

## CURRENT THEOLOGY

### BULLETIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The almost limitless field of New Testament studies has produced renewed activity on the part of those who would make its treasures available to a wider circle, and Catholic scholars have not been remiss in this regard. Particularly the excellent surveys of the Old and New Testament found in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* will supply adequate knowledge of many topics which are here omitted. My intention has been to choose a few articles from the periodical literature, especially from foreign and non-Catholic journals, and to devote more space to each item than is ordinarily done. Where possible, the material has been arranged according to the first New Testament text to which it would apply.

#### INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, METHODS

Fr. A. Bea, S.J., in an article in *Stimmen der Zeit* discusses the present state of biblical studies.<sup>1</sup> After briefly outlining the history of exegesis he calls attention to the importance of literary criticism in the era of Wellhausen and then points out the present trends. Recently the interest has been in factual studies, archeology, history, history of literature, etc., but at the same time historicism has given place to "pneumatic" and theological exegesis. These trends can be observed in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* which, he notes, is very valuable but cannot be taken without qualification as a norm for Catholics, because its conclusions are frequently affected by assumptions we find unacceptable.

Some have impatiently asked why Catholics do not produce a theological dictionary of their own. For his part, Bea thinks that the time is not yet ripe. Biblical theology is not a collection of *loci probantes* but a systematic presentation of the origin and gradual development of the doctrine of the Old and New Testament religion according to the various periods of revelation. Before such a history of revelation can be written, much spade work must be done, and not many Catholic books have appeared in this field. One can mention Heinisch on the Old Testament, and for the New Testament Meinertz, Bonsirven, and Prat, and various articles in the dictionaries. But before a Catholic Kittel can be produced, there is need of many preliminary studies, a rich field for young writers.

Kittel's theological dictionary has shaken many of the assumptions of conservative Protestantism on justification by faith, on Luther's concept

<sup>1</sup> "Der heutige Stand der Bibelwissenschaft," *Stimmen der Zeit*, LXXIX (1953-54), 91-104.

of original sin, and Calvin's ideas on predestination. As a reaction there has been a growth of Neo-Orthodoxy (Barth, Brunner, Stauffer). On the other hand one notices the extreme liberalism of Bultmann who, sharing the existential philosophy of his Marburg colleague, M. Heidegger, seeks to mediate the message of salvation for the present-day believer by removing the "myth" from the New Testament. In removing the "myth" he would take away the entire historical basis of Christianity. Bea concludes with a plea for more scholars who will devote themselves entirely to the field of exegesis, criticism, and biblical theology.

In the effort to achieve complete accuracy in rendering the biblical text into modern speech, translators are apt to "overtranslate," i.e., to find in the original distinctions and emphases which really are not there. The remedy is, of course, a correct knowledge of the biblical languages, and an excellent introduction is found in the pamphlet, *The Language of the New Testament*, by C. F. D. Moule.<sup>2</sup> It is the inaugural lecture on the occasion of the author's installation as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. In an article in the *Expository Times*, Prof. Henry J. Cadbury of Harvard gives high praise to the work, indicates some of its data, and adds observations of his own.<sup>3</sup> As examples of Moule's contributions we read:

In the New Testament the article is omitted with definite predicate nouns without any difference of meaning when the nouns precede the verb. The presence or absence of the article with important nouns is often due to sheer idiom not corresponding to English usage. The article in such phrases as 'God the Father' occurs in the nominative case, but not otherwise. The composite or general relative pronoun *hostis* is used almost exclusively in the nominative, and apparently with the same force as the simple relative which it so largely replaces in that case, especially in Luke-Acts, Paul and Hebrews. It is idiom, not difference of meaning, which determines in the Gospel of John the variation of words, like the two words for 'send,' and 'ask,' and even for 'love'; for example, the 'disciple whom Jesus loved' in 13, 23 [*agapao*] and 20, 2 [*phileo*] and the juxtaposition in Paul of two synonyms for 'new.'

Cadbury then observes that "in Paul derivatives of the Greek words for 'form' (two words) and 'image' tend to occur in juxtaposition (Rom 8, 29; 12, 2; 2 Cor 3, 18; Phil 2, 6-8; 3, 21), and that in relative clauses in the New Testament the use of *kai* seems often to be completely colourless. In the R.S.V. such cases are often translated without the meticulous inclusion of 'also.'"

<sup>2</sup> Cambridge University Press, 1952.

<sup>3</sup> LXIV (1953), 381.

Finally there is a plea for the recognition of words which are implicitly irregular verbs or nouns.

We are quite used to what we call irregular verbs in Greek. They are really collections of defective verbs, and we rightly translate the several parts as complete synonyms, though the present is one word, the future another, and the aorist a third. If the Gospel of John treats *pempo* and *apostello* as interchangeable, using the former in the present and future tenses and in the aorist active participle and the latter in the aorist and perfect active indicative and in the perfect passive participle, these two words have become for that writer a special irregular verb of his own. Other writers exhibit peculiar variations in case. As the forms *Zeus* and *Dios* for the Greek god serve to supplement each other, the latter in the oblique cases, so by Paul 'Christ Jesus' seems to be used generally in the genitive and dative, 'Jesus Christ' in the nominative and accusative.

How valid is the argument that the occurrence of rare words in two documents is a proof of the dependence of one upon the other? The question is considered by J. C. Fenton, who finds that the method must be used with caution.<sup>4</sup> He takes as test cases rare words occurring in Mark and the LXX. Swete's commentary on Mark lists the words which occur in that Gospel and in no other New Testament writing. Of these Markan words forty-one also occur in the LXX and eight are found only very infrequently in the LXX. It is with these eight cases that the test is made. Only in one instance, that of *mogilalos* (Mk 7:32, Is 35:6), do the passages seem to bear any relationship to each other. For example, he asks: "What connexion is there between the net of the wicked man in Habakkuk (1, 17) and the net of Simon and Andrew (Mk 1, 16)? . . . What link is there between Jeremiah's doom on Edom (Jer 49, 9 [LXX 30, 2]) and the difficulty of entering the Kingdom of God (Mk 10, 23-24)? . . . I cannot believe that in order to understand the enfolding of the children in Christ's arms (Mk 9, 36; 10, 16) we need to remember the folding of the sluggard's hands in sleep" (Pr 6, 10; 24, 33). His conclusion is that nothing is proved by the argument from rare words alone unless the content of the passages themselves adds considerable weight to it, as in the appearances of *mogilalos*.

C. K. Barrett began a series of articles on standard New Testament commentaries in the January 1954 *Expository Times*.<sup>5</sup> The two German series of Lietzmann and Meyer are given deserved commendation for their scholarship and for their efforts at constant up-to-date revision. The French Dominicans' work, especially Lagrange's, in the *Etudes bibliques* is lauded,

<sup>4</sup> "Rare Words in the Bible," *Expository Times*, LXIV (1953), 124-25.

<sup>5</sup> "New Testament Commentaries. I. Classical Commentaries," *Expository Times*, LXV (1954), 109-11.

as well as the new French Protestant *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*. Of older writers Calvin and Wettstein are still useful, as well as J. Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. At the end a deserved tribute is paid to Paul Billerbeck, a parish minister in Germany who labored for twenty-six years to produce the *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. While several other titles by Catholic authors could be mentioned, the article is nevertheless an excellent introduction to this special field.

A second article takes up the books on the Gospels and Acts.<sup>6</sup> In this Barrett praises among others the work of Montefiore and Abrahams on Jewish background material. Of Lagrange's work on the first three Gospels he says: "Philologically these are among the most useful books on the Synoptic Gospels; critical orthodoxy in the Roman sense is not obtruded, and the whole work is balanced and fair." On St. Mark he observed that scholars "must now wrestle with the length, depth and weight of V. Taylor's commentary" (1952). This volume replaces that of Swete, who however should not be neglected, because he is strong, where many moderns are weak, in his use of patristic material. Concerning John he notes that Bultmann's work, despite questionable interpretations and textual rearrangements, is yet very valuable. For the Acts of the Apostles *The Beginnings of Christianity* is the outstanding work in English and apparently in any modern language.

#### THE GOSPELS

The book of Dom Butler claiming that Matthew is prior to Mark has occasioned some articles, and H. G. Wood, D.D., writes upholding the priority of Mark.<sup>7</sup> Examining in detail some of Dom Butler's arguments he concludes that the latter thinks the only arguments in favor of the priority of Mark which deserve serious attention are the presence in Mark of phrases likely to cause offence, which are omitted or toned down in the other Gospels, and the fact that Mark reads like a first draft of an impromptu speech, while Matthew and Luke appear to be carefully revised as one would for publication. Wood claims that these arguments, despite Butler's attacks upon them, still favor the priority of Mark. But in addition there is the conclusive argument based on a comparison of the order and arrangement of incidents in Mark and Matthew.

