with no hope of help except from God, who was the helpful friend of their forefathers (Ex. 3, 15). Therefore both the actual contents and the aim of Genesis point to the time just before the Exodus; a later time is not likely.

In the foregoing discussion we analysed the book of Genesis into three main strands: A.B.C. It would be very interesting to establish between them the chronological order relative to their date of origin for it is not probable that they were originally cast into their mould at the same time or by the same author. Strand A is the most voluminous and the richest in its narratives, and interest in the personages and their doings; B is more fragmentary and not so alive in its stories as A; thus the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (22, 1-19), which could have given a chance to its writer to indulge in describing the feelings of Abraham and the others, is no match to the highly descriptive and copious language of 24, 1-67 recounting the journey of Abraham's servants into Mesopo-

tamia in search of a wife for Isaac, although it has its own beauty characteristic of oral tradition. C on its part is more 'pedantic' and interested in dates, names and covenants; no reference whatever to the domestic life of the personages concerned. This would make us believe that B is an oral tradition, written in its primitive form, which had been handed down to the Hebrew of the Exodus period from father to son; A, the richest narrative is the original story written by the compiler himself, who based himself on a given line of tradition which he worked over and radically recast according to his own views; the same writer, however, added to his own compositions excerpts from B, which he left in their original form. C seems to be the fundamental framework; but even without C the plan of Genesis would not break down, for after all C is mostly a synopsis of A and B and it betrays a strong theological interest in the facts recorded in them. It seems therefore, that C is the later document added to A and B after some time perhaps to give a more schematic order to Genesis, without breaking up the unity of the original work.

The source at the basis of Genesis betrays a strong Egyptian influence. The book is composed of three main strands one of which is an oral tradition preserved in its original cast, the second is an original composition, or at least an oral tradition which had been worked over by the writer; the third is a later addition to the other two. The question would now arise: who was the compiler? Naturally one who was most interested in the liberation of the Hebrews and in the establishment of their theocracy: Tradition has it that Moses was the writer of the book. Indeed Moses had all the means to write such work; he was an educated man in the court of the Pharaoh and was specially called by God to lead the people out of Egypt; we may surmise then that Moses jotted down the immemorial traditional lore dealing with the promises to work up the national feelings of the people unto boiling point. He wrote A, and absorbed within it B, without changing the name Elohim, into Yahweh; the latter name is generally used in A, the former in B. In Ex. 3 13 ff. Moses said to God: Lo I shall go to the children of Israel, and say to them: the God of your fathers hath sent me to you. If they should say to me: What is his name? What shall I say to them? God said to Moses: I am who am. The name Yahweh was revealed to Moses for the first time; obviously such a history then, written under the patronage of Yahweh, a name which evidently was not popular or rather current at the time immediately preceding the Exodus, could have as its author no one except Moses or one in intimate relations with him. Moses, however,

did not change Elohim of B into Yahweh, perhaps to show that both names refer to the same God, of the Patriarchs and of the living posterity.⁵ But C, the later document, has Elohim and EL Shadday as the names of the Deity; could this be written by Moses? One could, perhaps, opine that it was added later after the Exodus, but before the entry into Canaan by a writer other than Moses; e.g. Aaron or another interested in institutional religion; this document in fact does not have history so much as A and B; its interest lies in pedigrees, and institutions and promises, which it does not set in their historical settings but brings out their theological significance. Moses in this view, would have given it his approval. Thus we may conciliate together a documentary theory, and the traditional view with respect to Mosaic authorship.⁶

C. SANT.

⁵ J.M. LAGRANGE, *Ibid.* p. 181.

⁶ *Ench. Biblicum* n. 174-177.

THE MASS-MEDIA AND THEOLOGY

ON THE 25th November 1963, two votes were taken at the Vatican Council on the two parts of the schema on the Means of Social Communication. There were 331 votes against the first part, and as many as 502 (i.e. about a fourth of the Fathers present) against the second part. This is a large enough number to justify our asking why.

