

MELITA THEOLOGICA

Vol. XXIII

1971

Nos. 1 & 2

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH: SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ECCLESIOLOGY¹

It is a commonplace, and to a large extent deserved criticism of much of Catholic ecclesiology, that it has concentrated too much on the Church's institutional structure, and has paid too little attention to its inner, spiritual life. Another way of expressing this criticism (frequently heard from our Orthodox brethren) is that Catholic ecclesiology is too exclusively Christocentric, not sufficiently pneumatological. The typical Catholic treatise on the Church spends most of its time on such questions as the institution of the Church by Christ, his choice and commissioning of the Apostles, the special mission given to Peter, the succession in the episcopacy and the primacy, etc. The Church is presented as the 'Church of Christ', the 'Church of the Incarnate Word', the 'Mystical Body of Christ', perhaps even in some sense the 'continuation' or 'prolongation' of Christ on earth. But the place and role of the Holy Spirit has generally remained somewhat obscure. At best one will find a section in the treatment of the doctrine of the Mystical Body where the Holy Spirit will be called the 'Soul' of this body. But one would have to admit that in the typical Catholic treatise it has not been evident that the existence of the Church is the result of the sending of *two* Divine Persons: *both* the incarnation of the Son *and* the sending of the Holy Spirit. It has not been clear that the coming of the Holy Spirit is constitutive of the Church: that it is precisely the Holy Spirit that makes the human community of the faithful *become* the Body of Christ and the universal sacrament of salvation for mankind.

To tell the truth, all of this was not very evident in the first, preliminary draft of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the

¹Text of lecture given at the Accademia in honour of St. Thomas, April 21, 1971.

Church, either. But some very real progress was made, between the first draft and the final text, towards a more adequate recognition of the pneumatological aspect of ecclesiology. In the Constitution *Lumen Gentium* as it was finally approved we find some very significant statements that make it clear how essential the sending of the Holy Spirit is to the very existence of the Church.

While there are many other passages that deserve comment, I would like to mention just two statements in *Lumen Gentium* that will bear out what I have been saying.

In Chapter I, n. 7, we read: 'In the human nature which He united to Himself, the Son of God redeemed man and transformed him into a new creation by overcoming death through His own death and resurrection. By communicating His Spirit to His brothers, called together from all peoples, Christ made them mystically into His own body.' Note that the gathered disciples, Christ's 'brothers', become 'the body of Christ' only when Christ communicates His Spirit to them. The sending of the Holy Spirit is clearly constitutive of the Church as body of Christ.

Similarly, in Chapter 7, n. 48, we read: 'Christ, having been lifted up from the earth, is drawing all men to Himself. Rising from the dead, He sent His life-giving Spirit upon His disciples, and through this Spirit has established His body, the Church, as the universal sacrament of salvation.' What was before merely a group of disciples, becomes the Church, the efficacious sign of salvation for mankind, by the gift of the Holy Spirit, given by the glorious Lord.

In these two texts we see the decisive importance attributed to the coming of the Holy Spirit for the very existence of the Church as 'body of Christ' and 'sacrament of salvation for the world'. The Constitution by no means ignores the work of Christ in choosing, preparing and sending His Apostles. But all of this is preparatory to the crowning act of the risen Christ who, now Himself become a 'life-giving Spirit' (1 Cor 15, 45) sends His own Spirit upon his disciples. One cannot help thinking of the analogy with the Genesis account of the creation of man: 'Yahweh God fashioned man of dust from the soil. Then he breathed into his nostrils a breath of life, and thus man became a living being.' (Gen 2, 7). Perhaps St. John had this parallel in mind when he described the act of the risen Christ giving the Holy Spirit to His disciples on Easter Sunday: 'He said to them: Peace be with you. As the Father sent me, so I am sending you. After saying this he breathed on them and said: Receive the Holy Spirit' (Jo 20, 21-22). In any case, we see in *Acts II* the extraordinary transformation which the coming of the

Holy Spirit at Pentecost worked on the group of the one hundred and twenty disciples. It would perhaps not be too far-fetched to see a parallel here to the vision of Ezechiel: of the field of dry bones which became a living army at hearing the word of the Lord (Ezech 37, 1-10).

It is not surprising that the Fathers of the Church, seeking to express the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church, described the Spirit as the 'soul of the body of Christ'. When, following the lead of St. Augustine, we speak of the Holy Spirit as the 'soul of the Church', we have to keep in mind that this is an analogy; hence we must be careful to note the differences as well as the elements of likeness. The role of the Holy Spirit in the Church is like that of the soul in a living body, because the Spirit really is the inner principle of life, unity and vital activity of the body which is the Church. But the Spirit does not enter into a physical union with the Church, to form with it one composite being, as our soul does with our body. Nor is the life-giving activity of the Spirit circumscribed by the visible limits of the Church, as our soul is limited in many of its vital activities by our body. I shall return to this point later on.

For the moment I wish to speak of another analogy by which the Second Vatican Council has tried to express the mysterious relationship between the Holy Spirit and the Church. In *Lumen Gentium* the Council proposes the Incarnate Word Himself as offering such an analogy: that is, the union of the sacred humanity of Christ with the Divine Word is similar to the union of the human community of the Church with the Holy Spirit. 'The Church is one complex reality, comprising both a human and a divine element. For this reason, by an excellent analogy, this reality can be compared to the mystery of the Incarnate Word. Just as the assumed nature inseparably united to the divine Word serves Him as a living instrument of salvation, so, in a similar way, does the social organism of the Church serve Christ's Spirit, who vivifies it, for the building up of His body' (Chapter 1, n. 8).

Here again, of course, we are dealing with an analogy, and must stop to note the differences. The mission of the Divine Word is to an individual human nature, which He assumes into hypostatic union with Himself; hence there is only one person, one subject of attribution of all that the God-Man does. The mission of the Holy Spirit is to a community of persons, who do not lose their own personhood by their union with him. Hence the union of the Church with the Holy Spirit is not a hypostatic union; the Spirit does not 'become the Church' as the Word 'became man'.⁶

Still, keeping in mind these differences, there remains a rich theological content to this analogy between Christ (union of human nature and Divine Word) and the Church (union of human community and Holy Spirit). It suggests that the sending of the Holy Spirit, the mission of the Third Person of the Trinity, is just as essential to the constitution of the Church as the sending of the Divine Son, the mission of the Second Person, was to the constitution of the God-Man. As the assumed humanity is inseparably united to the Word, so the human community of the Church is inseparably united to the Holy Spirit. As the sacred humanity of Christ is the instrument of the Divine Word in his work of our redemption, so the Church is the instrument of the Holy Spirit in communicating the fruits of the redemption to mankind.

Previous documents of the magisterium had invoked the analogy between the Church and the Incarnate Word, to bring out the union of human and divine elements in the Church. But it is extremely significant, I think, that heretofore no statement of the magisterium had presented this analogy as *Lumen Gentium* does: that is, by comparing the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church to the role of the Divine Word in the God-Man. This surely marks a breakthrough in the direction of a more thoroughly pneumatological ecclesiology: one that recognizes the decisive importance of the sending of the Holy Spirit for the very constitution of the Church as Body of Christ and universal sacrament of salvation.

There are many implications of this new development for our ecclesiology. Given the impossibility of considering all of them in one lecture, I shall choose one which I think particularly interesting and important today: it is this. The recognition of the decisive role of the Holy Spirit in the very constitution of the Church means also giving full value to the 'charismatic' element in the Church's structure and life.

Giving full value to the 'charismatic' in the Church is a consequence of recognizing that the Holy Spirit, while the pre-eminent gift of the Risen Christ to His Church, never becomes the possession of the Church; never becomes a kind of power over which the Church has control; never is a kind of tool which the Church can manipulate at its will. No, the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person, with all the absolute and sovereign freedom of God with regard to his creatures. He is, as we confess in the Creed: 'the Lord and Giver of life.'

This sovereign freedom, this Lordship, of the Holy Spirit means that while He is faithful to the covenant with the Church into which He has

freely entered, and hence works his divine effects through and with the appointed ministers of the Church and her sacraments — still He is not bound or limited to these official, hierarchical channels in his direction of the life of the Church. As Vatican II teaches us in *Lumen Gentium*: 'It is not only through the sacraments and Church ministries that the same Holy Spirit sanctifies and leads the People of God and enriches it with virtues. Allotting His gifts "to everyone according as he will", He distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts He makes them fit and ready to undertake the various tasks or offices advantageous for the renewal and upbuilding of the Church, according to the words of the Apostle: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit." These charismatic gifts, whether they be the most outstanding or the more simple and widely diffused, are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation, for they are exceedingly suitable and useful for the needs of the Church.' (Chapter 2, n. 12).

I would like to point out just a couple of things in this text. The first is: the Council uses the present tense: the Holy Spirit *distributes* His gifts, He *makes* people fit and ready, his gifts *are* to be received with thanksgiving. In other words, the charismatic is not just a phase in the early history of the Church, a curious relic of antiquity, that disappeared when the hierarchical structure got well enough established to take things completely in hand. No, the Church, always, in every age, has a charismatic as well as a hierarchical structure, because the Holy Spirit is always sovereignly free. He can never be tied down with red tape or forced to follow official channels. St. Paul insists on this freedom of the Spirit: after enumerating various gifts of the Spirit, he concludes: 'All these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually *as he wills*.' (I Cor 12, 11).

The second point I would like to make is that when the Council speaks of charismatic gifts it does not mean just the extraordinary phenomena that we meet sometimes in the lives of the saints. No, it speaks also of charisms that are 'ordinary, simple, rather widely diffused'. And it states that such gifts are to be found among the faithful of every rank. The Holy Spirit is Lord of his gifts; he is free to give them to whomever he chooses.

My third point is that the hierarchical ministry itself, to be truly effective, depends not only on the sacramental grace of orders, but on the charismatic grace of vocation to the service of God's people. History tells us only too clearly what a sorry state the Church has gotten

into when many men were ordained priests and consecrated bishops who did not have the interior, charismatic gift of a genuine vocation to serve the Church in this state. What we call a 'vocation', to the priesthood or the religious life, is I think a good example of a genuine charisma in the original Pauline sense. But such vocations to priesthood or religious life are not the only examples of truly charismatic gifts. The Holy Spirit is at work everywhere in the Church, stirring up men and women to all kinds of works of charity, of service, giving to each the grace that equips him or her for the work the Spirit wants to be done. All of this is an essential part of the Church's life, and an abiding proof that the Holy Spirit is at work in Her, exercising his sovereign freedom to give his gifts to whom he chooses.

This same freedom of the Spirit means also that He is not circumscribed by the visible limits of the Church in his distribution of grace to mankind. The Risen Christ is Lord of the whole cosmos; his gracious reign extends over the whole of mankind, and wherever the grace of Christ is operative, there also His Spirit is at work. This is particularly true, of course, of the effective presence of the Holy Spirit in the Churches and ecclesial communities of our separated Christian brethren. Vatican II in its *Decree on Ecumenism* teaches that the Holy Spirit is not only present in individual Christians, but He makes use of their Churches and communities as means of grace and salvation for their members. (Chapter 1, n. 3). The Spirit likewise gives his charismatic gifts to members of these Churches, giving to some even the grace of martyrdom (*Lumen Gentium* n. 15). We can no longer think of the presence of charismatic gifts as a 'mark of the one true Church', which the exigencies of apologetics would require us to deny to other churches. Indeed, there is no reason to deny that the Holy Spirit grants charismatic gifts to non-Christians as well, since He is present wherever the grace of Christ is given. But this question would require separate treatment, and we shall not develop it here. What I would like to discuss, as the third and final point of this lecture, is this question: which has perhaps already occurred to many of you:

Would not this emphasis on the pneumatological aspect of the Church, and especially this emphasis on the freedom of the Spirit and hence on the charismatic element in the Church, involve some danger of bypassing or rejecting the 'institutional Church' in favor of a purely spiritual, charismatic fellowship? Or, to put the question another way, isn't there a danger here of going from a one-sidedly Christocentric ecclesiology to an equally one-sided pneumatocentric one?

It seems to me that the solution to this question lies in recognizing and then applying all that is contained in the truth that the Holy Spirit, as given to the Church and guiding its life, is the Spirit of Christ. This term, in fact, occurs with great frequency in the documents of Vatican II, where it speaks of the Holy Spirit. You may have noticed that it appears in pronomial form in the two passages we quoted earlier: 'By communicating *His Spirit* to his brethren, Christ made them mystically into His own body' (LG 7), and 'Christ, rising from the dead, sent *His life-giving Spirit* upon his disciples, and through this Spirit established His body the Church as the universal sacrament of salvation. (LG 48). Examples could easily be multiplied. What does this mean? And why is it important?

First of all, there is no question but that when these texts speak of the 'Spirit of Christ', or 'His Spirit', they refer to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. But they refer to the Holy Spirit precisely as the gift of the Risen Christ to his Church. What are the grounds for calling the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ? There are two reasons for this. The first is that Christ, the 'Anointed', at the very first moment of his human existence, received in his soul the very fulness of the Holy Spirit. And secondly, by the paschal mystery of his death, resurrection and glorification, Christ received the power to communicate this fulness of the Holy Spirit to his brethren. As St. Peter told his hearers on the first Pentecost, 'This Jesus God raised up: being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear' (Acts 2, 33). It is the risen, glorious Christ who now shares with his disciples the fruit of his victory; and the crowning fruit, the gift which contains all other gifts, is none other than the Holy Spirit. But it is Christ's own Spirit, it is of his fulness that we have all received. (Jo 1, 16).

In his discourse at the Last Supper, Christ told his disciples about this new Paraclete whom he was going to send them from the Father. He told them that it was expedient for them that he himself should leave them, because if he didn't leave them, this 'other Paraclete' could not come to them. He told them, too, what the role of the Paraclete would be: 'He will take of what is mine and declare it to you', 'He will call to your mind all that I have taught you'.² In other words,

²Cf. Jo 16, 7-14; 14, 26.

the coming Paraclete is not going to inaugurate a new economy of salvation, different from the work of Christ, No, rather, it is evident that His role will be completely homogeneous with the work of Christ; he will come to give life to the structure that Christ has established, to bring to fruition the seed that Christ has planted.

From all this it is evident that there can be no question of having to choose between a Church of Christ and a Church of the Holy Spirit: between an institutional Church and a charismatic Church, between a Christocentric ecclesiology and a pneumatocentric ecclesiology. If the Holy Spirit is indeed the gift of the risen Christ to his Church, if He is indeed Christ's own Spirit, then it can only redound to the glory of Christ if, in our ecclesiology and in our life in the Church we give to the Holy Spirit, and to his free, charismatic interventions, the attention which they rightly deserve, but have so often failed to receive.

At the same time it is equally true that no movement or tendency in the Church can be truly inspired by the Holy Spirit or be genuinely charismatic if it does not lead to greater devotion to Christ and contribute to the upbuilding of his body which is the Church. The Holy Spirit does inspire legitimate criticism of what is amiss in the Church, because such criticism is often needed to spur the Church to undertake reform. But we can be sure that it will never be the Holy Spirit that will lead anyone to abandon the 'institutional Church' and go seeking for a purely spiritual fellowship. The institutional Church will always be Christ's Church, and hence will always be the temple where Christ's spirit dwells. Not, to be sure, as a possession over which the Church can claim or exercise control. But as the 'Lord and giver of life', for whose grace and inspiration the Church must constantly pray, and whose direction the Church must constantly seek more closely to follow.

FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S.J.

