

hospitality and in which he preached the faith, and to those first Catholic Actionists, Aquila and Priscilla. But this would require much more space, and once we have understood what is meant by the active charity of the "communion," we have the key to understand the later developments. Less has been written about the "communion" than the Mystical Body. Together, both in theory and practice they make the answer of Catholic Society to Communist Society.

N.B. DBS=*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément.*

MMV=*Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.*

KNT=Mgr. Knox's translation of the New Testament.

THE "ORDERLY ACCOUNT" OF SAINT LUKE

by DOM LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.

SAINT LUKE'S words "to write to thee in order" (Luke i, 3) need not necessarily be taken as meaning an exactly chronological order throughout his Gospel. There is no difficulty in seeing a chronological sequence in the first two chapters, nor in those following chapter eight. But even in those passages Lagrange, who generally takes the beloved Physician as his guide, grants exceptions in x, 14, 15; also xi, 23.

When we look at the order of the second and third temptations (Matt. iv, 5—10; Luke v, 15) the first Evangelist seems to give a better sequence of events. In the otherwise excellent "Synopsis Latina" of J. Perik, S.S., his consistent adherence to the order of St. Luke leads to dismemberment of several chapters of St. Matthew and though we may deny the chronological order of the first Evangelist it is rather disconcerting to see his chapters 8, 9 and 10, scattered over five or six different places.

No one will venture to say that St. Luke's account of St. John the Baptist (iii, 1—20) is strictly chronological, e.g., that the events described in verses 19—20 closely followed those of the preceding verses and came before verse 21. St. Luke is an artist who likes to give full pictures. If we take this view we shall find how he throws light or beauty on passages of the other Synoptics. We can see this from his treatment of two events.

I. VISIT(S) TO NAZARETH.

(Matt. xiii, 53—58; Mark vi, 1—6; Luke iv, 16—30.)

If we look closely at the three Gospel accounts we shall notice a striking difference between the first two and the third, and it would seem an over simplification to combine the three into one. If we hold there were two visits it is clear that the account of St. Luke must

be put in the second place; for after the treatment meted out to our Saviour by his townsmen He could hardly go back again (Luke iv, 29). In the accounts of the first two Evangelists we find a cool atmosphere of haughty contempt for the carpenter who only a short time ago had left them, and during that interval could hardly have qualified as a Rabbi. The visit would best fit in either before or not long after the miracle in Cana; for the miracle at the marriage feast wrought in a circle of poor people may not have caused much stir, and its chief purpose had been to produce in the disciples some faith in his Divine Mission (John ii, 11). The Nazarenes did indeed admire his wisdom and powerful eloquence; but their narrow-mindedness prevented the beginning of true faith, so that great miracles would have been wasted on them. It would be natural for Him to say with a sigh: "It is only in his own country, in his own home, that a prophet goes unhonoured." At the visit described by St. Luke the mood of the hearers in the synagogue was different. By that time Jesus had been away for some time—had removed to Capharnaum and had gained fame by his miracles. (v. 23). They were jealous because no glory of His now reflected on them. They were again attentive and admired His graceful speech; but Jesus read the grumbling in their minds and replied to their murmuring. He came back to His former saying about a prophet being slighted^a in his own country, and He proved it from the histories of Elias and Eliseus. These truths only roused their indignation to a furious frenzy and incited them to an attempt at murdering Him.

Looking at both the accounts we see that the first two Evangelists treat the Nazarenes somewhat mildly. Why does S. Luke show them to us in such an unfavourable light? We must remember that he is the historian of our Lord's youthful life at Nazareth, years spent amongst a population that had no good name in the neighbourhood (John i, 46). We are then made to understand why his many years of quiet exercise of all virtues brought Him no credit, nor to his conceited neighbours special graces. This seems a lesson worth knowing and remembering.

II. THE CALL OF THE FOUR FISHERMEN.

(Matt. iv, 18—22; Mark i, 16—20; Luke v, 1—11.)

We shall not go far wrong if we accept the view that the first two Synoptics speak of the same event as that described by St. Luke. If we adhere consistently to the strictly chronological order of St. Luke we should have to put his account in the last place. But then, considering his accuracy as to details, we are puzzled by the fact that he never mentions a call, and makes our Lord address Himself to St. Peter alone, not giving him a call but rather another promise for the future.

