

diplomatic relations with the Vatican have been resumed and there has been friendship between Catholic and Orthodox. For example, in a Christmas message, Bishop Pichler begged forgiveness of the Orthodox Church and their Serbian brothers for all the wrongs done to them and funds have been raised by Catholics to restore the destroyed Orthodox churches.

Some of the leading Orthodox are not wholly happy about all this. Is it spontaneous or government inspired? Is it possible that Tito fears the deep-rooted and passionate nationalism of the Orthodox more than Catholic universalism, which can be manipulated by external arrangements? Under the amnesty to political offenders, many Ustashe have returned home, notably Father Draganovitch, one of the five 'regulators' of the Forced Conversions, who escorted Pavelitch and Artukovitch to safety. He is in a monastery near Sarajevo editing the Schematisam, a sort of ecclesiastical year-book, whose publication has been suspended since 1939. Some of his returned colleagues are more active politically.

There is, of course, everything to be said for peace and conciliation but the brotherly love that is brought about by diplomatic manoeuvres is often a little suspect.

Lead Us Not into Temptation by Aelred Baker, O.S.B.

Liturgy is a great thing for sending people to sleep. It does not matter how archaic a word or phrase in the liturgy is, or obscure or even downright nonsense, it can still be said, provided it is said or sung often enough. Witness the remarkable lines of some popular hymns. This is even true of such an exalted thing as the Lord's Prayer, which has been said somewhere in the liturgy from the earliest times.

Englishmen still say 'hallowed' long after the word has gone out of current use, largely because Englishmen have always said 'hallowed' since at least the days of King Alfred. This is not an English eccentricity. The Greeks have always recited the Lord's Prayer with the word *epiousios*, which is known to have been unintelligible to second-century Christians. Nobody then and nobody since has ever heard of this word in any other context, and nobody is really sure what it means. And yet for century after century the Greeks have gone on saying it.

If this is so of single words, it is more so with whole phrases. The meaning of the line 'lead us not into temptation' is no less obscure

than *epiuousios*. The words themselves do not present any difficulty, but taken together they seem to imply something that is quite unthinkable. Are we really meaning that God would lead us into temptation, if we didn't pray to him not to? This certainly troubled the early Latin Fathers when they were engaged on providing a satisfactory translation for the Western Church. They frequently softened the shock by inserting something like: 'do not suffer us to be led into temptation' (*ne patiaris nos . . .*). But the novelty wore off, and as this cushioning interpolation was not in the Greek, St Jerome stuck on *ne nos inducas . . .*, and the Western Church was quietly lulled off to sleep by the liturgical anodyne of centuries of repetition.

Commentators from the patristic age to our own usually say that of course the line does not mean that God leads anyone into temptation—see James 1, 13—but they do not explain why the Lord's Prayer seems to say that he does. One might have supposed that a spirit like John Calvin would have pounced on this as the most sacred scriptural support for his special ideas on predestination. But in fact in his best-known works, the *Institutes* and the Geneva Catechism, he stands firmly on the traditional evasion. Those few who threw off all pretence and asserted that this line means what it says, and God does in fact positively lead men into temptation, include, believe it or not, Albert the Great, and an anonymous writer lurking in our patrology volumes under the name of 'Jerome' (Migne, vol. xxx, col. 548). The one protestant to join this select company is Martin Bucer. But on the whole the traditional explanation—or 'get-out'—safely held the fort.

But in 1928 a protestant more Calvinist than Calvin adopted a little known translation in French: '*ne nous soumet pas à la tentation*', which seems to say quite openly that God would submit us to temptation if we didn't pray to him not to, and assuredly submits to temptation all those who don't pray at all. This might have remained a curiosity, except for the remarkable fact that in 1966 it was accepted as the ecumenical French translation. As perhaps with all large gatherings, this view was accepted because of the most vociferous and persistent party present, even though a minority. In this case the minority is strongly rumoured to have consisted in a party of one—a most forthright Calvinist of a quite unfashionable rigour. And yet his translation won the day. The text and agreeable commentary is set out enthusiastically in *La Maison-Dieu* 85 (1966), pp. 27-30.

It did not go unnoticed. Fr Jean Carmignac, a priest in Paris, well known as the editor of *Revue de Qumrán*, immediately weighed in as opponent. After one popular and one learned outcry, he has now served his adversaries with a book of 608 closely printed pages, *Recherches sur le 'Notre Père'* (Paris, 1969), of which 68 are devoted to a detailed analysis of this very point. Carmignac comes up with a highly original and ingenious solution of our problem. It would be

well for Englishmen to know about it, partly because it is ingenious and original, and partly because it is now our problem as well. I had thought that the whole business was a palaver for remorselessly logical Frenchmen, who want every sentence as crisp and clear as their accent. But a recent letter in the *Catholic Herald* (11th September, 1970) openly calls 'Lead us not into temptation' an innuendo, which savours as much of blasphemy as the ecumenical French. And privately I have been told that this petition has indeed been a thorn in the side of many long-suffering Christians.