ON THE FREUDIAN EQUATION OF RELIGIOUS RITUAL WITH COLLECTIVE INFANTILISM

FREUD'S writings on Religion centre on two themes. The first is the genesis of religious belief which is explained at the level of the individual in terms of the theory of wish fulfilment. The second is religious ritual which is explained at the social level as an expression of collective infantilism. The aim of this article, is to examine only this second theme, although it is dependent upon the first.

In *The Future of an Illusion* (1907), Freud noted four points of resemblance between religious ritual and neurotic behaviour. It would no doubt have been more exact, at least at this initial stage, to have said 'some forms of religious ritual' rather than to have assumed that the resemblance to neurotic behaviour is to be found in all.¹ At any rate, Freud noted in both neurotic behaviour and religious ritual the following four features:

1. a conscience upset by the failure to perform a task;
2. a scrupulousness about detail in the performance of a reparatory action is reported time and time again;
3. an increasing complicatedness as the reparatory action is reported time and time again;
4. a constant fear that the intention of preventing the anticipated punishment underlying the reparatory action be not fulfilled.

This fear explains the second and third features.

¹ 'Almost all of the early psychoanalysts in Freud's circle were Jewish. They were subject to the painful vicissitudes of Jewish life in Central Europe during the first part of the twentieth century. The religion they knew best was the religion of their family inheritance. In large measure their attempt to understand religion analytically reflected their attempt to achieve a heightened measure of self-understanding. Clinical practice also made psychoanalysts aware of personal rituals and delusional systems in their patients' (R.L. Rubenstein, in *The Religious Imagination, a study in Psychoanalysis and Jewish Theology*, New York, 1968, p.1). Thus it appears that initially Freud's two intimate sources of acquaintance with religious ritual — through himself and his parents — were of a rather special kind in the context of Western Civilisation or from the point of view of orthodox Christianity.

Even if the similarity noted is simply granted without more ado, it could still be interpreted in two very different ways. On the one hand, it could be that religious ritual and neurotic behaviour were not merely analogous, but identical. Obsessive neurosis, could then be called a 'private religion' and religion a 'public obsessive neurosis'. But precisely this difference between the *private* nature of the one and the *public* nature of the other made Freud hesitate at this stage to conclude at once that this was the right interpretation. An alternative interpretation could also be entertained. Perhaps obsessive neurosis was a tragi-comic caricature of religion. It could be what happens when religion is degraded. It could be the corruption and parody of true religion.

If the first interpretation was the correct one, a common source would be found for what happens at the individual level in obsessive neurosis and what happens at the collective level in religious ritual. The roots of religion, like those of individual neurosis, would then lie in the phenomenon of the failure to grow psychologically. Religious ritual would be infantilism of a collective kind, since for Freud, neurosis is due to the fixation of the neurotic's psychological state at a stage normally characteristic of an earlier phase of human development.²

Man is always, according to Freud, a feeble creature in a tough universe and, hence, a prey to fear. But fear can be of three kinds: *natural*, in the face of actual threats to his existence; *conscientious*, as a result of real misdeeds which lay him open to the threat of punishment; and *neurotic*, created by the gap between the infinite desires inbuilt in his nature and the actual achievements of his finite self. Because of this gap, man can never be perfectly happy. But the adult, normal man, unlike the child, or the neurotic, knows that he will not attain happiness by seeking to fulfill his actually unrealised desire in the fictitious or imaginative mode to which children and neurotics turn. The neurotic is the adult who does not grow out of the childish compensations for un-

²The phase of development most likely to result in a fixation which will express itself in a 'religious' form is the Oedipal crisis – the son's ambivalent attitude towards his father, moving from the desire of violently displacing the father in his relation with the son's earliest love-object, the mother, to identification with the father as the normal way of bringing the initial sense of rivalry to an end. (Cfr. *Totem and Taboo*, trans. from James Strachey, 1962 ed. p. 146ff).

fulfilled desire sought through imagined experience into the adult acceptance of the real limitations of the self.

Can it be that what is true of the human individual is also true of the human group? Can it be that when a human group fails to accomplish its collective desires, it is then prone to behave collectively like the individual neurotic? Can it be that what happens in such a case is a reversal to a more primitive state of mind of which religious ritual is the obsessive expression? Is religion at the collective level born out of social failure and the re-animation of the group's early history or of fixation at a primary level of its socio-psychological development?

The observed similarities between the behaviour of children and of neurotics had been Freud's starting-point in the production of his theory of neurosis as infantile fixation. Could the examination of apparent similarities between the behaviour of a third type of human being, primitive man, and that of the other two, children and neurotics, provide a proof of the correctness of the identification of religious ritual and obsessive behaviour and of the hypothesis that the first was a social expression of the same phenomenon of neurosis of which the second was simply the individual form?

From 1907 to 1939, Freud tried to map out a way, amid the maze of writings on the subject of primitive man which ethnologists had produced in our century, in order to find an explanation for the similarity between the child and the neurotic on the one hand and 'primitive man' on the other. The book *Totem and Taboo* (1913) was the first major product of this Freudian enterprise.

There are three issues to be now discussed. *In the first place*, Freud takes contemporary 'savages' as a sufficiently close approximation to 'primitive man' for knowledge about the former to serve as a substitute for knowledge about the latter. *Secondly*, working on that knowledge, he describes a form of totemic religion as the basic form of all religion. *Thirdly*, he outlines a history of the development of other world-views out of that basic form and concludes that the stages of the psychological history of mankind parallel those of the psychological growth of individual man. These three issues have to be discussed in turn. Then a final suggestion will be made about what it is possible to salvage out of the Freudian enterprise that can be considered as, in fact, having positive value today.

1. Freud supposes that there is an analogy between the psychological development of an individual man and of mankind as a col-

lectivity. It is of course well-known that there is an analogy between the stages gone through in the formation of the human body of each individual man in his mother's womb and the stages of the evolution of living beings towards the emergence of the first man. Is there something similar in mental development? Is there a kind of recapitulation of the phases of psychological development which mankind as a whole went through in the individual history of each human individual? If there is then it would explain why there are similarities between the mentality of children and the mentality of primitive humanity, and (since neurosis is interpreted as retardation) of both to that of the neurotic. The first supposition is therefore that man is microcosm.

Existing knowledge of primitive man is, however, necessarily scanty, if by 'primitive man' is meant solely the kind of man who lived in the earliest stages of the existence of humanity. The total of this knowledge is far from being adequate to support any hypothesis whatever as to his mental life on the scale required to parallel the knowledge already acquired of the mentality of children and of neurotics. Hence a second supposition was necessary. It must be assumed that 'there are men still living who... stand very near to primitive man... and whom we regard as his... representatives'. Such men would be the savages or half-savages whose ways of life ethnologists were describing before they disappeared altogether from the face of the earth (as will probably soon be the case).

Freud himself was aware of the impossibility of purely and simply identifying the present day savage with mankind's first ancestors. After alluding to the difficulties in obtaining trustworthy accounts of the contemporary savages themselves and the additional problems arising from the fact that the interpreter of the data is not their collector, Freud notes:

'It would not be forgotten that primitive races are not young races but are in fact as old as the civilised races. There is no reason to suppose that for the benefit of our information they have retained their original institutions undeveloped and undistorted. On the contrary, it is certain that there have been profound changes in every direction among primitive races so that it is never possible to decide without hesitation how far their present day opinions and conditions preserve their primeval past in a petrified form and how far they are distortions and modifications of it. Hence arise the all-too-frequent disputes among the authorities as to which characteristics of a primitive civilisation are to

be regarded as primary and as to which are later and secondary developments. The determination of the original state of affairs thus invariably remains a matter of construction'.

Freud here still assumes that there is a core of primary material the separation of which from later accretions and the restoration of which to its original shape is feasible although it will be controversial. But what if the contemporary savage is not at all like our primitive ancestors? Margaret Mead for instance has proposed a very ingenious hypothesis that a *biological* bifurcation or rather multifurcation may have occurred which in fact was the explanation why some human groups developed in ways quite different from others and which handicapped their acquisition of the characteristic marks of civilisation. The assumption that the contemporary savage is very like our ancestors is not as plausible to us today as it may have appeared to Freud in his time.

Freud, like Levy-Bruhl and the early Piaget, assumed that savages differed in a very important way from civilised man because it was possible to collect from them many more manifestations of what is today often called 'primary process thinking' and which Levy-Bruhl had called prelogical thinking. Correspondingly they provided fewer manifestations of what we consider as scientifically valid or logical thinking.

Ethnological observations have made it today clear that (as Boas was the first to emphasize in his *The Mind of Primitive Man*) there is nothing that can be called *the* 'primitive mentality'. There are many different kinds of primitive peoples, with very different mentalities. *Many*, but by no means all, of them make more use of 'primary process thinking' than so-called civilised peoples. This form of thought which we associate with dreams, art and neurosis does seem to be related with the struggles of the young child to come to grips with the real world in which his father looms over him as a towering giant in strength and power. It does *not* seem to be connected in the same way with those human groups who have remained in a state of technological inferiority in relation to the West and more generally uncivilised. As Margaret Mead states it, the contemporary view, which the increased ethnological data accumulated since Freud's day justifies, is that 'all modern *Homo Sapiens* carry within them the same potentialities to behave as savages, as early hunters, as agriculturalists, as men of the atomic age'. Ethnology cannot be said to provide adequate evidence to make the assumption that the savages of today or of Freud's day were

in general more like our primitive ancestors than the civilised are, but rather the contrary.

Even more radically the implausibility of the assumption is grounded in the loss of belief in the general association of those ways of thought which constituted the similarities between the savage and the child and the neurotic, with only primitive peoples. The proneness of some of these culturally undeveloped human groups to primary process thought forms is not rooted in their cultural underdevelopment. This is clear from the fact that the two are not generally but only frequently concomitant and that in certain situations culturally developed peoples manifest a similar proneness (e.g. Hitlerian Germany).

Without the possibility of assimilating the savages of recent times about whom, despite the all questions which can be raised about the certainty of the existing information about them, there is yet a sufficiently extensive knowledge, to the early ancestors of civilised men, the possibility of establishing the hypothesis of man as a psychological microcosm fades considerably. The gap between contemporary man, whether civilised or savage and his first ancestors appears to be impossible. Freud claimed to have discovered a method of recovering for consciousness the experiences of childhood lost to memory by the techniques of psychoanalysis. He obtained results which make his claims plausible from his clinical experience. Later investigation had modified but not radically contradicted them. There has yet not been discovered any similar way of coming to know on the basis of empirical evidence the experiences of our earliest ancestors once the possibility of assimilating contemporary savages to them is eliminated.

2. On the basis of the data accepted as a result of the assimilation, however qualified, of the modern 'savage' to man's first ancestors, Freud proceeds to depict Totemism as the original form of religion and the matrix of all subsequent forms.

In the first part of *Totem and Taboo*, he gives an account of all the then current theories of Totemism. Then he surveys the functioning of Taboos (of the dead, the enemy, the chiefs and kings). His purpose is to bring out the ambivalence of the taboos with which in turn he seeks to illuminate the ritual of totemism with reference to sexual relations.

All the material used is today of very dubious ethnographic value. Indeed, Margaret Mead has noted 'that Freud had not, if the footnotes give an accurate account, actually read any of the original accounts of primitive ritual behaviour at all. What he read were secondary sources

— the speculations of Atkinson, Darwin, Frazer, Wundt and Lang — in which small bits of ritual behaviour arranged according to the schemes espoused by each author were fitted together in a kind of mosaic.' (*Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 1960).

It is not difficult to see why Totemic religion should have captured Freud's mind. It allows him to postulate at its origin a crime in which the Father was killed by his sons. The distorted memory of this ancestral crime provides a parallel to the repressed memory of the father-hatred during the Oedipus-Crisis phase of childhood experience.³

Freud's grounds for postulating this original crime at the beginning of the religious history of mankind are mainly the *speculations* of Atkinson and Darwin. But, on this uncertain peg, he hangs a long line of ritual developments: first, the 'taboos' which the brothers create among themselves against the killing of each other, against anyone becoming the Father, and against taking the women who had belonged to the Father (mothers and sisters); then, 'totemism' as a ceremonial survival and institutional perpetuation of the emotions surrounding the crime.

³ According to Freud, mankind originally dwelt in primal hordes dominated by tyrannical patriarchs, who possessed exclusive right of sexual access to the females of their hordes, without as yet any prohibition of incest. The young males were forced to seek sexual partners elsewhere or they would be castrated or murdered if they challenged the Father's dominance. Finally, however the sons banded together to become like the father (i.e. have the same sexual rights) which could only be done by getting rid of him. Actually by eating the Father, the sons could simultaneously achieve the opposed aims of identification with and destruction of the Father. A similar deed is committed by all of us in fantasy as a result of our family structure, and like our forbears, according to Freud, we suffer feelings of guilt afterwards. They lacked the courage to assume responsibility for the deed and transformed the figure of the victim in their imagination into the revengeful, omnipotent God who ruled heaven and earth. Henceforth, there was no limit to his imagined power or to the fear he inspired. The cannibalistic parricides condemned themselves and their descendants to the incessant invention of new rituals to whitewash the crime. Although they denied having done the terrible deed, its memory could not be sponged away on two accounts. Guilt demanded the catharsis of confession and the triumph over the father called for celebration. The expression of both took the shape of a communion meal in which an animal (or later a man) substituted the father in an unconscious repetition or re-enactment in disguised form of the original deed. The nucleus of religious ritual appears in this paradoxical amalgam of self-assertion and guilty submission according to Freud.

That is the meaning of the animal which must not be respected, revered and sometimes eaten.

This interpretation of Totemic religion as set up by Freud as the model for the subsequent development of the religious rituals of mankind — including those of Judaeo-Christianity. Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* (1939) is a fragment of a projected great work in which he intended to provide a psychoanalytic interpretation of the whole Bible. It is enough to list some of the theses Freud is led to propound in order to see how strained the attempt is to bring the Bible into line with the Totemic hypothesis. Freud suggests that Moses was not a Jew, but an Egyptian. He was the founder of Monotheism which he adapted from the religion of Athon and Ikheraton. He was murdered. His religion was then fused with that of Yahweh, until the prophets sought to revive it in its original form... Thus, the Biblical 'story' becomes comparable to the myths about the murder of the Father by his children.⁴ The Jews furnish Western Civilisation with a model of self-accusation in which the sense of guilt is fed by the memory of a murder which they tried to hide. Christianity, 'originating in a religion of the Father,' becomes 'a religion of the Son, and could not avoid the elimination of the Father'.

In all this, Freud totally ignores the scientific study of the Biblical texts carried out by modern scholarship. His account of Moses cannot be regarded as anything more than an exercise of the imagination when compared to such studies as those of André Neher (to quote just one scholarly attempt to get a true historical picture of the man and his times). Freud's hypothesis invites, in the light of his own theories, the suspicion that it is itself the product of a conflict in his own unconscious. The denial of the fact that Moses was a Jew by the Jew Freud amounts to a renunciation by him of the Father of his race as a figure of authority. On the other hand, Moses fascinated him, as an aesthetic figure (as emerges, for instance, in Freud's essay on the *Moses of Michelangelo*). Is not this ambivalence an example of the disguised expression of the kind of unconscious conflict Freud so often analysed in others?

If, next, we turn to the assimilation of the Christian Eucharistic meal to the Totemic meal, the flimsiness of the parallelism becomes quickly apparent. In the Christian Mass, it is in the first place not the flesh

⁴Freud and other psychoanalysts interpret Circumcision in relation to the castration-complex. But it is not necessary to discuss the question here.

and blood of the *Father* that is eaten. It is the *Son* who is the sacrificial victim. It is not the *Father* who was murdered.