By-passing for the present his last verse (11), we shall have no difficulty but good reasons for putting St. Luke's account in the first place. If, according to Dom Chapman, he is supplementing St. Mark, he would see, as we do now, that the call mentioned by the two other sacred writers lacked a sufficient motive for its prompt success. Therefore he gives the special reason, viz., the miraculous catch of fishes which shortly before had overcome all the four active witnesses with amazement. After that all seems very plain and easy to understand. Coming back to verse 11 of St. Luke we can again discover the hand of the artist. He had supplied a charming background for the abrupt account of the call, and now he adds a frame to the picture, showing the satisfactory result of the miracle.

Saints Matthew and Mark mention Zebedee and his men, showing that he kept his business going, and was perhaps taking care of the deserted boat. Some commentators are puzzled as to where the holy Company found shelter when at Capharnaum; might one suggest the house of Zebedee, whose wife Salome was one of the "Holy Women?"

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The Glorified Body

St. Paul's "eschatology"—his view of death, and the life after it, and the resurrection—presents many questions. Some cuttings have been sent in to SCRIPTURE (with a request for comment) from the *British Weekly* for September 27th and 18th October, 1945, in which numbers Mr. J. Alexander Findlay himself comments on a question by a correspondent. Mr. Findlay considers that "on the subject of the Christian's life after death Paul's thinking went through no fewer than three stages, which can be seen in I Thess. iv, 14—18; I Cor. xv, 35—55; II Cor. v, 1—10."

It would take too long to criticize this view in detail; it must be enough to say that there is no inconsistency between the passages mentioned, and no need to suppose a change in St. Paul's views. It seems best to concentrate for the most part on II Cor. v, 1—10. While he is in his human body he is in a sense exiled from the Lord (because he has to walk by faith, not sight); but he has courage enough even to be exiled from the body and to be with the Lord (verses 6—8). That is to say, he is resigned to death, because it would mean being happy with Christ in heaven. This latter lot was in fact that of the just who died before the Last Day, mentioned in I Cor. xv, 52: "the dead shall rise incorruptible," with incorruptible and immortal bodies (verse 53). And these "dead shall rise first" (I Thess. iv, 16). But the just who are alive at

the Last Day are not to die, but merely to have their bodies transformed: all men are to be changed (I Cor. xv, 51, according to the true reading), the dead by receiving a glorified body, the living by having their natural bodies glorified. In I Thess. iv St. Paul does not mention this glorifying of the body, but it is quite gratuitous to imply (with Mr. Findlay) that he knew nothing about it.

In II Cor. v, 6—8 St. Paul lets us see that his natural preference was to have his body transformed directly into glory (which would mean being alive at the Last Day) without passing through death; but he is resigned to the other possibility. He would "fain not be unclothed," that is, stripped of his natural body, but be "clothed over" with glory, without dying (verse 4). The words "if indeed we shall be found clothed at all, and not naked" (verse 3), refer to the robe of grace, and illustrate the rather disconcerting way in which he sometimes shifts from one meaning of a word to another: his was a swift and sensitive mind. In verse 2 he is referring to his natural desire to be "clothed over" with glory without dying. This glory will be his in any case, as he well knows; even if his "earthly home" or tent, that is, his natural body, be destroyed, he has an eternal home or building, a glorified body, to which to look forward (verse 1). But it is not to be his till the Last Day, which he must live to see, if he is not to die. But whether he was to live to see the Last Day or not, he did not know, for Christ had expressly said that such knowledge was not for man; so that in I Cor. vi, 14 and II Cor. iv, 14 he rather seems to place himself among those who will have died before the Last Day, though I Thess. iv, 15, 17 and I Cor. xv, 52 give a contrary impression. He identifies himself now with the living and now with the dead, without really committing himself.

We profess in the creeds that Christ will "judge the living and the dead," that is, those who have died and those who have not. The words are taken from II Tim. iv, 1, and I Peter iv, 5; see also Acts x, 42. The mistaken translation of I Cor. xv, 51, in the Latin Vulgate was probably due to a failure to understand that St. Paul was writing only of the saved. The Vulgate speaks of a general resurrection—since only a very small fraction of mankind will be alive at the Last Day—and of some being glorified, some not; though an analogous change will take place in the bodies of the lost.

