

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

*How are the two apparently contradictory sayings of our Lord to be reconciled: 'He that is not with me is against me' (Matt. xii, 30; Luke xi, 23). 'He that is not against you is for you' (Mark ix, 39; Luke ix, 23). And which of these should be applied to co-operation with non-Catholics in Christian Action?*

Both these sayings are connected by the evangelists with accounts of exorcisms, but their contexts are different, and it is from a study of these contexts that the apparent contradiction is resolved. In the first case, our Lord has been accused of casting out a devil by the power of Beelzeboul. He shows that such a charge is ridiculous. In the first place for Satan to fight against himself is sheer suicide; secondly Christ has only done what others have done, and these have been held in honour; thirdly his action has shown Him to be more powerful than the devil, and only good can triumph over evil. If then, their accusation is so obviously false, then malice can be the only reason for their making it. In the second case, John complains that a certain exorcist was casting out devils by the use of Christ's name, although he was not one of Christ's disciples. They have gone so far as to take action against him. But why? If he uses the name of Christ then he cannot be one of those who abuse Christ. True, he is not one of their company; but this is through no malice, and if he bears no malice, then he is not on the side of the enemy. In the struggle between good and evil, neutrality is impossible; all those therefore who bear no malice towards Christ are, to that extent, refusing to co-operate with the enemy of Christ. The sayings might be thus paraphrased: 'He that is not with me, because he deliberately refuses my invitation to follow me, is my enemy', and 'He who bears no malice towards you, who does not refuse to join you for any evil motives, is on your side'. If it were considered desirable to apply either of these sayings to co-operation with non-Catholics in Christian Action, the second would be chosen, since it refers to those whose differences do not arise from ill-will, and who reverence the name of Christ, even though they are not counted among the company of disciples He has gathered together.

T. WORDEN.

*'A little while, and now you shall not see me: and again a little while, and you shall see me: because I go to the Father' (John xvi, 16). The Vulgate has 'videbitis' in both places for the words rendered in English by 'shall see', although the Greek Testament uses two different words. In the first place it uses θεωρεῖτε and in the second ὄψεσθε. Is there some shade of meaning which the Evangelist intended to convey by the use of two different words, which has become lost in translation?*

These words of our Lord refer to His departure by death and to his return by His resurrection. The last phrase 'because I go to the

Father' is not read in the better manuscripts, and is an insertion from verse 17. The long association which the apostles have had with Christ is soon to be ended. It will, however, be followed by the apparitions after the resurrection, which will turn their sorrow into joy. Judging from the context, one would be inclined to think that the two verbs have been chosen to express the difference between that continuous beholding which the disciples have enjoyed throughout the public ministry, and the brief apparitions they will be granted after the resurrection. It is possibly with the intention of expressing this distinction that the Westminster Version translates the verse: 'A little while and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me'. But this difference of meaning is decided entirely from the context and is not contained in the use of the two verbs.  $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\omega$  is certainly used in the sense of 'to behold, view attentively' even 'to enjoy the presence of someone' cf. Acts xx, 38. But  $\delta\rho\alpha\omega$  too, is used of a long contemplation: e.g., in Matt. v, 8; Heb. xii, 14; and Apoc. xxii, 4 it is used of the vision of God which is the reward of the just. Why then are the two different verbs used? The reason seems to lie simply in the New Testament usage:  $\delta\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  is the regular future tense of the verb 'to see', whereas the future of  $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\omega$  was not used. It is found once only: in John vii, 3, and even in this case, there is a variant reading (though with less support) of the aorist subjunctive.

T. WORDEN.

*In an old (1887) edition of the Missale Romanum the verses of the Epistles and Gospels are not given by numbers as in modern editions by but single letters, thus John xvi b. What was this system, when did it originate and when did it end?*

The books of the Bible were first divided into chapters by Cardinal Stephen Langton (d. 1228). A further step was taken soon afterwards towards facilitating reference when the first concordance to the Vulgate was compiled by Cardinal Hugh of Saint-Cher c. 1240. He sub-divided the chapters into seven parts which he noted in the margin by using the letters a, b, c, d, e, f, g. This system of sub-division was used for about three hundred years, until the verses were first numbered as they are to-day, in a Greek and Latin edition of the New Testament edited by Robert Estienne in 1555. This was obviously a more convenient method of reference and it soon replaced the former system, which, however, is still preserved in certain editions of the Missal and Breviary.