Part of the answer according to Mgr. Bernard, President of the *Office Catholique du Cinéma* and Council Expert, is that 'some thought that the Decree did not develop the theological grounds of the doctrine of the Church on these matters quite adequately;' and he goes on to remark on this as follows: 'This is, without doubt, true up to a point. The Decree relates these modern inventions to the Creator, both as to origin and as to end, but then it does not go into much detail. It ought to be said, however, that there hardly exists a theology of the Mass-Media yet. This is certainly a pity, but it is not up to a Council, perhaps, to be in the avant-garde of research and investigation, but to inventory the data existent at a given moment and to pronounce itself, if need be, on the different tendencies which appear. Let us hope that the lacuna, so acutely felt by some of the Fathers, will be the point of departure for new studies on this subject.' (*Revue Internationale du Cinéma*, Dec. 63 - Jan. 64, p. 5).

My brief paper could not have the ambition to fill this lacuna because of the limitations of time besides those of the speaker. I shall only offer some remarks meant to expand and illustrate the points made by the distinguished expert from whom I have just quoted.

Mgr. Bernard begins by admitting that only the sketchiest attempt is made in the Decree at providing a theology of the Mass-Media. By 'a theology of the Mass-Media' is meant, of course, an answer to the question: Do the Mass-Media have a definite, recognizable place in the divine plan for humanity? Have the Mass-Media, as such, got a specific function in the history of salvation? Or rather (since Mgr. Bernard assumes that the answer is 'yes'): How do the Mass-Media enter, specifically, in the vision which the Bible unfolds to us of the meaning of human history from the Creation of all things by the Word of God and its disruption by the Fall of the First Adam to the restoration of humanity and the world to God in Christ? How are they specifically related to the mission of the Church as seen, for instance, by St. Paul in the Epistles of the Captivity,

the Church, that is, 'as the destiny of the world, immanent in the world, ... the Church as a permanent avant-garde, always one jump ahead of the world, drawing it towards maturity and fulfilment'? (H. McCabe, in *Work*, p. 215).

It is important to realize, in order to understand the sense of this question, that it is an ontological question. It is quite separate from, e.g. the moral classification of films by competent authority, as 'good' or 'bad'. Anything man does may, from this moral viewpoint, be connected with the drama of salvation; for instance, if I eat a cheesecake, this may be related to my salvation, for it may be a fast-day and to eat it at an inappropriate time may be sinful and scandalous; or, if I make the cheesecake my main meal of the day, eating it may be an act of asceticism. But it is not such considerations of moral implications, however important they may be, I take it that Mgr. Bernard has in mind when he speaks of a theology of the Mass-Media. He assumes that they have a theological importance because of what they are by nature, in themselves; they are of interest to the dogmatic, and as well as to the moral, theologian. In this they are like sex or work or prayer, rather, than like eating cheesecakes.

Now, in the second section of the Preamble to the Decree, in what is given as an answer to the question: Why is the Council treating this subject?, the motives given for the Church's particular interest are essentially two: (1) positively, the mass-media can serve as a means for the 'spreading of the Kingdom of God' and (2) negatively, their misuse can cause great moral harm. What follows shows that, by the 'Spreading of the Kingdom of God', what is referred to are such uses of the Mass-Media as televising religious services, catechetical broadcasts, instructive films, Catholic newspapers etc. But, from the point of view of a *theology* of the Mass-Media, it is not the fact that they can be put to these uses directly in the service of the Church that is important; but rather the fact that by their very *nature*, even if they are not being used for an explicitly religious purpose, the means of social communication can be considered to be means of 'Spreading the Kingdom of God'. It is why this is so that I intend to outline, as briefly as possible in what follows; and I think that what follows can be taken as giving a deeper (because 'dogmatic' and not merely moral) justification of what is stated in the first section of the preamble:

'Among the admirable technical discoveries of our time ... the Church welcomes and follows with particular care those which concern the spirit of man and which have opened up new ways of more easily communicating

knowledge, thought and doctrine of every kind. The most important of these inventions are those instruments which are capable, by their very nature, of affecting and influencing not only individuals but also groups as such, and the whole of society'.

The Means of Social Communication are of particular theological interest because they are an important factor in the process of what has come to be called the 'personalization' of man and this process is an important aspect of the History of Salvation. That is the thesis which I propose to sketch out in this paper.

