

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

No. 23

May 1959

CONTENTS

1. Proceedings of the Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Society held in Croft Chapter House of University College, Toronto, on May 12th. and 13th., 1959.
2. The Presidential Address delivered by Rev. David M. Stanley, S.J., Jesuit Seminary, Toronto: "A Problem of Integration in the Primitive Church."

This Bulletin is published annually by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. The Secretary-Treasurer is Rev. David C. Wotherspoon, 47 Belsize Dr., Toronto 7.

THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The twenty-seventh annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Studies was held on May 12th. and 13th. in joint session with the twenty-first annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. The sessions took place in Croft Chapter House in University College, Toronto. The President was the Rev. David M. Stanley, S.J.

First Session: Tuesday, May 12th, 2.00 P.M.

The President opened the meeting by leading in prayer. Words of greeting and welcome were made by the President to the twenty members assembled.

It was regularly moved and seconded that the minutes of the 1958 meeting as printed in the Bulletin be adopted.

The Treasurer reported that during 1958 and 1959 dues were received to the amount of \$72.00. Some of this amount was dues for more than one year. Total balance from 1957-58 was \$214.84. Total receipts May 12th. were \$298.74. Total disbursements were \$77.96. Total balance \$211.78.

Upon a call for nominations for auditors the President was asked to name the auditors for this year. The President then named Professors E. Fairweather and J. Macpherson as auditors and called them to report at the third session of the meeting.

The secretary reported diligence in correspondence and pleasure in the same. 155 notices were sent out in February to the members of the two societies: C.B.S. and S.B.L.E. (Can. Sec.). The second notice was sent to 92 members of the C.B.S. Not all these 92 were paid up members. Bulletins were not sent to members who were recorded as more than 4 years behind in dues and a few whose addresses were not available.

Upon a call to nominate a committee to bring in a slate of officers for 1959-1960 the following were selected to form the nominations committee with instructions to bring in a slate of officers willing to act for 1959-1960 at the third session of the meeting: Professors Barnett, McCullough and the President.

Nominations for membership were then called for. The Secretary cast a nomination for J.E. Menard and Dr. S. Frank. It was agreed that this matter would be resumed at the third session of the meeting.

It was agreed that Professor D.K. Andrews should read a communication from Rev. Roy M. Pounder, Scotstown, Quebec who was unable to be present: "A Difficult Verse: Mt. 11:12". Discussion followed the reading of this communication.

Prof. D.W. Hay, Knox College, then presented a paper: "New Testament Cosmology". Discussion followed.

The first session of the meeting adjourned at 4.00 P.M. for tea to meet again in the same place at 8.00 P.M.

Second Session: Tuesday, May 12th. 8.00 P.M.

Prof. R.J. Williams presided at the evening session when the President, Rev. David M. Stanley, S.J., Jesuit Seminary, Toronto, gave the Presidential Address: "A Problem of Integration in the Primitive Church." Refreshments and discussion followed the paper. The society adjourned to meet at 10.00 A.M. in the same place, May 13th. There were 21 members present.

Third Session, Wednesday, May 13th. 10.00 P.M.

Prof. Fairweather reported for the auditors committee and moved that the Treasurer's report be approved since the committee had audited the records and found them correct. Agreed.

Prof. McCullough reported for the nominations committee that the slate of officers for the joint societies (C.B.S. & S.B.L.E.(Can. Sec.) be:

President- Rev. Prof. Robert Dobbie, Emmanuel College, Toronto.

Vice-President-Prof. Dean Stanley B. Frost, McGill University, Montreal.

Secretary-Treasurer- Rev. David C. Wotherspoon, 47 Belsize Dr., Toronto 7.

Executive Committee-Rev. Prof. J. Macpherson, Victoria College, Toronto.

Rev. R.A.F. MacKenzie, S.J., Jesuit Seminary, Toronto.

Rev. Prof. D.K. Andrews, Knox College, Toronto.

Upon being put to the vote this slate of officers was unanimously agreed upon.

Further nominations to membership were read out by the secretary: Rev. W. Gordon Brown, 225 St. George St., by the secretary; James M. Fennelly, 715 Main St., Youngstown, N.Y., by Prof. Andrews; Rev. W.O. Amey, 45 Leonard St. Kitchener; and Rev. Harold L. Hertzler, 137 Ontario St. W. Montreal, by Prof. deCatanzaro. Agreed.

After some discussion it was agreed that the secretary be empowered to pay travel expenses of members who come from a distance at the rate of 50% of travel expenses incurred up to \$25.00.

After further discussion it was agreed that wherever local hospitality or the host college does not afford accommodation the society will pay one night's accommodation.

The matter of regional meetings was raised, discussed and referred to the executive committee.

Farewell and good wishes were extended to Prof. de Catanzaro who leaves the Canadian scene for Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston. Best wishes were offered to Prof. Johnston who leaves Toronto for Montreal.

It was moved by Rev. MacKenzie and seconded by Prof. Staples that the secretary extend to the authorities of Univerity College the thanks of the society for the hospitality of the Croft Chapter House. Agreed.

After other courtesies were offered it was moved by Prof. Wevers and seconded by Prof. Johnston that the meeting adjourn. The President declared the joint meeting of the C.B.S. and the S.B.L.E. (Can. Sec.) adjourned. 24 were present.

David C. Wotherspoon (Secy-Treas).

Regrets were received from the following:

C. B. Reynolds; F. Zeman; R. Pounder; R. B. Y. Scott; H. A. Kent; R. A. Ward; Miss H. Milton; G. Parke-Taylor; R. H. Beatty; H. J. Skymner; E. Clarke; W. A. Irwin; W. Roth; R. Armstrong.

The following members registered attendance at the meeting:

D. W. Anderson; D. K. Andrews; T. Barnett; J. R. Brown; C. J. de Catanzaro; F. H. Cosgrave; G. Cotter; R. Dobbie; B. L. M. Embree; E. R. Fairweather; J. T. Forestall; S. B. Frost; D. W. Hay; S. M. A. Jellicoe; G. H. Johnston; R. Lennox; R. A. F. MacKenzie; J. Macpherson; W. S. McCullough; A. H. McKenzie; T. J. Meek; W. Power; W. H. Reid; N. Smith; D. M. Stanley; W. E. Staples; J. W. Wevers; R. J. Williams; D. C. Wotherspoon.

