

BIBLIOTECA DE AUTORES CRISTIANOS

SACRAE THEOLOGIAE
SUMMA
IA

INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY



ON CHRISTIAN REVELATION

By
Michaele Nicolau, S.J.

THIRD EDITION

Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.

KEEP THE FAITH

© 2015 Keep the Faith, Inc
All rights reserved
ISBN 978-0-9912268-5-6
Library of Congress Control Number
Printed in the United States of America

NIHIL OBSTAT:
Dr. Vincentius Serrano
Censor

IMPRIMI POTEST:
Emmanuel Olleros, S.J.
Prae. Prov. Tolet.

IMPRIMATUR:
+Joseph Maria
Ep. Aux. et Vic. Gral.
Madrid, 27 August 1955

The original title of this book is: *SACRAE THEOLOGIAE SUMMA, I.*
Theologia Fundamentalis.

The book was published in Madrid, Spain, in Latin, by:
Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

This English translation was made with permission of Biblioteca
de Autores Cristianos, P. Carlos Grandados Garcia, Director
General.

This book is a translation of treatises 1 to 2 in volume I of
B.A.C. under the title of *Theologia Fundamentalis*, pp. 1-496

Contents

VOLUME I A

TREATISE I

Introduction to theology

FOREWARD.....	1
PREFACE	3
THEOLOGICAL NOTES.....	6
ABBREVIATIONS.....	7
CHAPTER I – General introduction to Theology	12
On the nature of Theology (n.1-2).....	12
– Theology and faith (n.3-6).	13
– Positive Theology and scholastic or speculative Theology (n.7-10).	14
– On the subject of Theology (n.11).....	17
– On theological places (n.12-17).....	17
– Dogmatic or theoretical Theology, and practical Theology (n.18).....	19
– Kerygmatic Theology (n.19).....	20
– Theology and progress (n.20-21).....	20
– On the method of learning (n.22-25).....	21
– Theology and priestly life (n.26-31).....	24
General bibliography for all of Theology	26
– 1) For the general history of Theology (n.33).....	26
– 2) Treatises on nearly all of Theology (n.34-35).....	26
– 3) General helps for theological work (n.36).....	30
– 4) Lexicons (n.37).....	31
CHAPTER II – Prolegomena to fundamental Theology	32
On the nature of fundamental Theology (n.38-40).....	32
– The object of Apologetics (n.41-44).....	33
– Truths that must be presupposed (n.45).....	34
– The initial state of mind (n.46).	35
– The certitude to be obtained (n.47).....	36
Practical Apologetics (n.48-49)	37
– The usefulness of Apologetics (n.50-51).....	39
– The relations between Theology and Apologetics (n.52-55).....	40
Conclusion (n.56).....	42
– Another treatise of fundamental Theology (n.57).....	42
– Proportion between fundamental Theology and Criteriology and Ontology (n.58).....	43
– The two ways of Apologetics (n.59-60).....	43
– Outline of all Theology (n.61).	44
General bibliography for all Apologetics	46
– Historical outline of Apologetics.....	48

T R E A T I S E I I

On Christian revelation or on the true religion

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THIS TREATISE	60
BOOK I – The theory of religion and revelation	61
CHAPTER I – On religion	61
ARTICLE I – On the notion and nature of religion	61
by the way of etymology (n.3-4)	61
by the way of philosophy (n.5-11).....	62
by the way of history (n.12-18)	66
by the way of psychology (n.19).....	70
– False opinions on the nature of religion (n.20-23).....	70
ARTICLE II – On the obligation of religion in general	73
On the necessity of religion (n.24)	73
– Man has a grave obligation to embrace and practice religion (n.25-27)	73
– On the obligation of external worship and of public or social worship (n.28-31).....	74
Scholium 1. <i>In external social worship the tendencies of a community manifest themselves</i>	76
Scholium 2 <i>Religion and the happiness of man</i>	76
ARTICLE III – On the obligation of positive religion	77
Thesis 1. Man is bound to inquire into a positive religion that with appearance of truth presents itself as manifested by God and prescribed for him.....	77
Scholium 1. <i>Why it is not valid to apply probabilism here</i>	82
Scholium 2. <i>Who must inquire?</i>	83
CHAPTER II – On revelation	85
ARTICLE I – On the notion of revelation.....	85
The notion of revelation (n.45-49)	85
– Explanation of the concept of The supernatural (n.50-51)	87
– Supernatural revelation (n.52-58).....	89
False notions of revelation (n.59-61)	94
ARTICLE II – On the possibility and harmony of revelation	97
Thesis 2. Divine supernatural revelation whether immediate (I) or mediated (II) is possible.....	97
Thesis 3. Divine revelation is greatly in harmony both with the divine goodness and wisdom (I) and with the rational nature of man (II); but for man it is very useful (III)	105
ARTICLE III – On the necessity of revelation.....	109
Thesis 4. Supernatural divine revelation in the present condition of the human race is morally necessary for a suitable knowledge of natural religion	109
Scholium. <i>The agreement between the moral necessity of revelation and other truths</i>	120
ARTICLE IV – On the revelation of mysteries	122
Thesis 5. The existence of mysteries cannot be shown to be repugnant.	122

Scholium. <i>Whether the existence of the order of mysteries positively may be demonstrated by philosophical arguments</i>	128
Thesis 6. The revelation of mysteries cannot be shown to be repugnant.	131
Scholium 1. <i>The revelation of mysteries seems to be simply supernatural</i>	134
Scholium 2. <i>Whether the proofs made for the possibility of revelation are positive or negative</i>	135
Thesis 7. In divine revelation true and properly so called mysteries are contained	136
ARTICLE V – On the proposition of the fact of revelation before faith	138
Thesis 8. : In order to embrace revelation with faith (or the religion founded on it), certitude about the fact of revelation is pre-required (I); but moral certitude suffices, even the common kind (II)	138
Scholium 1. <i>Certitude is necessary about the fact whereby God prescribes religion for man</i>	143
Scholium 2. <i>Concerning the object of certitude required before faith</i>	143
Thesis 9. Respective certitude sometimes suffices in order to elicit a true assent of faith	146
ARTICLE VI – Criteriaology of revelation	148
Negative part	149
Thesis 10. In order to prove the historical fact of public revelation, subjective and internal criteria are not primary	149
Positive part	161
Thesis 11. The primary criterion for proving the fact of revelation must be placed in miracles and prophecies	161
Scholium. <i>On the criterion of immediate revelation: it is also a miracle</i>	163
Complementary part	163
Thesis 12. Subjective and internal criteria have their importance and usefulness	163
Corollary. Apologetic praxis	165
ARTICLE VII – On the primary criteria	167
On miracles	167
Thesis 13. Miracles are possible	167
Thesis 14. Miracles as a criterion of revelation are knowable	177
On prophecies	183
Thesis 15. Prophecies are possible (I), and after their fulfillment they are knowable as a criterion of revelation.(II)	183
Scholium. <i>Whether per se an interior supernatural enlightenment is required in order to know the fact of revelation with certainty</i>	189
BOOK II – On the historical sources to prove the fact of revelation	193
Connection of the treatise (n.186-187)	193
– The relation of the book to the Introduction to the Bible (n.188-189)	194
– Division of the book (n.190-192)	195
– General bibliography (n.193-194)	196
– The importance of the biblical Introduction (n.195)	197
CHAPTER I – On the text of the Old Testament	198
ARTICLE I – On the Hebrew text of the Old Testament	198
ARTICLE II – On the Greek versions of the Old Testament	201

ARTICLE III – On the Vulgate version of the Old Testament.....	202
ARTICLE IV – On the authenticity of the books of the Old Testament.....	206
CHAPTER II – On the text of the New Testament.....	211
ARTICLE I – On the text and manuscripts of the New Testament.....	211
ARTICLE II – On the versions of the New Testament.....	214
the Syrian versions (n.226).....	214
the Latin versions (n.227).....	215
the Vulgate (n.228).....	215
other versions (n.229).....	216
On the citations of the Fathers (n.230).....	217
ARTICLE III – History of the text of the New Testament.....	217
On the revisions of the text (n.231-234).....	217
– History of the text (n.235-236).....	218
– On the editions of the text of the New Testament (n.237-242).....	219
Reasonable norms for textual criticism.....	222
CHAPTER III – On the historicity of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.....	223
ARTICLE I – Previous notions and a survey of the adversaries.....	223
ARTICLE II – On the authors of the Gospels and Acts.....	229
Thesis 16. The author of the first Gospel is Matthew, an Apostle of Christ.....	229
Thesis 17. The author of the second Gospel is Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter.....	243
Thesis 18. The author of the third Gospel is Luke, a physician, the assistant and companion of Paul.....	250
Thesis 19. The evangelist Luke is the author of the Acts of the Apostles.....	256
Thesis 20. The Apostle John, and no one else, must be acknowledged as the author of the fourth Gospel.....	262
ARTICLE III – On the integrity of the Gospels and Acts.....	273
Thesis 21. The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles have come down to us integral and incorrupt, at least substantially.....	273
ARTICLE IV – On the historicity of the Gospels and Acts.....	280
Thesis 22. The synoptic gospels rightly claim for themselves complete historical faith.....	280
Scholium. <i>The synoptic question</i>	288
Thesis 23. The book of the Acts of the Apostles deserves historical credence....	293
Thesis 24. The fourth Gospel enjoys complete historicity.....	294
BOOK III—On proving the fact of divine revelation or on Jesus the divine legate.....	302
CHAPTER I—On the historical existence of Jesus of Nazareth.....	302
Thesis 25. The historical existence of Jesus the Nazarene, which is irrefutably certain from the gospels and from the fact of the Christian religion (I), is proved also from the letters of Saint Paul (II) and from profane authors (III).....	302
Scholium. <i>Whether extracanonial Christian writings can make another effective proof for the existence of the historical Jesus</i>	309
CHAPTER II—On the testimony that Jesus gave about Himself.....	315

ARTICLE I – On the messianic affirmation of Jesus	315
Thesis 26. Jesus of Nazareth testified that he is the Messiah.....	315
Scholium. <i>The name “Son of man” indicates also the divinity of the Messiah</i>	321
Thesis 27. Jesus of Nazareth already from the beginning of his public life knew and said that he is the Messiah	323
Scholium. <i>Jesus wanted to be acknowledged as the Messiah in the sense of the prophets of the Old Testament</i>	326
ARTICLE II – On the affirmation of the teaching legation of Jesus	329
Thesis 28. Jesus testified that he is the divine Legate, the religious Teacher ...	329
Thesis 29. Jesus willed that all men accept his teaching as morally obligatory and under the danger of losing salvation	333
ARTICLE III – On the affirmation made by Jesus of his own divinity	335
Thesis 30. Jesus affirmed that he is the Son of God in the natural and proper sense	335
CHAPTER III—On the proof of the testimony that Jesus gave about himself.	348
ARTICLE I – On considering the personal character of Jesus	348
Thesis 31. Jesus in giving his testimony was not a deceiver (I), nor was he deceived (II); in fact his holiness is a confirming moral miracle (III)....	348
Scholium. <i>On the character of Jesus</i>	356
ARTICLE II – On the works done by Jesus	363
Thesis 32. Jesus excellently proved his divine testimony by many physical miracles.....	363
Scholium 1 <i>On the false miracles that are reported and on the miracles of the false religions</i>	370
Scholium 2. <i>On the end of Jesus’ miracles</i>	376
Thesis 33. Jesus proved his divine testimony by many fulfilled prophecies....	383
Scholium 1. <i>On the prophecies not yet fulfilled</i>	398
Scholium 2. <i>Other intellectual miracles</i>	398
Corollary. On the fate of the Jewish people as an apologetic argument.....	400
Thesis 34. Jesus, after his predicted resurrection (I), by truly dying (II) and resurrecting (III), confirmed his divine testimony with an excellent proof	403
ARTICLE III – On the prophecies made about Jesus	424
Thesis 35. The fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament prove the divine legation and testimony of Jesus the Nazarene.....	424
CHAPTER IV—On the other criteria to prove the testimony of Jesus	468
ARTICLE I – On the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth	468
Thesis 36. The internal excellence of Christian doctrine confirms its divine revelation.....	468
Scholium 1. <i>The value of this criterion</i>	477
Scholium 2. <i>How the immanentistic argument differs from this internal examination of doctrine</i>	477
ARTICLE II – On the work of Jesus of Nazareth	478
Thesis 37. The fruits of holiness flowing from Christian doctrine prove its divine revelation.....	478
Thesis 38. The marvelous propagation of the Christian religion confirms its divine origin	489

Scholium. <i>On the nature of the extraordinary supernatural help given by God for the propagation of Christianity</i>	499
On conversions as an apologetic argument	503
Thesis 39. The invincible stability in Catholic unity of the Christian religion confirms its divine origin	506
Scholium 1. <i>On the mystery of love and hatred for Jesus</i>	512
Scholium 2. <i>On hatred for Jesus and his religion</i>	514
Thesis 40. The martyrdom of so many Christians proves the divine origin of Christian revelation	516
CONCLUSION.....	534
APPENDIX—On the historiography of Jesus of Nazareth.....	535
On the “biographies” of Jesus of Nazareth	537
INDEX OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.....	542
INDEX OF NAMES	547
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.....	560

F O R E W O R D

I studied theology for four years at the University of Innsbruck. At that time we had an outstanding faculty of teachers and scholars, including Fr. Hugo Rahner, S.J., Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., his younger brother, and Fr. J. Jungmann, S.J., the famous liturgist. Karl Rahner taught dogma and among the few books on his desk was the four volume set of *Sacrae Theologiae Summa* (B.A.C.), which had been published in 1955.