The death in the second place, did not occur by accident, but with the willing consent of both *Father* and *Son*. That is very important. It means that, although the *Mass* is (at least for Catholics) a sacrifice, it is not at all a question of the *guilty party* making an offering in return for pardon. It is *Christ* who offers Himself. There is no question of barter taking place. Nor is it like the Hobbesian idea of the Social Contract in which subjection is offered to a Sovereign in return for the promise of protection. The *Mass* is the sacrifice of the *Son* to the *Father*, not a human initiative. It is therefore, in the third place, *not* lived by the Christian with a consciousness of doubt about the validity of the act or with a continuing mistrust about the definitiveness of the pardon. The totality of the pardon is signified by the filial adoption by God of all men. For the Christian, there is no question of the *repetition* of a 'pact' of pardon. It took place *once for all*. The totality of the liberation is signified by the signs used in the rite of renewal (which is *not* repetition). God has made Himself into our food. We can devour the All.

The definitiveness of the redemptive act is rooted in the fact that the event which Christians believe they share in through the Eucharistic meal is a *historic* occurrence. The belief that time is not a repetitive, cyclical movement, but a progress from stage to stage (each a novel condition for mankind) towards a happy consummation, makes the vital difference. The historicity of reference of the Eucharistic meal implies not only that it is not enacted as the projection or objectivisation of mere desire, since it recalls an event which actually took place, but also that it constitutes a vital difference between the Christian concept of religious ritual with its grounding in a once-for-all event and the type of ritual represented by the Totemic Meal with its inbuilt need for repetition and re-inforcement.

This difference, in turn, founds the difference between the behaviour of the neurotic and of the religious rites of the Christian. The obsessive neurotic does not rid himself of his anguish except for the duration of the 'ritual' act, at most and at best. If he stops doing them, anguish takes over again. In the *Mass*, on the other hand, the ritual ends and there is a return to daily life. That is the meaning of the *Ite, Missa Est*. The Rite is a punctuation mark, not a completely filled out sentence. It is a part, not the whole, of life.

At the same time, this conclusion enables us to see why it is true that religious ritual can easily degenerate into obsessive behaviour. If

one seeks to prolong it as much as possible, if one gets locked up in it, if one stays glued in the moments of celebration and forgets the need of action and of the return to involvement in daily life affairs, it is a sign of both psychological immaturity and unchristian faith. It appears, therefore, that one should distinguish between different forms of religious ritual. There are those which manifest the noted similarities to the behaviour of children and neurotics and others which do not. This is the point to which we shall return in conclusion. It constitutes perhaps the really positive contribution to the understanding of and to discrimination about religious ritual.⁵

3. In Chap. III of *Totem and Taboo*, Freud sketched in (relying heavily on Robertson Smith) a history of the development of the collective spiritual history of mankind in order to bring out a parallelism with the development of the individual personality. In *Totemism* he had seen the matrix and model of all religious forms. Freud then sought to establish a connection between the three phases that he pictures mankind as having grown through in its history and three psychological phases discovered in psychoanalysis:

- (i) *animism* corresponding to *narcissism* (the omnipotence the self);
- (ii) *religion* corresponding to the phase in psychological growth when inner feelings are *transferred* on to outside objects (the omnipotence of God);
- (iii) *science* corresponding to the *reality-principle* (the renunciation to the concept of omnipotence with the realisation that it is a screen between the self and reality).

Freud himself was fully aware that no historical proof was available to support this construction. At one point he remarks in a footnote: 'The lack of precision in what I have written above, its *abbreviation of the time-factor* and its compression of the whole subject matter, may be attributed to the reserve necessitated by the nature of the topic. It would

⁵Bruno Bettelheim and other analysts have suggested a distinction between patriarchal and matriarchal religions and that Freud's theory is applicable only to patriarchal. Freud had confessed that he was unable to give an account of the Mother-Goddess Religions. Subsequent psychoanalysts are agreed that he underestimated the rôle of the Mother in his studies of the family. However, the criticism of this paper leads to a different and more radical kind of distinction.

be foolish to aim at exactitude in such questions as it would be unfair to insist upon certainty.' (p.142)

Nonetheless, the hypothesis must at least not run counter to known facts and be consistent in order to merit being seriously entertained. But the connexion of animism with narcissism (the first stage of development) in particular satisfies neither of those two minimal criteria. Ethnologists have provided evidence of pre-animist religion with no transcendent figures. The Freudian hypothesis thus runs counter to the now known facts. Moreover, the correspondence of animism and narcissism is inconsistent in terms of Freud's own account of them. In the narcissitic phase of psychological growth, Freud certainly found an excessive evaluation of the ego, but not the belief that it has the power to effect what it wants. There is no belief in the self's own omnipotence according to Freud himself. On the contrary, Freud presents Animism as implying a belief in a power over nature greater than over the self. The whole of this part of Freud's theory has to be discarded.

The correspondence found by Freud between the second phase of mankind's spiritual history (religion) and that of the Oedipus phase in the individual's works out only if the distinction seen to be necessary above between the different forms of religion is not made. Freud wrote: 'Neurosis replaces, in our age, the cloister where it was the custom for all persons deceived by life or too weak to stand up to it, to retire.' Religious ritual is an extension of the service rendered by the cloister to life. It provides a refuge to many believers from individual neurosis caused by the guilt-complex bequeathed by the infantile revolt against the Father. Anguish is got rid off through religious practices. Faced by the cruel demands of nature and society, some men cannot stand their own weakness and dereliction. They seek refuge in an infantile repression by 'projecting' a God who supplies protection and security.

However, the authentic Christian concept of ritual is not at all that of a means of acquiring 'security.' Rather the Christian rites are invitations to the risky exercise of freedom of choice. They are means not of rejecting or repressing the force of instinct, but of affirming the existence of free-will and of man's conscious mastery over instinctive action itself. Thus, the rite of Marriage is not a means of ensuring a sense of security supplied by some such illusion as that the rite will automatically guarantee the victory of love over the aggressive instinct. It is rather a means which asserts and strengthens the conscious resolve to

work for such a victory in a lifetime of free decision-making. In the rite of Baptism, there is a symbolism of light as well as of water. There is an implication of new understanding and intelligence, as well as of new life. Always, Christian ritual implies this reflexive assumption of the instinctive, so that the forces of nature be utilized in a specifically human and freely chosen way of life. Instinct is denied sovereignty, but not repressed. This Christian intent in ritual action is not to do away with instinct, but to channel, control and transfigure it. It is not a magical securization, but a free commitment to a pattern of decision-making in everyday life.

Why is ritual the adequate means for the expression of this Commitment? Why is an intellectual assertion not enough? I think that two reasons can be given.

True freedom is in creativity, or more precisely in the expression of of the uniqueness of one's personality. If it is true that by Baptism, for instance, I become the son of God, such a fact is best expressed by a sign which shows up the fact that I am a unique individual because I have a unique place in God's plan of creation. Only by that fact does my existence appear to be not a merely accidental result of the chance encounter between my parents. Freud himself showed that the deepest root of filial antagonism towards the Father lies in the son's sense of the apparently incidental character of his birth and consequent existence. The son rebels most because he feels he is not the product of a free decision of his own, but of the instinctive behaviour of his parents. But if I have a unique rôle in God's plan, my existence is *not* incidental. There is a reason for it. There is a rôle in the divine plan which only I can fulfil. I am God's son as well as my father's. It is this rational justification of my existence as an individual that the Baptism ritual supplies.

There is an *aesthetic* dimension precisely whenever a sign approaches to the expression of the uniquely individual. Only an artistic form, with its particularity and concreteness, as opposed to the abstract and universal character of purely intellectual assertion, can approximate to the rendering of the ritual intention. Nothing as much as an aesthetic form can signify the fact that I am a son of God. That is one reason for a ritual rather than a purely intellectual statement of the free resolve that is implicit in the Christian sacraments.

Another is that the problem caused by the accidentality or otherwise of my birth is not got rid off once for all. It keeps being constantly raised by my environment. It calls for constant emotional adjustment. Ritual invests the very signs which generate anguish with a pacifying meaning. This is something very different from the neurotic's repetition and complication of his 'ritual' actions in a state of perpetual uncertainty.

4. It appears therefore that it is necessary to distinguish in Freud's analysis of religious ritual two parts. On the one hand, there is the attempt to reconstruct the history of the spiritual development of mankind from the origin to the present day. Freud's attempt to characterise some forms of human behaviour (animist and religious) as the result of fixation at early stages of development before 'scientific' maturity was attained is unconvincing. The assimilation of contemporary 'savages' with historically primitive men is impossible and the ethnological evidence is contrary to the hypothetical outline of the course of the development formulated by Freud. Moreover the parallelism between the stages of the collective development and those of individual man is extremely faulty. All this part of Freud's construction emerges as erected with very flimsy material. On the other hand, it is possible to distinguish certain forms of religion which manifest the noted similarities to the mentality of children and neurotics from other types of religion which are practiced by peoples who are in no sense manifestly neurotic in the rest of their behaviour or 'primary' in their thought patterns. Such peoples are to be found both among the culturally developed and the culturally under-developed (the civilised and the uncivilised, in other words). It does appear that there are certain forms of religion which recur and which are associated with the nonresolution of the psychological conflicts (especially the Oedipus crisis) which Freud described. Of these the types of totem and taboo religion of the aboriginal Australians or that studied by Bettelheim in *Symbolic Wounds* or Jehovah's Witnesses seem to be examples. But there are forms of religion both ancient and modern which do not in their practice appear to be expressions of these conflicts in however disguised a way and which are markedly dissimilar from the childish or neurotic patterns of thought and action described and explained by Freud.

His analysis applies to other forms which recur and into which there is always the danger of falling. Applied to these forms the Freudian

analysis has a basic validity and can help Christians by acting as a warning to them to save their rites from falling into the corruption which would justify their consideration as essentially similar to neurotic behaviour. For this they can be grateful to Freud.

FR. PETER SERRACINO-INGLOTT

EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA'S VIEWS ON THE CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AND THE TEXTS HE USED IN HIS WORKS

EUSEBIUS of Ceasarea is commonly known for his *Historia Ecclesiastica*; but his literary activity was much wider; it included apologetic and biblical commentaries as well. His place in the history of Biblical interpretation is well assured in many ways.

In this short article, which originally formed part of a larger work, we propose to see what Canon of the Sacred Books he did follow and his views on it together with the Old Testament text he used in his works.

A. THE CANON

1. *The Canon in Eusebius' times*

Eusebius preserves for us the Canon of Josephus Flavius,¹ Melito of Sardis² and Origen.³

The canon of Josephus is extracted from his work *Contra Apionem*;⁴ it represents the Jewish Canon in Palestine in the late first century A.D. Eusebius introduces the list in these words: 'He gives the number of the canonical scriptures ἐνδιαθήκων γραφῶν of the so-called Old Testament and showed as follows which are the undisputed among the Hebrews as belonging to ancient tradition ἀρχαίας παραδόσεως.'⁵ Josephus lists the protocanonical books of the Old Testament. Flavius makes it clear that notwithstanding their antiquity no one dared to add or to detract from them. Other books were written after these but were not included in the canon as there was not a true concession of prophets at the time. These books are considered by the Jews as the decrees of God θεῶν δόγματα and are ready to die for them.⁶

This was the Canon in the first Century A.D. The Jewish Canon in Eusebius's time was that found in the Talmud in the tractate *Baba Bathra*, c. A.D. 100.⁷ It included all the protocanonical books; the deutero-canonical were not mentioned; hence one is not so sure as to their reception at any time into the Jewish Canon.

The canon of Melito of Sardis (c. 170), addressed to Bishop Onesimus is incomplete; it includes all the protocanonical books except Esther. Eusebius records that this list includes only those books which were un-
animously accepted by all τῶν ὁμολογουμένων τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.⁸

This explains why Esther is excluded: 'because the Jews themselves doubted its canonicity'. This canon agrees with the Palestinian canon except for the omission of Esther.⁹

The third list recorded by Eusebius is the one drawn up by Origen; this we believe must have been the one that Eusebius accepted for his own guidance. Origen introduces his list in these words: 'But it should be known that there are twenty two canonical books according to the Hebrews καθ' Ἑβραίους the same as the number of letters in their alphabet'. Origen then enumerates all the protocanonical books, adding to them explicitly the Letter of Jeremiah and the Books of the Maccabees. He omits the Twelve Minor Prophets, but in view of the fact that he himself had written a commentary on the book, one is justified in believing that Origen accepted it in his canon.

In the first centuries the Christians, following in the footsteps of the Apostles, made large use of the LXX version and indeed they believed in its inspiration, thereby indirectly also in the canonicity of the deutero-canonical books, which were included in it without exception.¹⁰ In the early fourth century there were still doubts, but we note that no one of the Fathers ever denied explicitly the canonicity of the deutero-canonical books.¹¹

Athanasius, contemporary of Eusebius, in Alexandria admits all the protocanonical books; he omits Esther, but accepts the Epistle of Jeremiah and Baruch. Then he adds other non-canonical οὐ κανονιζομένα books but composed by the Fathers to be read to those who would approach the faith, that is: *Wisdom, Ecclesiastici, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Didache, the Shepherd* (of Hermas).¹² He himself however uses all the deutero-canonical books.

Evidence in E's own work shows that *Irenaeus* quotes from the wisdom of Solomon as Holy Scripture¹³ and with regard to Clement of Alexandria he writes: 'and in them (Stromata) he has also made use of testimonies from the disputed ἀντιλεγόμενων writings, the book known as the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach*¹⁴ *Dionysius of Alexandria* quotes Tobit in the presence of the persecutors.¹⁵ In a letter to Africanus Origen defends the canonicity of the story of Susanna in the Book of Daniel; Africanus writes to him reporting that some denied or rather doubted its divine origin.¹⁶

This was the position with respect to the Canon in the times of Eusebius: no doubt whatever with regard to the protocanonical books, except perhaps for some wavering with respect to the book of Esther; and doubts with respect to the deutero-canonicals; in actual fact how-

ever they were used and included in the copies of the LXX version.¹⁷

2. Eusebius' View on the Canon

In recording the lists as drawn by others, E. does not pass any judgement on any one of them; hence it is difficult to state clearly what his view really was. Undoubtedly he accepted the canonicity of the proto-canonical books; with respect to the others it must be borne in mind that he used the LXX version as reviewed by Origen in the Hexaplaris; moreover he made use of them in his works although sparingly. We shall take them one by one. *Tobit*, *Judith* and *Esther* are never quoted. *Tobit* is quoted in a citation from Dionysius of Alexandria;¹⁸ *Esther* is inserted in the list of Origen, besides being one of the protocanonical books.¹⁹

Wisdom, *Sapientia*, is quoted, though never under this title, 15 times in PE; once in CM; four times in ETH and thrice in CP. Two texts, Sap 1, 13; 2, 24 are introduced as δόγμα δὲ Ἑβραίων²⁰ Sap 6, 22; 7, 22-26; 8, 1 are quoted together with Prov 8, 22-31: the first text is introduced by these words: ταῦτα Σολομῶν παροιμιῶν καὶ ταῦτα δε ἐξ αὐτοῦ λέγεται τοῦ προσάπτου.²¹ Then E. concludes that the Verbum λογός is presented in various ways in the divine Scriptures ἡ θεία γραφή;²² other texts are introduced preceded by the formula: τάδε λέγεται.²³ In PE I, 1, 4 wisdom is just a reminiscence;²⁵ then concludes²⁶ Sap 13, 5 is cited without any special formula together with Isaiah 40, 26;²⁷ so also Sap 7, 17-21.²⁸ Sap 14, 2 and Sap 14, 12 are introduced by κατὰ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν θεῖον λόγιον τὸ Φασκων²⁹ and καὶ τόδε καλῶς παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνῆρησθαι respectively.³⁰ This hints at the controversies about the authority of this book outside Christian circles. *Wisdom* is quoted against Marcellus, a remarkable fact in view of the controversy. Sap 7, 26 is cited 4 times in CM, once³¹ in conjunction with Gen 5, 3 and three Pauline texts introduced thus: καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις δὲ εἴρηται thrice in ETH: twice without any special formula in combination with Jh 1, 3; Col. 1, 16; 1, 15.³² In ETH Sap 7, 26 is introduced thus: λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου.³³ It is cited in CP three times: Sap 13, 5 twice in combination with or through Rom 1, 20;³⁴ Sap 7, 26 in together with Heb 1, 3.³⁵ The context within which these texts are used shows that Eusebius was considering this book as one of the divine Sacred Scriptures, and the introductory formulas indicate that the book was considered by him as of divine inspiration. We may add here that the book is never referred to by its proper title; the only time that one meets this title is when Eusebius records that Clement of Alexandria

quoted it as well as the other books.³⁶

Ecclesiastici or Ben Sirach is quoted in ETh and PE, without its proper ordinary title; it is mentioned again with reference to Clement of Alexandria who used it.³⁷ It is cited four times in PE in extracts from Clement of Alexandria³⁸ and once in his own text Eccli 11, 28³⁹ in combination with Prov 10, 7. Plato would be an interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures. Eccli 3, 21, 22 is quoted in ETh I, 12⁴⁰ without any special formula; Eccli 3, 20 appears in CP introduced by τὸ Φάσχον λόγιον⁴¹ and τὸ γὰρ.⁴² These last formulae are used by Eusebius to introduce canonical books. In spite of the spare use of this book, the few citations point to Eusebius' belief in its canonicity.

