

many of the revisions ; the American Revision was done by a committee of twenty-seven scholars ; and the Westminster Version adopts a different method, for a collaborator is entrusted with a whole book, for which he is responsible and which is published with his name, the Editor providing a general supervision.

Sources for this study, apart from the versions themselves, are as follows:

Two very important articles: "Catholic Versions of Scripture" by Cardinal Wiseman in the *Dublin Review* for 1837, republished among his "Essays on various subjects." (This was originally a review of Dr. Lingard's translation; the same journal contained in 1849 a notice of Abp. Kenrick's version by the same writer.) "History of the Text of the Rheims and Douay Version of the Holy Scripture" by Cardinal Newman in the *Rambler* for 1859, republished among his "Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical."

An invaluable source, if the declared hostile attitude is discounted, is Dr. Cotton's "Rhemes and Douay, an Attempt to show what has been done by Roman Catholics for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures," 1855. This Protestant writer has listed all editions from 1582 to his day, and frequently collated the texts carefully. One result is to show that, in spite of much confusion, a great deal "has been done."

Edwin H. Burton's *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, Vol. I, chap. xvii, and Fr. Hugh Pope's *Aids*, Vol. I, chap. ix, give all the main facts.

Among modern articles is that by Mgr. Knox entitled "Challoner and the Douay Version" in the symposium "Richard Challoner" published by the *Westminster Cathedral Chronicle*, Fr. Fuller's article in *SCRIPTURE* for January 1947, and the note by Fr. Anderson which appeared in the next (April) number.

The principal source for the dependence of the older revisions on one another is the aforesaid article by Cardinal Newman in 1859.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

*Could observance of the law of Moses secure eternal life? Mt. xix, 16-19 and Lk. x, 25-8 suggest it could. But if this was so, then what need was there for the Law of Christ?*

The lawyer's question was, "Master, what am I to do that I may inherit life everlasting?" (Lk. x, 25b W.V.); "Master, what good work am I to do in order to have life everlasting?" (Mt. xix, 16 W.V.).

The question was based on the assumption that eternal life was a reward for good works. At that time the Jews did not in practice admit the need of the interior action of grace for eternal life (*cf.* Bonsirven, *Le Judaisme palestinien*, Vol. I, pp. 178-82). In St. Paul's epistles (especially *Gal.* and *Rom.*) we see the Jews claiming that salvation (i.e. life everlasting) depends on fidelity to the Law and on freewill. In fact, the prevalent Jewish outlook was not far removed from Stoicism and Pelagianism. To this St. Paul opposed the authoritative teaching: salvation is won only through Christ and His grace. More precisely, the root of all justification is faith in God (and at least implicitly in Christ), and the essential condition is love of God.

Our Lord makes the lawyer himself give the answer, the substance of which is "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart . . ." and "thy neighbour as thyself." To this Our Lord assented.

The lawyer was already a good man, a man of faith in God, like our father Abraham. God imparted the grace of justification to Abraham

by reason of that Patriarch's faith in God (implicitly in Christ). Yet, just as Abraham had to "walk before God and be perfect" (Gen. xvii, 1) so must his spiritual descendants. The Law of Moses renewed and developed the Covenant made between God and Abraham; it provided the Israelites with signposts pointing the way to remaining in God's friendship. But all the time the Law was not divorced in God's intention from the Covenant—not separated from faith.

All that Our Lord says in effect to the lawyer is that if he observes the Law faithfully, he will continue in the friendship imparted to Abraham and Abraham's spiritual descendants. In view of Our Lord's "economy" of revelation no other answer was practicable. The Law of Moses was still in force. Though Our Lord had promulgated the New Covenant in the Sermon on the Mount, it was inaugurated actually only after Calvary (cf. Col. ii, 14). In the meantime the clearest expression of God's will for a man of faith was the Law.

But the Law was most difficult to observe faithfully—though not impossible. It was but a light; it was not a force. It needed to be completed and perfected by the grace of Christ. Hence, the Law brought mankind under a curse (Gal. iii, 10; cf. iii, 20). The fault lay not with the Law but with the force of concupiscent nature (cf. Rom. ii, 17-19, etc.)

The Law as a law separated from the Covenant never saved anyone. But practised by a man of faith, incomplete and preparatory though it was, the Law *could* bring a man to eternal life.

D. J. LEAHY.

*It is understandable that Herod should be troubled at the news of the birth of Christ "born king of the Jews" but why should "all Jerusalem" be troubled too? (Matt. ii, 3).*

The expression "all Jerusalem" may be regarded as a legitimate hyperbole to indicate many in the city apart from the king and his court. The reason for their fear was that a dynastic dispute nearly always meant bloodshed, sometimes on a considerable scale, as may be read in the history of all ages.

In the present case the danger was aggravated by the fact that Herod was both a usurper and a non-Jew, whose rule had never been willingly accepted by the Jews. In consequence he grew tyrannical and suspicious—and his natural tendency to cruelty was thus increased. He began his reign by putting to death forty-five nobles, adherents of Antigonus, the Hasmonaean king whom he supplanted, persuaded the Romans to kill Antigonus, had the Hasmonaean Aristobulus (High Priest and a possible rival), put to death, some years later he put his wife Mariamne (also one of the rival Hasmonaean dynasty) to death, on the grounds that she tried to poison him, and killed off the rest of the surviving Hasmonaeans in 25 B.C. In the year 8 B.C. he killed two of his own sons whom he suspected of plots against him, namely, Alexander and