A PROBLEM OF INTEGRATION IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

D.M. Stanley, S.J.

Within the past year or so, we have become very much aware of the word "integration", and still more acutely conscious of the social problem it represents. Accordingly, it might not be without interest to the members of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies to review, in this presidential address, an integration problem which was faced by the early Christian Church: the admission of Gentiles into the Jewish-Christian community.

When we re-assess the evidence provided by the NT, it becomes clear that this issue was one of the most difficult as well as one of the most fundamental which Christianity in the early years was called upon to decide. It was, in the first place, a social problem which deeply affected the intercourse between Jew and pagan in business, in entertainment, within the family, at worship. To the Jews, the goim were unclean, a quality, it will be remembered, that was looked on as something physical (like the colour of a man's skin). In fact, to abolish it, as we shall see, a special creative act of God himself would appear to be necessary.

More basically, however, the problem was a theological one, arising from the Jewish conception of sacred history. I am thinking of the Jewish sensitiveness, most probably already felt by the Judaism contemporary with Jesus, to the fact that the pagans have been deprived, atavistically, of all share in the mighty episode of Israel's exodus out of Egypt, through which a mob of Hebrew slaves had become Yahweh's segulah, his Chosen people, his first-born son. We see this conviction operative in the triple rite by which proselytes from paganism were admitted to Judaism: circumcision, baptism, and the offering of a special sacrifice. Rabbi Judah the patriarch, in the second century of the Christian era, explains that this initiation ritual enables the proselyte to share in the threefold experience by which Israel entered the Sinaitic covenant. The Hebrews were circumcised "a second time" (an inference from Jos. 5:2-3), were baptized in the desert (Ex. 19:10), and celebrated the covenant sacrifice (Ex. 24:3-8). Similarly, the non-Jew became a full-fledged Israelite by accepting circumcision and baptism; but he had to make a burnt offering before admission to any sacrificial meal.

Of the two aspects of this problem of the admission of Gentiles into the Christian Church without their first becoming Jews, I suggest that the theological was harder to solve than the social. And I believe that the series of extraordinary events which brought the final solution can only be explained by the inter-continued to direct from heaven the fortunes of his Church. However, to appreciate both the problem and its solution through the sacred history of the Church prior to the destruction of the Temple, we must recall Jesus' own attitude, during his earthly life, to the conversion of the pagans, the role of Peter and of Stephen in admitting Gentiles to Christianity, and finally, the theological working out of the whole question by Paul in his missionary work and in his letters.

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GENTILES 2

In the Franz Delitsch lectures for 1953, Joachim Jeremias has summed up Jesus' attitude towards the salvation of the pagans. On the one hand, Jesus restricted his own public ministry almost exclusively to his Jewish compatriots, as the Gospels testify: "My mission is only to the straying sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 15:24). His instruction to the twelve on their first mission echoes the same viewpoint, "Do not visit pagan territory, and do not enter any Samaritan town. Rather go out after the sheep belonging to the house of Israel that have been lost" (Mt. 10:5-6). Paul himself assures the Romans that Jesus was, during his earthly career, "minister of the circumcision on behalf of God's faithfulness" (Rom. 15:8).

Still, Jesus did make clear references to the ingathering of the pagans. In the Matthean description of the last judgement, we find "all the nations assembled" before the tribunal of the parousiac Christ (Mt. 25:32); and it is to be noted that the basis of discrimination between good and evil has nothing to do with racial affiliation. Moreover, the hour of salvation for the pagans is not reserved for the end of the world, but is a direct consequence of Jesus' glorification after his death and resurrection, as Mt. 28:19-20 makes abundantly clear. It is also noteworthy that the Son of Man, with whom Jesus identified himself during his lifetime, is a figure whom "all peoples, nations, and tongues shall serve" (Dan. 7:14). The same is true of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, whose role Jesus was conscious of playing: "the Servant brings revealed truth 'to the nations' (Is. 42:1,4), is a 'light to the nations' (Is. 42:5; 49:5), and dies in atonement for the 'sins of all men' (Is. 53:12).

While we are grateful to Dr. Jeremias for his careful study of Jesus' views on the salvation of the pagans, it is difficult to admit his opinion that the universal preaching of the Gospel referred to in Mt. 24:14 (Mk. 14:9) is simply an angelic proclamation of the end of human history. Such an interpretation appears to ignore the whole context of this remark, viz. Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple. This prediction surely announces the end of Judaism's influence in the nascent Christian Church and the passing of the Kingdom to the pagans. Professor J.A.T. Robinson has pointed out in his discerning review of Jeremias' book that it contains, significantly enough, no reference to the logion in Mk. 12:9 (Mt. 21:41; Lk. 20:16): "Now what will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy those tenants, and entrust his vineyard to other people." Unless we are prepared to scrap important elements in the apostolic tradition, we must admit that Jesus foresaw the Gentile missionary effort of the primitive Church as part of the divine plan for Christianity.

Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in his view that the Church's "missionary task is part of the final fulfilment, a divine factual demonstration of the exaltation of the Son of Man, an eschatology in process of realization".⁵ But he appears to go beyond his premises (viz. the Scriptural assertions of the supernatural quality of all Christian missionary endeavour), when he concludes that "Man can do nothing... God alone does it all".⁶ The evidence presented by the rest of the paper will, I think, show how necessary, in God's plan, was the divinely directed and divinely aided effort of those men to whom the risen Christ committed the destinies of his Church.

THE FIRST DISCIPLES

As a result of its experience of the Pentecostal Spirit, the original Christian community of Jerusalem possessed an undeniably Christian character. The first five chapters of Acts, despite a somewhat idealized picture of the first years, shows plainly that these disciples were aware of their new identity as the qahal of the New Israel. The repeated references made in these chapters to Deuteronomy, which, as the most prophetic of all the books in the Pentateuchal collection, had sketched the spirit of the eschatological congregation of "the last times", show how conscious these first Christians were that they had been, under the impulse of the Spirit, constituted as the messianic ekklēsia.⁸ Indeed, their quite astonishing conviction that the messianic age had been inaugurated in the absence of the Christ by the Holy Spirit shows their recognition of him as a divine personality, distinct from Father and Son. As for the Lord Jesus, they knew that, by his exaltation into heavenly glory and by his sending of "the promised Spirit", he had revealed himself as possessing those uniquely divine prerogatives which Christianity of a later age and different culture would call his divine nature and his divine person. This basic article of Christian faith they expressed simply by saying that Jesus had been seated at the right hand of God (Acts 2:33), had been "constituted by God as judge of living and dead" (Acts 10:42), had been given the divine Name, Kyrios (Phil 2:9).