When Karl Rahner came to the United States in the 1960s he gave a talk to some Jesuit seminarians. One of them asked him: "Fr. Rahner, what must one do to become a theologian?" He answered immediately, "The first thing you have to do is to master the four volumes of B.A.C. Then you can begin to become a theologian." He then added that those four volumes are the best summary of scholastic theology available. Needless to say, the young Jesuit seminarians at the time were rather shocked to hear the famous theologian praise a summary of scholastic and Thomistic theology.

I have been using B.A.C. for many years—as a student, as a textbook when teaching a course on dogmatic theology, and as a theological resource.

This English translation, *Introduction to Theology/On Christian Revelation* and the volumes to follow, is meant for seminarians and theology students who want to learn scholastic and Thomistic theology. The four volumes of B.A.C. contain treatises that cover all the basic dogmas of the Catholic faith and it does it in a detailed and scholarly way, with a heavy reliance on the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. One advantage of this *Summa* is that it gives the student the "theological note," that is, the grade of certitude for each thesis. Here you will learn what is a *defined dogma* of the Church, what is *theologically certain*, and what is just a *theological opinion*. That is important in order to know what level of assent is required for Catholic teachings, such as can be found in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* which, since it is for all the faithful and is not a theology textbook, does not, for the most part, give the theological note or doctrinal level of the various truths of the faith.

The original publisher has given permission to publish the individual treatises as separate books, instead of the four large volumes of about 1,000 pages each. The project will take a few years and, when finished, will add up to eight volumes covering all the traditional courses in dogma from the Unity of God to the Four Last Things. The next volume will contain the treatise *On the Church* and *On Holy Scripture*.

The text has not been altered from the original, with the exception of the numbering of the references to Denzinger (D). The most recent

and available version of Denzinger is the Denzinger-Hünemann edition (Ignatius Press 2012).

It is my fond hope that this book and those that follow will help theology students to learn the great Catholic tradition of dogmatic theology which is based on the Holy Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers of the Church and the ecclesiastical Magisterium.

Kenneth Baker, S.J.

P R E F A C E

Since Pius XI in the Apostolic Constitution, *Deus scientiarum Dominus*, for the students of the theological faculties and the Code of Canon Law prescribed a four year course of sacred theology for seminary students,¹ whereby in the Church good ministers of Jesus Christ may be nourished by the teaching of the faith and of good morals and so become faithful dispensers of the mysteries of God²; the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, professors in the theological faculties in Spain, decided to write this *Summary of Sacred Theology*. It has been produced in a scientific way and is especially designed for use in lectures in schools. It summarizes briefly all the basic questions of theology and carefully and continually examines new developments in doctrine and scholarship in successive editions.

But so that this *Summary of Sacred Theology* might be a suitable help for students to more easily learn the sacred doctrine, but also for teachers as a useful tool, which can be used for lectures in schools, we decided to provide a text that is not too long but at the same time gives ample coverage of each subject. But for a more extensive treatment of the individual questions we have provided a bibliography and added footnotes. With the help of these the proposed teaching can be more fully comprehended and abundantly illustrated.

In the whole treatise we have faithfully followed the Church in all things, “the teacher of divine truth that cannot be in error and so is the patroness and nurse of all human teaching.”³ Therefore we have followed “that solid doctrine handed on by the elders and commonly received by the Church, avoiding the godless chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge.”⁴

But we have purposely used the method which the Church long ago recommended: “Sacred theology is to be handed on with both the positive and the scholastic method; therefore, having explained the truths of faith and proved them from Holy Scripture and Tradition, the nature of those truths and their intimate reason are to be studied and illustrated according to the principles and teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas.”⁵ But in order to correctly observe this scientific way of studying, the Church recommends “that students be instructed in such a way that they not only learn the

1. *Deus scientiarum Dominus* (May 24, 1931) .43-44; *Ordinationes sacrae Congreg. Studiorum* (June 12, 1931) a.37-38; CIC cn.1365 § 2 [1917].

2. See 1 Tim. 4:6; 1 Cor. 4:1.

3. Apostolic Constitution, “*Deus scientiarum Dominus*,” at the beginning.

4. CIC cn. 129 [1917]; see 1 Tim.6:20.

5. Apostolic Constitution, “*Deus scientiarum Dominus*,” a.29 a; CIC cn.1366 § 2 [1917].

teaching very well, but also know the sources of each discipline and the correct ways of interpreting them. And they should accustom themselves to use in a fruitful manner the books and aids of scientific work.”⁶

Therefore in order to introduce students in some way to the method of study, we have written our *Summary of Sacred Theology* in such a way that according to it at the same time it is necessary to have at hand not only Holy Scripture and the *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, but also the *Enchiridion Patristicum* and the *Summa* of St. Thomas.⁷ Constantly we refer the readers to the texts of Holy Scripture, of the Church’s magisterium, of the holy Fathers and of St. Thomas rather than to quote the words of authors, so that the seekers after the sacred science may grasp more accurately the full meaning of the cited opinions in their context. In this way they can make constant use of the scientific way of studying that is especially appropriate to sacred theology.

We have followed carefully St. Thomas Aquinas as our true Leader and Teacher. Indeed Pius XI decreed that “he is to be called not only the Angelic Doctor, but also the *common* and universal Doctor of the Church, whose teaching... the Church has made her own.” This was done according to the norms of the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, “*Aeterni Patris*” and of Pius XI, “*Studiorum Duce*m,” according as it was prescribed by the sacred Congregation of Studies and finally it was strongly recommended by Pius XII.⁸

Furthermore, in questions that are freely debated among Catholics of good repute, we have tried sedulously to follow the golden advice of Pius XI when he said: “Among lovers of St. Thomas... We desire that there exist that honorable rivalry with just freedom from which studies make progress, but no detraction that is not favorable to truth and that serves only to break the bonds of charity. Therefore, let whatever is prescribed in the *Code of Canon Law* [can. 1366, § 2 (1917)] be sacred to each one of them... But let no one exact more from others than what the Church, the teacher and mother of all, demands of all; for in those matters about which there tend to be opposing opinions argued among authors of higher distinction in our Catholic schools, no one is to be prevented from following the opinion that seems to him the more probable.”⁹ These paternal warnings and exhortations, namely for a healthy rivalry, respectful moderation and

6. *Ordinationes sacrae Congreg. Studiorum* a.18 § 2.

7. H. Denzinger-P. Hünermann, *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals* (43rd ed., 2012); J.M. Rouet de Journel, *Enchiridion Patristicum* (1959).

8. Pius XI, Encyclical “*Studiorum Duce*m”: AAS 15 (1921) 314; *Ordinationes sacrae Congreg. Studiorum* a.18 § 1; Pius XII, *Sermo ad alumnos Seminariorum Urbis*, “*Solemnis conventus*”: AAS 31 (1930) 246.

9. Pius XI, Encyclical “*Studiorum Duce*m”: D 3666-3667.

legitimate freedom in studies, we have striven to follow, especially because Pius XII made it his own and recommended to the students of theology that it be observed.¹⁰

Concerning the order of study, we have adopted a twofold division of the whole discipline, namely, we divide it into Fundamental Theology and Dogmatic Theology; this is the arrangement recommended by the sacred Congregation of Studies.¹¹ But we present the whole treatment in four volumes; the first volume is dedicated to Fundamental Theology and the other three to Dogmatic Theology. We have arranged the matter to be treated according to the order given to us by the Angelic Doctor in his *Summa Theologiae*.

However, in each thesis we have paid close attention to harmony of style and a clear presentation. Therefore each thesis is presented in the same way: *thesis, connection, definition of terms, adversaries, doctrine of the Church, theological note, proof from Scripture and Tradition, arguments from reason and the answers to objections*. But we have placed the treatment of special and more subtle questions in the scholiums. Finally, what is presented in smaller type can be readily passed over in lectures given to seminary students, according to the prudent judgment of the professor.

Therefore after these preliminary notes, it is necessary for us now eagerly and faithfully to move on, under the guidance of the Vatican Council, to the study of the divine realities. For, “if reason illumined by faith inquires in an earnest, pious, and sober manner, it attains by God’s grace a certain understanding of the mysteries, which is most fruitful.”¹² But St. Augustine said very wisely: “Christ is the interior Master who teaches.”¹³ Therefore it is always to be desired by eager students of sacred Theology that Jesus “the Teacher and Lord” speak to us interiorly, since he alone can make us suitable ministers of the New Testament.¹⁴

10. Pius XII, *Sermo “Solemnis conventus”*: AAS 31 (1939) 247.

11. *Ordinationes sacrae Congreg. Studiorum* a.27,1, 1, a-b.

12. Vatican Council I, ses. 3; *Const. “De Fide catholica”* c.3: D 3016.

13. St. Augustine, *Exposit. In epist. 1 Io.* tr.3 n.13: ML 35,2004.

14. See John 13:13; 2 Cor. 3:6.

THEOLOGICAL NOTES

USED IN THIS "SACRAE THEOLOGIAE SUMMA"

Divine faith (de fide divina): what is contained in the word of God written or handed down. The opposite is: *an error in faith (error in fide)*.

Divine and catholic faith (de fide divina et catholica): what is contained in the word of God written or handed and is proposed by the Church either by a solemn judgment or by the ordinary and universal Magisterium to be believed as divinely revealed. The opposite is: *heresy*.

Defined divine and catholic faith (de fide divina et catholica definita): what is contained in the word of God written or handed down and is proposed by the Church by a solemn judgment, that is, by the infallible Magisterium, exercised in an extraordinary way, either in an ecumenical council or by the Roman Pontiff speaking "ex cathedra" and to be believed as divinely revealed. [N.B. Even the Chapter Titles in Trent and Vatican I are considered as true *definitions*.]

Proximate to faith (fidei proxima): a truth that by an almost unanimous agreement of theologians is contained in the word of God written or handed down. The opposite is: *proximate to error or heresy*.

Faith based on the authority of the Church (fides ecclesiastica): a truth not formally revealed, which is proposed infallibly by the Magisterium of the Church. The opposite is: *error in ecclesiastical faith*. [Those who do not admit there is such a thing as ecclesiastical faith give a different theological note for such a truth.]

Catholic doctrine (doctrina catholica): a truth that is taught in the whole Church, but not always proposed infallibly (for example, what the Roman Pontiffs wish to teach explicitly in encyclical letters). The opposite is: *error in catholic doctrine*.

Theologically certain (theologie certa): a truth that in the theological schools is certainly recognized as necessarily connected with revealed truths; this connection can be either virtual or presupposition or final. The opposite is: *error in theology*.

A doctrine to be so held that its contrary is temerarious (doctrina ita tenenda, ut contraria sit temeraria): a truth proposed by the Roman Congregations, which proposition however does not enjoy the special approbation of the Roman Pontiff.

Common and certain in theology (communis et certa in theologia): what by the common agreement of theologians is taught in the schools as well founded. The opposite is: *false in theology, temerarious*.

Probable (probabilis): a theological opinion with a lesser grade of certainty.

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

AAS	Acta Apostolicae Sedis
ASS	Acta Sanctae Sedis
Ang	Angelicum
Ant	Antonianum
ArchPh	Archives de Philosophie
ArchTG	Archivo Teológico Granadino
ASS	Acta Sanctae Sedis
Bibl.....	Biblica
BiblZeitschr	Biblische Zeitschrift
BullLitEccl.....	Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique
BullThom.....	Bulletin Thomiste
CathBiblQuart.....	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Cav	F. Cavallera, S.I., Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae
CE	Ch. G. Herbermann and associates, The Catholic Encyclopedia
CIC.....	Codex Iuris Canonici
CiencFe.....	Ciencia y Fe
CiencTom.....	La Ciencia Thomista
CivCatt.....	La Civiltà Cattolica
CL	Acta et Decreta sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum... Collectio Lacensis...
CollatBrug	Collationes Brugenses
CSEL.....	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum... Academiae...Vindobonensis
CTr.....	Tridentinum... Ed. Societas Goerresiana
CyF	Ciencia y Fe
D.....	H. Denzinger –P. Hünermann, Enchiridion Symbolorum 43
DACL.....	F. Carrol – H. Leclercq- H. Marrou, Dictionnaire d'Archeologie chrétienne et de Liturgie
DAFC.....	A. d'Ales, Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique
DB.....	F. Vigouroux, Dictionnaire de la Bible
DBS.....	L. Pirot-A. Robert, Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément
DivThom (Fr)	Divus Thomas. Freiburg i. der Schweiz
DivThom (Pi).....	Divus Thomas. Piacenza
DocCath.....	La Documentation Catholique
DocComm.....	Doctor Communis
DomSt.....	Dominican Studies
DTC	A. Vacant-E. Mangenot-E. Amann, Dictionnaire de

	Théologie catholique
EB	Enchiridion Biblicum2
EC	Enchiridion Clericorum
EchOr.....	Echos d'Orient
EphRhLov.....	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
EstBibl	Estudios Biblicos
EstEcl.....	Estudios Ecclesiasticos
EstFranc.....	Estudios Franciscanos
Et.....	Etudes
EtCarm.....	Etudes Carmelitaines
GChS.....	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
Greg	Gregorianum
Hrd	J. Harduini, S.I., Conciliorum Collectio regia maxima
JThSt.....	The Journal of Theological Studies
Kch.....	C. Kirch, S.I.-L. Ueding, S.I., Enchiridion Fontium historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae5
LTK.....	M. Buchberger, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche
Manr.....	Manresa
ML, MG.....	J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus Series prima latina. Series graeca.
MiscCom	Miscellanea Comillas
Msi	J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collection
NeuStGeschThK.....	Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie Der Kirche
NouvRevTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
OrChP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
Pens.....	Pensamiento
R.....	M. J. Rouët de Journel, S.I., Enchiridion Patristicum18
RazFe	Razón y Fe
RechScRel	Recherches de Science Religieuse
REPT.....	J. J. Herzog, Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche
RevBén	Revue Bénédictine
RevBibl.....	Revue Biblique
RevEspT	Revista Española de Teología
RevHist	Revue Historique
RevHistEccl.....	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RevHistPhRel.....	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses

RevHistLittRel.....	Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse
RevNéoscolPh	Revue Néo-scholastique de Philosophie
RevScPhTh	Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques
RevScRel	Revue des Sciences Religieuses
RevThom	Revue Thomiste
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
Sap	Sapienza
Schol	Scholastik
ScriptVict	Scriptorium Victoriense
ScuoCatt.....	Scuola Cattolica
SitzKPAkadWiss.....	Sitzungsberichte der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SThS	Sacrae Theologiae Summa
Stimm.....	Stimmen (aus Maria-Laach; ab anno 1915: der Zeit)
ThGl.....	Theologie und Glaube
ThLitZg.....	Theologische Literatur Zeitung
ThPraktQschr.....	Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift
ThRev	Theologische Revue
ThStKrit.....	Theologische Studien und Kritik
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VerDom.....	Verbun Domini
VerVid	Verdad y Vida
ZkathTh	Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZNTWiss.....	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

TREATISE I

INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY

By
Michaele Nicolau, S.J.

**Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.**

CHAPTER I

General introduction to Theology

S.Th. I, q. 1, a. 1; *In I Sent.* prolog. A.3; H. Dieckmann, *De revelatione christiana* n.3-32; M.J. Congar, *Théologie*: DTC 15,342-502; M. Nicolau, *Etapas del proceso teológico*: EstEcl 19 (1945) 145-205.¹

1. On the nature of Theology. *Theology is the science about God and about divine realities.*

Because it is a *science*, in theology there is an ordered and connected complex of certain knowledge from its causes.²

God is the *primary object* of this science; other things, inasmuch as they are made or willed by God, are the *secondary object*. Therefore earthly things can be the object of theology if they are referred to God, and in this sense they can be considered as divine realities, the object of theology.

2. Theology can be *natural* and *supernatural*.

Natural theology or *Theodicy* derives its knowledge about God from truths known or demonstrated by the light of natural reason; and it attains its material object inasmuch as it is knowable by natural reason. This is its *formal object*.

Supernatural theology, or theology simply and in the strict sense, derives its knowledge from principles known by the divine revelation of faith, and it attains its object inasmuch as it is knowable from divine

-
1. Among the different authors who have treated the introductory questions regarding theology more in detail, we will mention: M. d'Herbigny, S.J., *La Théologie du révéle* (Paris 1921); G. Rabeau, *Introduction à l'étude de la Théologie* (Paris 1926); J. Bilz, *Einführung in die Theologie* (Freiburg 1935); Th. Soiron, *Heilige Theologie* (Regensburg 1935); A. Stolz, O.S.B., *Introductio in Sacram Theologiam* (Freiburg Br. 1941); Charles Journet, *Introduction à la Théologie* (Paris 1947); F.P. Muñiz, O.P. *De diversis muneribus S. Theologiae secundum doctrinam D. Thomae*: Ang 24 (1947) 93-123; and more recently B.M. Xiberta, O.Carm., *Introductio in Theologiam* (Matriti 1949).
 2. On theology as a science, it was treated, among others, by L. Koesters, S.J., *Theologie als Wissenschaft*: Schol 14 (1939) 234-240; E. Platzeck, O.F.M., *Reflexiones sobre la definición de la Teología*: VerVid 2 (1944) 337-355; J.M. Alonso, C.M.F., *La Teología come ciencia*: RevEspT 4 (1944) 611-634; 5 (1945) 2-38, 433-450, 529-560; *ibid.*, in p. 2-4 he offers a bibliography on the historical aspect of this question; P.M. Daffara, O.P., *La Teología come scienza nella Somma Teologica di S. Tommaso*: Sap 1 (1948) 12-22; Greg 21 (1940) 235-266; M.R. Gagnebet, O.P., *Le problème actuel de la Théologie et la science aristotélicienne d'après un ouvrage récent* (A. Stolz, O.S.B., *Manuale Theologiae dogmaticae*, I. *Introductio in S. Theologiam* (Freiburg Br. 1941): DivThom(Pi) 46 (1943) 237-270; Ae. Magrini, O.F.M., *Ioannis Duns Scoti doctrina de scientifica Theologiae natura*: Ant 27 (1952) 39-74, 297-332, 499-530; F. Brandariz, S.J., *La Teología como ciencia, según Enrique de Gante*: MiscCom 19 (1953) 5-57; *La Teología en relación con las demás ciencias, según Enrique de Gante*: MiscCom 19 (1953) 105-204. And on the treatise of Maldonado "De constitutione Theologiae," see J.I. Tellechea, *Methodologia teológica de Maldonado*: ScriptVct 1 (1954) 183-255.

On the concept of science and its divisions, see among recent explanations: A. Brunner, S.J., *Das Wesen der Wissenschaft und seine Besonderung in Geistes- und Naturwissenschaft*: Schol 13 (1938) 490-520.

revelation; and in this its *formal object* is different from Theodicy.

Therefore natural theology ascends from the knowledge of creatures to God; supernatural theology descends from the knowledge of God and his revelation to the knowledge of other things.

3. Theology and faith. Each science begins either from its own principles or from principles derived from another science, and so it is called a *subalternate science*. In theology the principles, which are as it were per se known from which this science begins, are the articles of faith³ and also the teaching revealed by God supernaturally and publicly. This evidently is known by the science of God and of the blessed; therefore theology is subalternate to the science of God and the blessed.

But the man would not be a true theologian who did not have initial faith, at least unformed⁴; nor would heretical theology be true theology.⁵ In theology, therefore, one must proceed not by reason alone, but by faith. See D 2732 (*on the indifferentism of Lamménais*), D 1642 (ed. 34: *on rationalism*).

But if the articles of faith and the doctrine revealed by God are the *objective principles* for theological science, the *subjective principle* for the work of man in theology is *reason illumined by faith* (D 3016).

4. Therefore theology is *the science of faith*: because the object of investigation is the doctrine of faith; the objective principle from which the investigation begins is the doctrine revealed by God, which can be received only by faith; finally, the subjective principle of the investigation is reason illumined by faith. For this reason theology is a help for teaching the faith and for understanding and relishing faith.

Faith and the light of faith should also permeate the whole course of investigation, lest there be a contradiction to the initial commitment, with which it began, and lest someone depart from the right road.

5. However the faith we are considering (which it is necessary now to describe and define), according to the teaching of Vatican Council I, *is a supernatural virtue whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe that what he has revealed is true, not because the intrinsic truth of things is recognized by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God himself who reveals them, who can neither err nor deceive* (D 3008). “However, to enable us to fulfill the obligation to embrace the

3. S.Th., *In 1 Sent. prolog. A.3 q.3 solut.II.*

4. St. Bonaventure, *In 3 Sent. d.35 q.2 conclusion: Opera* (Quaracchi) 3,3776b.

5. Suarez, *De fide* d.3 s.11 n.9: *Opera* (Vivès) 12,98f.

true faith and persistently to persevere in it, God has instituted the Church through his only begotten Son and has endowed her with manifest marks of his institution so that she may be recognized by all men as the guardian and teacher of the revealed word” (D 3012). “Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed” (D 3011).

6. *The proximate rule of faith.* The proximate, immediate and supreme norm or rule of faith for a Catholic is the teaching of the living Magisterium of the Church, which is authentic and traditional. For, this magisterium gives the whole revealed teaching, its genuine meaning and true interpretation, and it takes care that at all times and everywhere it proposes the infallible, authentic and revealed doctrine.

Therefore, for the theologian, who must begin from the doctrine of the faith, his first task will be to know or to establish the doctrine itself of faith as proposed by the proximate norm of faith, the magisterium of the Church, or to investigate what the magisterium of the Church says about each thing.⁶ But this is only the beginning of theology, not what uniquely constitutes it.

7. *Positive theology and scholastic or speculative theology.* *By reason of its method and task, theology is divided into positive and into scholastic or speculative theology.*⁷

Where a theological datum given by the contemporary or quasi-contemporary magisterium of the Church is given, which we mentioned above, the work of the science of theology is *to justify this datum through its causes*; or, if the Magisterium has not yet made a pronouncement about some matter, the theological work will be to find which revealed truths are contained in the sources. These must be presented by the positive method, and the theological function, whereby is demonstrated by such a positive

6. “... this sacred office of teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ our Lord the whole deposit of faith— Sacred Scripture and divine tradition—to be preserved, guarded, and interpreted...” (Encyclical “*Humani generis*”: D 3884). A systematic explanation of the teaching of the Magisterium of the Church was made by F. Cavallera, S.J., *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae ex documentis Magisterii ecclesiastici*; a chronological presentation was made by H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum*.

7. Leo XIII in a document for the *Bishops and clergy of France* (September 8, 1899) speaks about *positive and speculative or scholastic theology* (EC 602). But in article 29 of the Constitution “*Deus scientiarum Dominus*” he talks about doing theology *with the method both positive and scholastic*; and in a. 18 of the Ordinations of the Congregation for Seminaries the *positive* (§ 2) part of the disciplines is distinguished from the *speculative* questions, in which *the method which they call scholastic* (§ 3) should be used. See below n. 24.

method what revealed truths the positive sources (Scripture, Tradition) contain, is called *positive theology*.⁸ This theological function was developed very much during the age of the renaissance and modern times, since it was necessary against the humanists and Protestants to defend the traditional deposit of faith as such; and the cultivation of this theology is desired explicitly by the Church:

“We will add that We deem worthy of praise those who with full respect for tradition, the holy Fathers, and the ecclesiastical magisterium, undertake, with well-balanced judgment and guided by Catholic principles (which is not always the case), seek to illustrate positive theology by throwing the light of true history upon it. Certainly more attention must be paid to positive theology than in the past, but this must be done without detriment to scholastic theology, and those are to be disapproved as of Modernist tendencies who exalt positive theology in such a way as to seem to despise the scholastic.”⁹

8. *Scholastic or speculative theology* proceeds especially with the speculative method and is the theological function which flourished mainly in the schools of the Middle Ages and it achieved great splendor also by the scholastics in the age of the renaissance. The Church strongly defends this theological function, especially after the invectives with which it has been attacked¹⁰; in this regard St. Pius X said:

“For scholastic philosophy and theology they [Modernists] have only ridicule and contempt. Whether it is ignorance or fear, or both, that inspires this conduct in them, certain it is that the passion for novelty is always united in them with hatred of scholasticism, and there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system....”¹¹

-
8. On the nature of positive theology, see F. Cavallera, *La Théologie positive*: BullLittEccl 26 (1925) 20-42.
9. Pius X, Encyclical “*Pascendi*”: ASS 40 (1907) 640-641. And in the letter *Humani generis* Pius XII says this about the correct use of the sources of revelation: “It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in tradition. Besides, each source of divinely revealed doctrine contains so many rich treasures of truth that they can really never be exhausted. Hence it is that theology through the study of its sacred sources remains ever fresh; on the other hand, speculation that neglects a deeper search into the deposit of faith proves sterile, as We know from experience. But for this reason even positive theology cannot be on a par with merely historical science. For, together with the sources of positive theology, God has given to his Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation, not to each of the faithful, nor even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. But if the Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or in the extraordinary way, it is clear how false is a procedure that would attempt to explain what is clear by means of what is obscure. Indeed, the very opposite procedure must be used. Our predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: ‘in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church’ (AAS 42 [1950] 568f.960; D 3886).
10. See D 2670 (against the Synod of Pistoia), 2814 (Bonnetty), 2828 (Günther), 2876, 2913: EC n.414.415.423.1132...
11. ASS 40 (1907) 636-637.

And Pius XII recently in his letter “*Humani generis*” said: “... to neglect, or to reject, or to deprive so many great things of their value, which in many instances have been conceived, expressed, and perfected after long labor, by men or no ordinary genius and sanctity, under the watchful eye of the holy *magisterium*, and not without the light and guidance of the Holy Spirit for the expression of the truths of faith ever more accurately, so that in their place conjectural notions may be substituted, as well as certain unstable and vague expressions of a new philosophy, which like a flower of the field exists today and will die tomorrow, not only is the highest imprudence, but also makes dogma itself as a reed shaken by the wind. Moreover, the contempt for the words and ideas which the scholastic theologians customarily use tends to weaken so-called speculative theology, which they think is void of true certitude, since it rests on theological reasoning.

Surely it is lamentable that those eager for novelty easily pass from a contempt for scholastic theology to a neglect, and even disrespect for the *magisterium* of the Church...” (D 2312f., 34th edition).

9. Positive theology is said to be *the intellect seeking faith*; that is, reason seeks what the sources of revelation and faith contain. But scholastic theology is called *faith seeking understanding*; it that which St. Augustine eagerly sought: “I wanted to see with my intellect what I believed,”¹² and St. Anselm: “I am not attempting, Lord, to penetrate your majesty, because in no way do I compare my intellect to it, but I desire in some way to understand your truth, which my heart believes and loves. For I am not seeking to understand in order to believe, but I believe in order to understand....”¹³ Finally, it is that very fruitful understanding of the mysteries which, as a gift of God, reason illumined by faith attains, when it seeks zealously, piously and prudently, both from the analogy to the things it knows naturally and from the relation of the mysteries among themselves and with the last end of man (D 3008).

10. By scholastic theology *the faith is explained more clearly*, namely:

a) revealed truths that are *less known are explained and demonstrated with the help of others that are better known* and “from the articles of faith it goes on to prove something else”¹⁴;

b) the truths of faith are explained *from the analogy to the things it knows naturally*;

c) from revealed truths *new truths are deduced*, which therefore are virtually contained in them; this takes place especially with the help of philosophy.

d) The connection between the revealed truths is demonstrated and they are organized into a *scientific system*.

