

A NEWLY DISCOVERED HEBREW MANUSCRIPT

We publish here below for the first time an English translation of one of the recently discovered Hebrew manuscripts, spoken of in the Editorial, page 2.

COMBAT BETWEEN THE CHILDREN OF LIGHT AND THE SONS OF DARKNESS

ORDER OF BATTLE

To direct the warriors armed with slings, the trumpets sound until they have cast their stones seven times. Then the priests will call them back, blowing their "Trumpets for the Return" and (these warriors) will assemble near the place where the whole host was deployed before the battle, in order to take up again their former positions. Then the priests will blow their "Trumpets of the Call" and the three ensign-bearers will go forward from the middle, out of the gates [of the camp], and they will stand between the two armies drawn up in order of battle; and near them will stand the horsemen, on their right and on their left. At this moment the priests will blow their trumpets again, giving out a low sound, which is a signal for battle.

Then the officers will separate, each going to the post which has been allotted to him. As soon as all the warriors have arranged themselves in three lines, the priests will sound the trumpets for them a second time, giving out a grave and sustained note which is the signal for advance, towards the enemy line, until they come near it. [The warriors] will then take hold of their weapons, and the priests will blow the "Six Trumpets of the Slain" giving out a sharp and violent sound which dominates the battle. The Levites and others who possess horns will blow warlike blasts on them so that the heart of the enemy may melt away. When this great sound of war is heard the warriors armed with spears will go forward to slay the enemy. The horns will then blow louder and the priests will sound their trumpets so as to dominate the battle, emitting a sharp and violent blast, until the warriors have cast their spears seven times at the host of the enemy. Then the priests will blow the "Trumpets for the Return" giving out a grave, low and sustained call.

Now this is the way the priests will recall the ensign-bearers: When the last spear has been cast [the Levites and priests] will blow their trumpets loudly, in order to dominate the war [till the last spear has been cast]. Then the priests will blow the "Trumpets for the Return" emitting a grave, low and sustained sound until the ensign-bearers [have returned] to their places.

Note by Père Bauchet. The passages in brackets have been supplied by myself, according to the context and the number of letters. They are missing in the original text. Professor Sukenik, whom I have consulted on the matter, has qualified my suggestions as "probable."

English Version by V. de M.

J.-M. Paul Bauchet, O.D.C.
Jerusalem, 25th November 1948.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What does St. John mean by "grace" when he speaks of our Blessed Lord as "full of grace and truth" (Jn. i, 14).

Christ in His human nature certainly possessed sanctifying grace, but it is unlikely that St. John in this passage specially wished to stress Christ's endowments as man. No possession of sanctifying grace would constitute our Lord the only-begotten Son of the Father. The uniqueness of Christ's Sonship consists in the fact that He Himself is in His Person the very source of all grace and truth, for He is God, the Word who dwelt amongst us. In Him the fullness of the Godhead dwells corporally, hence He possesses all divine perfection as God-Incarnate and is thus full of grace and truth as a spring is said to be full of water. Hence in the following verse St. John wrote "from His fullness we have all received and grace upon grace; the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We receive sanctifying grace not because Christ in His human nature possessed it, but because in His Person He is the source of all graces bestowed on us.

J. P. ARENZEN.

How do you account for the lack of direct quotations in the epistles from our Lord's actual sayings?

The above is (I think) the chief point in an enquiry far too long to be printed in full in SCRIPTURE; but in my answer I have tried to bear in mind the enquiry as a whole. If some point presents a further difficulty, it may perhaps be dealt with separately later on. In order to keep the answer reasonably short, I have broken it up into short headings, and have confined it to St. Paul. Much of what is written applies to all the epistles, in which however there are also some special features. Thus, I John i, 3 seems to be introducing St. John's gospel, rather than the rest of the epistle, and I may add that Hebrews is largely concerned with the *Old Testament*.

(1) St. Paul presupposes a careful oral instruction: see, for example, Acts xx, 20, 31. The Christians might be supposed to know well at

least the common *catechesis* or instruction, which probably consisted mainly of the narrative common to the first three gospels, the discourses common to the first three Gospels, and the discourses common to Matthew and Luke. But much might be added. "Don't you remember that while I was still with you I used to tell you these things?" (II Thes. ii, 5). So writes the Apostle, just where we should like him to tell us so much more. The epistles presuppose the gospels, at least in their oral form; there was no need to repeat them.

