

date. Incidentally the Pasch of 32 then becomes a very likely date for the shields affair, as this leaves time for the Roman correspondence and a necessary interval before Herod and Pilate would be inclined to be reconciled. Again, however, the surer and more important conclusion is about the date of the Crucifixion. It does indeed partly depend on conjectures as to what is 'likely' where complete evidence is lacking, and the more direct evidence of history and astronomy is capable of very divergent interpretation: thus the conclusive establishment of a two-year Public Ministry would seriously threaten the above theory.<sup>1</sup> Yet a straw may show the way the wind blows, and this account of the relations of Herod and Pilate may give an indirect hint of the truth. At least it agrees with one of the two most likely dates, 33.

A. D. DOYLE, S.J.

#### A NOTE ON THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS, X, § 1

‘Ο Θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἠγάπησε, δι’ οὗς ἐποίησε τὸν κόσμον.— This expression deserves a somewhat full treatment. The notion that the ‘world’ was made for men is apparently of Stoic origin, but it does not seem to have gained currency, to any extent, earlier than the first century of our era; then it became common in Church writers, some of whom went so far as to affirm that the world was made for the Church (e.g. in the Visions of Hermas, ii. 4, διὰ ταύτην [τὴν ἐκκλησίαν] ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη). The prevailing Judaistic belief, from the first century onward, was that the world was created for Jews, as we see in the *Assumption of Moses*, i. 12; and Harnack points out that even Jewish Apocalyptists wavered between the formulas (a) that the world was created for man, and (b) that it was created for Jews.<sup>2</sup> That man is the end of creation is a theory which no Christian philosophy can maintain, without many reservations; but, as Prof. A. E. Taylor has said, there is nothing in itself absurd in the medieval notion that human history is the main plot of the drama of the Universe (*Essays Catholic and Critical*, p. 57). Had the Jews or the Church Fathers turned to Plato, they might have

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *A Two Year Ministry*, by E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., London, 1938, for a detailed defence of the two-year theory.

<sup>2</sup> I have been favoured with a reference here to Moore's *Judaism*, i. 383: ‘To the question why the world was created, different answers are given: it was made for man (not man for the world); or for the sake of the righteous, such as Abraham and the patriarchs; or for the sake of Israel; or for the sake of the Torah (religion).’ Cf. also the Syriac Baruch, xiv. 18, in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, vol. ii, p. 491 (where Charles refers to Psalm viii. 6). That the world and all that is in it were created for the benefit of the ‘Faithful’ is the doctrine of the Qur’ân: see the xvith Sura.

been led to a somewhat different conclusion. Here is a passage from the *Laws* (903): 'Unhappy man! you do not seem to be aware that this and every other creation is for the sake of the Whole, and not the Whole for the sake of you'—which is in line with modern science. 'Copernicus', writes Prof. Joad (*Philosophy for Our Time*, p. 123) 'abolished the primacy of man's planet in the Universe; Darwin abolished the primacy of man in the planet, and materialistic philosophy abolishes the primacy of mind within the man', a conclusion which is no better (or more true) than the remark of Celsus, in his *ἀληθῆς λόγος* quoted by Origen: 'the Universe was no more made for man than for the lion, the eagle, or the dolphin.' Alexander of Aphrodisias (*de fato*, xxviii) refers to certain opponents who put forward the doctrine against which Celsus protests, in the following words: πῶς οὐχ ὁμολογήσουσι κάκιστον γεγονέναι τῶν ζώων τὸν ἄνθρωπον, δι' ὃν φασὶ πάντα τὰλλα γενέσθαι ὡς συντελέσαντα πρὸς τὴν τούτου σωτηρίαν; Epictetus puts the case admirably: 'God brought man into the world to be a spectator of Himself, and not merely a spectator but an interpreter also' (I. vi, § 19), which leads one to believe that 'that halting slave who in Nicopolis | Taught Arrian' would have welcomed the magnificent definition, in the Scottish Shorter Catechism, of the chief end of man, which is 'to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever'.