Baruch is quoted in HE, ETh, DE and PE. Bar 3, 24.25 is cited in the Panegyric at Tyre, together with other biblical texts from Old and New Testament;⁴³ Bar 3, 29-38 is one of the extracts in EP under the lemma ἀπὸ τοῦ βαρώχ in between an extract from Threni and another one from Ezekiel.⁴⁴ This same extract is found also in DE⁴⁵ under the lemma from Baruch in between an extract from Zechariah and one from Isaiah: this is followed by the statement: ὠδεν ἐπιλέγειν δεῖ ταῖς θείαις φωναῖς ἐναργως τῷ προβλήματι παρισταμέναις.⁴⁶ Bar 3, 38 is quoted under the name of Jeremiah in ETh II, 7.⁴⁷ The *Two Books of the Maccabees* are cited in the commentary on Psalm 78, 4; 10, 78, 4. 10 1 Macc 1, 21.44.57.65 are introduced by the formula: γεγράφται γουν ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον;⁴⁸ 1, 2 Macc 6, 18 is referred to only without an explicit quotation in these terms: ἢ γραφῆ τῶν καλουμένων Μωυσαβαίων.⁴⁹ The evidence is somewhat scanty for any solid conclusion; taken in its context in conjunction with what we read of Origen's view on the matter coupled with the introductory formulae we would say that Eusebius considered these two books as inspired books.

Fragments from Daniel. The Bel fragment is never mentioned; the Susanna story is mentioned in the letter of Africanus to Origen;⁵¹ obviously E. followed Origen. DE VII, 2, 24⁵¹ probably is a reference to Dan 13, 1ff; but it may be to another text; the quotation in PE VI, 11, 17-19⁵² is a quotation from Origen's version according to Theodotion and introduced by the words: ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν . . . αἱ προφητεῖαι Dan 3, 50 is quoted in DE Frag 2 without any formula.⁵³

This survey leads to this conclusion: Eusebius, following the example of Origen, Clement, and others, considered these books as canonical, but because of the controversies about them and also of the fact that they did not serve him for his set purpose he used them sparingly; Three of them – Tobit, Esther, and Judith – are never used. With res-

pect to Esther, however, at the end of EP I we read: 'This is from the Book of Esdras (that is from 3 Esdras 4, 34-40); there is nothing to the purpose in the Book of Esther'.⁵⁴ This means that Esther was considered by him as canonical. The extract from 3 Esdras is curious; it betrays the wavering of Eusebius on the matter. Athanasius states clearly that they were not canonical, yet he comments upon them.⁵⁵

The order of the Books in EP is that of Origen, with changes suiting his purpose: First the historical books in this order: Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Kings, Paralipomenon, 3 Esdras. After these books the poetical and prophetic ones are taken up⁵⁶ in this order: Psalms, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggi, Zechariah, Malachiah, Jeremiah, Threni, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, Isaiah. This order is similar to that of Origen, with changes suiting the ordering of the oracles; Job follows the Canticle; the Twelve Minor Prophets are at the head of the prophetic oracles, Isaiah at the end of the series in view of his importance.⁵⁷ In the Eclogues there is no attempt for ordering the extracts by subject matter as in DE.

3. *The Criterion of Canonicity*

It is obvious from what we have just said that Eusebius received his Canon from tradition traceable through Christ back to prechristian times to Judaic tradition. If we were to ask what did E. believe about the origin of the Canon, we would never have an adequate answer for lack of substantial evidence. Yet we have some hints which may help us to form an opinion.

In recording the List of the Sacred Books according to Josephus⁵⁸ E. states that the canon was closed, at least provisionally, if not definitely, at the time of Artaxerses because there was no more any prophetic succession. This may mean either that a book to be canonical, that is, to have its inspiration acknowledged by the people, must have been written by a prophet, this fact alone would be sufficient evidence for its authority; or that there was needed a prophet, taking the term in its wide meaning to include any man with special charismatic gifts, to declare its inspiration.

Discussing the criterion for Inspiration above we referred to two important texts which may help us here also to form an opinion on E's views on the matter: EP IV, Pr⁵⁹ and Ps 60, 6. In EP IV he is providing a demonstration for the reliability and divine authority of the sacred books, based on Inspiration. The indications for the divine origin of the books were: the manner of life of the prophets themselves, their

ethical teachings, and the truth of their sayings as proved by later events. These facts led the Jews to preserve their writings and hand them on to posterity. Who were these Jews? One would suppose that they were the official leaders of Israel. Eusebius states that the divine origin of Psalm 60 was discovered by the men gifted with the charism for the discernment of Spirits: David had recited many other ordinary prayers just as we do; this one however was not as the rest; it was divinely inspired and, therefore, it was preserved and inserted in the collection of sacred books by those men who were gifted with the charism of the discernment of the spirits: καὶ θεΐαις βίβλοις ἐγκατέττον οἱ τὸ χάρισμα τῆς διακρισεως τῶν πνευμάτων αἰληφότες.⁶⁰ This is an echo of 1 Cor 12, 10: ἄλλω δὲ διακρισεως πνευμάτων. The psalms after being scattered about for a long time were gathered in the psalter either by Esdras or some other prophet: ὕστερον δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔιτε "Ἐσδραν εἴτε τινὰς ἑτέρως προφήτας περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν ἐσπουδεκεναι, μεθ' ὧν καὶ τὴν βίβλον τῶν ψαλμων ἠγιοκέναι.⁶¹ Therefore E. believes that the Jewish collection or canon of Holy Scriptures was the work of inspired men, who may have been the prophets themselves, the leaders of the nation or Esdras, whom, as we know, both Jewish and Christian tradition held to have been inspired by God to reproduce the Books of the Old Testament after the restoration.⁶² This is not the place to discuss the historical value of this tradition; it suffices to say that this was the view of Eusebius, and most probably of all Fathers at this time.

Whatever was his view as to the actual origin of the canon of the Scriptures Eusebius was inclined, and actually he did, to accept as inspired and canonical only those books handed on down to them by ancient tradition. All of them were found in the LXX version, which E. together with other fathers of the Church starting with Irenaeus believed to be inspired.⁶³ His sparing use of the Deuterocanonical works is explainable by the purpose of his work and also his controversies with the Jews. Moreover in these books there is relatively little material by way of messianic oracles or historical importance, if we were to except the Maccabees, which cover a period in which Eusebius showed himself little interest.

B. THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Eusebius had at his disposal for his works no less than eight texts of the Bible to choose from: the *Hebrew Text*, the *Samaritan*, the *Septuagint*, *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, the *fifth* and the *sixth* ver-

sions. With the exception of the Samaritan all of them were transcribed in parallel columns in the Hexaplaris of Origen. The Samaritan text was limited to the pentateuch⁶⁴ and the *fifth* and *sixth* to the Psalter.⁶⁵ It is important to examine B's opinion of each of them; we leave his use of them for a later chapter.

1. *The Septuagint*

As to the origin of this translation E. accepted the tradition handed down from early times. He records the story of Irenaeus as to the inspiration of the seventy interpreters of the Scriptures in the time of Ptolemy: '... so that even the heathen who were present knew that the Scriptures had been translated by the inspiration of God κατὰ ἐπίπνοιαν.'⁶⁶ In HE Eusebius does not express his view on this story; in Chr I he relates it in his own words to justify his acceptance of its readings rather than those of the Hebrew text;⁶⁷ it is referred to in DE V Pr⁶⁸ and DE VIII. The Greeks, thanks to this translation, could easily read the Hebrew Scriptures.⁶⁹ It was in universal use throughout the Church;⁷⁰ Origen took special care for its restoration and conservation.⁷¹ Eusebius himself did a lot of work to circulate it in the form of Origen's edition, adding his own corrections.⁷²

That Eusebius attributed to it great authority is only to be expected; his assertions in this respect are quite clear. It is remarkable that while he quotes Irenaeus as to the inspiration of the LXX translators, he himself insists on more self evident facts, or what he believed to be, the real ones. The translators produced their texts in one and the same form word for word: σύμφωνας ἀπτας μεταβεβλήκασιν;⁷³ commenting on Is 7, 14, echoing Irenaeus,⁷⁴ E writes: 'In our exemplars of the translation of the 70 men, all of them were Hebrew by birth and trained carefully in the wisdom of their people τῆς πατρίου παιδείας δεδοκιμασμένων we read thus...'⁷⁵ Finally then follows clinching argument: 'the translation was put in the Library of Alexandria and diligently conserved there'.⁷⁶ Hence the translation, considered only from external circumstances of its origin, not to speak of its divine inspiration, has its own recommendation. This is not enough for him, however, he insists also on the fact that it had been used throughout the Church from the beginning: '... and also because it has pleased the Church of Christ to use it',⁷⁷ and 'the more so since the Church of Christ scattered throughout the world sticks to it only; it has been recommended to us by its use by the apostles and the disciples of our saviour.'⁷⁸

Eusebius therefore took the LXX as scientifically the most reliable

and theologically the most authoritative. He used it in the form in which it was edited by Origen in his Hexapla. In EP he mentions the *asterisk* and *obelo* of the Hexaplaris;⁷⁰ 16, 3; the Onomasticon is based on the Hexapla.⁸⁰

The Hexaplaric LXX was used by him not uncritically; Möhle drew the attention to the fact that in CI Eusebius removed all the additions introduced by Origen;⁸¹ neither was he slow to compare the relative value of the LXX when compared with the other texts.⁸²

2. The Hebrew Text

Whether Eusebius knew Hebrew is a moot point; certainly he could read it and understand it with the help of the Aquila translation.⁸³ He refers several times to the true Hebrew readings 'Εβραϊκή λέξις.

The Hebrew text was the work of Esdras who knew the Scripture by heart and was responsible for its restoration after the return from Babylon.⁸⁴ He refers to it in these terms: τὸ 'Εβραϊκόν,⁸⁵ ἡ 'Εβραίων παράστασις ἢ Γραφή,⁸⁶ 'Εβραϊκή λέξις,⁸⁷ ἡ 'Εβραίων Γραφή,⁸⁸ ἡ 'Εβραϊκή ἀνάγνωσις⁸⁹ 'Εβραϊκή Φωνή.⁹⁰ Eusebius charges against the Jews that they had manipulated the text for their own interest with respect to the chronology of ancient times and hence the LXX is to be preferred.⁹¹ Therefore the Hebrew text remains always ancillary to the Greek version:

3. The Samaritan Text

Eusebius makes use of this text only in the Chronicon as a witness of the ancient tradition of the Samaritans with regard to the ancient primitive Chronology; otherwise he does not use it at all.⁹²

The difference between the Hebrew text, the LXX and the Samaritan did not exist before the change of the script: 'The Samaritan text must be considered genuine and primitive (original); not even the heirs of the Jews do attack it. Therefore before the change of the script there was no divergence between them'.⁹³ The LXX is nearer to the Samaritan than to the Hebrew; Hebrew text is erroneous in the series from Adam to Abraham, with the exception of the period from Adam to Jared; the Samaritan is in default only for the period from Adam to the flood; for from the flood to Abraham, it agrees with the LXX series. It is obvious, then, that the Judaic text needs correction.⁹⁴

Eusebius believes that under certain respects the Samaritan is better than the Hebrew; but not superior to the LXX; the latter is the basis of comparison.

4. *Aquila Version*

This translation of the second century was reproduced in the third column of the Hexapla; in view of its servile conformity with the Hebrew text it enjoyed great critical authority amongst the early fathers and the Jews themselves. Aquila was a Jewish proselyte from Pontus; his intention in making this translation was to put before those unable to read the original Hebrew the peculiarities of the latter and thus putting into relief the divergences of the LXX from the Hebrew original.⁹⁵

Eusebius refers to Aquila more than once in HE. First in a quotation from Irenaeus wherein it is stated that Aquila was a Jewish proselyte from Pontus who had translated the Old Testament.⁹⁶ This information is repeated in DE.⁹⁷

Eusebius cites Aquila very frequently in his works though not in all. It is not cited in Chr nor in HE; 168 times in CP, 66 in On, 65 in DE, 27 in CI, and 2 in EP, always second to Symmachus, but more than the latter in DE, where it is engaged in controversy with the Jews. It is already an indication of Eusebius tendency in his work, that is, to be influenced by the particular purpose of a given work. This means that where fidelity to the text, rather than the literary commendation was essential or required, Eusebius went for Aquila.

5. *Symmachus' Version*

This translation was reproduced in the fourth column of the Hexapla. Symmachus published this translation in the last quarter of the second century. He was an Ebionite, therefore, a Christian heretic:⁹⁸ 'As to the translators it should be stated that Symmachus was an Ebionite...' Commentaries of Symmachus are still extant in which he appears to support this heresy by attacking the Gospel of Matthew. St. Jerome praises this translation for its diction based on the sense of the text rather than on the material wording of the Hebrew.⁹⁹

Symmachus is cited several times by E. CP 324 times, On 64, CI 43, DE 42, EP 4. This confirms what we have just said of Aquila: the latter is more frequently used in apologetic works against the Jews, whilst Symmachus in purely exegetical works.

6. *Theodotion's Version*

In the sixth column of the Hexapla Origen inserted the translation of Theodotion, a proselyte from Ephesus.¹⁰⁰ In this translation, also of the late second century, Theodotion attempted to produce a translation nearer to the original than the LXX; indeed it is more a revision of the

latter than a translation properly so called.¹⁰¹

Eusebius uses it to a much lesser extent than he does with the latter: CI 20 times, DE 19, On 10. He describes him as one of the more accurate translators: αὐτὸς τῶν ἐπιμελῶς ἐρμηνευσάντων τυγχάνων.¹⁰² The lesser use is easily explainable; Theodotion's possible help could easily be provided, and in a much better way, by Symmachus.