Armed with this completely new faith, these Jewish Christians set about the work of evangelizing their fellow countrymen through the kerygma, or Good News of salvation in Jesus Christ, as also through the sacraments of Christian initiation, Baptism and the imposition of hands. They celebrated the Eucharistic "breaking of the bread" in obedience to the command of the Master given at the Last Supper. They honoured the new commandment of fraternal love by a voluntary sharing of their material possessions (Acts 2:42ff.). And this new life, they lived under the direction of the Twelve, while Peter was regarded as having taken the place, within the community, of the ascended Lord Jesus. So evident, even to outsiders, was this last fact that they had recourse to Peter as they had formerly done to Christ, confident of being cured, if "at Peter's approach, even his shadow might fall upon some of them" (Acts 5:15; cf. Mark 6:56).

Yet for all this, the little band of Jesus' followers in the Holy City retained all the religious and ethical practices of Judaism. They participated in the Temple liturgy, offering prayers and sacrifices there according to Mosaic custom; and they faithfully carried out the dietary laws in which they had been reared, as well as the regulations forbidding intercourse with Gentiles.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STEPHEN AND THE HELLENISTS

Acts' sixth chapter reveals two distinct groups among these first disciples: the "Hebrews", Palestinian Jewish Christians, probably mostly Pharisees, with all the conservative and separatist tendencies of that party; and the "Hellenists", also mainly of Jewish origin, but liberalized and broadened by contact with Greek culture. Their leader, Stephen, was their most distinguished representative. Cosmopolitan, adaptable, with an original, creative and questioning mind and possessing the courage to die for his ideas, he had rare gifts of eloquence as well as the genius to construct what was probably the first Christian biblical theology.

Stephen's speech in Acts, based probably on a document Luke had found in the Antiochian archives, indicates that he was the first to see the essential incompatibility between Judaism and Christianity and the inevitability of a break between them. He taught his Jewish Christian confreres what they had seemingly failed to perceive, that by the will of Christ the Church must stand forth in history as something more than a pious sect of Judaism. In a word, Stephen drew attention to the visible character of the Church. Moreover, by accepting death before the triumphant return of Jesus Christ, Stephen proclaimed, in effect, that the Church had an important mission in this world: to bring all men to a knowledge of the truths of God revealed to her. She was not to content herself with merely waiting for the parousia.

The impact of Stephen's life and doctrine is traced by Luke, as an historian, in the subsequent chapters of Acts. They may be reduced to two historical happenings of paramount interest for our present study: the founding of the Antiochian church, and the conversion and work of Saul of Tarsus. These momentous events are linked by Luke with Stephen through the persecution of the Hellenists which broke out in Judea as a consequence of Stephen's death. Before investigating these two turning points in early Christian history, however, we must recall Peter's first experience of the Gentile mission.

THE CORNELIUS EPISODE

Whether Cornelius' conversion was chronologically antecedent to the foundation at Antioch or not is at present impossible to determine. In any event, it is significant for our inquiry that, on Luke's view, the first Gentile converts must be admitted by Peter as head of the Christian community. At Joppa, Peter learns Christ's will that he is to preach to pagans (Acts 10:17-23). He also learns, at the same time, interestingly enough, that God has, by a new creative act, abolished forever the distinction between clean and unclean (Acts 10:11-16). At Caesarea, the repetition of the miracle of the first Pentecost bestowed upon Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:44-48) banishes any final doubts Peter may have had about receiving pagans into the Christian Church; and he orders their baptism without hesitation.

Jerusalem's reaction to this move on the part of Peter was at first by no means favourable (Acts 11:2). Once Peter explained this admission of Gentiles, who had not accepted first the yoke of Judaism, as obedience to the divine will, the Jewish Christian community submitted with generosity to this new revelation. Luke tells us that they "glorified God, saying, 'Then even to the pagans God has granted repentance leading to life'" (Acts 11:18). Yet it is hard not to feel that this conversion of but a handful of Gentiles was regarded simply as an exception to the general rule, if we judge it in the light of two other crises of these eventful years: the foundation of the church at Antioch and the so-called Council of Jerusalem.

THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH

The Hellenist founders of the church at Antioch showed themselves heirs of Stephen's principles by "announcing the Good News of the Lord Jesus also to the Greeks", i.e. the pagans (Acts 11:20). Unprecedented success crowned this new departure, with the result that the first Christian community of predominantly pagan origin came into being. Since it was obviously distinct from Jews as well as pagans, it was the first group to bear the name of "Christian" (Acts 11:26).

This attempt at integrating Jewish and Gentile Christians appears to have affected without any great difficulty. Barnabas, a man possessing the confidence of the Mother Church of Jerusalem, was sent to investigate the orthodoxy of this novel experiment. What he found so pleased him that, after reassuring Jerusalem of the genuine Christian spirit which prevailed at Antioch, he remained there to head the new community. Eventually he summoned from Tarsus Saul the zealot who had become a Christian; and they worked together on the banks of the Orontes for well over a year.

What were the causes of this successful integration of Jew and Greek in the Antiochian church? One has already been indicated: Stephen's teaching about the necessarily relative and ephemeral character of the Mosaic institutions. There was, however, another factor: the absence of the Temple's influence in the Christian life of Antioch. This made it possible to avoid the deep-rooted discrimination in worship and in social relations which, in Jerusalem, would have separated Jewish and Gentile Christians. Until the appearance of certain trouble-making Christian pharisees, who exceeded the authority vested in them by James of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1 ff.), there was no "segregation" problem at Antioch (cf. Gal. 2:11-21). Moreover, the Eucharist became the unrivalled liturgical focus of Antiochian Christianity; and it is, I believe, scarcely accidental that the first divinely inspired call to the Gentile missions should have occurred in that community during the performance of the Eucharist (Acts 13:1 ff.).

PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES

The sending of Barnabas and Saul upon a tour of Evangelization through lower Asia Minor was not only to "open the door the Faith to the pagans" (Acts 14:27). It eventually brought the leaders of the apostolic Church together for a meeting in Jerusalem at which the principle of Gentile liberty vis-a-vis the Law of Moses was re-affirmed by Peter (Acts 15:7-11) and was even admitted by the Jewish Christian wing of the Church in the person of James, bishop of Jerusalem (Acts 15:12-21). The promulgation of this Christian Magna Charta was the last important official act of the proto-church of Jerusalem in her function as guardian of Christian orthodoxy, before her disappearance into the mists of history with the approach of Titus' armies.

It is interesting to note that the only restrictions placed on Gentile-Christian freedom aimed at facilitating social relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians in mixed communities. Three of the regulations regard foods considered unclean by Jews (and hence to be avoided at communal meals), while a fourth, proscribing "fornication", probably concerned marriages which the Mosaic Law considered invalid. In the later Pauline foundations, these decrees were regarded as without force, since Paul solves similar dietary questions at Corinth, for example, solely in terms of

the Christian virtues of prudence and charity (1 Cor. 8:1-11; Rom. 13:8-15, 13). Once this point in the development of apostolic Christianity is reached, the social question of Gentile integration in the Church have become of much less significance. Henceforth the Judæo-Christian element is a minority and its influence is on the wane.

PAUL AND THE JUDAIZERS

There was however a vexing question with which Paul had yet to deal during the years when his missionary activity was reaching its zenith: the provocation within Gentile communities given on the part of certain judaizing Christians by their insistence that even those of pagan origin must conform to the ethos of Judaism. In the course of Galatians and Romans, Paul hammers out the Christian answer to two questions: the place of law, considered as an extrinsic norm of conduct, in Christian life; and the validity of the Gentile Christian claim to be children of Abraham.

On the subject of the Christian's relation to law, Paul's thought naturally takes its rise from the conviction that in Christ all men are freed from the Mosaic Law. Hence the Christian vocation is essentially a call to liberty (Gal. 5:13, 18). The Mosaic Law was like a "pedagogue", the slave whose duty was to lead the child to the master for instruction (Gal. 3:23-24). Within the broader concept of O.T. Salvation-history, Paul sees the economy of the Law as an intrusion (Gal. 3:17) which however left intact the earlier and more significant economy of the Promise made to Abraham (Rom. 4:13). It was a regime of malediction (Gal. 3:23-24), under which "no man is justified in God's sight" (Gal. 3:11); it was imposed by God "because of transgression" (Gal. 3:19).

It is to be observed however that Christian liberty as Paul conceived it had nothing to do with the Greek idea of freedom. It is a spontaneous service of God under the pervading influence of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the just and directs him, as God's adoptive son, to "walk according to the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4ff.). It is in striking contrast with the "old letter" of the Mosaic legislation: not indeed as code to code, or as a higher to a less perfect moral ideal, but as an interior dynamic divine force to all extrinsic law. Thus, as Aquinas remarks in his *Summa Theologica*,¹⁰ relying on the authority of Augustine, Paul would include under the "letter that kills" (2 Cor. 3:6), "any scripture existing external to men, even those moral precepts such as are contained in the Gospel". And in his treatise on justification,¹¹ Robert Bellarmine explains the Pauline antithesis between the "law of works" and the "law of faith" (Rom. 3:27), by remarking that "the law of works, on the Apostle's view, is that which commands what must be done: the law of faith is faith itself which obtains grace to do what the law of works commands." And he adds, "Hence it follows that not only the law of Moses, but also the law of Christ, insofar as it commands anything, is the law of works; while the law of faith is the spirit of faith by which not only we Christians but also the patriarchs, the prophets, and all the just have obtained the grace of God, and being justified gratuitously by this same grace, have observed the commandments of the law."

Is there then, according to Paul, no room for law of any kind in the Christian Church? There is; but law occupies of necessity a secondary role, subordinate to what Ignatius Loyola in his Constitution call "the interior law of charity and love". The picture of the Christian life given in Romans 8 is an ideal: Paul knew better than most that not all Christians are saints. Elsewhere, he gives two reasons why the Church must promulgate laws and regulations as norms of conduct. The first reason is that the majority of Christians are sinners and so require to be aided by the constraining help of law, for the simple reason that they are not sufficiently attuned to the inner voice of the Spirit (1 Tim. 1:9). The second reason Paul gives is that even the holiest Christian is never free from the danger of falling from grace (Gal. 5:17); and hence he needs an objective guide for his fallible conscience.

Paul never forgets however that any law promulgated by the Church must somehow be an expression of that one command which sums up all law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Gal. 5:14; Rom. 13:9). This most characteristically Christian attitude, which as we have seen has never been forgotten by the Church's greatest theological minds, is in direct opposition to that spirit of Pharasaism, which ended

by dominating Judaism. It not only made possible the integration of Gentile Christians into the Jewish Christian Church; it also assured the Church's own liberation from the religion in which she had been born.

We have now to consider the second theological principle which, thanks to Paul's genius, played its part in the integration of converts from paganism: I refer to the relation of these Christians to Abraham. The importance of this issue can be seen in the assumption of the Jewish Christian party in the apostolic age that unless pagans should come to Christianity via Judaism they had no hope of inheriting the Promise Yahweh had sworn to confer upon "Abraham's seed", since they had not racial affiliation with that patriarch.

One can well imagine that this became a burning question in the Pauline Churches where the Apostle had repeatedly rejected all the observances of the Mosaic Law. If such Christians had not ties with Moses or Mosaic institutions, since Paul had taught that salvation-history consisted of only two essential elements, the promise to Abraham and its fulfilment in Christ, it was of course essential that these Christians of pagan origin should be able to invoke the patronage of Abraham. For even Paul admitted that only Abraham's heirs had a valid claim upon Abraham's promise.