12. *De Trinit.* 1.15 c.28 n.51: ML 42,1098.

13. *Prolog.* c.1,2: ML 158,227.

14. S.Th., I, q. 1, a. 8.

11. On the subject of theology. *The subject* of a science is that which primarily is subjected to consideration and investigation. It is the quasi basis and foundation supporting the other truths that are considered in the science.

God is *the subject of theology*. But it is not only from the part of the material object, but also from the part of reason by which it is considered, because “in sacred science all things are treated under the aspect of God; either because they are God himself; or because they refer to God as their beginning and end.”¹⁵

However, other ways of considering and ordering theological ideas are possible, according to the center or nucleus (v.gr., the incarnate Word) which is chosen, and according to the end (speculative, practical and kerygmatic) that is intended.¹⁶

12. On theological places or on theological method.

The sources of theological argumentation, having borrowed the name from Rhetoric or from the work of the Farmer, *De inventione dialectica* (dialectic places), are called *theological places*. Therefore they are the sources of theological knowledge, whether to find it, or to pass judgment on what has been found; and they are like categories of arguments or homes and seats of arguments in order to prove or refute some point. The most famous and classical one is the work of Melchior Cano, *De locis theologicis* (see n. 76).

13. Some sources are proper, some are adjuncts.


Proper theological places are those sources of argumentation proper to theology, which manifest revealed doctrine itself. *The fundamental and constituent* sources are those that contain revelation and constitute it: Scripture and Tradition. *Theological reasoning* is a form of argumentation from a revealed premise and a rationally known premise; it shows the virtualities of revelation.

The *adjunct* places are those that contribute to a better understanding and confirmation of the revealed doctrine: Philosophy, history, etc.

15. S.Th., I q. 1, a. 7.

16. See M. Nicolau, *Etapas del proceso teológico*: EstEcl 19 (1945) 187-192; concerning kerygmatic theology, *ibid.*, p.192-196 and below n.19.

14. Diagram of the places:



15. It helps to note that a demonstration of revealed truth with the help of tradition through acts of the extraordinary magisterium (definitions of Councils and Roman Pontiffs, and other documents of the Church...) *is not necessarily identified with*, although it can coincide with (especially in didactic practice), *what we said is the beginning of theology and its first function*: to find the doctrine itself of the Magisterium of the Church. For, this strives to find what the proximate rule of faith says, namely, the contemporary or quasi-contemporary magisterium; afterwards, with the help of other ancient documents, this is proved theologically as contained in the tradition.

16. Likewise there is a distinction between the argument from Scripture and tradition in dogmatic theology and the investigations proper to biblical and patristic theology. For, the former deals with a previously known thesis to be proved; it can be proved with a few documents. But the latter had to do with finding conclusions related to some theme, broad or narrow depending on the matter, and investigations as exhaustive as possible are presupposed. The former way is regressive and ascending, the latter is progressive and descending.

17. *The liturgies* teach us not only about the faith of a Father, but about the faith of a church, that is, of all the Fathers and faithful who used that liturgy. If the liturgies are *universal*, then they imply a universal tradition and magisterium (ordinary), and they are documents of great value.¹⁷

18. Dogmatic or theoretical theology and practical theology. *By reason of the matter*, theology can be theoretical or practical.

Theoretical theology deals with truths that are not ordained *immediately and directly* to the direction of man's actions; therefore it is ordered immediately to the contemplation of truth, although mediately and indirectly it does have a practical object, namely, the action whereby the spirit lives that truth.¹⁸ It is also called *dogmatic* theology, because it is very much concerned with dogmas or with those revealed truths, which have been proposed by the Church as such.

Practical theology deals with truths that tend directly to govern the life of man. Another form is *moral* theology, which is concerned with human action according as it is licit or illicit, or according as it should be in conformity with the supernatural norm of morality; another form is *spiritual theology* (ascetical or mystical), which studies the supernatural perfection of human action and life; finally, there is *pastoral* theology, which studies the way of conducting oneself in the care of souls.

17. See *Etapas del proceso teológico*: EstEcl 19 (1945) 168-170. M. Pinto, S.J., treats the value of the Liturgy according to different forms of theological argumentation, *O valor teológico de Liturgia* (Braga 1952).

18. See E. Sauras, O.P.: CiencTom 66 (1943) 329-332; and by the same author, *Immanencia y pragmatismo de la Teología*: RevEspT 5 (1945) 375-403.

According to St. Thomas sacred doctrine is more speculative than practical, because it deals more with divine things than it does with human acts.¹⁹ St. Bonaventure emphasizes the practical and affective aspect in theology: because if the intellect is considered in itself, it is perfected by speculative knowledge; if it is considered as regulating action, it is perfected by practical or moral knowledge; but if it is considered in an intermediate way, *as born to be extended to the affections*, it is perfected by an intermediate habit between the purely speculative and the purely practical, and this habit is *wisdom*, which consists in both knowledge and affection; theological science is such an intermediate habit, and it has for its end both contemplation and that we become good, but primarily that we become good.²⁰

The division, given in n. 7-10, into positive theology and scholastic or speculative theology, concerned the method. But this division, into dogmatic theology (theoretical) and practical, concerns—as we said—the matter; but in both theologies one can proceed with the method that is both positive and speculative.

19. Kerygmatic theology. The so-called *kerygmatic* theology is ordained for the *kerygma* or for preaching. Since the main purpose of preaching is to move the will, but the will is moved by the apprehension of the good or the value of things: this theology strives, not indeed to omit the apprehension of the true (the good and true are convertible), but especially to insist on the goodness of the dogmas. For this end—they say—the way of proceeding and the heart of this theology have been chosen: Jesus Christ.²¹

This kerygmatic *function*, or the consideration of values in theology, seems to us something by all means to be promoted, and we think that the authors who have worked hard in this area are worthy of praise; but *it does not therefore seem to be necessary to construct an independent or autonomous theology.*

20. Theology and progress. There are those now who are insisting on the *theological study of earthly things*, such as human societies, cultures and civilizations, fine arts, industry, human labor, the body, technology... with the idea that by this study from the sources of revelation the spiritual values of temporal things will become apparent and the separation between the kingdom of Christ and temporal realities in many human societies may

19. I, q. 1, a. 4.

20. *In 1 Sent.* prooem. q.3; Opera (Quaracchi 1,13).

21. See F. Lakner, *Das Zentralobjekt der Theologie*: ZkathTh 62 (1938) 1-39; H. Rahner, *Eine Theologie der Verkündigung* (Freiburg Br. 1939); C. Fabro, *Una nuova teologia: La „Teologia della predicazione*: DivThom(Pi) 45 (1942) 202-215; *Etapas del proceso teológico*: EstEcl 19 (1945) 192-196. Recently E. Kappler, *Die Verkündigungstheologie* (Freiburg, Switzerland 1949). P.J. Kunicic, O.P., *S. Thomas et theologia „kerygmatica“*: Ang 32 (1955) 35-51.

be avoided.²² Surely this study, which has not always been passed over, in a truly complete theology can be very well performed, either from a consideration of God the *Creator* of these earthly things and their *end*, or from the study of the relations between the punishments of original sin and the temporal world, or finally from the order of reintegration and *restoration and consummation of all things*, whether of things in heaven or things on earth, *through Christ and in Christ*.

21. Others have spoken about what is called *the new theology*.²³

It is necessary for a theologian that he speak to the men of his own time verbally or in writing in such a way that he is listened to willingly and in an intelligent manner. "From this it is inferred that in proposing and publishing questions, in conducting argumentations, and also in the choice of a way of speaking it is necessary that they wisely accommodate their words to the temperament and propensities of their own time. But no one should disturb or move what is immovable... When new or free questions are raised, the principles of Catholic doctrine should always be clear in their minds; what sounds completely new in theological matters should be evaluated with vigilant caution; what is certain and firm should be distinguished from what is conjectural, from what is a fleeting and not always laudable custom that can also be introduced into philosophy and theology; a friendly hand should be extended to those in error, but no concession should be given to the errors of these opinions."²⁴

22. On the method of learning. The theologian should first of all strive for this, that, *under the leadership of the teaching Church*, he has deep knowledge of the foundations of the Catholic religion and intimately grasps the motives of credibility of the faith; then that he acquire for himself the *clear and correct, solid and intimate* knowledge of the dogmas, and of the other revealed truths, while not neglecting the other doctrines that are connected with dogma or are derived from dogma. Thus let him obtain for himself *a systematic and fully scientific* grasp of the whole doctrine, and

22. Besides Jacob Balmes, who in 1841-1844 treated a similar object in his work, *El Catolicismo comparado con el Protestantismo en sus relaciones con la civilizaci3n europea*, see L. Malevez, S.J., *La Philosophie chr3tienne du progr3s*: NouvRevTh 64 (1937) 377-385; and G. Thils, *Th3ologie des r3alit3s terrestres*: I, *Pr3ludes* (Descl3e 1946). There especially in p. 72-76 is the outline of the things treated; t.II, *Th3ologie de l'Histoire* (Bruges 1949); *Th3ologie et r3alit3 sociale* (Tournai 1952).

23. Besides the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" (AAS 42 [1950] 561-578), see M. Nicolau, *La novedad en Teologia*: EstEcl 24 (1950) 5-41.

24. Pius XII in his allocution to the Jesuit Fathers at the 19th General Congregation (September 17, 1946): AAS 38 (1946) 384f. See also his allocution to the General Chapter of the Dominicans (September 22, 1946): AAS 38 (1946) 386-388.

fortified by it he will be able to devote himself more efficaciously both to his own spiritual salvation and to the salvation of others.

23. *The teaching of St. Thomas* and his reasoning, since it is more solid and more secure and more approved by the Church, should be followed conscientiously. Many commendations of the *Angelic and Common Doctor* have been given by the Supreme Pontiffs.²⁵

“Let none require from another more than the Church, the mistress and mother of all, requires from each: and in questions, which in Catholic schools are matter of controversy between the most reputable authorities, let none be prevented from adhering to whatever opinion seems to him to be more probable.”²⁶

24. However, the method which is recommended by the Holy See for theological (and philosophical) schools is *the method that is both positive and scholastic*. Thus the *Constitution “Deus scientiarum Dominus”* teaches:

“In the Theological Faculty let sacred Theology (dogmatic) have the first place. This discipline is to be handed on by the positive and scholastic method; therefore the truths of the faith having been explained and proved from Holy Scripture and Tradition, the nature and inner reason of these truths should be studied and clarified according to the principles and teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas” (a.29).

“In the *positive* part of the disciplines the students should be formed in such a way that they not only learn the doctrine itself very well, but also know the proper sources for each discipline and the norms of interpreting them, and they should accustom themselves to use fruitfully the resources and tools of scientific work.”

“In *speculative* questions whether of Theology or Philosophy let the method be used that they call “scholastic,” and the *sylogistic* form is not to be neglected, both in proposing arguments and in raising, debating and solving objections. By this method the students’ minds are trained in such a way that they become apt and prepared not only to judge and refute the false systems and errors of the past, but also to discern and evaluate truly new ideas that perhaps make their appearance in the theological and philosophical disciplines” (Directives of the Holy Congregation for Seminaries, a. 18, § 2,3).

25. Among others: Leo XIII, “*Aeterni Patris*” (August 4, 1879): ASS 12 (1879) 108-115; CIC cn.1366 § 2 [1917]; Pius XI, “*Studiorum Ducem*” (June 29, 1923): AAS 15 (1923) 309-329; “*Deus scientiarum Dominus*” a.29 a) and c); Ordinat. a.18 § 1; Pius XII: AAS 31 (1939) 246; likewise AAS 38 (1946) 384-387f. Recently in the Encyclical “*Humani generis*”: AAS 42 (1950) 573; D 3894; and in his allocution on the occasion of the Fourth Centenary of the Pontifical Gregorian University: AAS 45 (1953) 685.

26. Pius XI, “*Studiorum Ducem*”: AAS 15 (1923) 324; EC 1178. – And Pius XII, “But in this matter (on the prescriptions of following St. Thomas) now the questions seem to be of less importance, in which under the leadership and guidance of the ecclesiastical magisterium the power of thinking and disputing was always free, howsoever the same points are to be handled in philosophical and theological investigations and controversies. Accordingly, there is less talk now about those conjectures and formulas of doctrines pertaining to the things of nature, which were proper and peculiar to past epochs. (*To the General Chapter of the Dominicans*: AAS 38 [1946] 387). He also authentically explained the meaning of canon 1366 § 2 (CIC 1917) in his Allocution on the occasion of the Fourth Centenary of the Gregorian University: AAS 45 (1953) 685f.

25. Scholastic *exercises* are also to be held in high regard, namely those “whereby the students, under the guidance of the professors, learn the scientific method of research and the art of presenting in writing what they have discovered in their studies.” Moreover, they should take part in “scholastic disputations, in which the students accustom themselves to know the doctrine thoroughly, to explain it clearly, and to defend it effectively.”²⁷

And in recommending these exercises antiquity cries out with one voice; for this method was always held in high regard by the ancients as the way to produce learned and solid theologians. Let it suffice to quote the well-known John Maldonado, S.J., a professor at the University of Paris, who speaks about it in this way and recommends the various exercises:

“The more frequent the exercises and more useful they are, by that same measure the students become more learned. Seven of them seem to be necessary: The first is, after the lecture while it is still fresh in the mind, that they repeat it either in the school or elsewhere, according as they have understood everything rightly and committed it to memory; 2) that at another hour on the same day they repeat it again and debate it in the school or elsewhere in the presence of the teacher; 3) that on Saturday or feast days they debate in school or elsewhere in the presence of the teacher for two hours; 4) that every month they have more formal disputations for half a day, where not only the pupils but also the professors take part in the debate; 5) that also every year, before the general repetition of studies, they conduct disputations for a day or two with as much celebration as possible; 6) that they should have prelections on the matter sometimes privately at home, so that they gradually learn to be teachers; 7) that they treat some question in writing and submit it to the professor for correction....”²⁸

Certainly if theology is studied in this way, prudently suited to circumstances, you will obtain solidity and correct logical thinking, rather than the appearance or unassimilated abundance of erudition.²⁹

27. *Constitution “Deus scientiarum Dominus,”* a.30 § 1,2; see Directives a.22-24.—M. Nicolau treats the instructions of the Holy See on the theological method, *Modernidad y Escolastica:* EstEcl 29 (1955) 13-36.