A brief reply to certain criticisms of his book is given by Dom Butler in the *Journal of Theological Studies*.<sup>8</sup> Eight points are discussed, of which the

<sup>6</sup> "New Testament Commentaries. II. Gospels and Acts," *ibid.*, pp. 143-46.

<sup>7</sup> "The Priority of Mark," *Expository Times*, LXV (1953), 17-19.

<sup>8</sup> "Notes on the Synoptic Problem," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. IV (1953), 24-27.

following may be noted. There is no need to postulate a direct dependence of Mark on Matthew. An oral narrator could have intervened. Such a hypothesis is no more improbable than that of some who think that Mark depends on a lost first edition of Matthew. The doublets in Matthew can be explained by Matthew's own practice of self-repetition.

Just as he repeats formulae like 'And it came to pass when Jesus had completed these sayings,' I think he repeated (for instance) the teaching on scandal, first given in his Sermon on the Mount, when (at 18, 6 f.) the subject of scandal recurred. I pointed out in my book that there may be evidence of this practice in the fact that sometimes one of the doublet-twins seems not to belong, by inner coherence, to its context; it is like a footnote reference to its twin-passage.

To the objection that Mark would not have omitted the infancy narratives in Matthew, had he known them, the reply is given that Mark may have decided that the start of Christ's Gospel was not the birth but the baptism. In conclusion he asks his critics to study his detailed analyses of the individual passages, because here the "fundamental solution" of problems of this type must be found.

In the same number of the magazine Vincent Taylor takes issue with Dom Butler's contention that Q is "an unnecessary and vicious hypothesis."<sup>9</sup> He argues from the order of parallel passages in Matthew and Luke and draws up a list of them suggestive of the use of the document Q. His conclusion is: "Coupled with the other arguments in favour of Q, the manifest signs of a common order in Matthew and Luke raise the hypothesis to a remarkable degree of cogency, short only of demonstration. Of current suggestions regarding the demise of the Q hypothesis we may say, as Mark Twain said of premature announcements of his death, that they have been greatly exaggerated."

*The beatitudes*: Mt 5:3-10. That the beatitudes of our Lord were originally cast in poetic form in Hebrew or Aramaic is evident from the parallelism of lines and clauses still discernible in both Matthew and Luke. Prof. Matthew Black seeks to reconstruct the original form of some of the stanzas.<sup>10</sup> He suggests taking Matthew's first and third beatitudes together: "Blessed are God's poor, / For theirs is the kingdom of God. / Blessed are God's humble (servants), / For they shall inherit the earth." Another stanza results from a combination of Matthew's second beatitude and Luke's third: "Blessed are they that mourn, / For they shall be comforted. / Blessed are ye (they) that weep now, / For ye (they) shall laugh." Because,

<sup>9</sup> "The Order of Q," *ibid.*, pp. 27-31.

<sup>10</sup> "The Beatitudes," *Expository Times*, LXIV(1953), 125-26.

according to Black, Luke preserves the more primitive form of Q and in both Matthew and Luke the words are addressed to the disciples, it is suggested that the second person may have been original throughout. A similar four-line stanza with parallel couplets is obtained by taking Mt 5:7 and 9 together: "Blessed are the merciful, / For they shall obtain mercy. / Blessed are the peace-makers, / For they shall be called the sons of God." Finally, in the reference to hunger and thirst in Matthew he finds the suggestion that a stanza was compressed into a single verse: "Blessed are ye that hunger, / For ye shall be filled. / (Blessed are ye that thirst, / For ye shall be sated.)"

Mt 16:14. That a great personage, whether Elias, Jeremias, or one of the prophets, was eagerly expected in first-century Palestine, is evident from the statement of the disciples before the confession of St. Peter and from the questions put to the Baptist (Jn 1:19-21). A confirmation of this expectation has been found, if the thesis of N. Wieder regarding the Law-Interpreter of the Dead Sea Scrolls is correct.<sup>11</sup> He believes that the "Interpreter of the Law" was conceived as a Moses-like teacher who, on the basis of Deut 18:18, was expected to appear before the coming of the Messias.

This belief was current at the time of the rise of Christianity and has survived in a rabbinic source, though the Rabbis suppressed it for polemical reasons. The conclusion is supported by the proof-texts found in the Qumran caves. . . . The belief is also reflected in the Manual of Discipline and is demanded by the typological parallelism 'desert period'—'eschatological period.' Like the first Moses, the primary function of the second was to act as supreme teacher and exponent of the Torah. The study of the Torah assumed among the sectaries a messianic significance.<sup>12</sup>

Perhaps, we may add, this ardent devotion to the Law would explain the opposition to Christ and Paul by those who thought they were destroying the Mosaic Law and not fulfilling it.

"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock" (Mt 16:18). Perhaps the most important and controversial New Testament writing of many years is that of Oscar Cullmann on St. Peter. Originally published in German and quickly translated into French and English, it has aroused so much attention that *Time* devoted to it a news article.<sup>13</sup> Reviews have been many and lengthy, so that a collection of these would of itself constitute a book. Because of the author's profound scholarship and his irenic attitude towards

<sup>11</sup> "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Second Moses," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, IV (1953), 158-75.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 175.

<sup>13</sup> December 7, 1953, pp. 70-72.

the Church, Catholic reviews have often developed into articles, as the following list will demonstrate: P. Benoit, O.P., *Revue biblique*, LX (1953), 565-79; F. M. Braun, O.P., "L'apôtre Pierre devant l'exégèse et l'histoire," *Rev. thom.*, LIII (1953), 389-403; L. Cerfaux, "Saint Pierre et sa succession," *Rech. sciences religieuses*, XLI (1953), 188-202; Yves M. J. Congar, "Du nouveau sur la question de Pierre? Le saint Pierre de M. O. Cullmann," *La vie intellectuelle*, XXV (1953), 17-43; J. Cambier, S.D.B., "Dialogue avec M. Cullmann," *Eph. theol. Lov.*, XXIX (1953), 646-53; G. Dejaifve, S.J., "M. Cullmann et la question de Pierre," *Nouv. rev. théol.*, LXXV (1953), 365-79; J. Daniélou, S.J., "Une livre Protestant sur saint Pierre," *Etudes*, CCLXXVI (1953), 206-19; P. Gaechter, S.J., "Petrus und seine Nachfolge," *Zeit. kath. theol.*, LXXV (1953), 331-37.

Cullmann thinks that Peter was for a time head of the Church at Jerusalem, but that later he resigned that post to devote himself to the Jewish-Christian mission. In that capacity he was subject to James, who had succeeded him. Upon many points Cullmann agrees with or approaches the Catholic position. On others he is very far from us. It may be hoped that someone will soon summarize the various Catholic studies that have been made. In the meantime we may remark that frequently the objection is raised that Cullmann assumes without sufficient proof that Peter's role was unique in the sense that he could not have any successors. Furthermore, the suggestion of Peter being subject to James does not seem to explain adequately the texts of the New Testament. While the outlook of the book is unmistakably Protestant, the tone is moderate and we may hope that discussions on this theme will continue in the same spirit of tranquil objectivity.

"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Mt 16:18). One might expect to find a person the subject of the verb "prevail." This is one of the reasons which has led Dr. John B. Bauer<sup>14</sup> to adopt a suggestion made by Robert Eppel.<sup>15</sup> He claims that instead of "gates" we should read "keepers of the gates." The argument runs thus. According to Papias, Matthew wrote in Hebrew (which Eppel takes as Hebrew and not Aramaic), and in Hebrew the same consonants could mean either "gates" or "keepers of the gates." The Greek translator would have chosen the wrong vocalization. Bauer brings out the fact that the same confusion exists in II Sam 18:26 and Job 38:17 and in the Syro-Hexaplar version, and that such confusion was possible in Aramaic also. Besides, there is mention of "ostiarum inferi"

<sup>14</sup> "Ostiarum Inferorum," *Biblica*, XXXIV (1953), 430-31.