Paul established the relationship between Abraham and these Gentile Christians by developing the true conception of Abraham's paternity as a completely supernatural one, due solely to God's gracious and wholly gratuitous favour towards the patriarch. In Galatians, Paul shows that Abraham's universal fatherhood is the result of God's free choice and of Abraham's loving, trusting faith, antecedent to the performance of any "good works" and to the reception of circumcision, the symbol of his justifying faith (Gal. 3:6-29; Rom. 4:11; cf. Gn. 12:2-3; 15:6; 17:23-24). The supreme proof of the supernatural character of this whole economy, of course, is the fact that God made good his Promise in his own incarnate Son (Gal. 3:15-29; 4:4-6). In the letter to the Romans, Paul cites O.T. history to prove that mere carnal descent from Abraham, as the history of Ismael and of Esau bears witness, is without significance for salvation (Rom. 9:6-12; Gal. 4:22ff.). Accordingly, only those who have the true faith found in Abraham are, regardless of racial ties, genuine sons of Abraham (Gal. 3:9, 14, 18, 22; Rom. 4:11-12, 16). More positively, it is by the Christian's identification through grace with Christ, Abraham's "seed" par excellence, that the Gentiles inherit the Promise (Gal. 3:26-29).

With these questions settled, the integration of Christians of pagan origin becomes, in the history of the Church, not only an accomplished fact, but a theologically justified event in that sacred Christian history to which the N.T. bears inspired testimony.

NOTES

1. George Foot Moore, Judaism I, Cambridge, 1927, 334.
2. Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 24, Naperville, 1958.
3. Cf. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by St. Paul", Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16 (1954) 385-425.
4. Cf. Journal of Biblical Literature, 78 (1959), 101-104.
5. op.cit. 75.
6. ibid. 74.
7. R.A.F. MacKenzie, "The Messianism of Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19 (1957) 299-305.
8. J. Schmidt, "L'Eglise de Jerusalem ou la 'restauration' d'Israel," Revue des Sciences religieuses, 27(1953), 209-218.

9. Cornelius is described in Acts 10:2 as a phoboumenos ton Theon; for the meaning of the term, cf. Jeremias, op. cit. 15.
10. 1-11, 106, 3.
11. Roberti Berlarmini, Opera Omnia, V I, Parisiis, 1873 (ed. Justinus Fevre): De Justificatione, I, c. 19, 192: "Lex igitur factorum apud Apostolum est ea, quae jubet quid sit faciendum, lex fidei est ipsa fides, quae impetrat gratiam faciendi, quod lex factorum jubet... Denique lex factorum est littera, quae occidit jubendo et non juvando, lex fidei est spiritus, qui vivificat opem ferendo, ut justificatio legis impleatur in nobis. Ex quo sequitur, ut non solum lex Mosis, sed etiam lex Christi, quatenus aliquid imperat, sit factorum, et lex fidei sit spiritus fidei, non solum quo nos Christiani, sed etiam Patriarchae et Prophetae, et omnes antiqui justii, Dei gratiam impetrarunt. et justificati gratis per eandem gratiam, legis mandata servarunt."
12. Ignatii de Loyola, Societatis Jesu Constitutiones: Prooemium Constitutionum: "Quamvis summa Sapiencia et Bonitas Dei Creatoris nostri ac Domini sit quae conservatura est, gubernatura atque promotura in suo sancto servitio hanc minimam Societatem Jesu, ut eam dignata est inchoare; ex parte vero nostra, interna caritatis et amoris illius lex quam Sanctus Spiritus scribere et in cordibus imprimere solet, potiusquam ullae externae Constitutiones, ad id adiutura sit..."

A PROBLEM OF INTEGRATION IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

D. M. Stanley, S.J.

Within the past year or so, we have become very much aware of the word "integration", and still more acutely conscious of the social problem it represents. Accordingly, it might not be without interest to the members of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies to review, in this presidential address, an integration problem which was faced by the early Christian Church: the admission of Gentiles into the Jewish-Christian community.

When we reassess the evidence provided by the NT, it becomes clear that this issue was one of the most difficult as well as one of the most fundamental which Christianity in the early years was called upon to decide. It was, in the first place, a social problem which deeply affected the intercourse between Jew and pagan in business, in entertainment, within the family, at worship. To the Jews, the goim were unclean, a quality, it will be remembered, that was looked on as something physical (like the colour of a man's skin). In fact, to abolish it, as we shall see, a special creative act

Integration:2

of God himself would appear to be necessary.

More basically, however, the problem was a theological one, arising from the Jewish conception of sacred history. I am thinking of the Jewish sensitiveness, most probably already felt by the Judaism contemporary with Jesus, to the fact that the pagans have been deprived, atavistically, of all share in the mighty episode of Israel's exodus out of Egypt, through which a mob of Hebrew slaves had become Yahweh's segulah, his Chosen people, his first-born son. We see this conviction operative in the triple rite by which proselytes from paganism were admitted to Judaism: circumcision, baptism, and the offering of a special sacrifice. Rabbi Judah the patriarch, in the second century of the Christian era, explains that this initiation ritual enables the proselyte to share in the threefold experience by which Israel entered the Sinaitic covenant. The Hebrews were circumcised "a second time" (an inference from Jos 5,2-3), were baptized in the desert (Ex 19,10), and celebrated the covenant sacrifice (Ex 24,3-8). Similarly, the non-Jew became a full-fledged Israelite by accepting circumcision and baptism; but he had to make a burnt-offering before admission to any sacrificial meal.

Of the two aspects of this problem of the admission of Gentiles into the Christian Church without their first becoming Jews, I suggest that the theological was harder to solve than the social. And I believe that ~~the only satisfactory solution~~ ~~is~~ the series of extraordinary events which brought the final solution can only be explained by the intervention of the glorified Christ, who, as the Christians of the apostolic age believed,

continued to direct from heaven the fortunes of his Church. However, to appreciate both the problem and its solution through the sacred history of the Church prior to the destruction of the Temple, we must recall Jesus' own attitude, during his earthly life, to the conversion of the pagans, the role of Peter and of Stephen in admitting Gentiles to Christianity, and finally, the theological working out of the whole question by Paul in his missionary work and in his letters.

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GENTILES

In the Franz Delitsch lectures for 1953, Joachim Jeremias² has summed up Jesus' attitude towards the salvation of the pagans. On the one hand, Jesus restricted his own public ministry almost exclusively to his Jewish compatriots, as the Gospels testify. "My mission is only to the straying sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt 15,24). His instruction to the Twelve on their first mission echoes the same viewpoint, "Do not visit pagan territory, and do not enter any Samaritan town. Rather go out after the sheep belonging to the house of Israel that have been lost" (Mt 10,5-6). Paul himself assures the Romans that Jesus was, during his earthly career, "minister of the circumcision on behalf of God's faithfulness" (Rom 15,8).