7. *Anonymous Versions*

In the final column of the Hexapla, Origen edited another two translations which Eusebius describes thus: 'He discovered certain others which had been concealed from remote times – in what out-of-the-way corners I know not – and by his search he brought them to light. Since he did not know the authors, he simply stated that he had found this one in Nicopolis near Actium, and that one in some other place. In the Hexapla of the Psalms, after the four prominent one translations he adds not only a fifth but also a sixth.'¹⁰³

By the nature of the case these translations could not be used but on a relatively small scale; the fifth ones in DE; and 24 in CP; the sixth one thrice in CP. They are termed πέμπτη¹⁰⁴ and ἕκτη ἔκδοσις¹⁰⁵ respectively. They are mostly used to confirm the other translations.

This broad survey shows us that Eusebius makes full use of the textual resources at his disposal; he himself states clearly in a general way the principle at the basis of the way he uses them in DE V, Pr.: 'It is important that one should not overlook that the divine oracles contain marvellous things in the Hebrew tongue and because of their difficult understanding they have been translated into Greek in different ways. But since in time past a number of Hebrew men gathered together translated them in the same manner, to them as turn our mind, and this the more so since it has pleased the Church of Christ to make use of them. Whenever there would be any useful purpose we would not put aside the more recent translations, which even today the Jews like to use: in this way whatever pertains to our demonstration will be strengthened on all sides.'¹⁰⁶ This text confirms the evidence surveyed above: Eusebius is to use the LXX as a basis, the others as confirmation and help for the understanding the text. The Hebrew text is difficult to understand. The individual translations were not used in the same manner or to the same extent in the several works: this depended on the purpose of each individual one. This is confirmed by this table which represent graphically the relative use of each of the texts at his disposal:

WORK	HEBREW	AQUILA	SYMMACHUS	THEODOTON	OTHERS, 5TH & 6TH
Chr	Used	—	—	—	Samaritan
EP	8	2	4	—	—
On	11	66	64	10	—
HE	—	—	—	—	—
PE	—	—	—	—	—
DE	8	65	42	19	5th once
CI	1	27	43	20	—
Eth, CM	4	1	1	1	—
CP	24	168	324	16	5th 24
Theoph	—	—	—	—	6th 3
LC	—	—	—	—	—
VC	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	56+	329	478	66	28+

It is clear from this conspectus that Symmachus is used more in the strictly exegetical works, whilst Aquila in the controversial works with the Jews. In debating with the Greeks he does not use any other version except the LXX. It is enough here to point out the relative importance attached to these several texts by Eusebius and where his inclination lay. It is already a pointer to the fact that in selecting a particular reading he was influenced by the purpose for which he was using the text more than by anything else.

ABBREVIATIONS

- On – *Ōnomasticon*, ed. E. Klostermann, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (GCSE) III, i, Leipzig, 1904.
- Chr – *Chronicon*, ed. J. Karst, GCSE V, Leipzig, 1911.
- HE – *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. E. Schwartz and Th. Mommsen, GCSE II, Leipzig, 1903-1909.
- PE – *Preparatio Evangelica*, ed. K. Mras, GCSE VIII, Leipzig, 1954-56.
- DE – *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. I.A. Heikel, GCSE VI, Leipzig, 1913.
- LC-VC – *Laus Constantini* (LC) and *Vita Constantini* (VC), ed. I.A. Heikel, GCSE I, Leipzig, 1911.
- CM-ETH – *Contra Marcellum* and *Ecclesiastica Theologia* (ETH), ed. E. Klostermann, GCSE IV, Leipzig, 1906.
- TH – *Theophania*, ed. H. Gressmann, GCSE III, ii, Leipzig, 1904.
- EP – *Eclogae Prophetarum*, *Patrologia Graeca* (PG) 22, 1017-1262.
- CH – *Contra Hieroclem*, PG 22, 795-868.
- Can – *Canones*, PG 22, 1275-1292.
- CI – *Commentarium in Isaiam*, PG 24, 77-526.
- CP – *Commentarium in Psalmos*, PG 23 and 24, 9-76.
- CL – *Commentarium in Lucam*, PG 24, 529-606.
- QS – *Quaestiones et Solutiones*, PG 22, 879-1016.
- SP – *De Solemnitate Paschali*, PG 24, 693-706.

¹HE III, 10, 2-5; GCSE II, i, 222, 24-224, 15.

²HE IV, 26, 13-14; GCSE II, i, 386, 20-388, 8.

³HE VI, 25, 1-2; GCSE II, ii, 572, 10-576, 2.

⁴I, 38-42.

⁵HE III, 9, 5; GCSE II, i, 222, 17-21.

⁶HE III, 10, 5; GCSE II, i, 224, 10-15.

⁷P.H. Höpfl, *Introductio generalis in S.S.*, Romae 1950, p. 139.

⁸HE IV, 26, 12; GCSE II, i, 386, 16-19.

⁹A.C. McGiffert, *The Church History of Eusebius*, in *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Vol. I, Michigan 1952, p. 206. P.H. Höpfl, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

¹⁰P.H. Höpfl, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

- ¹¹*Institutiones Biblicae*: Vol. I: *De S.S. in Universum, De Canone*, Romae 1951, pp. 130-131.
- ¹²*Ep. fest.* 39; PG 26, 1176. 1436.
- ¹³HE V, 8, 8; GCSE II, i, 446, 7-13.
- ¹⁴HE VI, 13, 6; GCSE II, ii, 548, 6-9.
- ¹⁵HE VII, 11, 1; GCSE II, ii, 654, 1-6.
- ¹⁶HE VI, 31, 1; GCSE II, ii, 584, 21-586, 2.
- ¹⁷L. Diestel affirms that the information of the Canon was deeply influenced by the theological controversies of the second and third centuries against the Gnostics and the Montanists. *Geschichte des A.T. in der christliche Kirche*, Jena 1869, pp. 13-14.
- ¹⁸HE VII, 11, 1; GCSE II, ii, 654, 1-6.
- ¹⁹HE VI, 25, 1-2; GCSE II, i, 572, 1p-576, 2.
- ²⁰PE XIII, 3, 38; GCSE VIII, ii, 174, 27-175, 1.
- ²¹PE VII, 12, 6-9; GCSE VIII, i, 387, 7-17.
- ²²PE CII, 12, 8; GCSE VIII, i, 387, 18-19.
- ²³Another formula used is καὶ. PE XI, 14, 8-10; GCSE VIII, ii, 35, 13-14.
- ²⁴PE I, 1, 4; GCSE VIII, i, 6, 9.
- ²⁶PE XI, 14, 10; GCSE VIII, ii, 35, 25.
- ²⁷PE XII, 52, 34; GCSE VIII, ii, 162, 4.
- ²⁸PE XI, 7, 5; GCSE VIII, ii, 21, 22-22, 6.
- ²⁹PE I, 19; GCSE VIII, i, 39, 2.
- ³⁰PE VII, 2, 4; GCSE VIII, i, 365, 11.
- ³¹CM I, 4; GCSE IV, 25, 24.
- ³²ETH I, 9; GCSE IV, 67, 22.
- ³³ETH I, 12; GCSE IV, 72, 22.
- ³⁴Ps 65, 2; PG 23, 649B. Ps 91, 5; Pg 23, 1176A.
- ³⁵Ps 72, 1-3; PG 23, 863C.
- ³⁶HE VI, 13, 8; GCSE II, ii, 548, 15-19.
- ³⁷HE VI, 13, 8; GCSE II, ii, 548, 15-19.
- ³⁸PE XIV, 25, 14; GCSE VIII, ii, 330, 6-8.
- ³⁹PE XII, 34, 1; GCSE VIII, ii, 128, 12.
- ⁴⁰ETH I, 12; GCSE IV, 70, 28.
- ⁴¹Ps 69, 2-4; PG 23, 969A.
- ⁴²PS 56, 2; PG 23, 505B.
- ⁴³HE X, 4, 8; GCSE II, ii, 865, 2-11.
- ⁴⁴EP III, 39; PG 22, 1168BD.
- ⁴⁵DE VI, 19, 1; GCSE IV, 284, 20.
- ⁴⁶DE VI, 19, 2; GCSE VI, 285, 3.
- ⁴⁷ETH II, 1; GCSE IV, 99, 27.
- ⁴⁸Ps 78, 4; PG 23, 941D-945A.
- ⁴⁹Ps 78, 10; PG 23, 948C.
- ⁵⁰HE VI, 31, i; GCSE II, 586, 1.
- ⁵¹DE VII, 2, 24; GCSE VI, 332, 32.
- ⁵²PE VI, 11, 17-19; GCSE VIII, 1, 347.
- ⁵³GCSE VI, 495, 7.
- ⁵⁴EP I, 25; PG 22, 1085D.

⁵⁵ Cfr. supra

⁵⁶ EP I, 25; P^s 22, 1085D.

⁵⁷ EP III, 32; PG 22, 1160A.

⁵⁸ HE III, 10, 4; GCSE II, i, 224, 9-10.

⁵⁹ EP IV, Pr. PG 22, 1193V.

⁶⁰ P^s 60, 6; PG 23, 580C.

⁶¹ CP, Pr. PG 23, 74C.

⁶² HE V, 8, 15; GCSE II, i, 450, 1-5.

⁶³ HE V, 8, 14; GCSE II, i, 448, 17-22. Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-37.

⁶⁴ A. Vaccari, *De Textu*, in *Institutiones Biblicae*, Lib. III Romae 1951, p. 245.

⁶⁵ *ibid.* p. 284f.

⁶⁶ HE V, 8, 14; GCSE II, i, 448, 17-22.

⁶⁷ Chr. I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-36.

⁶⁸ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 28-210, 4.

⁶⁹ PE X, 8, 18; GCSE VIII, i, 584, 28.

⁷⁰ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 32-33.

⁷¹ Chr. I, 16, 17; GCSE V, 45, 16-19.

⁷² HE VI, 16, 1-4; GCSE II, ii, 552, 26-553, 17.

⁷³ Eusebius himself worked hard for the propagation of the LXX text as corrected and edited by Origen: Pamphilus et Eusebius' columnam

hexaplarum asteristicis obelisque distinctam, seorsim vulgare; quorum editio tanto favore recepta fuit, ut exemplaris omnium usus, saltam intra Palaestinae fines, prorsus antiquaretur... His igitur duum viris praeter caetera eorum egergia in se merita, pro reliquiis Hexaplorum, quas undique corrossas in hanc nostram apothecam condidimus, Ecclesia gratias ministrales debet. F. Field, *Hexapla*, Vol. I, p. XCIX.CI. Also St. Jerome: Praef. in Paral; PL 28, 1324f. MSS evidence: Ms Q, ante Ezechiel Ed. Ziegler, p. 32.

⁷³ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 31-32.

HE VII, 32, 16; GCSE II, ii, 724, 3-5.

⁷⁴ HE V, 8, 10-13; GCSE II, i, 446, 16-448, 13.

⁷⁵ DE VII, 1, 32; GCSE VI, 303, 29-304, 1.

⁷⁶ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 32-36.

⁷⁷ DE V, Pr. 35; GCSE VI, 209, 31-33.

⁷⁸ Chr I, 16, 17; GCSE V, 45, 16-19.

⁷⁹ P^s 72, 28; PG 23, 849D.

⁸⁰ E. Klostermann, *Das Onomasticon*, GCSE III, i, p. XV.

⁸¹ Möhle, *Der Jesaja kommentar des Eusebius van Kaisaria*, ZNTW, (1934)88.

⁸³ Is 29, 1; PG 24, 296D. Nestle, ZATW 29(1909) 57-62.

⁸⁴ Chr I, 18, 5; GCSE V, 60, 3-7.

⁸⁵ EP I, 2; PG 22, 1029BC; EP I, 5; PG 22, 1037. DE V, 4, 5; GCSE VI, 224; 26.

⁸⁶ DE IV, 15, 58; GCSE VI, 182, 31-34.

⁸⁷ DE IV, 61-62.

Is 20, 19; Pg 24, 308D; ETh III, 2; GCSE IV, 141, 30. P^s 67, 5; 23, 686D.

P^s 76, 17; PG 23, 897C.

⁸⁸ DE VI, 20, 6; GCSE VI, 286, 101. P^s 64, 6; PG 23, 634D. P^s 71, 12; PG 23, 809C. P^s 71, 18; PG 23, 821B. P^s 77, 15; PG 23, 914B.

- ⁸⁹ DE VIII, 3, 11; GCSE VI, 393, 20. ETh III, 23; GCSE IV, 41, 32. Is 51, 9; PG 24, 448B.
- ⁹⁰ Is 7, 14; PG 24, 136D; PS 77, 22-25; PG 23, 917C.
- ⁹¹ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37-38, 4.
- ⁹² Chr I, 16, 6; GCSE V, 37, 10-14.
- ⁹³ Chr I, 16, 7; GCSE V, 37, 17-38, 4.
- ⁹⁴ *ibid.*
- ⁹⁵ P.H. Höpfl, *Introductio Generalis in S. S.*, Romae 1950, p. 303.
- ⁹⁶ HE V, 8, 10; GCSE II, i, 446, 23.
- ⁹⁷ DE VII, 1, 32; GCSE VI, 304, 6.
- ⁹⁸ HE VI, 17, 1; GCSE II, ii, 556, 5.
- ⁹⁹ Comm in Am 3, 11; PL 25, 1019.
- ¹⁰⁰ HE VI, 16, 4; GCSE II, ii, 554, 16.
- ¹⁰¹ St. Jerome, *Comm. in Eccl.* 2; PL 23, 1024.
- ¹⁰² Ps 46, 10; RG.23, 417A.
- ¹⁰³ HE VI, 16, 3; GCSE II, ii, 554, 9-555, 13.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ps 64, PG 23, 637A. Ps 76, 11; PG 23, 893A. Ps 77, 22-25; PG 23, 917C.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ps 83, 8; PG 23, 1012C.
- ¹⁰⁶ DE V, Pr 36; GCSE VI, 209, 33-210, 4.

PONTIFICAL INSIGNIA

III

IN the first two sections of this study we have discussed the various vestments used during a liturgical celebration by bishops and by other ecclesiastics who have been granted the privilege of using pontifical vestments; we have now to discuss pontifical insignia proper. There is no complete agreement in enumerating pontifical insignia, but for our purpose it is enough to consider those listed as such in a recent study on pontifical rights and privileges.¹ According to this list the more important pontifical insignia are the pectoral cross, the ring and the crozier; to these we must add the archiepiscopal cross, the seventh candle on the altar, the *liber canonis* and the *bugia*, the silver ewer and basin, and the *formale*.

In the early centuries, the Church, contrary to civilian custom, was very slow in adopting and displaying insignia of office:² in fact the first certain reference to the use of episcopal insignia is found in a poem by St. Paulinus of Nola,³ where the saint describes the solemn processional entry of the bishop and clergy at the beginning of the liturgy, an entry which replaced the old greeting of the assembled church after an informal arrival. The bishop, entering the church, was preceded by torches and incense, much the same way as Roman magistrates going to court had been doing for centuries.⁴ Towards the end of the

¹Ioachim Nabuco, *Ius Pontificalium*, Tournai, 1956

²'Ancient Rome might look askance at official costume, but it had no such tradition against the display of other insignia of office. The consul had the *fasces* borne by lictors, and magistrates their *curule* chairs;... such symbols are the Western equivalent for the official robes of Greece and the Near East, where insignia were less common (e.g. the Old Testament High Priest had special vestments but no equivalent of the pastoral staff). The general Christian acceptance in the fourth century of the Western principle of NOT using special liturgical robes makes it a little surprising that the other Western practice of the display of symbols of office instead was not accepted.' (G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Westminster, 1954, chp. 12)

³*Carmina*, xxii, 203s.