<sup>15</sup> *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel* (1950), pp. 71-73.

in Job 38:17 (LXX & Syr. Hex.), in the Slavic version of Henoch 42:1, in Hagiga 15, b (Strack-Billerbeck, IV, 1090), and in Babylonian literature. If, then, the original text read "keepers of the gates," the meaning would be the demoniac powers of hell. A personal subject would be better for the verb "prevail" and there would be an easier transition to the image of Peter as the keeper of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The interpretation seems to be probable.

The "eye of a needle" (Mt 19:24) has surprised more than one person so that some have supposed that a narrow gate was called the "needle's eye" through which a camel could pass with difficulty. Fr. C. Lattey, S.J., takes up the question and observes that the theory of a narrow gate hardly needs refutation.<sup>16</sup> Then proceeding to a positive solution he proposes to read, "it is easier for a hawser (rope) to pass through an eye of a needle." His arguments are in part the following. In Arabic and Syriac the same word means camel and hawser. And from the Syriac one can argue with probability to the existence of this latter meaning in Aramaic, even though thus far no instance has been discovered. Furthermore, in Greek *kamilos* means "rope" and could easily have been mistakenly altered to *kamelos*, "camel." Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact also read the word as "a rope." The conclusion of the note is that, while our Lord used hyperbole, nevertheless in speaking of something passing through a needle's eye a hawser would be more appropriate than a camel.

Mt 24:16. Among the finds of manuscripts near the Dead Sea in recent years was a letter discovered at Muraba'at written by Simon bar Cocheba in which he orders a certain Jesua ben Gilgola and his followers to cease their dealings with the "Galileans."<sup>17</sup> The latter term may mean the soldiers who had fought with the Jews against the Romans. Or it may signify the Jewish-Christians who had followed the warning of Christ, "then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains" (Mt 24:16). These people would have lived peacefully in the desert of Juda until the third year of the war which bar Cocheba was waging against Rome when he sought to have them fight for him, the new Messiah. That Simon was hostile to the Christians is known from Justin and Eusebius.

A slightly different interpretation of the document is given by J. L. Teicher of Cambridge.<sup>18</sup> The Galileans are Christians who were rescued by

<sup>16</sup> "Camelus per foramen acus," *Verbum Domini*, XXXI (1953), 291-92.

<sup>17</sup> E. Vogt, S.J., "Epistula Simonis Ben Koseba," *Biblica*, XXXIV (1953), 421-22; cf. J. T. Milik, *Revue biblique*, LX (1953), 276-94.

<sup>18</sup> "Documents of the Bar-Kochba Period," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, IV (1953), 133-34.

the commander of the Jewish army in the field. The man is not being reprimanded for protecting them, but bar Cocheba wishes the Jews to have nothing to do with the Christians, probably because he "feared the effects of Christian propaganda on the morale of his army, and perhaps he also intended to exercise pressure on the Christians to join his movement."

*The Turin shroud* (cf. Mt 27:57). The discussions regarding the Turin shroud have occasioned renewed study of the burial of our Lord, and Fr. Paul Gaechter, professor of the New Testament at Innsbruck, studies four items in regard to the burial of the Savior.<sup>19</sup> First, he believes that the *sinдон* of the Synoptics does not indicate the shape of the cloth but only the material, a fine fabric. On the other hand, the *othonia* of St. John would indicate that the fabric was in the form of long bands or strips. The second point concerns the question whether the burial was a hasty and provisional one. Gaechter does not believe it was. Joseph and Nicodemus knew that the corpse must be buried before sundown and so would have made preparations. Being men of means they would have performed the burial with the help of their servants, so that there would be no need of haste. Thirdly, in the account of St. John there is strangely no mention of oil, which was customary in the burial of a distinguished person. In view of the large amount of myrrh and aloes mentioned, the omission could not have been due to negligence. Gaechter therefore thinks that Joseph could not buy any oil because the supply was sold out on account of the large number of pilgrims then in Jerusalem. The women noticing the omission decide that they will obtain oil, and Joseph tells them that he also will bring some later. After the Sabbath rest, i.e., at sundown Saturday night, the women purchase spices and oil, not the perfumed oil ready for the anointing but the rough material which would need to be boiled and have the spices worked into it, a task which kept them busy much of the night. Early Sunday morning they set out for the tomb. Fourth point: they expected to meet Joseph and his servants at the grave. But, once Joseph had heard that the tomb was watched by the soldiers, he decided not to come. All these points are worked out with careful consideration of the customs of the time. How far the solution will be adopted depends upon the readiness to accept the postulates involved.

One of the most effective objections against the authenticity of the Turin shroud has been drawn from the Gospel description of the burial of our Lord and of Lazarus, to such an extent that one finds it difficult to name exegetes who uphold the authenticity of the shroud. However, Fr. Vaccari, S.J., of the Biblical Institute, has on more than one occasion defended some posi-

<sup>19</sup> "Zum Begräbnis Jesu," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXXV (1953), 220 ff.

tions basic for the authenticity, and last year he delivered a public lecture which Fr. E. Vogt, S.J., summarized in *Biblica*.<sup>20</sup>

According to the Synoptics (Mt 27:59 ff.) Joseph wrapped the body of the Savior in a *sindon*, while Jn 19:40 says it was bound with *othonia*, and there is mention of a *soudarion* placed over the head. As for Lazarus, his feet and hands were bound with *keiriai*, and his face was covered with a *soudarion*. The question naturally arises: is the *sindon* of the Synoptics the same as the *othonia* of John, and are both these the same as the *keiriai* of Lazarus?

Light has been shed on this point by a Greek papyrus published in 1952.<sup>21</sup> A certain Roman magistrate named Theophanes was making a journey about 320 A.D. from upper Egypt to Antioch of Syria. In a large papyrus containing 349 lines he has kept an account of the places where he stopped, the distances travelled, the expenses, and the garments which apparently he carried on his journey. Under *othonia* are listed seventeen species of linen garments. Among them are four *sindonia* and one *phakarion*, a synonym for *soudarion*. On the other hand, *fasciai*, a synonym for *keiriai*, are placed under another heading, *sc.*, *stromata*. Therefore *othonia* is a generic term and can mean *sindon* and is not to be translated "swathing-band, bandages" (*keiriai*). When St. John wished to mention bandages or strips of cloth he used the term *keiriai*, and he does so speaking of the burial of Lazarus but not describing the burial of Christ. In conclusion it may be noted that a monk Anastasios ca. 650 distinguishes *tas sindonas* and *tas keirias*. Vaccari's contribution solves one difficulty raised against the shroud, and it is hoped that he may soon publish a study of the other exegetical questions involved.

"Abba, Father" (Mk 14:36). This expression occurs three times in the New Testament (Mk 14:36; Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15), and the Greek in all these passages is *Abba ho pater*. Professor S. Vernon McCasland, of the University of Virginia, seeks to discover the original meaning and provide an exact modern translation.<sup>22</sup> He claims that the phrase has defied translators from the very beginning and after consulting twenty-seven translations finds that almost all have merely transliterated *Abba*. His own position is that Mark did not intend to put *ho pater* as the translation of the Aramaic word

<sup>20</sup> "Sindon-othonia-keiriai in Evv.," *Biblica*, XXXIV (1953), 264.

<sup>21</sup> C. H. Roberts and E. G. Turner, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, IV (Manchester, 1952), Pap. n. 627, p. 117 ff. For arguments in favor of the shroud, cf. E. A. Wuenschel, C.S.S.R., "The Truth about the Holy Shroud," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXIX (1953), 3-19, 100-114, 170-87, and his *Self Portrait of Christ* (Esopus, N.Y., 1954), especially the bibliography, pp. 101-21.

<sup>22</sup> "Abba, Father," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXII (1953), 79-91.

*Abba*, because when he does translate a word he tells us so, as in Mark 3:17, "Boanerges, which is, Sons of Thunder."

The thesis of the author is developed thus. First, the Aramaic *Abba* or "father" is a Jewish metonym for God, i.e., a name which for good reasons has been substituted for another. Secondly, in the New Testament Father frequently is used as a metonym for God. "In all the 125 places in the Gospels where Father is used as a metonym—and of the 151 in the New Testament—we may drop the metonym and simply write in the name God for which it stands. To do this will usually rob the saying of some of its quaintness and force, as the poetic quality yields to a prosaic form of expression, but elements of ambiguity are often eliminated." Thirdly, Father is often used in the New Testament as an appellative, indicating the character and function of God as Christian faith apprehends him; thus I Thess 1:1, "in God the Father"; II Thess 1:1, "in God our Father," etc. Finally, the definite article in Greek often has the significance of a possessive pronoun, and the *ho pater* of Mk 14:36 is, in the parallel Mt 26:39, *pater mou*. The translation, therefore, of *Abba ho pater* should be "O God, my Father" or "O God, our Father."