28. *Monum. Paedig. S.J.* (Monum. Historica S.J.) p. 866f.

29. The logicians explain how the scholastic arguments should be presented. Here is how the theologian John Maldonado recommends it: “This is what I require: that he present the argumentation with few, suitable and clear words...; that he does not abandon, change or restate the argument; but where the strength of the argumentation is, that he remain there, insists on it, clings to it, with it attacks the adversary, and brings the opponent back to it when he tries to escape; that he does not address anything except what is denied by the adversary... For, you are accustomed often by badly proposing a weak argument to make it weaker; but to weaken, conceal and obscure a strong argument with unnecessary words; and, to put it briefly and bluntly, to say nothing with a great abundance of words. Therefore, what is to be sought is a strong, effective and pressing argument that is not hidden under many words as it were under a garment; but it should be girded up like one very light tunic, so it is possible to move quickly and with agility, and so that its muscles and bones can be seen. You are accustomed not to pursue one and the same argument to its logical end, as the nature of the discussion demands; but, having set it aside, to collect new things, to assemble many things together. You are accustomed not to prove what has been denied, but what you imagine has been denied” (*Epist. et orat.:* Opera [Paris 1677] 3,33; see J. M. Bover, S.J.: RazFe 104 [1934] 491. On the method, also in general, according to Maldonado A. Marranzini, S.J., *Il metodo teologico del Maldonado nella “Disputatio de Trinitate”* (Rhegii, July 1954); also more on this is given by R. Galdos, S.J., *Miscellanea de Maldonado* (Madrid 1947).

26. Theology and priestly life. It is certain from the clear and frequent teaching of the Church that theology is necessary for the priestly ministry. Thus in the Encyclical "*Ad catholici sacerdotii*," there is a well-expressed quote from the prophet Malachi (2:7): "The lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and men should seek instruction from his mouth"³⁰; likewise in the Liturgy of Ordination the earnest wish is expressed that the new priests may be *mature in knowledge, and that their teaching be spiritual medicine for the people of God; and by meditating on the divine law day and night, that they believe what they read, that they teach what they believe, and that they imitate what they teach.* And Paul the Apostle recommended to Timothy *that he take heed to himself and to his teaching, holding to that, for by so doing you will save both yourself and your hearers.*³¹

27. Theology is above all necessary also for the spiritual life and the prayer of priests. *For someone would err if he should think, having neglected theological studies either before the priesthood or ignored afterwards, that they could, lacking all that abundance, which is absorbed from those sacred doctrines, by the knowledge of God and of the mysteries of faith, easily rise on high and be elevated and raised to that intimate union with God.*³² And the Church has condemned, at least as tendentious, the proposition of Michael de Molinos that *a theologian is less disposed than an ignorant man for the contemplative state* (D 2264).

28. These advantages will be obtained if, as St. Bernard warns, one dedicates himself to study with the right intention. "For there are those who want to know in order only to know; and this is shameful curiosity. And there are those who want to know so that they might be known; and this is shameful vanity... And there are those who want to know so they can sell their knowledge; for example, for money, for honors: and this is shameful profit. But there are those who want to know in order to edify; and this is charity. Likewise there are those who want to know in order to be edified; and this is prudence."³³

29. With this in mind it will help, with the proper proportion, to pay attention to the following words of St. Bonaventure"

"Therefore like the groan of the prayer by Christ crucified, through whose blood we are cleansed from the stains of our sins, first of all I invite the reader, that he should not believe that reading without unction is sufficient for him, speculation without devotion,

30. AAS (1936) 33-36.

31. See also CIC cn. 130: EC 414.1156.1466 and *passim*. *On the importance of Philosophy and Theology* in order to fulfill properly the priestly office, Pius XII said in his *Exhortation to the Clergy* (September 23, 1950): "In the training of seminarians, although a knowledge of many subjects is required, among which today the study of social questions is also very important, *nevertheless the greatest effort is to be given to the study of philosophy and theology "according to the mind of the Angelic Doctor..."*; and the Supreme Pontiff mentioned its *usefulness* for the *spiritual* life and for the *apostolate*, which are based on them; and he said that this way of teaching in Catholic schools has proved its worth for a long time... (AAS 42 (1950) 687f.

32. Pius XI, "*Unigenitus Deus*": AAS 16 (1924) 137.

33. *Sermo 36 in Cant.*: ML 183,968.

investigation without admiration, circumspection without exultation, industry without piety, knowledge without charity, understanding without humility, study without divine grace, an image without divinely inspired wisdom. Therefore, having been preceded by divine grace, humble and pious, contrite and devout, anointed with the oil of gladness both as lovers of divine wisdom and inflamed with a desire for him, wishing to spend time magnifying God, admiring him and even tasting him, I propose the various speculations, suggesting that the image projected exteriorly is very little or nothing, unless the image in our mind is clean and polished...."³⁴

30. Thus it will come about that the theologian not only possesses theological knowledge, but also arrives at *wisdom*; and that not just in the Aristotelian sense, which derives its knowledge of things through their ultimate causes,³⁵ that is, through the first cause, God; but also in the sense that he has *savory* knowledge about divine realities.³⁶

31. Thus the *office of the theologian* can be conceived, just as Christ about to ascend into heaven announced to his disciples, to be a *witness to Jesus* in their own country, and in the surrounding regions, and to the ends of the earth; namely, as we may say about the next treatise on apologetic theology, the task of the theologian is to know all the arguments that clearly prove the mission of Jesus, his messiahship and his divinity so that he can present them effectively to both the unlearned and the wise. But he should not give only a purely scientific testimony for Christ (which certainly moves many people since they tend to believe erudite men), but the theologian should strive to be a true witness of Christ, as it were seen and heard, by his spiritual manner and inner experience of theological realities and by his own life. The theologian should live according to the words of Peter and John: *We did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty* (2 Pet. 1:16); and again: *That which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you* (1 John 1:3).³⁷

34. *Itiner. mentis*, prolog.: Opera (Quaracchi) 5,296. See also Pius XI, "Studiorum Duce": AAS 15 (1923) 321; EC 1442-1444.1467f. and passim.

35. S.Th., I, q. 1, a. 6.

36. St. Bonaventure, *In 3 Sent.* dist.35 q.2: Opera 3,774a. On the teaching of St. Bonaventure on this whole matter, see B. Madariaga, O.F.M., *Camino de la ciencia a la sabiduría* (Oñate 1945).

37. You will find prayers recommended by the Church and endowed with indulgences for those who dedicate themselves to study in the collection called *Enchiridion indulgentiarum: Preces et pia opera* (1950) b.759-765. Among these the following *Act of Consecration of Studies to the B.V. Mary* is rightly praised and promoted by some (v.gr., by J.B. Ferreres in his *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*):

"Under your protection, most sweet Mother, and by the invocation of the mystery of your Immaculate Conception, I want to pursue my studies and literary work: with these studies I protest that I will strive especially for this purpose that I may better serve the divine honor and the promotion of devotion to you. I beseech you, therefore, beloved mother and seat of wisdom, that you look with favor on my labors. But I, which is only just, promise piously and freely, that whatever good may come to me from these studies, I will consider as the result of your intercession with God. Amen" (Indulgence of 300 days once a day; *Enchiridion indulgentiarum* [1950] n.763).

General bibliography for all of Theology

32. In handing on this literary assistance it is not our intention to list all theologians and all their works; the intention is to mention only those which in order to help students with their studies are more useful and important, or are cited more frequently, or finally are more easily available.

Therefore in this general bibliography for an introduction to Theology we are attempting to list *general works*, surely not completely, which are either more detailed or more frequently used; we are not citing the theologians who have published particular treatises or have shed light on special questions. For, it will be more opportune to mention them, if we cite them before the various treatises or within the context of the discussion.

33. 1. For the general history of Theology

Grabmann, Martin, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg Br. 1933).

Congar, M.-J., art. *Théologie*, especially § II: *La Théologie. Etude historique*: DTC 15,341-447.

Bellamy, J., *La Théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle*³ (Paris 1904).

Hocedez, Edgar, S.J., *Histoire de la Théologie au XIX^e siècle*, 3.t (Brussels 1949 1952).

Also the authors listed below in n. 35, while considering one aspect often reflect the history of all theology.

34. 2. Treatises on nearly all of Theology

a) Among the great scholastics.

Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences (+ 1160), *Libri IV Sententiarum*, edited by The Fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure, 2.t (Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi] 1916).

Alexander of Hales, the Irrefragable Doctor (+ 1245), *Summa Theologica*, 4. T (Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi] 1924-1948).

St. Thomas Aquinas, Angelic and Common Doctor (1225-1274), *Summa Theologiae*. (t.4-12 in the *Opera omnia iussu impensaue Leonis XIII P.M.*

edited in Rome in 1882ff.).

Summa contra Gentiles (in the same collection t.13ff.).

Commentarius in IV libros Sententiarum.

Quaestiones disputatae (De veritate, De potentia, De mal...) Opera omnia, t.1-34 (Paris [Vivès] 1871-1880).

St. Bonaventure, the Seraphic Doctor (1221-1274), *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum* (t.1-4 in the *Opera omnia*, Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi] 1882-1902).

John Duns Scotus, the Subtle and Marian Doctor (ca. 1270-1308), *Commentaria Oxoniensia ad IV libros Magistri Sententiarum*, 2 t. (Ad Claras Aquas 1912-1914).

—*Reportata parisiensia* (t.23-24 in the *Opera omnia*, 26 t. Paris [Vivès] 1891-1894).

Opera omnia... by the study and care of the Scotistic Commission... (Vatican City 1950ff).

Capreolus, John, O.P., Prince of Thomists (+ 1444), *Defensiones Theologicae Divi Thomae Aquinatis* [4 t. Venice 1483] published recently by the study and care of C. Paban and Th. Pegues, 7 t. (Turonibus 1900-1908).

Cajetan, Tomas de Vio, O.P. (1469-1534), *Commentaria in "Summam" Sancti Thomae* (Lyons 1540...). A new edition in the Leonine edition of the *Summa Sancti Thomae*.

Valencia, Gregory de, S.J. (1549-1603), *Commentariorum theologicorum tomi quatuor, in quibus omnes materiae quae continentur in "Summa" Divi Thomae Aquinatis explicantur* (Ingolstadt 1591-1597).

Bañez, Dominicus, O.P. (1528-1604), *Scholastica commentaria in Primam Partem... D.Thomae* (Salamanca 1585); *In Primam Secundae* q.1-18, 71-189, 3 t. (Madrid 1942-1948 edited by V.B. de Hereda, O.P.); *In Secunda Secundae* Venice 1586).

Vázquez, Gabriel, S.J. (1549-1604), *Commentarius ac disputationes in Primam Partem "Summae Theologicae" S.Thomae Aquinatis*, 2 t. (Venice 1600-1608); *In Primam Secundae et in Tertiam Partem*, 7 t. (Compluti 1598-1614).

Suarez, Franciscus, S.J., Distinguished and Pious Doctor (1548-1617), *Opera omnia*, 26 t. (Paris [Vivès] 1856-1861).

St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J. (1542-1621), *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei*, 3 t. (Ingolstadt 1586-1593) (in the *Opera omnia*, 12 t.,

Paris [Vivès] 1870-1876.

John of St. Thomas, O.P. (1589-1644), *Cursus theologicus in "Summam Theologicam" D.Thomae*, New edition, 10 t. (Paris [Vivès] 1883-1886).

Frassen, Claudius, O.F.M. (1620-1711), *Scotus Academicus seu universa Doctoris Subtilis Theologica dogmata, quae ad nitidam et solidam Academiae Parisiensis docendi methodum concinnavit R.P....*, 12 t. (Paris 1672-1677). New edition, 12 t. (Rome 1900-1902).

Salmanticenses: *Collegii Salmanticensis Fr. Discalceatorum B. Mariae de Monte Carmelo... Cursus Theologicus "Summam Theologicam" Angelici Doctoris D. Thomae complectens* [a.1679]. New editio, 20 t. and ss (Paris-Rome... 1876ff.).

Gonet, John B., O.P. (ca. 1616-1681), *Clypeus Theologiae Thomisticae*, 5 v. ed. 6.^a (Lyons 1681).

35. b) *From the 18th century:*

Abárzuza, F.X. de, O.F.M.Cap., *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 3. t. (1947-1949).

Bartmann, Bernard, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*⁸ (Freiburg Br. 1932).

Baisi, Conradus, *Institutiones Theologiae Scholasticae*, 4 t. (Milan 1948-1949).\

Billuart, F. Carolus Renuatus, O.P. (+ 1757), "*Summa*" *Sancti Thomae hodiernis academiaram moribus accommodata*, or *Cursus Theologicus iuxta mentem Divi Thomae*. New edition, 10 t. (Paris 1886).

Casajoana, Valentinus, S.J. (+ 1889), *Disquisitiones scholastico-dogmaticae*, 5 t. (finished by Ignatius Serra, S.J.) (Barcinone 1888-1895).

Castro Alonso, Emmanuel de, *Institutiones Theologiae scholstico-dogmaticae ad mentem D.Thomae Aquinatis*, 6 t. (Vallisoleti 1894-1896).