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

1. *Is the Magnificat based on the canticle of Anna?* 2. *Were Anna and Samuel types of our Lady and our Lord?*

1. The similarity of the two canticles has long been recognized. A Lapide writes of the Magnificat: "This canticle of our Lady's is a complete counterpart to the canticle of Anna, I Sam. ii. For the theme of both is the same, both breathe the same exultant spirit of

humility, of gratitude, and of devotion towards God, according to the words of the psalmist. 'My soul rejoiceth in the Lord and delighteth in His salvation' Ps. xxxiv, 9." Similarity of occasion and of theme might well lead to similarity of thought in holy persons of the same race, but the similarity is such as to leave no doubt that our Lady drew some of her thoughts and expressions from the earlier canticle. The Magnificat occurs in Luke i (=L), 46—55 and the canticle of Anna in I Sam. ii (=S), 1—10. The reader may compare L 46—47 "My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit rejoiceth in God my Saviour" with S 1 "My heart rejoiceth in the Lord and my horn is exalted in my God . . . because I joy in Thy salvation"; L 49 "He that is mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is His name" with S 2 "There is none holy like the Lord . . . and none strong like our God" (where the Hebrew has "rock" for "strong"); L 51 "He hath showed might in His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the conceit of their heart" with S 4 "The bow of the mighty is overcome and the tottering are girt with strength"; L 52 "He hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble" with S 7—8 "The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich, He humbleth and He exalteth; He raiseth up the needy from the dust and lifteth up the poor from the dunghill"; L 53 "He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away" with S 5 "They that were full have hired themselves for bread and the hungry are filled."

These similarities must, moreover, be considered in the light of the literary dependence of the Infancy Gospel of St. Luke as a whole on the narrative of the early story of Samuel. L 48 "He hath regarded the lowliness of His handmaid" is reminiscent of I Sam. i, 11 "If Thou wilt regard the affliction of Thy handmaid." Here the resemblance is more striking in the Septuagint which has "lowliness" for "affliction." The details of this dependence have been worked out by Eric Burrows, S.J., in *The Gospel of the Infancy and other Biblical Essays*, 1940.

2. A Lapide does say that Samuel was a type of Christ. He writes thus on Luke i, 47: "As the barren Anna rejoiced when by the miraculous help of God she conceived Samuel, so our Lady rejoiced when by the Holy Ghost she conceived Emmanuel, for of Him Samuel was a type." And P. Renard in the article "Anne" in Vigouroux's *Dict. de la Bible* speaks of Anna as of one "in whom all the commentators have seen a figure of the miraculous fecundity of the Mother of God." Stephanus Székely does not mention Anna or Samuel in the list of types he gives in his *Hermeneutica Biblica* (1902) 237, and, if I am not mistaken, there is no reference to their having this typical significance in the commentaries of Nicolaus de Lyra, Cajetan, Sanctius, Menochius, Mariana, de Mendoza or Tirinus.

For a person or thing really to be a type it must be the intention of the Holy Ghost and so can only be known to us by revelation. The Bible does not speak of Anna or Samuel as types of our Lady and Christ, nor, to the best of my knowledge, is any such reference to be found in the works of the following Fathers, Saints Jerome, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom.

On the other hand, St. Cyprian, *Lib. de Oratione Dominica* 5, Migne *P.L.* 4, 522, speaks of Anna as being a type of the Church. So also St. Gregory the Great in his *In Primum Librum Regum Expositiones*, Migne *P.L.* 79, 27: "What is expressed by Phenenna if not the Synagogue? What is figured by Anna if not Holy Church?" St. Isidore of Seville also considers Anna to signify the Church of Christ, Migne, *P.L.* 83, 112. As she, he says, was sterile but afterwards a mother, so the Church was at first barren among the gentiles but now rejoices in the blessing of a numerous offspring throughout the world. This typical significance is to be found also in Nicolaus de Lyra.

The conclusion therefore is that, although there is some resemblance between Anna and our Lady, and between Samuel and our Lord, the sources of revelation do not warrant the assertion that there is between them the relation of type and antitype.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

BOOK REVIEWS

In Isaiam 9, 5 (Vulg. 9, 6) by P. Gaudentius Governanti, O.F.M.
Pp. 126. Jerusalem, Typis PP. Franciscanorum 1945.

Is. 9, 5 (Douay 9, 6) contains the names given to the future Incarnate Messiah by God. Among these names is *El Gibbor*. Christian interpreters up to the nineteenth century understood this to mean "mighty God" and the vast majority still continue to do so. But many non-Catholics regard the expression as a metaphor, and the normal Jewish tradition makes the title "Prince of Peace" refer to the Child, but all the other epithets to God Himself. The booklet under review is an admirable exposition of how the traditional interpretation is arrived at. The reader equipped with even a nodding acquaintance with Hebrew is led gently through the exegetical part (Part I of the book), and then on to what the Tradition of the Church has to say (Part II).

The author completed the writing of his book before the publication of Dr. Kissane's commentary (*The Book of Isaiah*, Dublin, 1941) but Dr. Kissane's interpretation is not new (*Divine hero*), and in this book