Probably *Abba* was used in prayer by Greek-speaking Christians who knew that it meant God but did not know its original, literal meaning. "Paul and Mark knew what it meant, but they are using what has become an idiom among their Greek readers. *Abba* was a loan-word which no longer meant 'the Father' or 'my Father' in this idiom, but simply God. That made it possible to write 'Abba, Father' without being conscious of tautology." Perhaps it is simpler to suppose with Lagrange (Mk 14:36) that in the early catechesis *Abba* was repeated and immediately explained. Mark does not say "Abba, i.e., father" because the phrase "Abba, father" came to him ready-made.

"Men of good will" (L 2:14). The text of the angels' song at Christmas has the famous variety of readings: "peace, good will to men" and "peace to men of good will." While the former is popularly used by many Protestants, yet scholars of all denominations favor the text, "peace to men of good will." More important is the question, whose good will is meant. Is stress to be placed upon the good will of men, so that peace is offered to those who fulfill this condition? Or, as seems more probable, is the good will that of God, so that the sense would be, "peace among men with whom he is pleased"?<sup>23</sup>

The latter alternative is more common, but one objection constantly raised against it was that no direct parallel existed for the phrase, "men of

<sup>23</sup> Revised Standard Version.

good will," meaning men for whom God has good will. In one of the recently discovered manuscripts found near the Dead Sea a parallel has been found and its importance set forth by Claus-Hunno Hunziger in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.<sup>24</sup> The text speaks of the overflowing of God's mercy upon all the sons of His good will.<sup>25</sup> Here the suffix clearly indicates that the good will is that of God, but even without this new discovery the meaning could stand, as can be argued from the expression, "children of wrath" (Eph 2:3), evidently meaning the wrath of God.

Hunziger thinks that there are many similarities between the Dead Sea text in question and the early Christian language, so that he concludes that the term "sons of good will" was part of the tradition common to the Dead Sea sect and the Jewish-Christian community in which Luke 2:14 originated.

One may further ask whether the good will of God means His benevolence in dispensing favors to men or the good pleasure He finds in men, i.e., whether it is *benevolentia-gratia* or *delectatio-approbatio*. The latter seems the sense in the Dead Sea text, whose members are described as those who walk according to the heart of God.

*The Paraclete—the Comforter* (Jn 14:16). The word *parakletos*, used four times in St. John's Gospel, presents a notorious *crux exegetica*, since it is difficult to decide how far it has assumed an active meaning (consoler, comforter) despite its undoubtedly passive form (one called to the side of a person, hence an advocate). While Mr. Davey suggests that the term includes both meanings,<sup>26</sup> Mr. Barrett detects a connection with the primitive *kerygma* and with *parakalein* in the sense of "to exhort."<sup>27</sup> Not excluding either of these views, but rather seeking to define its primary meaning, J. G. Davies studies the word in its context and compares it with the similar setting in the LXX.<sup>28</sup> As used by the fourth Evangelist, *parakletos* belongs to a complex of ideas (glory, peace, weep, spirit, rejoice, water, resurrection, etc.) from which it should not be separated. And the term is found in the same complex of ideas in the LXX. The author thinks that the complex of ideas in John 14-17 is taken either consciously or unconsciously from the LXX, so that *parakletos* would derive its primary significance from the LXX. Now in twenty-three out of twenty-four of the LXX examples of the complex under consideration *parakalein* bears the meaning "to comfort."

<sup>24</sup> "Neues Licht auf Lc 2,14," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIV (1952-53), 85-90.

<sup>25</sup> E. L. Sukenik, *Megilloth* [Hebrew title], (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Bialikfond, 1950), Plate IX, ll. 26-29.

<sup>26</sup> *The Fourth Gospel* (1940), pp. 549-54.

<sup>27</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. I (1950), 1-15.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, IV (1953), 35-38.

"We may conclude therefore that, despite its passive form, *parakletos* set by the author of the fourth gospel in the same complex, has assumed an active significance and that its primary meaning is 'comforter.'"

Did Pilate have Jesus sit upon the judgment-seat (Jn 19:13)? That the verb *ekathisen* in this verse has an intransitive meaning, *sc.*, Pilate sat down on the judgment-seat, is the generally accepted interpretation. But some have favored a transitive sense, thus providing additional mockery for the Messianic claims of the Savior. Fr. Joseph Bonsirven, S.J., espoused this second interpretation,<sup>29</sup> and the same conclusion was reached independently by A. Kurfess.<sup>30</sup> His arguments are from the *Gospel of Peter* 3, 7 and from Justin, *Apol.* I, 35. In the first it is said that Pilate delivered him to the people. But they took the Lord . . . and clothed him with purple and put him on the judgment-seat and said: judge justly, thou king of Israel. Obviously Justin is quoting this text when he says that they mocked Jesus and put him on the judgment-seat and said to him: be our judge.

*The crown of thorns* (Jn 19:2-5). In a very interesting and copiously documented article H. St. John Hart suggests that the crown of thorns was intended to caricature the radiate crown indicating divine rule which was worn by Hellenistic rulers and Roman emperors.<sup>31</sup> Thus there would be mockery not only of the kingship but also of the divinity of Christ. For his argument he assumes that the crown was of thorns and not of any sort of leaves, that it need not necessarily have been designed for torment, that it was a caricature of a recognizable crown, that the material would have been readily available and could be reasonably called "thorns."

The radiate crown, a headband with long rays like spines projecting upward from it, had been systematically publicized on coins in the East for some centuries before the passion. A plate gives reproductions of eight coins depicting rulers with such crowns. There are coins of Ptolemy III Euergetes, 246-221 B.C.; Antioches VI, Epiphanes Dionysos, *ca.* 144 B.C.; Augustus, *ca.* 18 B.C.; and Tiberius, 19/20 A.D. Familiarity with a coin like that of Tiberius' may have suggested to Pilate's soldiers the crown which they wished to imitate in their sport.

The material for such a crown could come from the long thorns (some are twelve inches in length) that grow on the base of the *rachis*, or axis, of the date-palm frond. This tree grew then and still grows near Jerusalem. The Talmud mentions that the palm has thorns and uses the term "thorn

<sup>29</sup> *Biblica*, XXXIII (1952), 511-15; cf. esp. pp. 512-13.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, XXXIV (1953), 271.

<sup>31</sup> "The Crown of Thorns in John 19, 2-5," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. III (1953), 66-75.

palms." A Jew, therefore, could speak of a crown of thorns using "thorn" as a synonym for palm, if the crown was made of palms, even though the thorns were not used. A crown made from palm thorns would be particularly adapted to the soldiers' purpose in mocking the Savior.

On this view, when Pilate's soldiers had finished the dressing up of their prisoner he wore a mock-royal robe of purple, he carried a mock-royal sceptre, and he was crowned with a mock-radiate crown. He was presented as at once *theos* and *basileus*—he was as it were *divus Iesus radiatus*. Accordingly he was the object in mockery of *proskynesis*, cf. Mark 15, 19. This interpretation also lends a vivid force to the narrative of John 19, 1 ff. Thus there is irony in the *idou ho anthropos* of verse 5, for the figure before the people's eyes is dressed as *basileus* and *theos*.<sup>31a</sup>

Confirmation is found in a fresco in the Roman catacomb of Praetextatus, which is usually agreed to represent the crowning with thorns, and to belong to the mid-second century. A soldier stretches out towards the head of the central figure something very much like a palm-branch. In the head are already a number of palm fronds set at different angles, as if radiation had been attempted and failed.

A confirmatory argument for Mr. Hart's suggestion is brought forth by Professor Campbell Bonner, of the University of Michigan.<sup>32</sup> It is a passage in Apuleius, *Metam.* 11, 24: "At manu dextera gerebam flammis adultam facem et caput decore corona cinxerat palmae candidae foliis in modum radorum prosistentibus. Sic ad instar Solis exornato me et in vicem simulacri constituto, repente velis reductis, in aspectum populus errabat." Apuleius is describing the culminating moment of Lucius' initiation into the mysteries of Isis, the scene in which the neophyte, in the likeness of the Sun God, is revealed to a throng of admiring devotees. His crown may have been made of the long narrow "thorns" of the palm fixed in a headband which could also have been made of palm.