Still, Jesus did make many clear references to the ingathering of the pagans. In the Matthean description of the last judgment, we find "all the nations assembled" before the tribunal of the parousiac Christ (Mt 25,32); and it is to be noted that the basis of discrimination between good and evil has nothing to do with racial affiliation. Moreover, the hour of salvation for the pagans is not reserved for the end of the world, but is a direct consequence of Jesus' glorification after his death and resurrection, as Mt 28,

19-20 makes abundantly clear. It is also noteworthy that the Son of Man, with whom Jesus identified himself during his lifetime, is a figure whom "all peoples, nations, and tongues shall serve" (Dn 7,14). The same is true of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, whose role Jesus was conscious of playing: the Servant brings revealed truth "to the nations" (Is 42,1,4), is a "light to the nations" (Is 42,5;49,5), and dies in atonement for the "sins of all men" (Is 53,12).

While we are grateful to Dr Jeremias for his careful study of Jesus' views on the salvation of the pagans, it is difficult to admit his opinion that the universal preaching of the Gospel referred to in Mt 24,14 (Mk 14,9) is simply an angelic proclamation of the end of human history. Such an interpretation appears to ignore the whole context of this remark, viz. Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple. This prediction surely announces the end of Judaism's influence in the nascent Christian Church and the passing of the Kingdom to the pagans. Professor J.A.T. Robinson⁴ has pointed out in his discerning review of Jeremias' book that it contains, significantly enough, no reference to the logion in Mk 12,9 (Mt 21,41; Lk 20,16): "Now what will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy those tenants, and entrust his vineyard to other people." Unless we are prepared to scrap important elements in the apostolic tradition, we must admit that Jesus' foresaw the Gentile missionary effort of the primitive Church as part of the divine plan for Christianity.

Jeremias is undoubtedly correct in his view that the Church's "missionary task is part of the final fulfilment, a divine factual demonstration of the exaltation of the Son of Man, an eschatology in process of realization".⁵ But he appears to go beyond his premises

(viz. the Scriptural assertions of the supernatural quality of all Christian missionary endeavour), when he concludes that "Man can do nothing...God alone does it all"⁶. The evidence presented by the rest of this paper will, I think, show how necessary, in God's plan, was the divinely directed and divinely aided effort of those men to whom the risen Christ committed the destinées of his Church.

THE FIRST DISCIPLES

As a result of its experience of the Pentecostal Spirit, the original Christian community of Jerusalem possessed an undeniably Christian character. The first five chapters of Acts, despite a somewhat idealized picture of the first years, show plainly that these disciples were aware of their new identity as the gahal of the New Israel. The repeated references made in these chapters to Deuteronomy, which, as the most prophetic of all the books in the Pentateuchal collection, had sketched the spirit of the eschatological congregation of "the last times"⁷, show how conscious these first Christians were that they had been, under the impulse of the Spirit, constituted as the messianic ekklēsia.⁸ Indeed, their quite astonishing conviction that the messianic age had been inaugurated in the absence of the Christ by the Holy Spirit shows their recognition of him as a divine personality, distinct from Father and Son. As for the Lord Jesus, they knew that, by his exaltation into heavenly glory and by his sending of "the promised Spirit", he had revealed himself as possessing those uniquely divine prerogatives which the Christianity of a later age and different^{erent} culture would call his divine nature and his divine person. This basic article of Christian faith they expressed simply by saying that Jesus had been seated at God's right hand (Acts 2,33), had been "constituted

by God as judge of living and dead" (Acts 10,42), had been given the divine Name, Kyrios (Phil 2,9).

Armed with this completely new faith, these Jewish Christians set about the work of evangelizing their fellow countrymen through the kerygma, or Good News of salvation in Jesus Christ, as also through the sacraments of Christian initiation, Baptism and the imposition of hands. They celebrated the Eucharistic "breaking of the Bread" in obedience to the command of the Master, given at the Last Supper. They honoured the new commandment of fraternal love by a voluntary sharing of their material possessions (Acts 2,42 ff). And this new life, they lived under the direction of the Twelve, while Peter was regarded as having taken the place^{within the community,} of the ascended Lord Jesus. So evident, even to outsiders, was this last fact that they had recourse to Peter as they had formerly done to Christ, confident of being cured, if "at Peter's approach, even his shadow might fall upon some of them" (Acts 5,15; cf. Mk 6,56).

Yet for all this, the little band of Jesus' followers in the Holy City retained all the religious and ethical practices of Judaism. They participated in the Temple liturgy, offering prayers and sacrifices there according to Mosaic custom; and they faithfully carried out the dietary laws in which they had been reared, as well as the regulations forbidding intercourse with Gentiles.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STEPHEN AND THE HELLENISTS

Acts' sixth chapter reveals two distinct groups among these first disciples: the "Hebrews", Palestinian Jewish Christians, probably mostly Pharisees, with all the conservative and separatist tendencies of that party; and the "Hellenists", also mainly of

Jewish origin, but liberalized and broadened by contact with Greek culture. Their leader, Stephen, was their most distinguished representative. Cosmopolitan, adaptable, with an original, creative and questioning mind and possessing the courage to die for his ideas, he had rare gifts of eloquence as well as the genius to construct what was probably the first Christian biblical theology.

Stephen's speech in Acts, based probably on a document Luke had found in the Antiochian archives, indicates that he was the first to see the essential incompatibility between Judaism and Christianity and the inevitability of a break between them. He taught his Jewish Christian confreres what they had seemingly failed to perceive, that by the will of Christ the Church must stand forth in history as something more than a pious sect of Judaism. In a word, Stephen drew attention to the visible character of the Church. Moreover, by accepting death before the triumphant return of Jesus Christ, Stephen proclaimed, in effect, that the Church had an important mission in this world: to bring all men to a knowledge of the truths God had revealed to her. She was not to content herself with merely waiting for the parousia.

The impact of Stephen's life and doctrine is traced by Luke, as an historian, in the subsequent chapters of Acts. They may be reduced to two historical happenings of paramount interest for our present study: the founding of the Antiochian church, and the conversion and work of Saul of Tarsus. These momentous events are linked by Luke with Stephen through the persecution of the Hellenists which broke out in Judea as a consequence of Stephen's death. Before investigating these two turning points in early Christian

history, however, we must recall Peter's first experience of the Gentile mission.