I may now set down some quotations, by way of illustrating the Patristic point of view, but, first of all, by way of contrast, the Eucharistic prayer in the *Didaché*, X, § 3: σύ, δέσποτα Παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος σου . . . εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. x, πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα δημιουργῆσαι αὐτὸν (viz. God) ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης δι' ἀνθρώπους δεδιδάγμεθα—a sentence which reappears, in much the same shape, in *Apol.* 2, chap. 5. One of the leading beliefs of Aristides, the Apologist, is that 'the Mover of the world (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκε) created all things for our sakes', a view emphasized in the Baruch Apocalypse (an orthodox Jewish work of about A.D. 50-60): 'Thou didst say that Thou wouldest make for Thy world man, as the administrator of Thy works, that it might be known he was by no means made on account of the world, but the world for him.' In the Ezra Apocalypse (= 4 Ezra, vi. 55, 59) we read: [Man is made in Thine image, and] it is for his sake Thou didst fashion all things. Similarly in the Catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem (xii. 5): 'the world was made for man, and all things serve him.' In the Epitome of Arius Didymus of Alexandria—he was tutor to the Emperor Augustus—the philosopher declares that τὰ ἅλλα πάντα γεγονέναι τούτων ἕνεκα (i.e. for mankind at large): this quotation will

be found in Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.* 817. Lactantius several times writes in a similar strain, e.g. *Instit.* vii. 5, § 3, mundum non propter se Deus fecit, quia commodis ejus non indiget sed propter hominem qui eo utitur. So in his *de ira*, xiii, § 1, and again in the *Institutes*, vii. 3, § 13, where he quotes the lines of Lucretius v. 156:

dicere porro hominum causa voluisse parare  
praeclaram mundi naturam.

Cicero rather varies the thought, as we see from the *de natura deorum*, I, § 23; and compare II, §§ 133, 154, where the thought is that the Universe exists both for gods as well as men; Mayor, ad loc., gives further references, including the passage in the *de finibus*, III, § 67. See also Reid on Cic. *Acad.* ii. 120; and a note by Newman on Aristot. *Pol.* I. viii, § 20. Lucretius v. 198 refers to the doctrine, only to deny it—nequaquam nobis divinitus esse paratam | naturam rerum. Pliny, *N.H.* vii, hominis causa videtur cuncta alia genuisse natura (without mentioning gods). There is a sentence in Porphyry (*de abst.* III. 20) which may be cited here: ἀλλ' ἐκείνο νῆ Δία Χρυσίππου πιθανόν, ὡς ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀλλήλων οἱ θεοὶ χάρις ἐποιήσαντο, ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ ζῶα.

No doubt other examples might be collected, but enough have been cited to show that the belief that the world (or Universe) was made for the sake of man, though of Stoic origin—so far as we know—was one that sank deeply into the hearts of many writers. It would be interesting to ascertain whether it reappears in medieval authors; I examined—somewhat cursorily—the *Polycraticus* of John of Salisbury, but without finding anything relevant to the purpose. Perhaps others may have better success in their search there, or elsewhere.

E. H. BLAKENEY

### ADAPTATIONS OF THE *TE DEUM LAUDAMUS*

THE most complete account of adaptations of the *Te Deum* easily accessible is that by the late Dr. J. Wickham Legg in vol. iii (pp. 35–40) of the *Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, 1891. The texts given by Dr. Legg are:

- (a) From the printed *Breviarium secundum ordinem vallisumbrose*, probably to be dated 1493, (i) Hymnus ambrosianus, (ii) Hymnus in honore beatissime marie uirgine, (iii) Ad honorem sancte crucis. To (ii) he adds variant readings from an edition of Quignon's Breviary printed at Lyons in 1543, and from a Bonaventurian Psalter by Thielman Kerver, *Psalterium intemerate dei genitricis uirginis Marie*, Paris, 1509. A reference is given to