The possibility of a different interpretation of the crown of our Lord is set forth by E. R. Goodenough and C. B. Welles.<sup>33</sup> They doubt that thorns were used at all and interpret the Gospel passages as referring not to a thorny plant but to the acanthus and to the *acanthus mollis*. "For there are two basic forms of acanthus, the *acanthus spinosus*, which has thorny leaves, and the more common *acanthus mollis* with 'large, deeply cut, hairy, shining leaves.' It is the latter variety which was usually used on Corinthian capitals, and very widely as a religious symbol."<sup>34</sup> The use of *acanthus mollis* as a

<sup>31a</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.

<sup>32</sup> "The Crown of Thorns," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLVI (1953), 47-48.

<sup>33</sup> "The Crown of Acanthus (?)," *ibid.*, pp. 241-42.

<sup>34</sup> *Encycl. Brit.*, 14th ed., s.v. "Acanthus."

general symbol and specifically as a crown is well attested in Palestine, e.g., in the synagogues of Capernaum and Chorazin. But the acanthus crown may have been unknown or little known outside of Palestine, which could account for the fact that the true interpretation of the Gospel term was so soon forgotten.

*Proto-Luke and Acts.* The Rev. C. S. C. Williams, of Merton College, Oxford, in a short article, "The Date of Luke-Acts,"<sup>35</sup> suggests that "St. Luke sent as his *protos logos* to Theophilus not his Gospel, as is so often assumed, but an early draft of the Gospel material, such as Proto-Luke, in a form not of a complete Gospel, but of a collection of sayings and doings of the Lord; that he then wrote Acts; and that he then revised the Third Gospel, basing it chronologically on a copy of Mark's Gospel, which had come into his hands before he wrote Acts but not before the 'early draft.'"

On this theory Luke purposely omitted from his final revision of the Gospel the Markan material to which he had alluded in Acts. Some may object to the theory that a collection of Q and L material, such as Proto-Luke is assumed to have been, must reflect the historical situation after 70 A.D., and that this theory consequently is of no value for dating Acts. Williams discounts the objection. First, there is no need to postulate Luke's dependence on Josephus in L 19:11-27 or elsewhere. "Again, Jesus' lamentation over Jerusalem in Lk 19, 41-44 does not prove that Luke composed it after A.D. 70. Jesus was at least a prophet." Finally, the terms for the description of the siege, as C. H. Dodd has observed, could be taken from the LXX.<sup>36</sup> The "conception of the coming disaster which the author has in mind is a generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalem as imaginatively presented by the prophets. So far as any historical event has coloured the picture, it is not Titus's capture of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but Nebuchadrezzar's capture in 586 B.C."

By placing Acts before the final revision of Luke's Gospel one is able better to explain the situation which Acts supposes. The later the date assigned to Acts in the first century A.D., the harder it is to account for Luke's silence about Paul's death and for Luke's lack of knowledge of the Pauline letters in some collection. Moreover, when Acts was written the tension between Jewish and Gentile Christianity (Acts 16:3; 21:21) was acute, but by the second century the controversy was almost dead. If the reference to the high priest, Ananias (Acts 23:8), be a *valicinium ex eventu*, the earliest date for Acts would be 66 A.D. Between 66 and 70 Luke may have become familiar with a copy of Mark on which (perhaps after 70 A.D.) he was to base the final revision of his Gospel.

<sup>35</sup> *Expository Times*, LXIV (1953), 283-84.

<sup>36</sup> *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1947), 52.

## ACTS, PAUL, JAMES, APOCALYPSE

*Symeon and Peter* (Acts 15:14). At the Council of Jerusalem St. James stated that Symeon related how first God looked upon the Gentiles to take from them a people unto his name (Acts 15:14), and the question naturally arises: who is this Symeon?<sup>37</sup> The prince of the Apostles is the obvious answer found as early as Irenaeus. To the objection that his name was not Symeon but Simon Peter the reply can be made that Simon and Symeon are apparently interchanged in Josephus, and in the greeting of II Peter 1:1 we read Symeon Peter. While St. Luke on every other occasion calls Peter Simon, there could have been a special reason for preserving the Hebrew form in recording the speech of James, just as *Saoul* is found only in the direct discourse of the heavenly voice to Paul and on the lips of Ananias, while *Saulos* occurs elsewhere.

Differing from this common identification is the first formal commentator on the Acts, Chrysostom, who does not identify Symeon with Peter. Apparently he was influenced by the difference between Simon and Symeon, and he never cites the one place in the New Testament in which Symeon is called Peter (II Peter 1:1). He states that Symeon was the one who prophesied in Luke, which naturally suggests the old man who took the infant Savior into his arms at the presentation in the Temple.

A different understanding of Chrysostom's words is proposed by Stanislaus Giet, professor of ancient church history in the University of Strasbourg.<sup>38</sup> According to him the Greek Father means Symeon Niger, one of the five prophets and doctors mentioned when Barnabas and Saul are sent forth on their mission (Acts 13:1). Taking up the arguments point by point Fr. Smothers, S.J., of West Baden College, finds the theory unacceptable and notes that Symeon Niger is so obscure a person that Chrysostom mentions him when commenting on Acts 13:1 and nowhere else. Fr. Smothers' final conclusion is that St. John Chrysostom identified Symeon as the prophet of the *Nunc dimittis*, but that he erred in this, because Symeon was actually St. Peter.

*St. Paul's use of "I" and "We."* In the letters of St. Paul one can observe a rapid transition from the first singular to the first plural. Singular and plural are not to be regarded as interchangeable, and the reason for the transition is sought by the Rev. W. F. Lofthouse in an article, " 'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters."<sup>39</sup> He finds the reason in the rapid movement

<sup>37</sup> Edgar R. Smothers, S.J., "Chrysostom and Symeon (Acts XV, 14)," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLVI (1953), 204-15.

<sup>38</sup> *Mélanges Jules Lebreton*, I (Paris, 1951); = *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXXIX (1951-52), 203-20.

<sup>39</sup> *Expository Times*, LXIV (1953), 241-45.

of the Apostle's thought and his profound sympathy and close identification with others.

[When Paul] wrote 'I,' he was thinking of himself as distinct from his companions, his hearers, and the Church in general, and of experiences which others could not share; when he wrote 'we,' he was thinking of himself as one of a number, either the little band of his companions, or his readers, or the whole company of believers always in the background of his mind. The circle expands or contracts; but it is always there when the plural is used; never when it is not.<sup>40</sup>

Concerning the "I" of Romans 7, in which Paul describes the misery of the sinner, the author claims that the pronoun here is typical. It is Paul's own experience but one which could have happened to others, though not all believers have shared the experience. At the end the writer has an excellent paragraph on the sympathy of the Apostle.

When he says 'I' he means 'I'—there can be no doubt about that. But the barrier between singular and plural is constantly breaking down. So far from being self-centered or occupied with himself, the Apostle habitually links himself with others; the friends at his side, the recipients, whether they will welcome his letters or criticize them, or the whole company of the faithful through all the world. The one identification never expressed in so many words—reverence would forbid it—is that with God the Father or the Lord Jesus Christ. When we follow these almost lightning transitions, we find him letting out the secret of his intense sympathies by a door the handle of which he never consciously turned. The usage is as unique in the New Testament as it is illuminating for the passionate invasiveness, as we may perhaps venture to call it, of one who sought to be all things to all men, though he never ceased to be either himself or the servant of Jesus Christ.<sup>41</sup>

"Paul to the church of" (cf. Rom 1:1) is well known as a beginning for the New Testament letters, and students are aware that this salutation was customary in Christian, Jewish, and pagan letters of the period. Yet in a letter published last year and purporting to be written by bar Cocheba and therefore in the second century A.D., a different wording is found, "from S . . . to . . ."<sup>42</sup> Arguing from this phrase, Prof. Solomon Zeitlin claims that the form of salutation is of itself sufficient to prove that the document was written in medieval times, because from the third century B.C. to the third century A.D. no letter in Hebrew, Aramaic, Latin, or Greek begins with the formula, "From X to Y."<sup>43</sup>

However, Prof. Ralph Marcus, of the University of Chicago, challenges

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 241.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 245.

<sup>42</sup> J. T. Milik, "Une lettre de Simeon Bar Kokheba," *Revue biblique*, LX (1953), 276-94.