THE CORNELIUS EPISODE

Whether Cornelius' conversion was chronologically antecedent to the foundation at Antioch or not is at present impossible to determine. In any event, it is significant for our inquiry that, on Luke's view, the first Gentile converts must be admitted by Peter as head of the Christian community. At Joppa, Peter learns Christ's will that he is to preach to pagans (Acts 10, 17-23). He also learns, at the same time, interestingly enough, that God has, by a new creative act, abolished forever the distinction between clean and unclean (Acts 10, 11-16). At Caesarea, the repetition of the miracle of the first Pentecost bestowed upon Cornelius and his household (Acts 10, 44-48) banishes any final doubts Peter may have had about receiving pagans into the Christian Church; and he orders their baptism without hesitation.

Jerusalem's reaction to this move on the part of Peter was at first by no means favourable (Acts 11, 2). Once Peter explained this admission of Gentiles, who had not accepted first the yoke of Judaism, as obedience to the divine will, the Jewish Christian community submitted with generosity to this new revelation. Luke tells us that they "glorified God, saying, 'Then even to the pagans God has granted repentance leading to life'" (Acts 11, 18). Yet it is hard not to feel that this conversion of but a handful of Gentiles was regarded simply as an exception to the general rule, if we judge it in the light of two other crises of these eventful years: the foundation of the church of Antioch and the so-called Council of Jerusalem.

THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH

The Hellenist founders of the church at Antioch showed themselves heirs of Stephen's principles by "announcing the Good News of the Lord Jesus also to the Greeks", i.e. the pagans (Acts 11,20). Unprecedented success crowned this new departure, with the result that the first Christian community of predominantly pagan origin came into being. Since it was obviously distinct from Jews as well as pagans, it was the first group to bear the name of "Christian" (Acts 11,26).

This attempt at integrating Jewish and Gentile Christians appears to have been effected without any great difficulty. Barnabas, a man possessing the confidence of the Mother Church of Jerusalem, was sent to investigate the orthodoxy of this novel experiment. What he found so pleased him that, after reassuring Jerusalem of the genuine Christian spirit which prevailed at Antioch, he remained there to head the new community. Eventually, he summoned from Tarsus Saul the zealot who had become a Christian; and they worked together on the banks of the Orontes for well over a year.

What were the causes of this successful integration of Jew and Greek in the Antiochian church? One has already been indicated: Stephen's teaching about the necessarily relative and ephemeral character of the Mosaic institutions. There was however another factor: the absence of the Temple's influence in the Christian life of Antioch. This made it possible to avoid the deep-rooted discrimination in worship and in social relations which, in Jerusalem, would have separated Jewish and Gentile Christians. Until the appearance of certain trouble-making Christian pharisees, who exceeded the authority vested in

them by James of Jerusalem (Acts 15,1 ff), there was no "segregation" problem at Antioch (cf. Gal 2,11-21). Moreover, the Eucharist became the unrivalled liturgical focus of Antiochian Christianity; and it is, I believe, scarcely accidental that the first divinely inspired call to the Gentile missions should have occurred in that community during the performance of the Eucharist (Acts 13,1 ff).

PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES

The sending of Barnabas and Saul upon a tour of evangelization through lower Asia Minor was not only to "open the door of the Faith to the pagans" (Acts 14,27). It eventually brought the leaders of the apostolic Church together for a meeting in Jerusalem at which the principle of Gentile liberty vis-a-vis the Law of Moses was re-affirmed by Peter (Acts 15,7-11) and was even admitted by the Jewish-Christian wing of the Church in the person of James, bishop of Jerusalem (Acts 15,12-21). The promulgation of this Christian Magna Charta was the last important official act of the proto-church of Jerusalem in her function as guardian of Christian orthodoxy, before her disappearance into the mists of history with the approach of Titus' armies.

It is interesting to note that the only restrictions placed on Gentile-Christian freedom aimed at facilitating social relations between Jewish and Gentile Christians in mixed communities. Three of the regulations regard foods considered unclean by Jews (and hence to be avoided at communal meals), while a fourth, proscribing "fornication", probably concerned marriages which the Mosaic Law considered invalid. In the later Pauline foundations, these decrees were regarded as without force, since Paul solves similar dietary questions at Corinth, for example, solely in terms of the Christian virtues of prudence and charity (1 Cor 8,1-11,1; Rom

13,8-15,13). Once this point in the development of apostolic Christianity is reached, the social aspects of the question of Gentile integration in the Church have become of much less significance. Henceforth the Judaeo-Christian element is a minority and its influence is on the wane.

PAUL AND THE JUDAIZERS

There was however a vexing question with which Paul had yet to cope during the years when his missionary activity was reaching its zenith: the provocation within Gentile communities given ^{ON THE PART OF} certain judaizing Christians by their insistence that even those of pagan origin must conform to the ethos of Judaism. In the course of Galatians and Romans, Paul hammers out the Christian answer to two questions: the place of law, considered as an extrinsic norm of conduct, in Christian life; and the validity of the Gentile Christian claim to be children of Abraham.

On the subject of the Christian's relation to law, Paul's thought naturally takes its rise from his conviction that in Christ all men are freed from the Mosaic Law. Hence the Christian vocation is essentially a call to liberty (Gal 5,13,18). The Mosaic Law was like a "pedagogue", the slave whose duty was to lead the child to the master for instruction (Gal 3,23-24). Within the broader concept of OT salvation-history, Paul sees the economy of the Law as an intrusion (Gal 3,17) which however left intact the earlier and more significant economy of the Promise made to Abraham (Rom 4,13). It was a regime of malediction (Gal 3,23-24), under which "no man is justified in God's sight" (Gal 3,11); it was imposed by God "because of transgression" (Gal 3,19).