By 'personalization' is meant here the process by which man's reflective capacity augments with the increasing 'socialization' of human life, taking 'socialization' in the sense in which it is used in *Mater et Magistra*, i.e. as 'the progressive intensification of social relationships through the differentiation of roles and activities in life and the juridical institutionalization of this'.

It is not necessary to swallow Teilhard de Chardin whole in order to accept his view that mankind does not develop only in the same way as infra-human biological phenomena, i.e. by expansion or multiplication of numbers, like a colony of bacteria; but also in a 'convergent way', i.e. by moving from an initial state of dispersion to a greater interdependence and co-ordination. This is an evident feature of human history and the process is at present proceeding at an immensely accelerated rhythm. Nor can one deny in the face of the evidence that this process is accompanied by a heightening of the individual's self-consciousness; i.e. that the individual becomes more acutely aware of his specific nature (more conscious of his 'self') and that he acquires greater possibilities of having his nature more adequately fulfilled, the richer his participation in the social life of the community becomes. By 'personalization' is meant the sharpening and deepening of my self-consciousness and reflective ability, not through my isolation, my retreating within myself, my cutting myself off from society, but, on the contrary, through my sharing more fully in its cultural life, through increasing participation in a creative co-existence with my fellow-men in full and equal membership of (to put it in christian terminology) the New Body of the Second Adam.

If the Mass-Media are, as is said in the Preamble to the Conciliar Decree, of particular interest to the Church, is it not because they are evidence, as well as instruments, of this process of 'personalization' in as much as they provide, at once, a means of self-expression of unprecedented effectiveness and a means of social communication on an equally unprecedented scale? The Mass-Media have rendered possible the crea-

tion of a unified spiritual horizon for all mankind. Because the Mass-Media are the agents of heightened human self-awareness, self-possession, self-expression and self-communication, functionally related as these are to an increasingly socialized existence and to the enlargement of the communitarian dimension of the individual's spiritual life, they can be said to assume theological significance inasmuch as they can be seen, when placed in the perspective of the history of salvation, to be means which by their specific nature, allow man to become a better image of God in His Trinitarian life.

This follows, clearly enough, from the fact that, as the Dogmatic Constitution 'De Ecclesia' stresses, by Divine will, the Redemption does not consist in the bringing of salvation to men individually, but in solidarity, through their communion in the one Mystical Body. Just as the Fall, by dividing man from God, divided Man within himself, divided men between themselves, the Redemption restores the possibility of communion with God through communion among men, in Christ. Love reorganizes what sin had isolated.

Now human love differs from animal love, and is capable of being supernaturalized precisely because of its intimate connection with knowledge; because it can be communicated. Spiritual union is possible among men precisely because of their knowledge of themselves and their ability to communicate their knowledge reciprocally.

This communication is never perfect among men as it is between the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit; but man is an image of the Trinitarian God inasmuch as he has this capacity for selfcommunication; and the more this capacity is amplified, developed and increased, the closer the image comes to its source.

But the growth of this capacity is a function of the progress of personalization of which the means of social communication are especially effective instruments. Hence it will be readily seen how the Mass-Media, regarded as means of the social communication of self, permitting in the process the deeper fathoming of human nature in essentially social ways, can be regarded as apt by nature to contribute to the divine plan of restoring humanity to the Trinitarian life even when not used for specifically religious ends.

Contemporary theologians have placed the greatest emphasis on the fundamental contrast between the Judeo-Christian 'linear' vision of history (i.e. history as having a sense and an end) and the Greek-Oriental 'cyclical' conception of it. But it seems a pity that many who write on this topic do not stress the point on which the theologian who was per-

haps the first to emphasize the contrast, Laberthonniere, laid great stress viz. that the contrast between these two opposed conceptions of History is dependent on the contrast between the Judeo-Christian concepts of God and man as both 'personal' (the term being used analogically) and the absence of these concepts in Greek thought. It is because God is thought of as personal, that He can be thought of as intervening in and guiding history – unlike Plato's Idea of the Good or Aristotle's Pure Act who 'having nothing to become has nothing to do.' And it is because man is conceived as a person, i.e. not as a mere individual living an isolated life but as someone to whom communication with his fellows is connatural, that the drama of his spiritual history is possible. The doctrine of the Fall is only conceivable if Adam is seen as, in some way, already containing the whole of humanity; i.e. that each individual is a person, a part of an organically organized whole; and the same is true of the Redemption: the person of Christ contains the whole.