<sup>43</sup> *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIV (1953), 85-115.

the statement.<sup>44</sup> He produces five examples of Greek letters written before the end of the second century A.D. which are at least a partial refutation. For they have the wording "from X" at least after the name of the recipient. The examples are taken from the collection of papyri edited by Hunt and Edgar in the Loeb Classics. They are Pap. Teb. 776, early 2nd century B.C.; Pap. Amherst 35, 132 B.C.; Pap. Tebt. 39, 114 B.C.; Pap. Rein. 18, 108 B.C., and Pap. Grau 2, 55-59 A.D. The text of the last can suffice as an illustration: *Tiberioi Klaudioi Balbiloi para Nemesionos*. In conclusion Marcus observes: "One could multiply this list at least ten times."

The question of the person who is the subject of the drama described in Romans 7 is considered anew in a series of articles by Rev. C. Leslie Mitton in the *Expository Times*.<sup>45</sup> In the first article he summarizes the position of those who maintain that Paul is speaking of his experience as a Jew under the Mosaic Law. Then he presents Nygren's opinion that Paul pictures his own Christian life, and the purpose would be to make Christians realize that here on earth they cannot expect any release from the note of helpless failure in striving for the full Christian life. In a second article the author studies Nygren's arguments and finds them insufficient.<sup>46</sup> His own final solution is that Paul is thinking of the distressing experience of any normally earnest man, whether Christian or not, and a strong argument is made from 7:25: "So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." The entire chapter would describe a man who is trying to live the good life but doing it in his own strength only.<sup>47</sup> Catholic authors who hold that Paul is speaking of a man under the Law (and this is the common opinion today) admit that one can, with certain limitations, argue to the situation of a Christian who because of the weakness of his nature realizes the need of divine assistance.

I Cor 4:21. When Paul speaks of coming to Corinth in his first epistle, he has some doubt whether all the faithful will accept his decisions readily and therefore sets before them the choice: "What is your wish? Shall I come to you with a rod, or in love and in the spirit of meekness?" Most commentators understand the rod to be that of a pedagogue punishing a recalcitrant child. But Père Spicq, O.P., observes that such an interpretation seems to ignore the Hebrew concept of paternal correction (cf. Heb 12:5-11).<sup>48</sup> Instead he thinks that the Apostle has in mind the text of Job in

<sup>44</sup> "A Note on the Bar Kokeba Letter from Muraba'at," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XIII (1954), 51.

<sup>45</sup> "Romans—vii. Reconsidered—I," *Expository Times*, LXV (1953), 78-81.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 99-103.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 132-35.

<sup>48</sup> "Un réminiscence de Job XXXVII, 13 dans I Cor, IV. 21?", *Revue biblique*, LX (1953), 509-12.

which God says that He accomplishes His will either by chastisement (*shebet*, *sc.*, a rod) or by mercy (*hesed*) (Job 37:13). Previously Paul had said that he had the mind of the Lord (cf. I Cor 2:16).

A *liturgical Eucharistic background* (I Cor 16:20-24). The final words of the Letter, according to John A. T. Robinson, indicate a liturgical sequence which is reflected in the Apocalypse and the *Didache*.<sup>49</sup> He argues thus. In the customary Pauline ending of an epistle there suddenly appears a disturbing note: "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema. Maranatha" (v. 22). The strangeness of this verse gives the key to the solution. The Apostle's language is unusual because he is employing a formula already stereotyped. A similar expression occurs in the *Didache*: "If any man is holy, let him come; if any be not, let him repent. Maranatha" (10, 6). Probably the *Didache* is referring to the preparation for the Eucharist after the completion of the Agape. The Aramaic word Maranatha seems to mean "Lord, come!", an appeal to Christ to come in His Parousia, which is anticipated by the real presence of the Eucharist.

The author suggests that Paul is quoting a similar liturgical sequence. (1) The mutual reconciliation and the kiss of peace. Paul envisages the meeting of the church and sees that the reading of his letter is coming to an end. Now in preparation for the Eucharist they greet one another and give the kiss of peace. Writing from Ephesus he pictures that church as also taking part and he too wishes personally to greet the Corinthians. So he writes: "All the brethren salute you. Salute one another with a holy kiss. The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand" (I Cor 16:20-21). (2) Next would come the warning dismissal of those unfit; thus: "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema" (22). (3) There follows the prayer, "Lord, come!", i.e., "Maranatha!" (4) Finally, the closing words echo those with which the presiding cleric begins the Eucharistic rite: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you!", to which Paul adds as it were his response: "My love be with you all in Christ Jesus." A similar liturgical background seems supposed in the ending of the Apocalypse where also we read, "Come, Lord Jesus." Prof. Robinson points out the significance of his thesis:

We have in 1 Cor 16, 22 (which at all events appears to be pre-Pauline in origin) the remains of the earliest Christian liturgical sequence we possess. The fact that Paul can quote a formula with which he can assume, without explanation, that his audience is familiar, indicates that fixed eucharistic forms were in use at Corinth within twenty-five years of the Resurrection. The fact that that formula

<sup>49</sup> "Traces of a Liturgical Sequence in 1 Cor. 16, 20-24," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. IV (1953), 38-41.

includes a word that must have established itself beyond possibility of translation before the rise of Gentile Christianity takes us a great deal farther back still.

“The thorn for the flesh” (II Cor 12:7). Readers are no doubt familiar with the current interpretations of the “thorn for the flesh.” The opinion that Paul is speaking of carnal temptations is not common today. There are defenders for Chrysostom’s view that Paul is speaking of the persecutions aroused against his ministry by the devil. But the prevailing opinion among scholars is that the term refers to some sort of disease, whether ophthalmia, epilepsy, or malaria. However, Prof. Menoud of Neuchâtel has proposed the theory that the thorn is psychological and describes Paul’s anguish of soul over his failure to convert his own people.<sup>50</sup>

First he sets aside the arguments for some sort of disease. Gal 4:13 with its clear reference to “physical infirmity” does not mean sickness but rather that Paul arrived in Galatia with bodily bruises sustained in his apostolic labors. II Cor 4:7–12, describing the labors and sufferings of the Apostle, does not refer to the “thorn” but to trials inevitable for any missionary like Paul.

Positively Menoud argues that the thorn must be connected with the exercise of Paul’s apostolate, and it must have been something peculiar to him. Everyone knows how heartbroken he was that he could not convert his own Jewish nation. At first he thought that Jewish unbelief was Satan’s work directed against him personally, but later he learned that this failure was part of the Lord’s plan to keep him humble. By the time he writes Romans he will have realized that Israel’s unbelief was providentially meant only to be temporary. Confirmation for this view is sought from the account of the vision in the Temple (Acts 22:17–21), in which the protesting Paul is told that the Jews of Jerusalem will not hear him and he is to go to the Gentiles far away. The equivalent of this vision would be the statement about the thorn and about the grace which is sufficient. The writer in the *Expository Times* to whom we are indebted for this information remarks: “An interesting theory? Yes. A convincing one? We wonder very much.”<sup>51</sup>

*Joy and perseverance* (Phil 3:1). At the beginning of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians Paul writes: “For the rest, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To rewrite the same things to you is no trouble to me, whilst for you it is a measure of safety.”<sup>52</sup> It seems odd that Paul’s exhortation to rejoice should be a measure of safety for them. Fr. Zerwick, S.J.,

<sup>50</sup> *Studia Paulina* (Festschrift Johannes DeZwaan).

<sup>51</sup> “Notes of Recent Exposition,” *Expository Times*, XLV (1953), 1.

<sup>52</sup> C. Lattey, S.J., *Westminster Version: The New Testament* (Small edition; 1948). Fr. Lattey’s translation is given here because the Confraternity revision is based on the Vulgate and does not bring out the idea of the Greek, *sc.*, “measure of safety.”

finds the answer in the connection between spiritual joy and security, a combination found elsewhere in the Epistle: "Rejoice in the Lord always; again will I say it, rejoice. . . . And the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus" (4:5-7).<sup>53</sup> The writer then considers the psychological link between joy and security and concludes that in Paul's mind peace and spiritual joy in no small measure firmly establish faith and charity and thus guard our hearts in Christ Jesus.

"The law of liberty" (Jas 1:25). More than one writer has noticed resemblances in the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly those which deal with the Essene community, to certain places in the New Testament.<sup>54</sup> In fact E. Stauffer has claimed that the influence is palpable which this tradition exerted on the writings of St. John.<sup>55</sup> And he would also explain the "law of liberty" in St. James (1:25; 2:12) as being the community rule of the Dead Sea monastic group.<sup>56</sup> The "law of liberty" in St. James would be the Christian teaching freely accepted by the church group, while in the Essene community the term would mean the special obligations of the members in addition to the burden of the Mosaic Law.