Charmes, Thomas ex, O.M.C. (+ 1765), *Theologia universa ad usum Sacrae Theologiae candidatorum*¹¹, 2 t. (Bassani 1887).

Diekamp, Franz, *Katholische Dogmatik nach den Grundsätzen des hl. Thomas*, herausgegeben von Klaudius Jüssen. T.III¹¹⁻¹² (Münster 1954).

Fernández Fernández, Petrus, O.S.A. (+1896), *Cursus theologicus in usum scholarum*, 5 t. (Matriiti 1890-1892).

Goupil, Auguste-Alexis, S.J., *Une Théologie en français*, 15 t. (Paris, Laval).

- Herrmann, J., C.SS.R., *Institutiones Theologiae dogmaticae*³, 3 t. (Rome 1903).
- Hervé, I.M., *Manuale Theologiae dogmaticae*, 4 t. recent edition (Paris 1951-1953).
- Hugon, Eduardus, O.P., *Tractatus dogmatici*, 3 t. T.II¹⁰ (Paris 1935).
- Hurter, H., S.J. (+ 1914), *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium in usum studiosorum Theologiae*¹², 3 t. (Innsbruck 1909).
- Kleutgen, Josephus, S.J. (+ 1893), *Theologie der Vorzeit*², 5 t. (Münster 1867-1874).
- Lercher, Ludovicus, S.J. (+ 1937), *Institutiones Theologiae dogmaticae in usum scholarum*, 4 t. (Innsbruck 1927ff.). Third edition revised by the Professors of the Pontifical Faculty of Theology Canisianum, 4 t. (Innsbruck 1939-1950). T.I⁵ (Barcinone 1951).
- Lottini, Ioannes, O.P., *Institutiones Theologiae dogmaticae specialis*, 3 t. (Florence 1903-1904).
- Mazzella, Cardinal Camillus, S.J. (+ 1900), *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae*. Second edition, 4 t. (Rome 1899-1901).
- Mendive, Joseph, S.J. (+ 1906), *Institutiones Theologiae dogmatico-scholasticae*, 6 t. (Vallisoleti 1895).
- Mors, Joseph, S.J., *Theologia dogmatica*, 6 t. T.I, *De religione revelata*² (Buenos Aires 1954); t.II, *De Ecclesia Christi. De fontibus revelationis*² (Buenos Aires 1955).
- Otten, Bernardus I., S.J., *Institutiones dogmaticae in usum scholarum*, 6 t. (Chicago 1924ff.).
- Perrone, Ioannes, S.J. (+ 1876), *Praelectiones Theologicae quas in Collegio Romano S.J. habebat*. New edition, 4 t. (Paris 1897).
- Pesch, Christianus, S.J. (+ 1925), *Praelectiones dogmaticae*⁶⁻⁷, 9 t. (Freiburg Br. 1924).
- Compendium Theologiae dogmaticae*^{6m} 4 t. (Freiburg Br. 1941-1942).
- Parente, Petrus, *Collectio theologica Romana ad usum seminariorum*, 7 t. T.I⁴ (Marietti 1955).
- Pohle, J., *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, revised by J. Gummersbach, S.J., 3 t. T.I¹⁰ (Paderborn 1952).
- Puig, Narcissus—Xarrié, Franciscus, O.P. (+ 1865, 1866). *Institutiones theologiae ad mentem Angelici Praeceptoris D.Thomae Aquinatis*, 3 t. (Barcinone 1861-1863).

- Scheeben, M. Jos. (+ 1888), *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 4 v. (Freiburg Br. 1873-1901 (L. Atzberger continued the work)).
- Schmaus, Michael, *Katholischer Dogmatik*, 4 vol. Vol.I⁵ (Munich 1953).
- Schoupe, Franciscus X., S.J. (+ 1904), *Elementa Theologiae dogmaticae e probatis auctoribus collecta et divini verbi ministerio accommodata*²⁴, 2 t. (Lyons-Paris).
- Tanquerey, Ad. (+ 1932), *Synopsis Theologiae dogmaticae*²⁶, 3 t. (Paris 1949-1950).
- Tepe, G. Bernardus, S.J., *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum*, 4 t. (Paris 1894-1896).
- Val, Honoratus del, O.S.A., *Sacra Theologia dogmatica recentioribus Academicarum moribus accommodata*, 3 t. (Matriti 1906-1908).
- Van Noort, G., *Tractatus apologetici et dogmatici*, 10 t. The edition which J.P. Verhaar produced, *De vera religione*⁵ (Bussum 1949), *De Ecclesia Christi*⁵ (1951), *De fontibus revelationis nec non de Fide divina*³ (1949).
- Wirceburgensis Theologia, RR. *Patrum Societatis Iesu Theologia dogmatica, polemica, scholastica et moralis, praelectionibus publicis in alma Universitate Wirceburgensi accommodata* (by the authors H. Kilber + 1782, Ig. Neubauer + 1795, Th. Holzclau + 1783, U. Munier) 5 t. Another edition (Lutetiae Parisiorum 1852-1854).
- Zubizarreta, Valentinus (Fr. Valentinus ab Assumptione), O.C.D., *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis*, 4 t. (Vitoria 1948-1949).
- Medulla Theologiae dogmaticae*² (Bilbao 1947).

36. 3. General helps for theological work

Collections of principal documents:

- Denzinger, Henricus, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 43rd edition, Latin-English, recently edited by Peter Hünermann, Ignatius Press, San Francisco 2012.
- Cavallera, Ferdinandus, *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae ex documentis Magisterii ecclesiastici*, new edition (Paris 1936) [Cav.]
- Kirsch, Conradus, S.J., *Enchiridion fontium Historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae* ed.6.^a expanded and amended by Leo Ueding, S.J. (Barcelona 1947) [Kch].

Rouet de Journel, S.J., *Enchiridion Patristicum. Loci SS.Patrum, Doctorum, Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, quos in usum scholarum collegit...*, ed.18^a (Freiburg Br.—Barcinone 1953) [R].

Enchiridion Biblicum. Documenta ecclesiastica Sacram Scripturam spectantia auctoritate Pontificiae Commissionis de re biblica edita² (Naples-Rome 1954) [EB]. We will give the numbers of the second edition and the numbers of The preceding edition in brackets [].

Enchiridion clericorum. Documenta Ecclesiae sacrorum alumnis instituendis (Rome 1938) [EC].

Patrologiae cursus completus... Series graeca... accurante I.-P. Migne [MG].

Patrologiae cursus completus... Series latina... accurange I.-P. Migne [ML].

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobondensis [CSEL].

Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte... (Corpus Berolinense) [GChS].

37. 4. Lexicons

Dictionnaire apologetique de la Foi catholique contenant les Preuves de la Verité de la Religion et les Réponses aux Objections tirées des Sciences humaines. sous la direction de A D'Ales, 4 éd. 4 t. (Paris 1912-1922 [DAFC].

Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique contenant l'exposé des doctrines de la Théologie catholique, leurs preuves et leur histoire. Commencé sous la Direction de A. Vacant... (the work was continued by E. Mangenot and E. Amann), 15 t. (Paris 1909-1950) [DTC].

Dictionnaire de la Bible... published by F. Vigouroux... 5 t. (Paris 1895-1912). Supplément publié sous la direction de Louis Pirot... (Paris 1928ff.).

Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche... (ed. Mich. Buchberger; direxit Konrad Hofmann). Zweite newbearbeitete Auflage des Kirchlichen Handlexikon, 10 t. (Freibur Br. 1930-1938).

Catholicisme. Hier-Aujourd'hui-Demain, 7 t. Dirigée par G. Jacquement (Paris 1948ff).

Enciclopedia de la Religión católica, 5 t. (Barcelona 1949-1954).

Enciclopedia Cattolica, 12 t. (Vatican City 1949-1954).

Hurter, H., S.J., *Nomenclator litterarius Theologiae catholicae theologos exhibens aetate, natione, disciplinis distinctos*, 5 t. (Innsbruck 1895ff).

CHAPTER II

Prolegomena to fundamental Theology

L. Maissoneuve, *Apologétique*: DTC 1,1511-1533; Le Bachelet, *Apologétique*: DAFC 1,189-251; H. Diekmann, *De revelatione* n.33-75; A. Gardeil, *La crédibilité et l'Apologétique*¹ (1928); Id., *Crédibilité*: DTC 3,2201-2310.

38. On the nature of fundamental Theology. Theology is the science of faith; fundamental Theology is the science of the *foundations of the faith* or the part of Theology that treats the foundations of the faith.

Theology—as we have said—has as the principles *from which* it argues the principles of faith; *therefore the principles of faith, or faith in the objective sense, are the foundation upon which the theological edifice is built.* But faith on the other hand, and the Theology founded on faith, presuppose logically and pre-require:

1) Certain knowledge of the fact of divine revelation and of other things that show the reasonableness of faith and the obligation of adhering to it, that is, they pre-require *the knowledge of the credibility and of the necessity (credentitas) of faith.* The knowledge of all these things is also in the logical sense, *although it does not univocally* agree with the foundation explained above, the foundation of faith and the foundation of the Theology based on that faith, because *by their mediation* faith and Theology are constituted as reasonable and credible.

2) But since the faith, upon which Catholic Theology is based, is Catholic faith (n. 3-5) and has as its norm the doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church, the reasonableness and obligation of adhering to this norm presuppose *certain knowledge of the existence of this infallible and authentic Magisterium as the guardian of the revealed word of God.* So it is easily apparent into what special parts fundamental Theology is to be divided.

3) Moreover, in order for dogmatic Theology to proceed correctly, *the knowledge of the sources from which it draws its truths and the knowledge of the matter used in arguing are presupposed.*

The science, therefore, or rather the part of Theology that deals with these logical foundations of faith and Theology is *fundamental Theology.*

39. As is clear, this discipline is something like an *introduction to dogmatic Theology* and a quasi *bridge between Philosophy and dogmatic Theology.* It also considers the whole object of revelation inasmuch as it concentrates on general and common characteristics of what is credible,

to be believed and desirable... Therefore it is also called *general Theology* (H. Hurter), *general dogmatic Theology* (F. Egger, P. Mingès), *dogmatic fundamental Theology* (A. Tanqueray). Others call it *Apologetics*, from the more important matter that is considered in fundamental Theology.

However, the name “Fundamental Theology” designates the internal, primary, *positive* and more comprehensive purpose of this discipline, in contrast to the external, defensive, secondary, less comprehensive and to some extent negative purpose, which the name of “Apologetics” signifies.

40. Fundamental Theology comprehends two different parts in its way of proceeding: *Apologetics* and *the Treatise on the sources containing revelation*. Therefore the nature of both needs to be explained.

41. The object of Apologetics. *Apologetics*, from the Greek word (ἀπολογεῖσθαι), to defend, means (in the religious context) the defense and justification of religion.

According to its use it is to be distinguished from an *apology*, because this word refers to the defense of a particular truth or fact; but Catholic Apologetics has as its purpose *the scientific justification, and therefore systematic, of all religious truth, or of the Catholic religious fact*. Therefore its goal is not that it wishes intrinsically to demonstrate all of Catholic dogma (since that cannot be done, when one is dealing with the mysteries); nor also that it intends to offer an extrinsic proof from authority for each and every dogma (that is what dogmatic Theology does from the sources of revelation); but its purpose is to justify the Catholic religion and to demonstrate the fundamental fact of divine revelation through Jesus Christ, and also to protect and explain the office committed to the Catholic Church concerning the Christian revelation.

42. Just as there is a concept, which each one has, about faith and religion, so there are different ideas about the apologetics of faith and religion. Thus there are some who understand faith or religion as a vague and obscure sentiment regarding God, or a purely natural cult of God without giving any thought to positive dogmas and obligations... But we understand religious faith as the Catholic Church understands it, namely, that faith is an intellectual assent (not sentiment) to truths revealed by God, because of the authority (knowledge and veracity) of God who reveals them (D 3008).

Just as in *human faith* we believe not because of the intrinsic evidence of the matter, but because of the extrinsic testimony of the man who knows about it, that is, because of the known doctrinal authority of the one who has knowledge about the matter and his truthfulness; so also in *divine faith*, we do not believe because of the intrinsic evidence of the truth, but because of the extrinsic testimony of God, who made the matter known,

that is, we believe because of the authority of God who reveals, who can neither err nor deceive.

But we understand divine and Catholic faith as assent to truths revealed by God and as such proposed by the Church (D 3011).

Often and in general we know that God has spoken because of the proposal of the Church, which affirms it. Hence, in order for faith to be reasonable, it pre-requires not only certitude about the fact of revelation, whether acquired in a popular or scientific way, but also a demonstration of the right of the Catholic Church to propose and teach the doctrine of divine revelation.

43. The object of Apologetics is also the demonstration of obligation of believing (*credenditas*).

For, if it demonstrates only the credibility of faith, it then demonstrates only the possibility of faith but not the obligation of embracing it and submitting oneself to the ecclesiastical Magisterium. But Apologetics is cultivated with the intention that, by showing this obligation, it can bring the unbeliever to the Church, but for the theologian it is like a bridge between Theodicy and Theology. Therefore Apologetics would not fulfill its function, if it did not direct its attention to the demonstration of the obligation to believe (*credenditas*).

44. From what has been said it is certain that the object of Apologetics is not to treat anything biological, or cosmological, or astronomic, or historical... by which religion is established, *but to treat the rational credibility of and the obligation to believe in the Christian-Catholic religion*. Therefore the object of Apologetics is *to demonstrate the fact of divine revelation and the magisterial authority of the Church*, and the other truths that are closely connected with these. We said *closely*: because concerning the other truths that are *remotely* connected, there is no need to deal with them in scientific Apologetics; for, all of the truths of the other sciences do not have to be proved again, but to be accepted.