The suspicion of a serious difficulty here is apparent in the fact that a number of twentieth-century English translations of the Bible have sought to get out of the innuendo by substituting 'test' or 'trial' for 'temptation'. This is certainly a possible translation of the Greek word, and its convenience can be bolstered up by an appeal to the very fashionable cult of eschatology. Hence the Jerusalem Bible and the New English Bible have: 'do not put (or 'bring') us to the test'. But this meaning is far from certain. The parallel cases in Apocalypse 3, 10 and the Gethsemane incident (Mark 14, 38 and parallels) are equally ambiguous. There are two other very near parallels outside the New Testament in Qumran and the Talmud, which both seem to understand 'temptation' in our sense as 'solicitation to evil'. We shall come to these presently. For the moment, there is a great deal to be said for looking at the context. The line before 'lead us not into temptation' talks about forgiving 'our trespasses', and the line after of delivering us from 'evil'. What has a 'trial' got to do with it? I am sure that nobody thinking of the word in this context would ever have thought it meant anything else but 'temptation', had it not raised such an enormous theological problem. It is really the whole sentence, and not the word 'temptation', that proves such a stumbling block.

The problem can be seen by comparing the nearest parallel in the Gethsemane story. Here we have the advice of Jesus to the disciples: 'pray that you do not enter into temptation'. Those modern translations which have 'test' or 'trial' in the Lord's Prayer, naturally have the same word here, for it is a well-worn parallel. But it is at least arguable that in the context Jesus' words do mean 'temptation', even if it is only a temptation to fall asleep. In view of the warning in Luke 22, 31 to the effect that Jesus' prayer was to prevent Satan from sifting the disciples like wheat, it seems at the very least likely that fifteen verses later the 'temptation' refers to 'losing faith'. Satan is obviously the source and active promoter of this sifting and temptation. So then supposing the word here does mean 'temptation' in our sense, what would the disciples have said if they had taken Jesus' advice? It would presumably have been something like this: 'God, see that we don't enter into temptation or 'see that we aren't led into temptation by Satan'. This would be a satisfactory prayer. Why then is the actual prayer that all Christians

have prayed since the earliest times, addressed to God in such a way that it seems to be asking God not to lead us into temptation?

Carmignac's answer is that there is an anomaly in the underlying Semitic form. For in Hebrew or Aramaic there is normally no separate verb for 'lead'; it is simply provided by what is called the *hiph'il* voice of the verb 'to come'. This *hiph'il* voice is extremely common in Semitic languages and is described by grammarians as 'causative'. Thus the *hiph'il* of 'come' is 'cause-to-come' or, in our language, 'lead'. It is necessary to break down our word into this pedantic 'cause-to-' in order to grasp the way Hebrew or Aramaic expresses it.

This is simple enough. But now supposing we add a negative. In Hebrew or Aramaic you simply place the negative particle before the causative verb. But what happens in English? Does the negative 'not' go with the 'cause' or the 'come'? There are two distinct possibilities. You can either mean 'do not cause to come' or 'cause not to come'. In a prayer form this makes a very real difference. In the first case you are pleading with someone not to do something he would otherwise certainly do, whereas in the second case you are asking him to take active steps to stop someone else doing it.

This ambiguity will always exist in Hebrew because both senses are expressed in the same way. Only the context can determine. This is indeed a phenomenon that is worth pondering for exegesis. Let us take an example from a prayer form in Psalm 141, 3-4. The old Authorized Version cautiously translates as follows:

Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips.

Incline not my heart to any evil thing.

Now the words in italics present us with a negative *hiph'il*. What does it really mean? In the line before there are two imperatives, 'set' and 'keep', calling on God to do something definite. The meaning of this line, therefore, can not be 'do not cause my heart to incline to evil' but 'cause my heart not to incline to evil'.

There are two special cases outside the Bible of this negative *hiph'il* which have to be taken into account in any discussion of our problem because they present the nearest parallels to the Lord's Prayer apart from the Gospels.

The first appears in the newly discovered Psalms from Qumran. The text is translated by J. A. Sanders (*The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*, Oxford 1965, p. 71) as follows:

Remember me and forget me not,
and *lead me not* into situations too hard for me.

The sins of my youth cast from me.