Moreover, we may note, that the structure of the Redemption is determined by the Trinitarian concept of God who engenders, in His own unity, a plurality of persons. As Laberthonniere said, the dualism conceived by the Greeks between God and the world is radically abolished, 'les êtres son reliés a lui et les uns aux autres, non par un rapport logique, mais par un rapport physique qui, pratiquement, devient un rapport moral'. (Le Realisme Chrétien et l'Idealisme Grec 1904, p. 71). The relationship between God and His creatures is founded on God's Omnipotence – which is itself exercised with freedom and love and demands a free and loving response. On the contrary, when the personal God is substituted by an abstract Ideal, instead of a dynamic relationship of love and freedom, a static necessity (*ananke*) will be affirmed as the only possible relationship between God and the cosmos.

If, therefore, on the one hand, it can easily be seen that any means which render social communication easier and closer are, by nature, means which by relating human beings more intimately with each other, *ipso facto* relate them more intimately with God, on the other hand, it can just as easily be seen that this will happen only on condition that these means be used according to their nature. The conditions of their moral use can be founded on a consideration of their intrinsic nature and not only according to the consequences which might flow from their good or bad use. The means of social communication will be seen to be inauthentically used not only when they are used in particular ways which are judged to have evil consequences (provocations to impurity or spreading of misinformation, etc.) but, in general, when they are not used as a

means which helps the personalization of man i.e. as a means which establishes inter-personal communication conceived as an invitation to a personalized response by the receiver to a personalized expression by the transmitter. It is to be assumed that the fact that the 'production side' of the means of social communication is essentially a task of collaboration, far from destroying 'personalization', on the contrary, allows it to be of even greater value from this point of view, because, as was said above, personalization is a function of the socialization of the individual and collaboration, when successful, helps its realization, rather than hindering it. But love and freedom of expression and response are essential conditions of personalized communication. The criteria for moral judgements can be derived from our ontological considerations.

I feel, however, that it should be emphasized that there are other ways of considering the cinema, radio, TV, the Press than as 'means of social communication', ways which might prove to be, perhaps, theologically even more interesting.

In order to explain why this term was chosen, Father Baragli, S.J. has written that 'better than any other, in fact, it indicates the precise and predominant aspect because of which this complex of facts interests the church; an aspect which can be considered as the point of arrival of a long conceptual development on a matter still fluid, and of a progressive growth of awareness which has only now become total'. Father Baragli then says that the various Secretariats established by the Holy See with competence in sectors of the field were after 'a common term which, while including them all, would designate the most relevant and total aspect – scholastically one would say: the formal reason – which interested Church and Council.'

He says that the terms *techniques de diffusion* and *mass-media* or *mass-communications* were avoided because the first 'imparted to *diffusion* the character of mechanical impersonality' while the second might give rise to the idea that, by nature, these means tended to produce the 'mass-man', i.e. to depersonalize the individual, which is precisely what the Church is concerned to say they should not do when properly used, in spite of what may have been historically taking place. (*Civiltà Cattolica*, 1963, Vol. I, p. 114-118).

This confirms the view outlined above that it is because of their *personalizing* potentiality that the 'Means of Social Communication' have a specific place in the History of Salvation. But I would not agree that the term 'Means of Social Communication' designates the 'total', or even the most 'relevant' aspect which is of interest to the Church in the Cinema,

Radio, T.V., although it would be difficult, (impossible perhaps), to find any blanket term to do this job. Indeed I would question whether there is a common 'formal reason' for all the 'means of social communications' being of interest to the Church, i.e., whether there is this job for a word to do.