45. Truths that must be presupposed. It is not necessary in scientific Apologetics to prove the principles that are derived from other sciences; for, they must be proved in those sciences. But in practical apologetics often these principles must be verified and demonstrated at the beginning, since “for many men it is not so much religion that is lacking, but reason” (Fénelon).

The truths that in Apologetics logically are presupposed for the validity of its own process and for the efficacy of its own demonstrations are the foundation of Apologetics; and hence they are also the remote foundations

or “*preambles*” of faith.

Thus from Criteriology what must be retained is the objective value of human knowledge and of our faculties and the existence of absolute truth, not merely relative; from Psychology the spirituality and freedom of the human soul; from Theodicy the existence of a personal God and his principal attributes—omnipotence, omniscience, veracity, mercy, providence...; from Ethics the obligation for man to tend towards God as his final end and to show him both private and public worship....

On this matter St. Augustine said: “If we did not believe that God both exists and helps human minds, then surely we would not have to seek the true religion”¹; and again: “For if the providence of God does not rule human affairs, there is no reason to trouble oneself about religion.”²

Hence that philosophy is to be rejected that does not establish the rational truths about God and about our duties that are the presuppositions of faith; likewise, as we shall see, also those philosophies that attack the possibility of revelation and the fact of the divine locution; also those that attack the objective and sufficient value of the motives of credibility, and even of external ones such as miracles and prophecies.

But not every philosophical error, even though crass, necessarily destroys valid apologetics nor impinges on the motives of credibility; indeed both the errors that appear in an unbeliever in the course of an apologetic demonstration, and the difficulties he might make against the demonstration, do not therefore destroy common sense and the use of reason in him, with the help of which he will be able gradually to abandon his false philosophy and slowly conform himself to the religious truth, which should be proposed to him in such a way that his heart and mind are changed.

46. The initial state of mind. The theologian does not begin the apologetic inquiry with a real and objective doubt, as Hermes and his followers advocated,³ concerning the things that faith and the Church teach; nor by prescinding totally from the things that the Church declares, even if only for a time; because the apologetic theologian during the inquiry *does not cease to be Catholic and he is certain about the charism of truth*, and he has the obligation already before (although perhaps in a common way) of not abandoning the faith that he is certain of.

1. *De utilitate credendi* c.13 n.29: ML 42,86.

2. *De utilitate credendi* c.16 n.34: ML 42,89.

3. Their teaching was condemned by Gregory XVI in the year 1835 (D 2738ff.), and in Vatican Council I (D 3013-3014, 3036).

“For, those who have received the faith under the teaching authority of the Church *can never have a just reason to change this same faith or to call it into question* (D 3014). See Treatise II, n. 43.

Furthermore in no scientific investigation is it allowed to prescind from a fount of information, even if it seems to be suspect; but much more *it is not allowed to reject a fount already previously accepted as certain*, provided that they do not have a bad influence on the objective proof of the new truth. For, light is sought with light; and even in Philosophy itself it is not licit with a real doubt about everything.

Here there is no psychological problem, because of the extrinsic coercion of the Church, of admitting things proved falsely; for, per se such a danger can be guarded against beforehand, as also on the other hand any prudent person should protect himself against the authority and words of unbelievers.⁴

However, care must be taken lest in the *intrinsic* demonstration itself of apologetic truths anything be admitted or introduced which presupposes what must be proved, namely, the authority of the Church’s Magisterium.

47. The certitude to be obtained. It is not mathematical, for a mathematical question is not being handled. Nor will it always be metaphysical, because the concern is not always with truths of the metaphysical order. The question concerns the historical-philosophical area and therefore *the certitude to be obtained will be in the moral order*, although not rarely it can be reduced to metaphysical certitude. However, this apologetic certitude does not force the intellect to assent, so that place may be given not imprudently to doubt; here it is a matter of *free* certitude—something that suitably takes place in matters of religion.

Furthermore, the passions and concupiscences of man are also involved, which can disturb his peace of mind regarding religious truth. For if geometric theorems had any influence in the moral and psychological order, we could easily consider them as a para-logic (Leibnitz).

“...the human intelligence sometimes experiences difficulties in forming a judgment about the credibility of the Catholic faith, notwithstanding the many wonderful external signs God has given, which are sufficient to prove with certitude by the natural light of reason alone the divine origin of the Christian religion. For man can, whether from prejudice or passion or bad faith, refuse and resist not only the evidence of the external proofs that are available, but also the impulses of actual grace” (Encyclical “*Humani generis*”: D 3876).

4. See S. Harent, *Foi*: DTC 6,349-357.

And again he says in “*Humani generis*” concerning the influence of the will in order to know speculative truth:

“For never has Christian philosophy denied the usefulness and the efficacy of the good disposition of the entire mind for fully comprehending and embracing religious and moral truths; on the other hand, it has always taught that the lack of such dispositions can be the cause of the intellect becoming affected by disordered desires and an evil will, and of being so obscured that it does not see rightly. On the other hand the Common Doctor is of the opinion that the intellect can in some way perceive the higher goods that pertain to the moral order, whether natural or supernatural, since it experiences in the mind a kind of passionate “relationship” with these goods, whether natural, or added by the gift of grace [II-II, q. 1, a. 4 ad 3; q. 45, a. 2 c]; and it is evident how much even such an obscure understanding can be an aid to the investigations of reason. Yet, it is one thing to recognize the force of the will for the disposition of the affections in aiding reason to acquire a more certain and firmer understanding of matters of morals; but these innovators make a different claim, namely, they assign to the faculties of desiring and coveting a kind of intuition, and that man, when he cannot through the process of reason decide with certainty what is to be accepted as true, turns to the will, by which he decides freely and chooses between opposite opinions, thus stupidly confusing the act of cognition and of the will” (D 2324, 34th edition).

In some people there is present a sense of *hypercriticism*, which as an intellectual defect (like scruples and indecisiveness in daily life) can hinder the equilibrium of the mind and has the effect that the mind is not rendered serene in the truth.

48. Practical Apologetics. There are two types of Apologetics, one is theoretical and the other is practical.

Theoretical Apologetics focuses on the theoretical explanation and the scientific systematizing of all the motives and proofs which demonstrate the Christian religion so that Catholicism is made credible and the religion that should be believed.

But *practical* or *pastoral Apologetics* focuses on the practical use of these arguments and proofs, according as pastoral experience and common sense show that they should be used.

Then certainly the psychology of conversion will help very much and above all to pay attention to the goodness and the kindness of the Divine Redeemer⁵; and the purely dialectical and abstract order should not be given as much attention as the psychological, concrete, moral...; it will also help to invoke not so much the principles of the school of philosophy, but

5. See the documents of Bl. Peter Faber to P. Lainez on how to converse with heretics (March 7, 1546); Monum.Hist. S.J., *Fabri Monum.* P.399-402.

rather those of the perennial Philosophy.

Moreover, someone who is strong in theoretical Apologetics and knows well the force of the various arguments will more easily accommodate himself to concrete circumstances and needs of souls, so that he may use one argument rather than another, or go this way rather than that way.

For, in practical apologetics a great difficulty comes from the feeble religious instruction of men, or from their own crass ignorance. For their religious instruction often is quite childish in comparison with their secular learning; hence it happens that many difficulties disappear in the light alone of a positive and clear explanation of the Catholic teaching concerning the reasonableness of faith.

49. *For the practical bringing of someone to the faith*, the following points should be kept in mind: 1) that faith is a reasonable act of the intellect, whose presupposition is in the certain knowledge of the fact of divine revelation; 2) that this act of faith is commanded freely by the will; 3) that both the act of faith and the preceding judgment of credibility and the command of the will and the preceding judgment of credendity? are de facto supernatural acts.

Hence practical Apologetics should strive 1) that as much as possible it demonstrate with clarity and firmness the fact of divine revelation entrusted to the Church⁶; 2) that with as much efficacy as possible it attract the motion of the command of the will by proposing motives of obligation and of all good things and values that are found in faith and religion, and by bringing it about that a man avoids the contrary impediments; for it is known how bad habits and a bad disposition of heart make one blind to moral and religious truth: *because the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil* (John 3:19); 3) since the desire to believe and the actual believing *as one should* surpasses the powers of nature, there will be a need for humble prayer by asking for a good spirit from the Father of lights, who gives generously to all without delay.

However, a sincere and generous acceptance of a new faith supposes a change and *conversion* of man, which must be prepared for by a desire of possessing the light, by humility of heart, by the purity of an integral life. And we will never say sufficiently—and feel—that all these *supernatural* aids must be obtained by divine grace, acquired by humble and persevering prayer.⁷

-
6. It helps to note that the explanation of the motives should be solid so that their knowledge is fixed deeply in the mind, and not just for the present moment but for one's whole life, lest the house built on sand falls to ruin. And because these motives, although known clearly and solidly, do not of themselves force the assent of the intellect, like the evident truths of mathematics, there is a place for the free command of the will in order to obtain assent and faith.
 7. On the types of conversion, L. Penido gives a lengthy explanation, *La conscience religieuse. Essai systématique suivi d'illustrations* (Paris 1935) 41-115. On the psychology of conversion, see L. Franca, *A Psicologia da fé* (Lisbon 1945) (new edition); apologetics, Th. Mainage, *La Psychologie de la conversion* (Paris 1915); on the dogmatic, apologetic and pastoral values, briefly M. Nicolau, *Valores teológicos en la Psicología de la conversión* (Granada 1943).

50. The usefulness of Apologetics. Although the name signifies a *defense*, it should not be believed that Apologetics has only one polemical task; for it includes a *positive function*—the explanation of the foundations of faith and Theology carried out in a scientific and exhaustive way.

It helps not only for the defense and justification of the Catholic faith, if at times it is necessary, and for a *fuller scientific knowledge of the theological object*; but it also responds to the *psychological interest* whereby someone wishes to know the foundations of his own faith, and he desires to be always ready to give an answer to anyone who asks him about the faith that is in him (1 Pet.3:15).

Therefore Apologetics *converts common certitude about the motives of the credibility of faith into scientific certitude.*

In common certitude, which is really objective and not subjective opinion the valid motives for a firm assent of the mind are present and known; but they are not known *reflexively*, and hence there is a difficulty, for those who have only that certitude of extricating themselves from difficulties or explaining their own motive of certitude. But in scientific certitude the motives are known reflexively. But in the science of Apologetics almost all of the motives are known, judged and suitable connected with each other.

Therefore the difference between scientific and common certitude is in the *reflex* knowledge of the motives, but not in the firmness of assent. Hence it can happen that an uneducated man, having only common certitude, may possess a stronger faith than a learned theologian, who knows all the motives and can discourse at length about them.

But also from the scientific knowledge of the foundations of the faith, *the faith is loved*, since it is certain that it is true and very credible; thus faith is strengthened.

51. However it is not to be believed that the strength of faith is measured by the mere knowledge of the motives of credibility, and that he has more and a more fervent faith who is more versed in the science of Apologetics. For faith, although it presupposes such certain knowledge of the motives, depends on the free command of the will, as was said above (n. 47.49). Hence this command and the resulting faith will be firmer, more intense and more lasting, according as the faith is more loved and considered as a good thing, according as we cling to God and place our hope in him. Thus *the values of the faith are to be pondered* and the benefits: that it is just, equal? And good to adhere to the first truth and to give pious submission of the intellect to a loving Father; that it helps to believe in Christ revealing himself; that the religion, which we embrace in faith, a good conscience, fortitude among the miserable events of this life, moral beauty....

Moreover, it is of the greatest importance in order to foster firmness and continuation of faith in adolescents and those who are suffering not only to know these values in a speculative way, but also *to have experienced them affectively*.⁸

Finally, for the one who must teach the people, or for a Christian adult who wishes (and must) to give an account of what he believes; also for someone who wants to give a satisfactory answer to difficulties and objections that may arise: Apologetics is absolutely necessary.

52. The relations between Theology and Apologetics. By attending to principles and method: *The principles of the science of Theology* are the truths of faith; the principles of Apologetics are truths of the natural order—philosophical, historical, experimental....

The method of truth in theology is based on divine revelation, that is, on the sources containing it—Scripture and Tradition; the method of proof in Apologetics is based on natural reason.

Theology supposes faith, and the man who did not have faith would be a pseudo-theologian; but Apologetics makes faith possible, inasmuch as it builds its rational foundation. Therefore Theology is for believer; Apologetic is directed completely to unbelievers whom it intends to convince.

If Apologetics at times considers the same truths as dogmatic Theology, v.gr., the divinity of Jesus Christ and teaching, it does it from a different formal object; namely, Apologetics inasmuch as they are known and demonstrated by historical-philosophical arguments of reason, dogmatic theology inasmuch as they are known and demonstrated from divine revelation. But if to some extent dogmatic questions are mingled with apologetic ones, especially in the treatise on the Church, at the proper time that will be explained; but you should completely distinguish between the two kinds, until the custom grows stronger of inserting the dogmatic treatise on the Church or on the mystical Body of Christ after the treatise on the Incarnate Word and his Grace.

53. Nevertheless Apologetics must be said to pertain to Theology or to be a theological task or theological function: not only by reason of the object, because the truths, which both disciplines treat and affirm, are often the same, v.gr., Christ the Lord, the Church..., although they are considered under a different aspect and are affirmed under a different motive; but, and especially, because *the task of dogmatic Theology is to defend and to justify its own principles*, just as any supreme science does, like Metaphysics (which is not subalternate to others), since its principles

8. See M. Nicolau, *La virtud de la fe en las obras del B. Avila*: Mnfr 17 (1945) 236-252.

are not per se evident.⁹ Therefore the function of theology is to justify and defend divine faith itself and its dependence on the magisterium of the Church, which is what is established by Apologetics.