⁴Horace, *Satires*, I, v, 36; Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 35.

fourth century, the State was placing upon bishops some of the duties of civil magistrates in those cities where they were bishops, and it may be that for this reason bishops going to church adopted the custom followed by magistrates going to court. At this time, magistrates, to the torches and incense, had added their 'liber Mandatorum' or 'Instrument of Instructions,' namely the document they received on taking their office, setting forth the general line of policy which the reigning emperor intended them to follow; bishops, instead of the 'Liber Mandatorum,' adopted the Gospel book — 'the Law of Christ.' These insignia were therefore originally simply signs of civil honour, and only two or three centuries later did they take on a religious significance, as we will see discussing each one of these pontifical insignia separately.⁵

*The Pectoral Cross*⁶

In the early centuries, especially in the East, Christians used to wear, suspended round the neck, a small casket,⁷ generally in the form of a cross,⁸ containing relics, called ἐγκόλιον.

⁵Dix, l. c.

⁶A bishop's pectoral cross should be distinguished from the pectoral cross granted by the Holy See to certain chapters: the 'cruz canonicalis' has the form of a Greek cross and is suspended round the neck by a five centimetre-wide silk ribbon; the bishop's pectoral cross has the form of a Latin cross and is suspended round the neck by a gold chain or a cord of silk and gold. The 'cruz pretiosa,' i.e. the pectoral cross with gems, is an exclusive privilege of bishops, which later on was extended to cardinals and to protonotaries 'de numero' (J. Nabuco, *Ius Pontificalium*, lib. II, tit. ii, c. 1).

⁷St. John Chrysostom in *Quod Christus sit Deus* speaks of a small relic of the true cross suspended from the neck of both men and women, enclosed in gold.

In 1571, two such reliquiaries, made of gold, were found in tombs near the Vatican: they are square in form and are furnished with rings which indicate their use, and on one side they bear the monogram of Christ between A and Ω; probably they belong to the fourth century (Smith-Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London, 1908, s.v. Encolpion).

⁸The oldest pendant reliquary in the form of a cross is probably that preserved in the treasury of St. Peter's, Rome, and known as the 'Encolpion Constantini Magni.'

Two remarkable examples of pectoral crosses exist in the treasury of the church of Monza: one has always been regarded as that given by Gregory the Great to Queen Theodolinda in 603, with a letter in which these words occur:

From the ἐγκόλπιον we can perhaps trace the origin of the pectoral cross, for even today the bishop's pectoral cross ought to have relics of the saints, or, preferably a relic of the Holy Cross.⁹

Whatever the origin of the pectoral cross, there is no doubt that in the thirteenth century Pope Innocent III (+1216) considered it to be a papal privilege, and traced its use by the Pope to the vesting of the High Priest in Mosaic Law.¹⁰

Soon bishops began imitating the Pope in using the pectoral cross during a pontifical Mass, although for a long time it was not considered to be one of the episcopal insignia – in fact Durandus in his Pontifical says that a bishop may use it, but is not bound to do so.¹¹ It is only after the Council of Trent, in a rubric of the Missal of Pius V, that we first meet with the directive: 'episcopus accipiat cruciculam a collo ante pectus,'¹² although its use was already firmly established, as the prayer said by the bishop on vesting it dates from the fourteenth century.¹³

The many pontifical decrees between the ninth and fourteenth centuries granting to abbots the use of various pontifical insignia, never mention the pectoral cross, but from the fifteenth century onwards it is commonly used by abbots, although up to the time of Pope Benedict XIV (+1758) the Holy See was still prohibiting abbots from using the pectoral cross at low Mass.¹⁴

Nowadays Cardinals, bishops and abbots use the pectoral cross both when celebrating the liturgy and with their ordinary walking dress, but up till the time of Pius X, Cardinals were not permitted to use the pectoral cross when the Pope was present, and Cardinal-priests and Car-

Excellentissimo autem filio nostro Adulouvaldo Regi transmittere phylacteria curavimus, id est crucem cum ligno sanctae crucis Domini et lectionem sancti evangelii theba persica inclusa (Ep. lib. XIV, 12); the other cross is the one called 'crux regni' which belonged to Berengarius, king of Italy (+924). (Smith-Cheetham, s.v. Reliquary).

⁹ Cic. 1288.

¹⁰ *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, I, 53

¹¹ '... pectoralis si quis ea uti velit'

¹² In the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* the rubric reads: *Diaconus postea sumpta cruce pectorali... ipsi Episcopo osculandam praebet et eius collo imponit, ita ut ante pectus pendeat...* (II, viii, 14).

¹³ It is found in the Pontifical of Pius IV, 1561.

¹⁴ In the letter *In throno iustitiae*.

dinal-deacons could only use it when celebrating a pontifical Mass.¹⁵

Since the sixteenth century bishops outside Rome began using the pectoral cross with their ordinary walking dress in their diocese.¹⁶ This custom was opposed by the Patriarch of Lisbon, who enjoyed several pontifical privileges, among which that of the pectoral cross with two bars or transoms: he objected to bishops, even apostolic nuncios, using a pectoral cross in his presence, but Benedict XIV, after a protest of the nuncio Acciapuoli in 1755, decided against the Patriarch.

At the time of Vatican Council I, bishops began using the pectoral cross with their 'habitus praelatitius' outside their diocese,¹⁷ but not in Rome, on account of the Pope's presence, so as to be in line with the Cardinals.

Protonotaries were not allowed the use of the pectoral cross by Pius IX, but Pius X granted them its use when celebrating a pontifical Mass.¹⁸ Nevertheless, protonotaries, both in Rome and elsewhere, have been wearing the pectoral cross not only when celebrating pontifical Mass, but also with the 'abito prelatizio' and the 'abito piano.'

*The Episcopal Ring*¹⁹

The first mention of a ring as a special symbol of the episcopal office is in the 28th canon of the fourth Council of To-

¹⁵ Formerly Cardinals in Rome wore the pectoral cross over their 'mantelletta' and their 'abito piano,' but under their 'mozzetta;' nowadays they also use it over their 'mozzetta.' The pectoral cross is still worn under the 'cappa magna.' In 1916 the Congregation of Ceremonies expressly stated that the wearing of the pectoral cross over the 'cappa magna,' a use introduced by bishops and Cardinals outside Rome, was contrary to tradition, and therefore not to be permitted in the Roman Curia and at a 'Cappella Papale.' In 1943 another decree insisted that Cardinals should not wear the pectoral cross over the 'cappa magna.' (Cfr. Nabuco, *Ius Pontificalium*, pag. 195, note 48).

¹⁶ For example, St. Francis of Sales (+1622) is often portrayed wearing the pectoral cross over his ordinary walking dress.

¹⁷ This custom was sanctioned by the Congregation of Rites in 1899 (*Decreta authentica*, n. 4035)

¹⁸ 'ad ecclesiam accedentes pontificalia celebraturi, ab eaque recedentes, habitu praelatitio induti, supra mantelletum crucem gestare poterunt a qua alias abstinebunt.' (*Inter multiplices*, 7 and 26)

¹⁹ Nabuco (*Ius Pontificalium*, Lib. II, tit. ii, c. 2) distinguishes various types of rings used by ecclesiastics, the most important being what is known as 'the

do held in 633.²⁰ St. Isidore of Seville, who presided over the Council, is his *De ecclesiasticis officiis* says that the ring is given to the bishop at his consecration 'propter signum pontificalis honoris vel signaculum secretorum.'²¹ This might mean that the ring given to the bishop at his consecration was a signet ring. Bishops in common with other Christians, used signet rings from early times, and it is impossible to say when such rings became also a badge of office.²²

In eighth and ninth century manuscripts of the Gregorian Sacramentary and in several early Pontificals we meet with various formulae for the blessing and delivery of the ring,²³ which give a symbolical mea-

fisherman's ring.' This is the ring which the Cardinal-Camerlengo places on the finger of the newly elected Pope; it is made of gold, with a representation of St. Peter in a boat, fishing, and the name of the reigning Pope around it. The ring, together with the seal of the Apostolic Chancery, is broken by the Cardinal-Camerlengo at the first meeting of the Congregation of Cardinals after the death of the Pope. The first mention of such a ring occurs in a private letter of Pope Clement IV to his nephew Peter Grassi in 1265; *Saluta matrem et fratres: non scribimus tibi neque familiaribus nostris sub bulla, sed sub Piscatoris sigillo, quo Romani pontifices in suis secretis utuntur*. From the time of Martin V it has been used to seal papal briefs, and the first briefs to be sealed are dated 1426.

²⁰ *Episcopus, presbyter aut diaconus si a gradu suo iniusta deiectum in secunda synodo innocens reperitur non potest esse quod fuerat nisi gradus amissos recipiat coram altari de manu episcopi... (si episcopus) orarium, anulum et baculum.*

²¹ Lib. II, c. 5

²² St. Augustine speaks of sealing a letter with a ring: *... si veraciter hanc epistolam signatam nisi anulo qui exprimit faciem hominis adtendentis in latum* (Ep. 59, 2). A letter of Clovis to the Gallican bishops, written about 511, promises to recognise their letters if signed with their ring: *epistolas vestras de annulo vestro infra signatas...* (S. Greg. Turonensis, *Opera omnia*, ML. 71, 1158). Other examples may be found in Smith-Cheetham, s.v. Rings, pp. 1903-1904.

²³ The Romano-German Pontifical of the tenth century has the following prayer for the blessing of the ring: *Creator et conservator humani generis, dator gratiae spiritualis, largitor aeternae salutis, tu, domine, per mitte tuam benedictionem super hunc anulum, ut quicumque hoc sacrosanctae fidei signo insignitus incedat, in virtute coelestis defensionis ad aeternam vitam sic proficiat*. Per. (C. Vogel-R. Elze, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixieme siecle*, Studi e Testi, 226, Città del Vaticano 1963, vol. I, LXIII, 38.

With slight changes (*emitte* for *per mitte*, *sibi* for *sic*) this prayer is found

ning to it, being commonly regarded as emblematic of the betrothal of the bishop to his church.²⁴ In the eleventh century it was almost universally considered as a badge of office, together with the crosier: this is quite evident from the strife concerning investiture,²⁵ although one

also in the Roman Pontifical of Clement VIII, in use till last year. This prayer, in the reformed rite for the ordination of a bishop, has been substituted by the following prayer '*de benedictione insignium pontificalium*' (ring, crosier and mitre), which may be used '*tempore opportuno, ante ordinationem Episcopi:*' *Omnipotens sempeterne Deus, benedic haec (hoc) muneris pastoralis et pontificalis honoris insignia (insignium) ut qui ea (id) gestaverit praemium dispensationis sibi creditae cum Christo, summo sacerdote et bono Pastore in aeterna vita accipiat. Per. (De Ordinatione diaconi, presbyteri et episcopi, Vatican, 1968).*

²⁴ The Romano-German Pontifical of the tenth century distinguishes between the *traditio anuli* and the *imposito anuli digito*. *Quando datur anulus*, these words are said: *Accipe anulum discretionis et honoris, fidei signum, ut quae signanda sunt signes, et quae aperienda sunt prodes, quae liganda sunt liges, quae solvenda sunt solves atque credentibus per fidem baptismatis, lapsis autem, sed penitentibus, per ministerium reconciliationis ianuas regni coelestis aperias, cunctis vero de dominico nova et vetera proferas ad aeternam salutem hominibus consolatus gratia domini nostri.*

Ad anulum digito imponendum. two formulas are given, the first one being the following: *Accipe anulum, fidei scilicet signaculum, quatenus sponsam Dei sanctam, videlicet ecclesiam, intemerata fide ornatam, illibata custodias;* the second is as follows: *Accipe anulum pontificalis honoris ut sis fidei integritate ante omnia munitus, misericordiae operibus insistens, infirmis compatiens, benivolentibus congaudens, aliena damna propria deputans, de alienis gaudiis tamquam de propriis exultans.* (C. Vogel-R. Elze, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixieme siecle*, Studi e Testi 226, Città del Vaticano, 1963, vol. I, LXIII, 44-45) The first form is found in the Gregorian Sacramentary and is still used in the reformed rite of the ordination of a bishop, published in 1968.

²⁵ The whole problem of investiture must be considered in the light of the special circumstances of an age which did not know yet the essential distinction between State and Church, but merely the functional distinction between *Sacerdotium* and *Regnum*. Since both powers, as members of the one superposed unity under the rule of Christ, regarded themselves as bound to the same religious and political goal, royal service, secular administration, and divine service could all be conceived as one and the same religious and moral accomplishment. The ruler, from whose hands, the bishops at their investiture by ring and staff, received not only the property and the secular rights of sovereignty, but also the ecclesiastical function, was, in the view of the age, not simply a layman. His anointing... raised him to the sphere of a *vicarius Christi* and

might perhaps doubt whether the ring and crosier at this time had any liturgical significance: in fact the whole problem of investiture seems to imply that they were more tied to the power of jurisdiction than to the pastoral charge of a particular diocese,²⁶ at least with regard to the ring.²⁷

In the twelfth century the ring was considered to be an exclusive right of bishops,²⁸ although Popes had been granting the ring to abbots

made him, according to the anointing formula of a Mainz Ordo, a participant in the episcopal office and an intermediary between clergy and people.' (*Handbook of Church History*, Freiburg, 1969, vol. III, sec. 7, chp. 27, p. 202)

'Election to the episcopate was followed by installation and consecration, two separate acts which in themselves could be carried out by different representatives of the law. Naturally only bishops were taken into consideration as consecrators, whereas installation in office and in possession presupposed an authority which held rights of donation or of property in regard to the church concerned. In the case of bishoprics these were the kings and princes who had taken their place.... The important functions which the bishops exercised in the political field of themselves suggested the idea of binding them to the crown by means of vassalage.... But... not merely Church property but also the office of bishop was drawn into the wake of the *beneficium*. In the ninth century over and above the fiscal goods belonging to an office, the very function itself was regarded as a *beneficium* to be conferred by the king. This made it possible for a ruler to confer the *episcopatus*, that is, the office of a bishop with all its rights of ownership, administration and usufruct after the manner of a *beneficium* by delivering the symbol of office, the pastoral staff, and later also, under Henry III, the ring;... from the tenth century this act was called investiture.' (*Handbook of Church History*, vol. III, sec. 7, chp. 34, p. 275)

²⁶ Salmon, *Etude sur les insignes du Pontife dans le rit romain*, Roma, 1965, chp. I, p. 25

²⁷ 'L'anneau est avant tout un sceau: *ut quae signanda sunt signes* (on lit dans la formule de tradition de l'anneau dans le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle). Il est un symbol du majordomat, comme serait la clé de majordomat spirituel, (*ut quae aperienda sunt prodas, quae liganda sunt liges, quae solvenda sunt solvas*). Il est le symbol de l'intendance confiée a l'evêque sur le tresor du Seigneur. On comprend après cela qu'il symbolise la mise à la disposition de l'evêque des biens, soit temporels, soit spirituels, de l'église dont il devient l'evêque. Et, en vertu même de ce symbolisme, conformément à la mentalité du IXe siècle, l'anneau peut devenir le signe de l'investiture.' (P. Batiffol, *La liturgie du sacre des évêques*, in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, XXIII (1927), p. 753.

²⁸ Gregory VIII informed all bishops that *clerici... anulos non portant in manibus, nisi episcopos fuerit, qui habet hoc ex officio*.

since at least two centuries: in fact Pope Leo IX had granted it to the abbot of Monte Cassino, contrary to the wishes of St. Bernard who considered the wearing of a ring by an abbot as a piece of useless ostentation.²⁹ With the Pontifical of Durandus the blessing and delivery of the ring form part of the ordinary ritual for the blessing of an abbot, and this is still the case at the present day.