It is to be observed however that Christian liberty as Paul

conceived it had nothing to do with the Greek ideal of freedom. It is a spontaneous service of God under the pervading influence of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the just and directs him, as God's adoptive son, to "walk according to the Spirit" (Rom 8,4ff). It is in striking contrast with the "old letter" of the Mosaic legislation: not indeed as code to code, or as a higher to a less perfect moral ideal, but as an interior dynamic divine force to all extrinsic law. Thus, as Aquinas remarks in his Summa Theologica,¹⁰ relying on the authority of Augustine, Paul would include under "the letter that kills" (2 Cor 3,6), "any scripture existing external to men, even of those moral precepts such as are contained in the Gospel". And in his treatise on justification,¹¹ Robert Bellarmine explains the Pauline antithesis between the "law of works" and the "law of faith" (Rom 3,27), by remarking that "the law of works, on the Apostle's view, is that which commands what must be done: the law of faith is faith itself which obtains the grace to do what the law of works commands." → And he adds, "Hence it follows that not only the law of Moses, but also the law of Christ, insofar as it commands anything, is the law of works; while the law of faith is the spirit of faith by which not only we Christians but also the patriarchs, the prophets, and all the just have obtained the grace of God, and being justified gratuitously by this same grace, have observed the commandments of the law".

Is there then, according to Paul, no room for law of any kind in the Christian Church? There is; but law occupies of necessity a secondary role, subordinate to what Ignatius Loyola in his Constitutions calls¹² "the interior law of charity and love". The picture of the Christian life given in Romans 8 is an ideal: Paul knew better than most that not all Christians are saints. Elsewhere, he gives two reasons why the Church must promulgate laws and regulations as norms of conduct. The first reason is that the majority of Christians are sinners and so require

to be aided by the constraining help of law, for the simple reason that they are not sufficiently attuned to the inner voice of the Spirit (1 Tim 1,9). The second reason Paul gives is that even the holiest Christian is never free from the danger of falling from grace (Gal 5,17); and hence he needs an objective guide for his fallible conscience.

Paul never forgets however that any law promulgated by the Christian Church must somehow be an expression of that one command which sums up all law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Gal 5,14; Rom 13,9). This most characteristically Christian attitude, which as we have seen has never been forgotten by the Church's greatest theological minds, is in direct opposition to that spirit of Pharasaism, which ended by dominating Judaism. It not only made possible the integration of Gentile Christians into the Jewish Christian Church; it also assured the Church's ^{own} liberation from the religion in which she had been born.

We have now to consider the second theological principle which, thanks to Paul's genius, played its part in the integration of converts from paganism: I refer to the relation of these Christians to Abraham. The importance of this issue can be seen in the assumption of the Jewish Christian party in the apostolic age that unless pagans should come to Christianity via Judaism they had no hope of inheriting the Promise Yahweh had sworn to confer upon Abraham's "seed", since they had not racial affiliation with that patriarch.

One can well imagine that this became a burning question in the Pauline churches where the Apostle had repeatedly rejected all the observances of the Mosaic Law. If such Christians had not ties with Moses or Mosaic institutions, since Paul had taught them that salvation-history consisted of only two essential moments, the Promise to Abra-

ham and its fulfilment in Christ, it was of course essential that these Christians of pagan origin should be able to invoke the patronage of Abraham. For even Paul admitted that only Abraham's heirs had a valid claim upon Abraham's promise.

Paul established the relationship between Abraham and these Gentile Christians by developing the true conception of Abraham's paternity as a completely supernatural one, due solely to God's gracious and wholly gratuitous favour towards the patriarch. In Galatians, Paul shows that Abraham's universal fatherhood is the result of God's free choice and of Abraham's loving, trusting faith, antecedent to the performance of any "good works" and to the reception of circumcision, the symbol of his justifying faith (Gal 3,6-29; Rom 4,11; cf. Gn 12,2-3; 15,6; 17,23-24). The supreme proof of the supernatural character of this whole economy, of course, is the fact that God made good his Promise in his own incarnate Son (Gal 3,15-29; 4,4-6). In the letter to the Romans, Paul cites OT history to prove that mere carnal descent from Abraham, as the history of Ismael and of Esau bears witness, is without significance for salvation (Rom 9,6-12; Gal 4,22 ff). Accordingly, only those who have the true faith found in Abraham are, regardless of racial ties, genuine sons of Abraham (Gal 3,9,14,18,22; Rom 4,11-12,16). More positively, it is by the Christian's identification through grace with Christ, Abraham's "seed" par excellence, that the Gentiles inherit the Promise (Gal 3,29,29).

With these questions settled, the integration of Christians of pagan origin becomes, in the history of the Church, not only an accomplished fact, but a theologically justified event in that Christian sacred history to which the NT bears inspired testimony.

NOTES:

1. George Foot Moore, Judaism I, Cambridge, 1927, 334.
2. Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 24, Naperville, 1958.
3. Cf. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by St. Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16(1954)385-425.
4. Cf. Journal of Biblical Literature 78(1959)101-104.
5. op. cit. 75.
6. ibid. 74.
7. R. A. F. MacKenzie, "The Messianism of Deuteronomy," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 19(1957)299-305.
8. J. Schmitt, "L'Eglise de Jérusalem ou la 'restauration' d'Israël," Revue des Sciences religieuses, 27(1953)209-218.
9. Cornelius is described in Acts 10,2 as a phoboumenos ton Theon; for the meaning of the term, cf. Jeremias, op. cit. 15.
10. I-II, 106,3.
11. Roberti Bellarmini, Opera Omnia, VI, Parisiis, 1873 (ed. Justinus Fèvre): De Justificatione, I, c.19, 192: "Lex igitur factorum apud Apostolum est ea, quae jubet quid sit faciendum, lex fidei est ipse fides, quae impetrat gratiam faciendi, quod lex factorum jubet... Denique lex factorum est littera, quae occidit jubendo et non juvando, lex fidei est spiritus, qui vivificat opem ferendo, ut justificatio legis impleatur in nobis. Ex quo sequitur, ut non

NOTES (2)

- solum lex Mosis, sed etiam lex Christi, quatenus aliquid imperat, sit lex factorum, et lex fidei sit spiritus fidei, non solum quo nos Christiani, sed etiam Patriarchae et Prophetae, et omnes antiqui justii, Dei gratiam impetrarunt, et justificati gratis per eandem gratiam, legis mandata servarunt."
12. Ignatii de Loyola, Societatis Jesu Constitutiones : Prooemium Constitutionum : "Quamvis summa Sapiëntia et Bonitas Dei Creatoris nostri ac Domini sit quae conservatura est, gubernatura atque promotura in suo sancto servitio hanc minimam Societatem Jesu, ut eam dignata est inchoare; ex parte vero nostra, interna caritatis et amoris illius lex quam Sanctus Spiritus scribere et in cordibus imprimere solet, potius quam ullae externae Constitutiones, ad id adiutura sit..."