

I have not left myself any time to comment on the late Dr Streeter's fine book, *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan 1924). It must suffice to quote his views that 'the presumption that the Old Syriac represents the second-century text of Antioch is decidedly high' (p. 75); and that the Cæsarean text 'is slightly, but only slightly, nearer to the Western than to the Alexandrian type' (p. 77). That the Antiochene text should prove the stronger even at Cæsarea helps to show how confined was the textual influence of Alexandria, how ubiquitous the influence of Antioch.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

A NOTE ON THE SCROLL OF THANKSGIVING SONGS¹

(HODAYOTH SCROLL)

BY the use of infra-red photography (cf. *SCRIPTURE*, October 1949, p. 115) Dr Sukenik has succeeded in revealing once again certain faded parts of the text. Among others we may mention the end of the Psalm (a translation of which appeared in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1949, p. 621 ff), the whole of the page referred to in *SCRIPTURE*, October 1949, p. 115 (of which a photograph appeared in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, July 1949, and a translation in *C.B.Q.* July 1950) and other passages. One of these (end of chap. i) contains the name *Eli* (My God) written in ancient Hebrew characters, as also is the Sacred Name YHWH in the Comm. on Habakkuk (cf. Sukenik, *Megilloth Genuzoth*, pl. xx) and in the fragments of Leviticus published in *Revue Biblique*, July 1949.

The third chapter of the Scroll indirectly furnishes information about the author. He presents himself as one who is expecting some private revelations from God himself. He speaks of his antagonists, of the large number of disciples faithful to his teaching and of all those who have had recourse to him. Dr Sukenik thinks he is the *Moreh has-sedek* (Master of Justice) of whom there is frequent mention in these scrolls, as also in the work known as the *Berith Dammeseq* or *Damascus Covenant*. It is, moreover, interesting to note that the complaints of the author (Plate IX, lines 4 to 5):

¹Cf. *The Scrolls Newly Discovered in Palestine* by R. T. O'Callaghan, S.J., in *SCRIPTURE* April 1949, p. 41ff.

'For they have cast me out of my country
As a sparrow from its nest'.

are quite in harmony with what is said in the Comm. on Habakkuk, namely, that the Priest of Iniquity had compelled the Master of Justice to go into exile.

We may mention the following points as relevant to identifying the author: (a) the use of UR—TOM (Plate IX, line 19) singular of Urim and Tummim, according to Dr Sukenik's interpretation. This term seems to have been peculiar to the sect and its founder, connected with the 'Sectarian Document'; (b) the use of *byhd* as a substantive, i.e. 'in society'. The substantive is found also in the Sectarian Document.

J-M. PAUL BAUCHET, O.C.D.

Sainte Thérèse, Jerusalem.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

The encyclical 'Humani Generis' lays down that the whole of the present human race must be held to descend from a single pair of ancestors. Is it permissible to hold that other races of men, (i) now extinct, did not descend from this pair and (ii) may even (e.g. Neanderthal) have survived to be contemporary with the present human race (homo sapiens)? Do any Catholic scholars hold such a view?

The encyclical *Humani Generis* covers a wide field, but most, I think, will agree that the definite condemnation of polygenism is the most important single point in the document. Polygenism has taken more than one form; it may be enough to mention the hypothesis that the so-called *homo sapiens* and Neanderthal man had already diverged in a pre-human stage. The encyclical mentions Rom. v, 12-19 and the Council of Trent, session 5, canons 1-4, both of which texts must be accepted as of faith; and indeed I have never been able to see how polygenism could be squared with them. One must hold that all men being descended from Adam, thereby inherit original sin (except of course our Lady, and our Lord Himself in His human nature). I do not see how even an extinct race can be excepted.

Scientific difficulties, as is well known, have been raised against this doctrine. Upon this subject I would recommend Father Humphrey Johnson's excellent article in the *Downside Review* (Summer, 1950),