It may well be (I think it is) that it is not a common essence which they have in common, but rather a 'family relationship' – not one element in common which defines them, but a system of interconnexions which relates them to each other and makes of them a 'family'. At a certain point, the Decree of the Council itself mentions 'the particular nature of each instrument', and perhaps it would be more fruitful to approach them separately in order to see whether each of them has not a theological significance in itself, which need not be shared by another, and then to see what relationships existed between the different media.

For instance, Prof. Appollonio has tried to distinguish between the cinema and television by characterizing the former as 'narrative by means of images' and the latter as 'communication by means of images'. The late Father Ayffre has attempted to determine the ways in which the cinema can serve as a *locus revelationis* or as a 'theophanic' medium. I have published a long and detailed criticism of Ayffre's thesis in which I tried to show why his proposed distinction between two ways – the 'liturgical' and the 'phenomenological' – in which the cinema could act as a manifestor of God in the creation, doesn't work: neither of the characterizations he gives of the 'liturgical' and the 'phenomenological' styles do justice to the films he quotes as examples of them; but, I suggest, that the films which he justly identifies as 'theophanic' are better characterized as stylized visions of a world in the process of transfiguration.

But, whatever the interest of this particular debate, I think that the cinema might well be judged to have a more specific relevance, in itself, to the Church than is indicated when it is merely treated as a 'means of social communication.' If one looked at it from another point of view, let us say as an 'art-form', it might be discovered to have a religious significance, in addition to that which it has as a possibly 'personalizing' factor. In order to show this, however, it would be necessary to go deep into the theology of art – a task which falls quite outside the scope of this brief paper.

It is, however, a task which I strongly feel should be attempted. I expect it to be more fruitful, as an approach, to study, say, the cinema in itself, and then in relation to T.V., before attempting to generalize. I expect more development to come out of a consideration of the cinema as

an art-form than as a means of social communication. Considered as the latter, I think the essence of the matter has been said from the theological point of view. But I think that questions such as: how is the religious cinema related to religious painting, – making use of the distinction (if there is one) between religious and liturgical painting, and others on those lines, might well yield considerations of not a little theological interest.

P. SERRACINO INGLOTT

CASUS MORALIS

DE QUIBUSDAM ACTIBUS ILLICITIS IN MATRIMONIO

MACARIUS et Carolina antequam matrimonium contrahant, intendunt, matrimonio durante, juribus matrimonialibus uti tempore agenesiaco. Nihilominus Carolina ob rationes hygienicas, post coitum, lotionem vaginae facit. Omnibus praedictis mediis nonobstantibus Carolina concipit. Ut deinceps novam conceptionem evadent coniuges ad amplexum reservatum recurrere intendunt.

QUAERITUR

- I. Estne tale matrimonium validum?
- II. Estne usus matrimonii tempore agenesiaco peractus licitus?
- III. Quid de lotionem post coitum facta dicendum?
- IV. Quid de ultima intentione coniugum sentiendum?

SOLUTIO

AD I. Pius Papa XII in allocutione die 29 Octobris 1951 ad 'Unione Cattolica Italiana delle Ostetriche' habita dixit: 'Se già nella conclusione del matrimonio almeno uno dei coniugi avesse avuto l'intenzione di restringere ai tempi di sterilità lo stesso *diritto* matrimoniale, e non soltanto il suo *uso*, in modo che negli altri giorni l'altro coniuge non avrebbe neppure il diritto di richiedere l'atto, ciò implicherebbe un difetto essenziale del consenso matrimoniale, che porterebbe con sè la invalidità del matrimonio stesso, perchè il diritto derivante dal contratto matrimoniale è un diritto permanente, ininterrotto, e non intermittente, di ciascuno dei coniugi di fronte all'altro'.¹

In matrimonio valide contrahendo utraque pars libere dat et acceptat jus ad usum corporis quoad actus natura sua aptos ad proles generationem. Hoc jus non tantum exclusivum sed et permanens et ininterruptum esse debet.² Igitur si matrimonii contrahendi tempore aliqua pars limites temporis huic juri ponit, si v.g. ipsa intendit illud jus alteri parti concedere *tantum* tempore agenesiaco, accidit quod haec pars non dat alteri parti verum jus contractus matrimonialis; et quia hoc jus ad essentiam contractus pertinet, matrimonium ita contractum invalidum evadit.