Protonotaries 'de numero' may use the ring not only at a pontifical Mass but also at any Mass, while other protonotaries can only use the ring when saying a pontifical Mass.³⁰ Members of several chapters in Italy, Portugal and Brazil have been granted the privilege of the ring by the Holy See, but not *infra Missiam*; several decrees of the Holy See prohibit the use of the ring by ecclesiastics during Mass, but these decrees are more honoured in their breach than in their observance.

*The Crosier*³¹

The first mention of a pastoral staff by Greek writers is

²⁹ The granting of rings to abbots became general from 1154, when Pope Anastasius IV granted it to the abbot of Corbie, who received the ring as a gift from the Pope; in 1177 the abbot of Santa Giustina, Padua, received from Pope Alexander III the privilege to use the ring every day; the same Pope granted the ring to the abbot of Lorsch in 1181 at the request of the archbishop of Strasbourg. (Salmon, l. c., chp. II, 2, p. 54.)

³⁰ Pius IX in his Apostolic Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis officium* expressly says: *sciunt numquam sibi licere praeterquam in celebratione Missae pontificalis* while Pius X in the *Inter multiplices*, 26, expressly prohibits the use of the pectoral cross with the 'abito piano' and the 'abito prelatizio,' but does not make any mention of the ring.

³¹ Ecclesiologists distinguish three early forms of the crosier: the first was a rod of wood bend or crooked at the end and pointed at the lower end: this is the oldest form and was known as the *pedum*. The second, instead of the crook, had a knob which was often surmounted by a cross, and was called the *ferula* or *cambuta*. The term *cambuta*, with its many variants due to the vagaries of copyists, is traced by some authorities to the Irish missionaries who crossed over to Europe at the time of the Merovingians, while others derive it from the Greek *καμπύω* or *καμπύλη*. In the third form the top consisted of a *crux decussata* or a Greek T, the arms of the cross being so twisted as to represent two serpents opposed. This was known as the *crocia* or *crose*, and is the type of crosier used by Eastern abbots and bishops. The term *crose* is of doubtful etymology, some deriving it from the Latin *crux*, while others (v.g. Magri, *Hierolexicon*, Bologna, 1777, s.v.) derives it from the English *crutch*, because originally used as a support for walking.

as early as the time of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, who says: 'I know the staff which can support and the one which belongs to pastors and teachers and which corrects the sheep which have reason.'³²

Among Latin writers the earliest mention seems to be found in a letter of Pope Celestine (+432) addressed to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne on the subject of episcopal dress, and the Pope seems to regard the use of the staff by a bishop in the light of a *reductio ad absurdum*.³³

Another early mention of the pastoral staff in the West is found in a prophetic poem of the fifth century, in which the Druids of Ireland are warned of the arrival of St. Patrick with 'his staff crook-headed.'³⁴

At the time of St. Isidore the granting of the ring and crosier were already a sign of episcopal jurisdiction,³⁵ at least in those countries subject to Gallican influences. In fact we read in the life of St. Caesarius of Arles (+542), written by his pupil Cyprian, that his pastoral staff was borne by his chaplain.³⁶ We also find that Romanus, archbishop of Rouen, about 623, was invested with the pastoral staff by the king.³⁷ Finally, Charles the Bald, writing to Pope Nicholas I, in 867, says that Ebbon, the archbishop of Rheims, on his return to the see, from which he had been forced to depart by Hincmar, gave the crosier and ring to those suffragan bishops who had been consecrated during his forced absence, and this in compliance with Gallican uses.³⁸

In the eleventh century, when the mitre was coming into use in count-

³²Oratio, 42

³³*Nam si ad hoc ista praecepta sunt ut taliter servarentur, cur non fiunt pariter quae sequuntur, ut lucernae ardentes in manibus una cum baculo teneantur? Habent enim ista mysteria, et intelligentibus ita clara sunt ut ea magis qua decet significatione servantur. Nam in lumborum praecinctione castitas, in baculo regimen pastoralis, in lucernis ardentibus fulgor operis.... indicatur.*

³⁴H. Thurston, *The Alphabet and the Consecration of Churches*, in the Month, 1910, p. 629

³⁵*Huic autem dum consecratur, datur baculus, ut eius iudicio subditam plebem vel regal, vel corrigat, vel infirmitates infirmorum sustineat.* St. Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. II, c. v, n. 12

³⁶*Cum vir Dei ad aliquam ecclesiam pergeret clericus cui cura erat baculum illius portare (quod notariorum officium erat) oblitus erat.*

³⁷*rex, baculum illi contulit pastorem.*

³⁸*omnesque suffraganei, qui eo absente ordinati fuerant, annulos et baculos et suae confirmationis scripta a more gallicarum ecclesiarum, ab eo acceperunt.*

ries across the Alps, we find the crosier being adopted in Italy, even in Rome itself,³⁹ although the Pope, it seems, never used the crosier, but used instead, a staff surmounted by a crucifix.⁴⁰

The use of the crosier may have originated in Spain and from there spread to the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon churches, from whence, between the eighth and ninth centuries, it spread all over the West, and finally arrived in the Italian peninsula towards the eleventh century.

Even the earliest Christian writers consider the pastoral staff as a symbol of authority.⁴¹ There are sufficient grounds to suppose, accord-

³⁹ The first representation of a pastoral staff in Rome is in the eleventh century frescoes of San Clemente: the person wearing a chasuble and holding a staff, is certainly not the pope but a bishop or an abbot, for the person represented is of an inferior rank to the pope. (Salmon, *Etude*, . . . p. 43)

⁴⁰ Pope Innocent III, writing to Basil, archbishop of Trnovo, primate of the Bulgars, in 1206, says: *Licet Romanus pontifex non utatur baculo pastorali, tum propter historiam, tum propter mysticam rationem, tu tamen ad similitudinem aliorum pontificum poteris eo uti.* But early representations of the popes on tablets, coins and other monuments often show them holding a staff, some examples of which are mentioned in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (s.v. Pastoral staff). In fact, some authorities hold that the popes carried a staff, but not the crook or T-shaped staff, which implies limited power (S. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, suppl. q. II, art. 3, ad 8um); he used the *ferula* or sceptre-like staff which betokened sovereign authority. The pope's *ferula* would correspond to the $\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\theta\eta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}$ or *ferula* of the Byzantine emperor, rather than to the bishop's staff. (Nabuco, *Ius Pontificalium*, p. 204, note 68).

⁴¹ The staff could betoken either the shepherd's duty to tend the flock of God or the responsibility and rights of the ruler: both ideas are combined in St. Isidore's statement quoted in note 35.

In the Romano-German Pontifical of the tenth century, the idea that the staff is a symbol of authority is clearly expressed in the words accompanying the delivery of the staff: *Accipe baculum pastoralis officii et sis in corrigendis vitiis pie saeviens, iudicium sine ira tenens in favendis virtutibus auditorum animos demulcens, in tranquillitate severitatis censuram non deserens.* The Pontifical has also a second formula: *Accipe baculum sacri regiminis signum, ut imbecilles consolides, titubantes confirmes, pravos corrigas, rectos dirigas in viam salutis aeternae, habeasque potestatem eligendi dignos et corrigendi indignos, cooperante Domino nostro Iesu Christo. Memor sponsionis et desponsationis ecclesiasticae et dilectionis domini Dei tui: in die qua assecutus es hunc honorem cave obliviscaris.* (L. Vogel-R. Elze, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle*, vol. I, LXIII, 41-43)

The first formula was maintained in the Roman Pontifical to the present time,

ing to some authorities, that the use of the crosier by the Christian clergy was but the adoption with a new significance of a religious usage older than Christianity itself;⁴² nevertheless others think that the crosier is a survival, in the case of bishops of what once was in the hands of all: a walking stick, a staff or crutch used as a support while standing in church. This opinion would agree with that which holds that the staff used by Eastern bishops is derived from the crutch or leaning-stick employed by Eastern monks as a support when standing through their long office: Eastern bishops being almost entirely recruited from monastic orders, they retained as bishops the staff they were used to, merely having it in a more expensive and elaborate form.⁴³

It seems that abbots have always used the crosier, as something pertaining to them by right: every time Popes have granted the use of pontifical insignia to abbots there is no mention of the pastoral staff, and it seems that the assumption of the staff has always formed part of the ceremonial for the investiture of an abbot.⁴⁴

The Archiepiscopal Cross

Processional crosses are of a very ancient and general use. They may owe their origin to Constantine's *labarum*, the most important of standards borne before the emperors. Constantine's *labarum* consisted of a gilded cross, surmounted by the monogram of Christ, from the arms of which hung a banner of purple silk; Con-

but in the reformed rite for the ordination of bishops, published in 1968, the formula has been changed to the following: *Accipe baculum, pastoralis muneris signum, et attende gregi, in quo te Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopum regere Ecclesiam Dei.*

⁴²The pastoral staff, according to some authorities, has an affinity with the *lituus* or staff used by the Roman augurs in their divinations.

⁴³Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Westminster, 1954, chp. XII, p. 413.

⁴⁴The first mention of an abbot's crosier is in the life of St. Gall, who lived in the early part of the seventh century; it is a description of the staff of St. Columban: *qui et baculus ipsius, quem vulgo cambuttam vocant, per manum diaconi transmiserunt dicentes, sanctum abbatem ante transitum suum iussisse ut per hoc potissimum pignus Gallus absolveretur.*

Pope Stephen II (+752), or perhaps Pope Hadrian (+872) granted the use of the crosier to Anselm, abbot on Nonantola: this does not detract from the fact that abbots had always the right to use the crosier, as the abbey of Nonantola was in Italy, were the use of the staff, as we have seen, developed later.

antine also set a gilt cross above the figure of the dragon on the pole which had formed the cavalry standard of Diocletian's army. ●

The Church was very slow to adopt the carrying of the cross in liturgical ceremonial. The first instance we find of the cross being carried in a Christian procession is when St. John Chrysostom in Constantinople organised a procession to counter the street propaganda of the Arians, and silver crosses, to which burning candles were attached, were carried in procession.⁴⁵ Nevertheless this does not seem to have been liturgical practice transferred to the streets, but a novelty to attract attention: in fact the crosses were presented by the empress herself for the occasion.

In the sixth century we first meet in Gaul with 'hand-crosses' being carried in procession, but these 'hand-crosses' may have been reliquaries. One such cross was carried by St. Augustine at Thanet in 596, but, again, this may have just been a device to attract attention rather than a customary liturgical action. We also meet with occasional mentions of processional crosses in the writings of Gregory of Tours and other contemporary writers.⁴⁶ In Gaul again, in the sixth century we find the custom of bishops being preceded by a processional cross, a custom which later became a privilege reserved to prelates, especially metropolitans, who had received the pallium from the Pope.⁴⁷

These processional crosses were also in use in Constantinople and in Rome in the sixth century. When Pope John I (+525) arrived at Constantinople he was met by the people of the city, carrying crosses. When

⁴⁵Socrates in his Ecclesiastical history (lib. VI c. 8) reports the fact with these words: σταυροὶ ἄργυροὶ φέροντες φῶτα ἐκ τῶν κηρίων λαμπάδων, while Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History (lib. VIII, c. 8) says: σταυρῶν ἄργυρα σημεῖα ὑπο κηροῦ ζήμιένοις προηγούμενοι αὐτῶ.

⁴⁶Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, chp. XII, p. 414.

⁴⁷Andrieu, (*Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age*, Louvain 1951, vol. III, p. 243), mentions the fact of St. Samson, abbot of Dol (circa +565) who left an *imago crucis quae ante eum ferre semper solebat*.

Andrieu also mentions the fact that St. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, remarked to Samuel, bishop of Dublin: *Praeterea audivi quia facis portare crucem ante te in via. Quod si verum est, mando tibi ne amplius hoc facias, quia non pertinet nisi ad archiepiscopum a romano pontifice pallio confirmatum*. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries there are several instances of Popes granting the privilege of the processional cross and the pallium to archbishops and some bishops.

Pope Stephen II in 759 returned from France he was met by the Roman clergy carrying crosses – *cum crucibus* – These crosses might have been the stational crosses of Rome, but they also might have been any other type of processional crosses.

The use of stational crosses in Rome was very old. These crosses, when not in use, were kept in the church of St. Anastasia at the foot of the Palatine hill. They served as a *signum* for each of the seven regions of Rome, and when the Romans went to meet the exarch or other dignitaries representing the imperial authority, the inhabitants of each region would walk after the cross of their region. When Charlemagne, in 744, arrived in Rome, Pope Hadrian sent the stational crosses to meet him; the same thing happened again when Louis II arrived in Rome on the 8th June 844.⁴⁸

The various *Ordines Romani* always speak of seven stational crosses;⁴⁹ but when the Roman regions were increased to twelve in the twelfth century, the seven stational crosses were no longer carried in procession – henceforth only one cross, borrowed from one of the Roman basilicas, headed each procession. The twelve regions now served only to provide the cadres of the Roman militia, whose ensigns were no longer crosses but banners,⁵⁰ and with these banners at their head they took part in processions, preceding the cross.

The stational crosses were carried by *staurophoros*, and on each cross three lighted candles were fixed. The term *staurophoros* and the lighted candles may indicate Byzantine influence.⁵¹

Besides the stational crosses, other crosses were carried in pro-

⁴⁸... *obuiam illi, dirigens venerandas cruces, id est signa, sicut mos est exarchum aut patricium suscipiendum. (Lib. Pontificalis)* There is nothing to prove that these *venerandas cruces* are not the seven stational crosses so often mentioned in the *Ordines Romani*, although other crosses were carried in procession. (See below, note 51).

⁴⁹The *Liber Pontificalis* says that Pope Benedict II (+858) *fecit cruces argenteas VII, quae per olitana tempora per omnes catholicas ecclesias more solito procedebant, quae nimia vetustate contracta fuerant.*

⁵⁰*ante crucem milites drachonarii portantes XII vexilla quae bandora vocantur.*

⁵¹We have already mentioned above the fact that St. John Chrysostom organised a procession in which crosses having lighted candles were carried.

In the catacomb of St. Pontianus there is a fresco showing a *crux gemmata* with lighted candles on each arm.

cession: from the *Ordines Romani*⁵² we know that in the procession of St. Mark the old people from the poor house walked behind a painted wooden cross; after them the seven stational crosses followed, and finally the Pope with two other crosses in front of him.⁵³ These processional crosses in front of the Pope are often mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* and in the *Ordines*, and Charlemagne, after his coronation, presented a magnificent jewelled cross to the Pope:⁵⁴ this cross was in use up to the time of Pope Paschal (+824), when it was stolen, and later on substituted with another by Pope Leo IV (+855).⁵⁵

Some have thought that this gift of Charlemagne was the occasion for the introduction of a cross at the head of a procession⁵⁶ but we have seen that this came about in the twelfth century, when the use of the stational crosses was discontinued. What seems to have been considered a papal privilege was the processional cross carried in front of the Pope. We have already mentioned instances, in Gaul, of bishops

⁵²The *Ordo letaniae maioris* (*Ordo XXI*, ed. Andrieu) says: *et interim egrediuntur omnes de ecclesia. Primitus enim pauperes de xenodochio, cum cruce clamando Kyrie eleison. . . . Et Post ipsos egrediantur cruces VII stationarias portantes ab staurophoros, habens in unaquaque III accensos cereos. Deinde secuntur episcopi vel presbyteri et subdiaconi, deinde pontifex cum diaconibus et duae cruces ante eum, portantes ab subdiaconibus et timiamasteria portantur a mansionariis ecclesiae et scola post pontificem psallendo.*

⁵³The *Ordo Romanus I* speaks also of crosses carried behind the Pope, apparently not by clerics but by lay servants: these seem to have been rather something belonging to secular pomp as they recall to mind the eagles and other standards carried by slaves behind the consul and other Roman magistrates.