The words in italics here present us with the very *hiph'il* of the verb 'to come' which is the cause of all the trouble. It will also be noted that the sense is one of temptation. The humble psalmist is saying that he has committed a lot of sins in his mis-spent youth and

as likely as not he will commit a whole lot more, knowing how he can resist anything but temptation. And so he asks God to do something; not merely not to lead him into difficult situations—he is not blaming God for that in the past—but to cause him *not* to come into situations too hard for him.

The second appears in the Babylonian Talmud (*Berakot* 60b) and is familiar from Jewish morning and evening prayers. Epstein's translation of the Talmud reads as follows: 'do not bring me into sin, or into iniquity, or into temptation'. There cannot really be any question that 'temptation' here means temptation. The whole construction is so like the Lord's Prayer that it is worth following in detail. The Hebrew text puts the negative before the *hiph'il*, translated here as 'bring', as is normal; but then it repeats the negative before the first object 'sin'. This is most unusual and is probably meant to impress on the reader what the negative really refers to. So we could reasonably translate as 'cause us *not* to be brought neither into sin . . . nor into temptation'.

On the basis of these two examples which both employ the *hiph'il* of 'come' with a negative, we can give a reasonable translation of our troublesome petition in the Lord's Prayer. All the other petitions in the last half are asking God to do something positive: 'Give us . . .', 'Forgive us . . .', 'Deliver us . . .', and so why not 'Cause us . . . not to be led into temptation'?

It will be objected that in the case of the Lord's Prayer we are not dealing with a Hebrew text. This is perfectly true. But all that we are contending here is that the Greek left to us represents some original Semitic construction such as we have in Qumran and the Talmud. There are a large number of scholars who feel that explaining something in the Greek text we have, from something in a Hebrew text we haven't, is another sort of temptation into which they would rather not be led. But all scholars are agreed that the Lord's Prayer is saturated in Biblical and Semitic phraseology. The near examples we have mentioned show that a real exegetical ambiguity can exist purely because of a phenomenon in the Hebrew or Aramaic language.

If the main argument is admitted it may now be asked how it can be expressed in tolerable English. 'Cause us not . . .' is a pedantic nightmare. If we ever express a causative at all in English it is usually by 'make to', but that is very difficult to work in the present case. The only idiomatic forms would be: 'Make sure we don't enter into temptation', or 'See to it that we don't . . .'.

Alternatively the whole construction can be turned over into a positive form, and we could say: 'Keep us from entering into temptation'. This is, in fact, a highly traditional translation. It appears in the Scottish Catechism of Bishop Hamilton published in 1559 and the Larger Catechism approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1648, and more recently in the modern English

version of J. B. Philips. These translations were, of course, made without knowledge of the argument from Hebrew given above. But they do give what we believe to be the correct meaning.

Now that there is an opportunity for an ecumenical version of the Lord's Prayer in our liturgy, it is imperative to face up to all the difficulties in the text, and especially in this sixth petition. With the incessant cry for meaning on all sides, it is impossible to go on saying ambiguously 'Lead us not . . .'. Some other translation based, not on a devious manoeuvre to escape the difficulty, is now surely called for.

Corruption Begins at Home? by Bernard Sharratt

Towards a political theology of marriage

Anyone sensitive to symbolism must normally shudder at the words of eucharistic consecration. Not because of the current English translation. Something that cuts deeper: the priest takes the chalice and says: 'And when supper was ended, he took the cup, saying: This is my blood. . . .' Most chalices are still lined with gold, a mark of respect, the most precious metal alone allowed to touch the consecrated wine. Yet that gold, enshrined at the heart of our celebration of love and peace, is also, still, at the base of the international monetary system; more specifically, it underpins the economy of South Africa, the world's largest gold-producing country: the blood that is relevant here is also the blood of apartheid. The hasty response, that a gold-lined cup is a mere container, can only be dubious in the light of a sacramental theology that recognizes the sign-value of *form*. More honest to admit the contradiction, acknowledge indeed the wider interlocking of the eucharistic community itself with that systematic exploitation revealed in a minor, everyday detail.

The other words of consecration, 'This is my body', have resonance for another sacrament: matrimony. Bellarmine traced a further echo: 'The sacrament of marriage . . . is similar to the Eucharist, which likewise is a sacrament not only in the moment of its accomplishment, but also as long as it remains.'¹ But the eucharistic bread, one might argue, can decay and corrupt; it may not 'remain'; an opening, by analogy, towards divorce appears: individual relationships may cease adequately to measure up to the form of marriage; the core corrupts, the sign decays. Perhaps. But, further, what if the form, the shape and structure offered to receive the marriage, is

¹*De Controversiis III (de Matrimonio)*, cont. 2, c. 6; quoted by Pius XI, *A.A.S.* 22 (1930), p. 583.