¹ Cfr. *Atti e discorsi di Pio XII*, Ed. Paoline, ed. II, (XIII), 1957, p. 333.

² Can. 1081, § 2.

In casu nostro clare non constat coniuges jus matrimoniale restringere ad tempus sterilitatis tantum, imo potius e contra. Ergo matrimonium non potest retineri invalidum donec saltem per probationem contrarium certo constaret.³ Et Pius XII in supra dicta allocutione adjungit: 'Se invece quella limitazione dell'atto ai giorni di naturale sterilità si riferisce non al diritto stesso, ma solo all'uso del diritto, la validità del matrimonio resta fuori di discussione'.⁴

AD II. Idem laudatus Pontifex in eadem sapienti allocutione supra dicta et de hujus praxis moralitate locutus est. Atq̄ enim: 'La liceità morale di una tale condotta dei coniugi sarebbe da affermare o da negare, secondo che l'intenzione di osservare costantemente quei tempi è basata, oppure no, su motivi morali sufficienti e sicure'. Et postea: '... abbracciare lo stato matrimoniale, usare continuamente la facoltà ad esso propria e in esso solo lecita e, d'altra parte, sottrarsi sempre e deliberatamente, senza un grave motivo, al suo primario dovere, sarebbe un peccare contro il senso stesso della vita coniugale'.⁵

Hoc prae oculis habito, ad supra dicti usus moralitatem quod attinet, auctores distinguere solent casus verae necessitatis et casus in quibus continentiae periodicae usus nulla rationabili causa excusatur. Ad casus verae necessitatis pertinet sic dicta 'indicatio' sive medica, sive hygienica, sive oeconomica, sive socialis. Indicatio haec, ab ipso Pontifice nominata, eximere potest 'da quella prestazione positiva obbligatoria (bonum prolis) anche per lungo tempo, anzi per l'intera durata del matrimonio'.⁶ In aliis casibus in quibus nulla justa causa suppetit, doctores in diversas sententias abeunt circa moralitatem usus matrimonii tempore agenesiaco peracti. Ne eadem quae alibi scripsi repetam⁷ hic, claritatis utilitatisque causa, quaedam principia quae a quodam recenti auctore⁸ referuntur adduco et quidem uti jacent:

1. 'Se il suo uso (continentiae periodicae) comporta per una delle parti la privazione ingiusta dell'atto coniugale, o la pone nel pericolo prossimo di peccare gravemente, essa è gravemente illecita.

³ Can. 1014.

⁴ Cfr. *Atti e discorsi di Pio XII*, l.c., p. 334.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 335.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 335.

⁷ Recole si vis *Casus Moralibus Secundus* in MELITA THEOLOGICA, III, 2, (July-December), 1950, pp. 99-106, quo diversas sententias fuse exposui et explanationem dictae *Indicationis* dedi.

⁸ HEALY E., S.J. — *Medicina e Morale*, ed. ital. riveduta e annotata da R. BORTOLLOTTI, S.J. — Ediz. Paoline, 1958.

2. Se una coppia ha già parecchi bambini (cioè tre o più), essa ha già sostanzialmente assolto al proprio obbligo di provvedere alla propagazione del genere umano. Quindi per essa l'uso di tale continenza sarebbe in se stesso lecito. Ma se essi non hanno alcuna ragionevole causa per il loro desiderio di evitare la nascita di altri bambini, la pratica del ciclo rappresenterebbe di solito un peccato veniale, a causa del motivo non gravemente peccaminoso (per es., egoismo, avarizia).

3. Se una coppia non ha ancora bambini ma intende averne per il futuro, la pratica di detta continenza per essi non sarebbe gravemente illecita...

4. Se una coppia senza figli facesse uso, senza alcun ragionevole motivo, di questa continenza per tutto il periodo della vita coniugale, ciò risulterebbe seriamente illecito. Questa è oggi la comune dottrina dei moralisti, sebbene... pochi... sostengono che... non sarebbe in se stessa gravemente illecita'.