⁵⁴The *Liber Pontificalis* says: *crucem cum gemmis hyacinthinis, quam almificus pontifex in letania praecedere constituit secundum petitionem ipsius piissimi imperatoris.*

⁵⁵. . . . *necnon et crucem ex auro purissimo, gemmis ornatam, quam Carolus. . . . obtulerat, quae mos et ut in letania ante sacratissimum pontificem ipsa precederet. . . . a latronibus nocte furtim ablata. Et nullus predecessorum pontificum tam domnus Paschalis, quam domnus Eugenius, sive domnus Valentinus, sive domnus Gregorius, necnon et domnus Sergius recordatus fuit, ut in eam restauraret, et ad usum sanctae Dei romanae ecclesiae pararet; sed idem praefatus (Leo IV) et magnificus praesul fecit ex auro purissimo et mirae magnitudinis margaritis et gemmis hyacinthinis et prae finis utiliter ornavit, et ad usum pristinum sanctae Dei romanae ecclesiae mirifice decoravit (*Liber Pontificalis*)*

⁵⁶Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, chp. XII, p. 411

being preceded by a cross, in the sixth century,⁵⁷ and therefore we must perhaps conclude that the processional cross may originally have always been a papal privilege in Italy, and when Roman uses began to be adopted outside Italy, then, even here, the processional cross became a privilege reserved to archbishops who had received the pallium from the Pope, and so were considered to be born legates in their region; ultimately it was granted to all metropolitans.

At the beginning of the eleventh century, legates a latere were already using the processional cross for Humbert the Cardinal legate at Constantinople in 1054 was preceded by a cross.

The privilege of the processional cross has hardly ever been granted to bishops,⁵⁷ and Innocent III in the fourth Lateran Council in 1215 expressly stated that it was an exclusive privilege of the Roman Church although in canon V of the decrees of the Council he recognised the right of the titulars of the four great patriarchates to be preceded by the processional cross even outside the territory of their jurisdiction, but not in Rome or when an Apostolic delegate was present.⁵⁸

The custom of bringing the processional cross in front of an archbishop before he gives his blessing, now obsolete, may be perhaps what had remained of an old custom of handing the cross to an archbishop before he gives his blessing, a custom still in use in the Anglican church, Formerly archbishops before taking possession of their see, would sit on their throne holding the processional cross in their hand; this is still done by the Pope and his legates a latere when the Holy Doors of the Roman basilicas are solemnly opened at the beginning of a Jubilee.⁵⁹

⁵⁷Only five bishops have the right to the archiepiscopal cross, granted to them by Pope Benedict XIV, i.e. one in Italy (Pavia), one in Hungary (Pecs), two in Germany (Wurzburg and Eichstadt), and one in the new territories of Poland (Ermland or Warmia).

Pope Gregory XVI granted the same privilege to the bishop of Algiers (Iuliae Caesareae) in 1844, but in 1866 Algiers became a metropolitan see.

⁵⁸*Antiqua patriarchalium sedium privilegia renovantes.... sancimus ut post Romanam ecclesiam.... Constantinopolitana primum, Alexandrina secundum, Antiochena tertium, Hierosolymitana quartum locum obtineant.... Dominicae vero crucis vexillum ante se faciant ubique deferri, nisi in urbe Romana et ubicumque summus pontifex praesens extiterit vel eius legatus....*

⁵⁹Nabuco, *Ius Pontificalium*, lib. II, pars II, c. viii, note 108 •

The Seventh Candle

In ancient times nothing was put on the altar except the altar-cloths and the bread and wine: lamps and candelabra were hung above the altar, six or eight, or even more, candlesticks stood around, but none at all on it. This feeling of the special sanctity of the altar began to break down in the ninth century in Gaul, and we begin meeting with candlesticks on the altar, although it is not yet something common even in great churches.⁶⁰ In Rome Pope Leo IV (+855) limited the objects to be placed on the altar to the shrine containing relics, the Gospel book, and the pyx or tabernacle containing the consecrated bread for the sick;⁶¹ not even the cross had a place on the altar but was put either on the top of the *ciborium*, or suspended from the *ciborium* over the altar.

It was only towards the eleventh century that the cross and candlesticks were first put on the altar. The cross on the altar is often derived from the processional cross, the head being detached from the staff after the procession and placed on the altar facing the celebrant during the celebration of the liturgy: but this is very doubtful. The first clear reference to a cross between two candles on an altar dates from the twelfth century;⁶² fifty years later we find that seven candles are to burn on the altar when the Pope celebrates the liturgy.⁶³

⁶⁰Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, chp. XII, p. 419

⁶¹The directive is found in a pastoral homily which is generally attributed to Pope Leo IV, and is quoted by RATHERIUS OF VERONA (+958); probably the homily of Gallican origin and belongs to the ninth century (DENDY, *Use of Lights in Christian Worship*, London, 1959, chp. 2, page 18).

⁶²In Pope INNOCENT III'S *De sacro Altaris Mysterio: in missa solemnī papae praeferuntur duo lumina cum incenso* (Lib. II, c. 8), and: . . . *in comibus altaris duo sunt constituta candelabra, quae, mediante cruce, faculas ferunt accensas* (Lib. II, c. 21)

⁶³An *Ordo Romanus* attributed to Cardinal CENCIVS DE SABELIS, who later on became Pope HONORIUS III (+1227), says this: *notandum quod septem faculae debent esse in missa super altari. . . . deinde Dominua Papa incipit missam sollempnem*. This seems to contradict what Pope INNOCENT III expressly says, describing the same service at the same period. But it has been proved without doubt that this *Ordo* was not part of the original *Liber Censuum* compiled by CENCIVS, but one of a number of sections inserted in 1254. In the original manuscript of the *Liber Censuum* there was an *Ordo*, but this is now missing,

It has been often suggested that the seven candles on the altar when a bishop celebrates pontifical Mass, are directly connected with the seven candles carried in procession to the altar and then put behind the altar during a Papal Mass, a custom which spread widely throughout the West from the ninth century onwards, chiefly through the adoption of the *Ordo Romanus I*. It might be possible that these candles were transferred from behind the altar to the altar itself when, towards the eleventh century, the custom of adding a reredos to the altar was slowly being introduced. Whatever the reason for the change, nowadays, the Pope 'ubique terrarum,' Cardinal legates *a letere*, and residential bishops have the right to a seventh candle on the altar when celebrating a pontifical Mass.

The remaining pontifical insignia may be easily disposed of in a few words as they are, so to say, of recent origin.

The *liber canonis* is not even mentioned in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* except when it speaks of the private Mass of a bishop.⁶⁴ The first *canones pontificales* or *libri canonis* date from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and were introduced for a practical purpose: missals in use then were rather heavy to be held up by a book-bearer in front of the bishop at the throne.

Formerly the book-bearer was accompanied by the *bugia*-bearer, who held the *bugia* with the lighted candle, on the right hand near the book whenever the bishop read, *etiamsi aer sit lucidus, ita ut opus non sit lumine ad legendum* as the *Caereminale Episcoporum* says.⁶⁵ The use of a candle for reading undoubtedly originated from a practical purpose,

and there is nothing to show that what was inserted in 1254 was by Cencius. From the contradiction between the *Ordo* and Innocent's extremely definite words, it seems clear that a change took place in the first half of the thirteenth century (D.R. Dendy, *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship*, chp. 3, page 51). Perhaps the symbolism of the seven golden candlesticks of the Apocalypse may have been a reason for the change: the bishop is the earthly representative of Christ, as the Eucharist is the earthly manifestation of the heavenly worship, and the adaptation would easily lend itself (Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, chp. XII, p. 414)

⁶⁴ *Calix igitur, missale, et alia necessaria prout in rubricis missalis romani et Canone pontificali...* (Caer. Episc. lib. I, c. xxix, n. 2) The words *canone pontificali* first appeared in the edition of Pope Benedict XIII. ●

⁶⁵ *Caer. Episc. lib. I, c. xx, n. 1*

but in the sixteenth century it was considered to be a papal privilege, denied even to Cardinals.⁶⁶

The *ewer and basin*: the washing of hands during the liturgy is found mentioned in very early documents,⁶⁷ and the term used by early writers to indicate the ewer and basin used for the ritual washing of hands was the *aquamanus*,⁶⁸ *id est*. says the Gelasian Sacramentary, *vas manuale quo scilicet manus lavantur*. The *Ordo Romanus I* describing the Pope's solemn procession from the Lateran on Easter Sunday morning, besides the *aquamanus*, mentions also the *gemelliones*.⁶⁹ These *gemelliones*, or *fontes* as they were often also called, were a pair of silver basins one of which was filled with sweet-smelling rose water for ablutions during the Mass; they were in use for several centuries, but are now obsolete. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* says that they are to be used only when a Cardinal is celebrating Mass.⁷⁰

The *formale* or *pectorale*, i.e. the clasp for holding the cope, became a very elaborate object of art in the late Middle Ages,⁷¹ and from the

⁶⁶ At least this seems to be the conclusion to be drawn from the fact that Paris de Grassis, in his *caeremoniale* (c.1520) for the Cardinal archbishop of Bologna, does not mention the *bugia* or the *bugia*-bearer.

⁶⁷ One can mention in this connection the *Apostolic Constitutions* (lib. VII, c. 2): 'let one subdeacon give water to the priests for washing their hands, a symbol of purity of souls consecrated to God.' One can also mention what St. Cyril of Jerusalem says in his *Mystagogical Catechesis* (V, 1): 'You saw the deacon who gave to the priest and to the elders surrounding the altar of God (water) to wash.... (their hands).... the washing of hands is a symbol of guiltlessness of sins.'

⁶⁸ Other variants are: *aquamanile*, *aquaminale*, *aquaminarium*, *aquamanarium*.

⁶⁹ L, 19: '.... *acolyti.... portent chrisma ante pontificem et evangelia, sindones et sacculos et aquamanus post eum...* L, 21:.... *aquamanus, patena cotidiana.... scifios et pugillares et alios aureos et gemelliones aregenteos.... de ecclesia Salvatoris.... sumunt*.

⁷⁰ Lib. I, p. ii, n. 12:.... *si celebrans esset S.R.E. Cardinalis aut Archiepiscopus aut Episcopus valde insignis possent ad.... ministerium ablutionis manuum ipsius celebrantis invitare aliqui ex magistratu, vel proceribus, et nobilibus viris illius civitatis.... duas aregentes lances, seu fontes, so com-modum erit, vel et buccale cum aqua odorifera.... suo tempore ministrent*.

⁷¹ Righetti (*Storia Liturgica*, Milano, 1950, vol. 8, pag. 511) says that the first mention of an ornate clasp is found in the necrology of Monza, where one can read that in 1196 the archbishop Oberius, formerly the archpriest of Monza, left a *piviale peroptimum cum armilla argentea*.

beginning of the fourteenth century it was considered as one of the pontifical insignia, to be used only by those who had the privileges of a diocesan bishop. the *formalia* used by the Renaissance Popes are certainly worthy of special mention and undoubtedly the most famous of these is the *formale* of Pope Clement VII made by Benvenuto Cellini, which had as a centre piece a thirtyfour carat diamond. The *formale* has never been granted to abbots or protonotaries and Cardinals in Rome did not use it even if they had been granted the throne by the Pope.

Many of these insignia are out of place in the new rite of the Mass; in fact there has been a provisional regularization of them with the Instruction *Pontificales Ritus*⁷² – a final regularization will come with the publication of the new Pontifical and the new *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*.

J. LUPI

⁷²A.A.S. vol. LX (1968), p. 406-412

BOOK REVIEWS

J. SCULLION, S.J., *The Theology of Inspiration*, A Mercier paperback
Cork 1970. 8/-

A. MEREDITH, *The Theology of Tradition*, A Mercier paperback, Cork
1971. 8/-

These two small volumes in the series 'Theology Today' give us a complete picture of the situation today with respect to the problems related to Biblical Inspiration and Tradition respectively. They are written by two different authors but they complement each other. Neither is Inspiration treated independently from Tradition nor Tradition independently from the Bible.

It is the solid gain of Biblical studies in these last decades that the writings of the Bible, individually and collectively, have been placed in their proper historical setting. They have helped us to understand better the problems connected with inspiration and interpretation, as evidenced in the Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum* of Vatican Council II. Now we are in a better position to define the 'truth' of the Bible and interpret the Sacred Records, 'that truth which God wanted to put into the sacred writings for the sake of our salvation.' This principle helps us to solve the difficulties presented by scientific advance and historical research. The Bible is a witness to God's truth, fidelity and steadfast love for his people.

The second volume supplements the first one, namely, the place of tradition, that is, the oral teaching, including the pact itself of Biblical Inspiration, in the life of the Church. Indeed the Biblical records themselves are witnesses for the part played by tradition as enshrined in various institutions of the Church right from the very beginning. It is due to the constant action of the Spirit within the Church, — that is Scripture, Tradition and the Magisterium. The author studies the problems involved in relating these basic elements in the life of the Church. Scripture needs tradition for its own interpretation — indeed to prove its own authority — because it is the product of the community as much as an individual writer; tradition needs Scripture as a normative element and Standard to judge its own witness. The Magisterium is there to serve the people of God in preserving the Scriptures and guiding the Tradition.

The author rightly gives a lot of attention to Newman's doctrine on the development of doctrine under the guidance of the spirit. This approach is not without its own difficulties, but at least it enlivens theology and helps us to go discovering the truth throughout the ages. The difficulties still remain notwithstanding the Council's declaration. It only points out the way for a solution, if ever it is possible to solve it. It is the spirit of the Lord working in and guiding the Church.

These two volumes are invaluable for those who want to have a kind of balance sheet with respect to today's study and analyses of the problems involved by the terms Inspiration and Tradition respectively.

MGR. PROF. C. SANT

MICHAEL SIMPSON, S.J., *Death and Etemal Life*. Cork, The Mercier Press, 1971. 96 pp. 40 p. (8/-).

Eschatology as a theological treatise has been undergoing a thorough face-lifting in recent years. Ever since the revival of scriptural studies encouraged by Pius XII's encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, the need has been felt of demythologizing much that had been said about the Last Things. As a result of this purifying process, which has uncovered much symbolism in many scriptural texts that referred to man's life after death, hope and joy have emerged as the characteristic features of Christian eschatology.

This Father Simpson has brought out very well indeed in this booklet, the forty-second in the Theology Today Series. This work, in fact, synthetizes all recent developments in this field and shows how joy and hope, which are typically Christian virtues, should inspire the life of the authentic Christian whose eternal destiny with Christ has already begun to take shape and be realized here and now.

M.E.

L. BROCKETT, R.S.C.J., *The Theology of Baptism*. Cork, Mercier Press, 1971. 94 pp. 40 p. (8/-).

This booklet, the twenty-fifth in the new Theology Today Series, is mainly a historical study on the sacrament of baptism. Starting from the New Testament data and proceeding all the way down through the centuries, Sister Brockett introduces the reader to the valuable teachings and insights of the early Church in both East and West in accordance with the Church's wish that we return to the sources.

In addition to this, the author points out clearly throughout the book the development of doctrine that lies behind the external changes and adaptations in the Church's practice. Theological views of recent theologians, such as those relating to the salvation of the non-evangelized and the fate of unbaptized infants, are also reported.

This is a most readable book on a very central theological topic. Its content is far greater than one might expect to find in its few pages.

M.E.