The term in question occurs three times in the Scrolls, *sc.*, D.S.S. X, 6, 8, 11. Discussing these texts F. Noetscher finds Stauffer's thesis unacceptable.<sup>57</sup> He claims that, while the consonants could be vocalized to mean "law of liberty," it would be better to translate as the "law engraved," *sc.*, upon tablets as in Exodus 32:16. If the word were to be rendered "liberty," one would expect *plena scriptio*, elsewhere so frequent in the Scrolls. Finally, the last instance where the term occurs hardly permits the sense of "liberty," *sc.*, "My sins are before my eyes as the law of liberty!" (D.S.D. X, 11). Until further evidence is produced, Noetscher thinks that one cannot claim that the Dead Sea Essene group had a "law of liberty."

The "woman clothed with the sun" (Apoc 12:1). The Blessed Mother is often represented as clothed with the sun and with the moon under her feet and a crown of twelve stars about her head. Does Apoc 12 refer to her literally or is this merely an accommodation? For some time it has seemed that the common opinion among Catholic authors was that our Lady was in the text only by accommodation, but in recent years some writers have defended

<sup>53</sup> M. Zerwick, S.J., "Gaudium et pax—custodia cordium (Phil. 3, 1; 4, 7)," *Verbum Domini*, XXXII (1953), 101-14.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. E. Vogt, *Biblica*, XXXIV (1953), 472.

<sup>55</sup> *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXVII (1952), 532. <sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 527-32.

<sup>57</sup> "Gesetz der Freiheit im NT und in der Moenchsgemeinde am Toten Meer," *Biblica*, XXXIV (1953), 193-94. Similarly W. H. Brownlee translates the term, "an ordinance engraved"; *Bulletin American Schools of Oriental Research; Supplementary Studies*, nos. 10-12 (1951), pp. 40-41.

the view that the literal sense there refers to Mary. Fr. Bernard LeFrois, S.V.D., has presented this interpretation very well in a doctorate examination held at the Biblical Institute. According to him the Marian interpretation is confirmed by arguments from the apocalyptic genre, by the accurate study of every word in the scene of Apoc 12, by the comparison of the woman with other persons in the drama, and the comparison of Apoc 12 with other messianic texts of the Old and New Testament. He holds that the woman is Mary, the Mother of the Savior, but the Church is not excluded. For in the style of Hebrew prophecy the same person is represented at times with his individual traits, at times as representing the group of which he is, as it were, the expression and representative. So that in Apoc 12 the woman is the mother not only of the physical body of the Savior but also of His Mystical Body, the Church.<sup>58</sup>

Fr. LeFrois has presented the essence of his thesis in an article contributed to the *American Ecclesiastical Review*.<sup>59</sup> In it there is an excellent bibliography. The following paragraph illustrates one of the key points of his position.

If we examine the symbols in the book of Daniel we find that they allow a certain amount of fluctuation in the objects they symbolize. Not that they fluctuate between designating various objects, but rather between a collective body and the chief representative of that collective body. The golden head of the statue in Daniel 2 refers to Nabuchodonosor in person and at the same time, the Babylonian Empire in its entirety. The two-horned ram in chapter 8 (vv. 3 and 20), according to the tenor of the angel's explanation, symbolizes the Medo-Persian Empire and at the same time its chief representative who fought the Greeks. Similarly with the Holy One of Israel and His people, the holy one of God (vv. 14, 21, 27). In all these cases God *intended* to symbolize both the collective body and its chief representative by one and the same symbol, and in both cases we are dealing with the Scriptural sense of the symbol. There need be no question of a double literal sense, for the collective body and its chief representative do not form two diverse objects, but one organic unity. They really are one.<sup>60</sup>

#### NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY, ARCHEOLOGY

*The Ebionites.* Prof. H. J. Schoeps, author of two books on Jewish Christianity,<sup>61</sup> has recently presented the results of his studies in an article entitled, "Ebionite Christianity."<sup>62</sup> After indicating that the extant sources

<sup>58</sup> *Osservatore romano*, Nov. 29, 1953.

<sup>59</sup> "The Woman Clothed with the Sun," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXVI (1952), 161-80.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 172-73.

<sup>61</sup> *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (1949); *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (1950).

<sup>62</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. IV (1953), 219-24.

allow us to deduce the view of the first-century Jewish Church, he seeks to determine its stand on three points: Christology, St. Paul, and the Law. Concerning the person of Jesus Christ the Ebionites held an adoptionist Christology. Jesus is the Son of Man who was consecrated to be the Messiah and invested with power in His baptism. He was also to come as the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven for the last judgment. The true messianic prophet promised by Moses, He was so completely like him that "for the Ebionites conversion to Christ and conversion to the holy God and to the Jewish law . . . are one and the same" (p. 221).

Holding this view of Christ the Ebionites were necessarily opposed to Paul. Though not directly challenging his theology they brand him as the deceiver and claim that his appeal to visions and revelations cannot accredit him as an apostle. In fact his teaching is held to be the opposite of Jesus'. In their attitude to the Mosaic Law the Ebionites sometimes add to it and sometimes detract from it. They are strict in insisting on vegetarianism, obligatory poverty, and community of goods. They have a vigorous system of purifications, culminating in the act of baptism. On the other hand they do away with sacrifice, the institution of kingship in Israel, and delete from the text the "unfulfilled" prophecies and anthropomorphic utterances of God.

Because of their abolition of sacrifice the Ebionites rejected Paul's teaching on Christ's death as an atoning sacrifice, considering this doctrine a blasphemy so great that of itself it proves the Apostle to be a type of the false prophet. According to them Jesus by the waters of baptism extinguished the fire of sacrifice. Concerning the law Jesus came as a reformer to find behind it the will of God. What was of God in the law He confirmed. What was not of God He abolished. Doctrinally the Ebionites are linked to the Zadokite group of Ain Feshka, the Damascus sect, and the Essenes. They are also physical descendants of the original Jerusalem community.

*The Vatican excavations.* From 1940-50 excavations were carried out under the Basilica of St. Peter's at the express wish of Pope Pius XII. The interest was such that *Life* carried an account with pictures,<sup>63</sup> and the late Roger T. O'Callaghan, S.J., of Fordham University, gave a scientific account in the *Biblical Archaeologist*.<sup>64</sup> In 1951 appeared the definitive publication, two large quarto volumes, which because of their price will not be purchased by many individuals but no doubt will be in the libraries of universities.<sup>65</sup> A

<sup>63</sup> March 27, 1950, pp. 65-79, 82, 85.

<sup>64</sup> XII (1949), 1-23, "Recent Excavations underneath the Vatican Crypts."

<sup>65</sup> B. M. Apollonj, A. Ferrua, S.J., E. Josi, E. Kirschbaum, S.J., *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano*, I, *Testi*, pp. 227, figs. 171, pls. A-K; II, *Tavole* CIX (Città del Vaticano, 1951).

convenient summary of these findings is presented by Fr. O'Callaghan in the *Biblical Archaeologist* for December 1953.<sup>66</sup> Two questions are involved.

First, have the bones of Peter been found? Second, has the place of Peter's burial been found? With regard to the first question, some human bones were found dispersed with loose earth and coins in a hollow beneath an underground niche . . . ; and although no comment is made on this in the official publication beyond the mere statement of fact, still according to latest reports from Rome subsequent study by experts has determined that these bones were of an elderly man of powerful physical growth. It is also true that, in a radio message of Dec. 23, 1950, Pope Pius XII admitted that it was impossible to identify these remains with those of the Apostle to any degree of certitude. As for the coins, one was of the Emperor Antoninus Pius (138-61), six from the years 168-185, and more than forty were from the years 285-325.

In regard to the second question archeology, as far as it goes, answers that the place of Peter's burial has been found. Fig. 1 gives a reconstruction of the memorial erected to Peter about the year 160 A.D., Fig. 10 a reconstruction of the memorial constructed by Constantine. It is conjectured that the burial of St. Peter was a very simple one, the corpse lying just below the surface of the earth, the place marked by a simple covering of long bricks or tiles, like an inverted V.