Et dein cl. A. statim adjungit: 'Una delle seguenti ragioni, per tutto il tempo in cui sussiste (anche per l'intero corso della vita coniugale), giustificerebbe due coniugi che praticassero la continenza periodica: (i) se la gravidanza creasse per la madre o pericolo di morte o pericolo di grave danno alla sua salute; (ii) se tutti i figli concepiti da quella madre dovessero nascere probabilmente morti o ereditare un grave difetto; (iii) se si incontrassero gravissime difficoltà da parte dei genitori per poter provvedere a un numero di figli superiore all'attuale. Ragioni meno gravi di queste giustificerebbero la pratica della continenza per un breve tempo'.⁹

AD III. Brevitatis causa juvat et hic quaedam principia generalia ab alio auctore recentiori¹⁰ deprompta referre et quidem iterum uti jacent. Haec sunt:

(a) *Per scopo anticoncezionale o abortivo.* Quando una donna acconsente a compiere l'atto coniugale, le lavande vaginali o uterine, fatte a scopo antifecondativo o abortivo, sono gravemente colpevoli, almeno nell'intenzione.

(b) *In una donna violentata.* La donna *violentata*, nel senso stretto della parola, la quale, cioè, ha dovuto cedere alla violenza, senza minimamente consentire all'atto coniugale, può farsi una lavanda vaginale o farsi fare una lavanda uterina, anche con l'intenzione di impedire la

⁹ HEALY E, o.c., p. 213.

¹⁰ PAQUIN J., S.J. — *Morale e Medicina*, seconda ed. ital. a cura di A.M. DI MARINO, S.J. — Roma, Edizioni Orizzonte Medico, 1962.

concezione, finchè non v'è pericolo di aborto: per questa donna, è questo l'unico mezzo di difendersi da una ingiusta aggressione...

A questo potrebbe assimilarsi il caso di una ragazza, non violentata fisicamente, ma ingannata da chi avesse abusato della sua ingenuità o del suo stato mentale per nasconderle le conseguenze dell'atto.

In pratica, la lavanda della vagina è allora permessa in ogni momento, anche subito dopo lo stupro.*

La lavanda uterina è permessa immediatamente dopo lo stupro e finchè, a giudizio dei ginecologi, non v'è pericolo di aborto... Crediamo che la lavanda uterina possa essere permessa almeno entro le prime ventiquattro ore...

(c) *Per scopo diverso da quello antifecundativo.* La lavanda vaginale allora è permessa dopo un'ora. ...Però, talora, in virtù del principio del doppio effetto (supposto sempre che l'intenzione non sia anticoncezionale), si può permettere la lavanda vaginale, non immediatamente dopo l'atto, ma prima di un'ora, se vi è una causa scusante proporzionalmente grave, come potrebbe essere un'irritazione *molto dolorosa* degli organi: caso di infiammazione pelvica o vaginale. Tuttavia, si noti bene, la sola pulizia non è causa proporzionata.¹¹

AD IV. Imprimis per *amplexum reservatum* intelligimus illam unionem coniugalem sine emissionem seminis ne in loco naturali neque extra, hocque non ex aliqua justa non praevisa ratione, sed ex proposito antea concepto. Aliis verbis amplexus reservatus est actus coniugalis incompletus qui confundendus non est cum actu *interrupto*, peccato Onan in V.T. graviter a Deo prohibito.¹²

Amplexus reservatus, theoretice loquendo, non est ex se illicitus cum intrinsece malus non sit.¹³ *Practice* vero cum actus hic secumferat in viro maximum periculum semen extra effundendi et in uxore orgasmum producendi, *saepissime*, si non habitualiter, graviter illicitus evadit. Et praecise propter hoc periculum S. Off. die 30 Junii 1952 'Monitum' emanavit quo scriptores graviter monet ne amplexum reservatum describant, laudent vel suadeant. Hortatur insuper S. Off. Sacros Pastores ut in his rebus sedulo advigilent et directores spirituales monet ne unquam, sive sponte sive interrogati, ita loqui praesument quasi nihil esset objiciendum ex parte legis christianae contra amplexum reservatum.¹⁴

¹¹ PAQUIN J., o.c., p. 290. Cfr. etiam HEALY E., o.c., p. 200.

¹² Gen. XXXVIII, 9.