(2) St. Paul then does not write for the sake of giving general instruction, but in order to meet definite needs. The Thessalonians are disturbed by the expectation of an early coming of the Lord, the Corinthians have sent him questions (I Cor. vii, 1), and are also somewhat unruly (I Cor. iv, 21; II Cor. xiii, 2): and so on. If everything were already clear enough for his purpose in the Gospel message itself, he would not be writing.

(3) His sure anchor was the full measure of dogmatic truth revealed to him, not the details of our Lord's words and works, which can hardly have been revealed to him with minute precision. He had seen the risen Lord, and therefore was a fit witness of the Resurrection and a fit apostle (cf. I Cor. ix, 1; xv, 8; etc.). Nevertheless, when need arises, he shows himself well acquainted with Our Lord's words. Thus in I Cor. vii he carefully distinguishes between Christ's explicit teaching and his own supplementary doctrine, delivered with apostolic authority; and in I Cor. xi, 24, 25 it may be he alone who preserves the command to the apostles to continue celebrating the Holy Eucharist. The Lucan parallel is not a certain reading. He alone, too, preserves the beautiful saying of the Lord in Acts xx, 25. Much he would learn from the apostles; he early visited Peter (Gal. i, 18). In his beloved companion Luke he had one who diligently investigated the facts (Luke i, 3), and who, like most—perhaps all—of his important helpers, had been a Christian before Paul himself; he too may have been a source of information. Not that I wish to deny to St. Paul the revelation of historical facts; but it does not seem quite in harmony with the usual workings of Divine Providence to suppose that a full narrative was revealed in detail to him, at least equal in length to one of the gospels. This was not essential for his mission.

(4) One more feature of the epistles must be borne in mind: they are intensely personal. St. Paul's character was a highly emotional one: he is dictating at high speed, trying to catch up with his own thoughts and emotions, and with his secretary trying to keep up with him. It is not uncommon with him to be ungrammatical, and to finish a sentence without any very clear recollection as to how he began it. His message is urgent, and he is trying to push it home. He was not the sort of man to be continually consulting his authorities and verifying

his quotations ; it was enough for him to be confident that he too had the spirit of God (I Cor. vii, 40), the mind of Christ (I Cor. ii, 16).

C. LATTEY, S.J.

What is the meaning of the word "poor" and the phrase "poor in spirit" in the Old and New Testaments?

The Italians, I believe, have a proverb, "Traduttori traditori" (literally, "Translators are traitors," *i.e.*, to their authors), which it is worth while always to bear in mind, for it is often impossible for a translator to express the precise shades of meaning in a great author's mind, or the melody of his sentences. Words are not mere counters, to be exchanged at will between languages ; rather they are the centres of a cluster of connotations, which do not follow them from language to language. Thus, to give a rough but obvious example, our English enthusiasm for sunshine (with the consequent figures of speech drawn from it) does not appeal so strongly to the oriental, who may be sure of three or four months of scorching heat every year, with its partially bad effect upon vegetation ; nor do we quite understand his enthusiasm for rain.

Hebrew has a word which I may write simply '*ani*', translated in the Brown-Driver-Briggs dictionary, "poor, afflicted, humble," thus showing the difficulty of translation. The same word is found in a slightly varied form in Aramaic, the closely related language spoken by our Lord. The word implies a resigned state of mind *besides* an external condition of poverty. Perhaps "under-dog" might illustrate it, just as (to use a rather remote comparison) "inwards" would be far superior to "all that is within me," etc., if it were still refined English.

St. Matthew, then (or, to be more accurate, the translator of his Aramaic original), has added "in spirit" to the Greek "poor" in Matt. v, 3, in order to bring out the implied internal disposition ; but it must be remembered that a rich man, however much detached in spirit and able (by a sort of spiritual miracle : cf. Matt. xix, 23, etc.) to save his soul, is not here in question. The Lucan parallel (vi, 20) does not of itself imply any internal disposition, though it must be understood from the context. It is in fact one of St. Luke's characteristics that he stresses the danger of riches and the blessedness of poverty well borne ; he alone, for example, has preserved the parable of Dives and Lazarus (xvi, 19-31). No sin is explicitly imputed to Dives, nor is it said that Lazarus practised virtue ; the only explanation offered by Abraham is that after death their positions are reversed.

It does not follow that the poor may not make reasonable efforts to better their position ; excesses of wealth and poverty are alike dangerous to the body politic. Within prudent limits the Church encourages voluntary poverty, but not absolute destitution.

C. LATTEY, S.J.