Many *graffiti* were found, such as "Victor with Gaudentia, may you live in Christ," but except in one probable instance the name of Peter does not occur. Subsequent to the publication of the official report Prof. Margherita Guarducci, of the University of Rome, announced that she had found about 25 meters east of the *confessio* a crude drawing of an old man with the name Petrus.<sup>67</sup> She would date this find about 280 A.D. One conclusion from the new discovery would be to disprove the opinion held by many that the bones of Peter were transferred from the Vatican during the fierce persecution of Valerian in 258 A.D., and interred in the catacombs of St. Sebastian where they remained until Constantine constructed the Vatican basilica. The *graffiti* at St. Sebastian's invoking Peter and Paul do not necessarily suppose that the remains of both Apostles were buried there. It seems better to assume that the bones of St. Peter were never moved from the Vatican. In an appendix to the article Fr. O'Callaghan goes into more technical details of the burials and niches of the area.

A very detailed and excellent account of the excavations and the official report and its value is given by J. M. C. Toynbee in the *Journal of Roman Studies*.<sup>68</sup> The author was able to visit the site and discuss privately with

<sup>66</sup> XVI (1953), 70-87.

<sup>67</sup> *Osservatore romano*, Nov. 22, 1952.

<sup>68</sup> "The Shrine of St. Peter and Its Setting," *Journal of Roman Studies*, XLIII (1953) 1-26.

the excavators a number of questions. The writer shows by a detailed historical treatment that the martyrdom of Peter took place in Rome, but the question to be decided is whether the excavations have discovered his tomb. The conclusions are very moderate, *sc.*, that there is

evidence for the pre-Constantinian cult of St. Peter under the Vatican Basilica, a cult which we can at present trace back as far as the second half of the second century, and may, perhaps, be able to trace back still further. . . . Was that cult practised at a species of cenotaph, or remembrance-place, or at the grave of some person who could have been erroneously identified with St. Peter; or was it practised at the spot beneath which the Apostle was really buried? Everyone must find his answer to that question according as he interprets the evidence.

Of similar scholarly thoroughness and detail is the article by José Ruyschaert in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*.<sup>69</sup> He believes with the official report that the tomb is that of St. Peter. Concerning the bones discovered he would admit that they may be those of the Apostle and were never moved from the Vatican. Later the author intends to deal with the epigraphical and literary data connected with the excavations. A very complete bibliography accompanies the article.

*Dead Sea Scrolls.* Because news reached Jerusalem in February 1952 that some unauthorized Bedouins were excavating in the district of the Dead Sea Manuscript caves, an expedition was quickly formed and from March 10 to March 29 carefully explored that territory. The group was composed of representatives of the American School of Oriental Research, the Palestine Museum, and the Ecole archéologique française. Père de Vaux has written a preliminary report, from which the following items are derived.<sup>70</sup>

One of the most surprising finds was the discovery of two copper rolls upon which a text is written in large letters. Apparently the rolls originally formed a public notice which had been erected on a wall but was hurriedly removed and deposited in the grotto. In the part now visible the short paragraphs, numerical signs, abbreviations, and repeated formulas suggest a sort of catalogue or list. Prof. A. H. Corwin, of Johns Hopkins University, is studying a method of unrolling the copper sheets so as not to harm any of the writing. Another point of interest concerns the existence of coins. In these newly excavated caves no coins were found, though 250 had been discovered at Khirbet Qumran. That latter place could have been the center of financial operations for the community, which would agree with the statements of Pliny, Philo, and Josephus that the Essenes held property in common.

<sup>69</sup> "Réflexions sur les fouilles vaticanes. Le rapport officiel et la critique. Données archéologiques," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XLVIII (1953), 573-631.

<sup>70</sup> "Explorations de la région de Qumran," *Revue biblique*, LX (1953), 540-61.

Later news from Jerusalem tells us that at Qumran fragments of more than a hundred scrolls have been found. Some of these fragments contain only one or two or three letters, others are of considerable extent. They are being studied at the Museum of Jerusalem, which also houses the desks and benches upon which the ancient scribes sat, the inkwells, and a strange-looking object about 5' by 3' containing what looks like two basins. Someone has suggested that these contained water in which the scribe washed his hands after writing the divine name or before and after inscribing the sacred text.

*The earliest Christian inscription?* In 1953 no little excitement was aroused by the report that at Rome there had been discovered an early Christian inscription antedating any other by more than a century.<sup>71</sup> A young archeologist had called attention to a *graffito* found in the *domus Flavia*, the emperor's palace on the Palatine. The text read: (Anchor) "Panis accep-[p(tus) i]n luce Crestos / susceptus pr. K. Mai Com. Pris. coss." This could be rendered: "Bread received in the light of Christ, received the 30th April under the consulship of Commodus and Priscus" (A.D. 78). Apparently the inscription would refer to the first Communion of a person, or at least to a reception of the sacrament which was quite important.

From the beginning doubts were entertained about the find. The text was unusual. Two different terms, *acceptus* and *susceptus*, were employed for "received." Moreover, in early Christian inscriptions *susceptus* regularly signifies the departed who have been received into the peace of God according to the frequently found sepulchral formula, *in luce Domini susceptus*, followed by the day of the month and the name of the consuls. Another odd circumstance was that the *graffito* stood completely isolated on a wall lacking any other mark. Modern scientific methods including chemical treatments were used to test the inscription. At length the falsity of the *graffito* was firmly established, and a declaration to that effect was issued to the press by the *Direzione generale delle antichità e belle arti*.<sup>72</sup>

*The earliest records of Christianity?* The death of the famed archeologist, E. L. Sukenik, in Feb. 1953 can suggest a review of the excitement produced some years ago by the publication of his book on a tomb containing some inscriptions discovered near Jerusalem.<sup>73</sup> He held that the tomb's ossuaries, i.e., the stone boxes containing the bones, give us the earliest records of

<sup>71</sup> "Addendum to News Letter from Rome," *American Journal of Archeology*, LVIII (1954), 53-54; a letter from Prof. Margherita Guarducci written from Rome Sept. 2, 1953.

<sup>72</sup> The discoverer of this *graffito* has called attention to other new inscriptions on various occasions; *ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> E. L. Sukenik, *The Earliest Records of Christianity* (Philadelphia: American Journal of Archaeology, 1947).

Christianity. And in them he claimed that a Christian family had expressed its grief over the crucifixion, the implication being that they did not accept the resurrection. Sukenik's scholarship caused the matter to be studied carefully, but the verdict of competent authorities has been that the tomb and its contents date from the first century A.D., but without having any connection with Christianity that can be proved.

Sukenik argued from the use of the name Jesus and the appearance of decorative crosses on the ossuaries. But Fr. Abel, O.P., briefly refuted the arguments.<sup>74</sup> Jesus, he pointed out, was a fairly common name, five high priests of the Herodian epoch having borne that name. Moreover, the "cross" can be a simplification of the star of David such as appears on some Jewish coins of that era. Similar doubts were expressed about any connection with Christianity by C. H. Kraeling,<sup>75</sup> H. R. Willoughby,<sup>76</sup> and Fr. Sylvester Saller, O.F.M.<sup>77</sup> A further contribution was made concerning the cross by Ethelbert Stauffer.<sup>78</sup> He noted that in the years 132-135 A.D. bar Cocheba brought out a series of silver coins which have a representation of the Temple façade on which are decorative crosses similar to those on Sukenik's ossuaries. That the cross should be found on the Jewish Temple and on the coins of one known for his hostility to the Church is an evident sign that such a cross does not of itself prove the Christian character of the ossuaries on which it is found.

Lack of time has prevented the writer from treating many other important articles, and he has decided to omit those written in American Catholic magazines because they are so readily available. For the books which have appeared on the New Testament we are fortunate because the review section of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* has so fully developed that it forms almost a brochure in itself. We may close with a word of congratulation to the editors and collaborators of the *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, which has proved so welcome and is being used more and more by the clergy and the laity.

Weston College

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.

<sup>74</sup> J. M. Vosté, O.P., "Supposed Inscriptions on the Crucifixion of Our Lord," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XLVI (1946), 407-9; contains the substance of a letter from Père Abel, O.P., written Nov. 12, 1945. Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 344-46.

<sup>75</sup> "Christian Burial Urns?," *Biblical Archaeologist*, IX (1946), 16-20; cf. also G. E. W[right], "New Information Regarding the Supposed 'Christian' Ossuaries," *ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>76</sup> *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVIII (1949), 61-65.

<sup>77</sup> M. Hegener, O.F.M., "Supposed Inscriptions on the Crucifixion," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, XLVI (1946), 695-96; he quotes from a letter written from Jerusalem by Fr. Saller.

<sup>78</sup> "Zu den Kreuzeszeichen von Talpioth," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIII (1950-51), 262.