¹³ Non desunt tamen auctores qui contrarium sentiunt. Cfr. PERFICE MUNUS, 1961, p. 395.

¹⁴ AAS, 1952, p. 546.

Dixi supra *saepissime*, quia si in aliquo casu particulari periculum de quo supra non haberetur, amplexus reservatus non esset damnandus, modo ambo conjuges consentiant.

Ex dictis sequitur quod intentio coniugum de quibus in casu minime laudanda est. Imo etiamsi periculum de quo supra non adesset, intentio coniugum evadit mala cum habitualis sit circa praxim amplexus reservati. Coniuges enim qui uti volunt juribus matrimonialibus onus quoque habent providendi conservationi generis humani, quod onus, si non in singulis actibus, certo pro tota vita coniugali subsistit. Ab hoc onere rationes et causae proportionate graves tantum excusare possunt.¹⁵

A. TABONE

¹⁵ PAQUIN J., o.c., p. 303.

BOOK REVIEW

XAVIER LEON-DUFOUR, *Les évangiles et l'histoire de Jésus*, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1963, pp. 525.

The problem of the historical Christ has long engaged the attention of scholars. As the Gospels are our only source of information, one is naturally bound to ask: What do the Gospels tell us about Christ? Is their information historically true? The answer to these questions has already been given by such scholars as Lagrange and Grandmaison in their respective works on the Life of Christ. But other scholars as Bultmann and his school, in spite of their good intentions, unduly minimise the results of historical criticism and deny all historical value to the story of Jesus reducing Christ to an object of pure faith.

Are the conclusions of the Bultmann school justified? The majority of protestant critics and all catholic theologians reject them on the grounds of scientific method and faith. But the object of this book is not only a refutation of such erroneous conclusions, but a positive exposition of all the problems which tend to put Christ in his proper historical light. In other words, the writer inquires: Can we through our four Gospels get a true picture of the historical Christ?

The book, therefore, is not an exposition, as the title may seem to suggest, of the life of Christ as narrated in the Gospels, but a discussion of all the problems connected with the main issue, that is, the true character of the historical Christ as portrayed in the Gospels. The task of the historian must be that of a painter who, not content with looking complacently at an old masterpiece, endeavours to clean the picture of all the overlaying coats of dust and other impurities and restore it to its original form. So the author leads us through the intricate and difficult way of historical criticism clearing the way of all encumbrances of wrong theories accumulated by prejudiced or superficial critics and shedding a bright light which helps the reader to get safely at the end of his journey.

As we have said above, this work is not a reconstruction of Christ's life out of the material provided by the Gospels, but a thorough discussion of all the problems which modern historical criticism has raised all along the way of Gospel exegesis. Hence we read of such questions as the canonicity of the four Gospels, the Gospels in the early Church, Jesus and Paul, the Gospels and non-biblical witnesses, the language of the Gospels. To these we add: the authorship of each of the Gospels, Christ and his Church in the first Gospel, the Church of Matthew; the

origin, author and teaching of the Gospel of Mark; Luke the writer and the theologian; the authorship and literary form of the fourth Gospel, its symbolism, John as a witness of the history of Christ; the literary genre of the Gospels, history, apology or speculative theology? the Gospels and pre-synoptic tradition, the synoptic problem, the composition of the Gospels, the source of tradition.

After the discussion of these and many other related questions the writer sets the prolegomena to a history of Christ. After having sifted all the material available for a life of Christ, how are we to work it out into a history of the life of Our Lord Jesus Christ? The author proposes two ways inseparably bound up together and forming both the task of the historian, first, by arranging in a complete synthesis all the material critically verified, secondly, by presenting Christ as apprehended by the first christian community. A full exposition and discussion of the two ways forms the conclusion of the book.

Throughout the whole book the reader feels refreshed by a pleasant atmosphere of soundness of criticism, modernity of problems, up-to-date-ness of bibliography, richness of views and new outlooks. Although the writer modestly confesses that the book is not meant for specialists, one feels confident that both the ordinary reader as well as the professional theologian and critic will find the reading of the 500 pages of the book amply rewarding.

P.P. SAYDON