Therefore just as rational Metaphysics defends its own principles, among which are those that make fast human knowledge (by Criteriology and Epistemology); so also supernatural Metaphysics (Theology) defends the supernatural knowledge of faith: its possibility and credibility, by treating (with supernatural Epistemology or Criteriology) the possibility of divine revelation and the criteria necessary to recognize true revelation and how these criteria are fulfilled in Christian-Catholic religion.

Likewise the function of theology is *to show the properties of faith*, among which this one should be mentioned and defended: *that faith is reasonable*, credible; therefore Theology has to prove that this property pertains to faith, and it does it with rational arguments, as when it demonstrates the existence of God: the arguments are from reason, but the consideration is theological.¹⁰

54. Therefore in *apologetic Theology* the common theological norms are valid, that is, those that are suitable for it; certainly the task of the apologetic theologian will be first of all to find and establish the doctrine of the Church's Magisterium concerning Apologetics and concerning the apologetic theses, and to allow himself to be led by them as *positive* norms, not merely negative, as for Christians philosophy, for example, in a definition of accidents and the person. However, the demonstrations do not proceed from the Magisterium of the Church or from revealed doctrine as such, because, since it wants to demonstrate precisely, it would be a vicious circle.

Therefore apologetic Theology operates *under the leadership of faith and the Magisterium of the Church*, but it does not argue from faith or from the Magisterium of the Church.

55. Apologetics also, by demonstrating the reasonableness of faith, demonstrates indirectly the principles of dogmatic Theology, so that it can be said to be a science also in the sense of some who give this name only to those sciences in which non-evident principles are proved. Thus Apologetics can be said in this sense the logical, mediated and extrinsic

9. S.Th., I, q. 1, a. 8. See *In 1 Sent. Prolog.* q.1 a.3 q.3 sol.II. On the opinion of Scotus concerning the defense of the principles in theology, see Ae. Magrini, O.F.M., *Io. Duns Scoti doctrine de scientifica Theologiae natura*: Ant 27 (1952) 507ff.

10. This was the way of proceeding of the scholastics. See v.gr. L. de Molina, *Comment. in 1 Divi Thomae* q.1 a.2 disp.1; Domin. Bañez, *Scholastica commentaria in 1 Partem* q.1 a.8. Suarez considers credibility in his treatise *de fide* d.4.

foundation for Theology. But the immediate and intrinsic foundation for dogmatic Theology, the revealed object itself, *is not given by Apologetics, it is given by faith*; just as the knowledge of natural being, for one who is not a skeptic, is not given by Epistemology—it is given by natural knowledge, by the activity before Criteriology.

56. Conclusion. If Apologetics has a material object different from that of other philosophical and historical sciences, it will be a true science and independent of them; if it also has a different formal object than dogmatic Theology, because it knows its object inasmuch as it is demonstrable by philosophical and historical arguments (but not from divine revelation) it will also be a science different from dogmatic Theology. This is *apologetic science*, which seeks to find and prove from outside to inside the fact of divine revelation and the institution of the infallible Magisterium of the Church.

In a different way *apologetic Theology* which, as a demanding function of Theology, from the inside to the outside, under the leadership of the faith and the Magisterium of the Church, does not wish to find but merely to demonstrate and to show the credibility of the fact of revelation and the institution of the Magisterium. This is also a discipline different from the dogmatic treatises, since it demonstrates things differently than the way it is done in dogmatic treatises, that is, it has a formal object different from that of dogmatic Theology; but it is a task or *function of the same theological science*.¹¹

57. Another treatise of fundamental Theology. The treatise *on the sources containing revelation, or on Tradition and Scripture*, is the foundation for dogmatic Theology, because for Theology it is worthwhile to know where revelation is contained, if in fact dogmatic Theology, as we said, establishes its demonstrations from divine revelation.

But since the categories or seats of arguments in Theology are called *theological places*, therefore this thesis is also called *on the theological places*; because the principle and proper seats of arguments are Tradition and Scripture. It *helps also, before one enters more deeply into dogmatic Theology, to have weighed carefully its methodology, as a quasi theological Logic*.

This treatise *pertains to dogmatic theology*, because it investigates the dogma itself concerning the sources of revelation, and it demonstrates from revelation and faith, which has already been known and justified

11. Opinions about the nature of fundamental Theology (Apologetics) and its relations with dogmatic Theology are reviewed by Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.65-70.

though Apologetics. Therefore it is *the quasi intrinsic foundation of dogmatic Theology*, and is of the same nature as dogmatic Theology; but the foundation of a building is rightly said to pertain to the building. But Apologetics is *the logical and quasi-extrinsic foundation* for dogmatic Theology, because it proceeds in a different way.

Hence fundamental Theology comprehends *Apologetics* and *the treatise on Tradition and Scripture*, the quasi foundation for dogmatic Theology, but in different ways; and fundamental Theology and Apologetics are not to be identified, unless it is done in an inadequate way.

58. Proportion between fundamental Theology related to Theology, and Criteriology and Ontology related to the rest of Philosophy. Fundamental Theology is related to Theology as Criteriology and Ontology to the rest of Philosophy.

For a) Criteriology and Ontology are *parts of Philosophy*; fundamental Theology is a *part of Theology*.

b) Criteriology *does not necessarily suppose real skepticism or real methodical doubt* about the ability of our faculties to know the truth; indeed it has a natural conviction about the reality of being and about the knowing power of our faculties. Fundamental Theology *does not include an initial doubt about the Catholic faith*, but it has the conviction, which is at least common, about the reality of the truths of faith and about their cognitive value with the help of faith and of the Magisterium of the Church.

c) Criteriology *studies the cognitive value of our faculties*. Fundamental Theology *studies the value of the demonstration of divine revelation by Jesus and the Magisterium of the Church*.

d) Criteriology inquires into *the criteria of certitude*. Fundamental Theology asks *which arguments demonstrate validly and certainly the fact of revelation and the infallible Magisterium of the Church*; also, fundamental Theology inquires into the theological places or *the sources of certain argumentation for dogmatic Theology*.

e) Ontology considers the *more general principles about being, and hands on more useful notions for the rest of Philosophy*. Fundamental Theology considers the more general nature of credibility and the obligation to believe... *in all divine revelation and all propositions of the Church*; and it hands on her more general and useful notions: namely, of religion, revelation, supernatural reality, mystery, miracles, prophecies, Messiah, martyrs, infallibility, things that are a necessary means, inspiration, and so forth.

59. The two ways of Apologetics. The apologetic demonstration can be made by beginning from the contemporary fact of the Church, which is easy to see; indeed in this way many persons, especially the less educated, are led to a knowledge of the truly valid motive for the credibility of the Catholic faith. For the Church “by herself, with her marvelous propagation, eminent holiness, and inexhaustible fruitfulness in everything that is good, with her Catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and perpetual

motive of credibility and an irrefutable testimony of her divine mission. Thus, like *a standard lifted up among the nations*, she invites to herself those who do not yet believe and at the same time gives greater assurance to her children that the faith that they profess rests on solid ground” (D 3013-3014).

Thus by an analysis of the fact of the Church, and at the same time by concluding by way of reasoning, one can establish the divine origin of the infallible and authentic magisterium of the Church, and arrive at its historical source and *of going back* to the founder himself, Jesus Christ, whose very credible and divine revelation will be demonstrated and appear to all as deserving of belief... Therefore this is the *regressive* and *ascending* way.


60. Another way is *historical and chronologically progressive*, whereby anyone from a historical examination of the life of Jesus Christ concludes to the certain fact of divine revelation made known by him (*a Christian demonstration*); and from that he inquires into the characteristics of the institution of Christ in order to continue his work, so that finally he may arrive at certain conclusion about the institution of the Catholic Church as the guardian and teacher of the revelation of Jesus Christ (*a Catholic demonstration*).

We will follow this road which, since it follows the historical and Chronological order, seems to be more suited to arrange all the facts and arguments in a scientific order.

But as an introduction to the demonstration of the fact of Christian revelation, and as a defense against adversaries, it will be necessary to consider *the theory of revelation*, whereby its concept and importance are applied more easily later to the concrete order. And since the revelation itself founds supernatural religion, which is what we are going to treat, it will be necessary first to treat *religion*, so that we can know the fact of natural religion (*a religious demonstration*).

61. Here is an overview of the treatise on fundamental Theology and on dogmatic Theology:

61. Division of Fundamental and Dogmatic Theology:



General bibliography for all Apologetics

62. Besides the authors listed in n. 34-37, which treat all theology in general, the following can also be consulted:

Aliberch, Sebastianus, *Novissimum Breviarium de locis theologicis, praeposita de Theologiae prolegomenis disquisitione*³ (Vici 1891)

Beni, Arialdo, *La vera religione* (Florence 1949), *La vera Chiesa* {Cipriani, Settimio, *Le fonti della Rivelazione*} (Florence 1953).

Brinktrine, J., *Offenbarung und Kirche*², 2.t. (Paderborn 1947-1949).

Brunsmann, Iohannes X., S.J., *Lehrbuch der Apologetik*² 2.t (St. Gabriel bei Wien 1930).

Calcagno, Franciscus X., S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis. VI. I. Cursus Theologici a Professoribus Facultatum Cheriensis et Kurulitanae exarati* (Naples 1948).

Casanovas, Ignacio, S.J., *Conferencias apologeticas*, 2 t. (Barcelona 1950).

Cotter, Anthony C., *Theologia fundamentalis*² (Weston 1947).

Didiot, Jules, *Logique surnaturelle objective* (Paris-Lille 1892).

Dorsch, Aemil, S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae fundamentalis*²⁻³, 2 t. (Innsbruck 1930) [T.III: *De inspiratione S.Scripturae*² 1927].

Falcon, Joseph, S.M., *La crédibilité du dogme catholique. Apologétique scientifique*² (Paris 1948).

Felder, Hilarinus, O.M.Cap., *Apologetica sive Theologia fundamentalis in usum scholarum*², 2 t. (Paderborn 1923).

Garrigou-Lagrange, Reg., O.P., *De revelatione per Ecclesiam catholicam Proposita*⁵, t. 2 (Rome 1950).

Guthberlet, G., *Lehrbuch der Apologetik*⁴, 3. T (Münster 1914).

Goebel, Bernardin, O.M.Cap., *Katholische Apologetik* (Freiburg Br. 1930).

Hettinger, Franz, *Lehrbuch der Fundamentaltheologie. Dritte, neu bearbeitete Auflage von S. Weber* (Freiburg Br. 1913).

Kneib, Philipp, *Handburch der Apologetik* (Paderborn 1912).

Lang, Albert, *Fundamentaltheologie*, 2 t. (Munich 1954).

Marxuach, Francisco de P., S.J., *Origen divino de la Iglesia y de su dogma* (Barcelona 1925).

- Mazzella, Camillus, S.J., *De religione et Ecclesia praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae*⁶ (Prati 1905).
- Michelitsch, Antonius, *Elementa Apologetica sive Theologiae fundamentalis*² (Graecii et Viennae 1921).
- Ottiger, Ignatius, S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis*, 2 v. (Freiburg Br. 1897-1911).
- Schiffini, Sanctus, S.J., *De vera religione seu de Christi Ecclesia eiusque munere doctrinali* (Senis 1908).
- Specht, Thomas, *Lehrbuch der Apologetik oder Fundamentaltheologie*² (edited by G.L. Bauer) (Regensburg 1924).
- Van Laak, H., S.J., *Institutionum Theologiae fundamentalis Repetitorium* (Rome 1921).—There are different works of the same author where he developed more at length what is contained in the *Repetitorium*. These contain all: *Institutiones Theologiae fundamentalis*; among which is Treatise I: *De Theologiae generatim*; Treatise II: *De religionis revelatione in abstracto considerata...*; Treatise III: *De revelatione christiana*.
- Yelle, G.-Fournier, R., S.S.S., *Apologetica* (Montreal 1945).
- Yelle, G., *De Ecclesia et locis theologicis* (Montreal 1945).
- Weber, Simon, *Christliche Apologetik in Grundzüge für Studierende* (Freiburg Br. 1907).
- Zigliara, Thomas Maria, O.P., *Propaedeutica ad Sacram Theologiam in usum scholarum seu Tractatus de ordine supernaturali*⁵ (Rome 1906).

Historical outline of Apologetics

63. L. Maisonneuve, *Apologétique*: DTC 1,1533-1580; X.M. Le Bachelet, *Apologétique. Apologie*: DAFC 1,189-225; G. Bareille, *Apologistes*: DTC 1,1580-1602; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.76-117; Tanquerey, I^a, 36-90; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. Fundam.* N.80-94; K. Werner, *Geschichte der apologetischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie*, 5 v. (Schaffhausen 1861-1867).

64. Since the Christian religion from the beginning seemed to be an exclusive religion, opposed to the other religions, contradicting the vices of nature, from the beginning it had to defend itself from the pagans and Jews, and at the same time show its own claims whereby it wished to be accepted as the only legitimate religion. This of course was the source of the ancient Apologetics, which was not only defensive and negative, but also expository and positive.

65. **The early period.** Jesus Christ, having proposed his divine mission, against the unbelieving Jews did not fail to give *the argument from his own personal charism* of a holy and truthful emissary (John 7:18; 18:14...); but to justify directly his own legation *he appealed to the prophecies of the Old Testament* fulfilled in himself, since the Scriptures themselves are what give testimony to him (John 5:39.46), and it was necessary that everything should be fulfilled that was written about him in the law of Moses, in the prophets and in the Psalms (Luke 24;44; see Luke 24:23-25...); or Jesus appealed in a special way to his *miraculous works*, which he performed, that they might believe his works, because the works that he did gave testimony to the fact that the Father had sent him (John 5:36; 10:38; 14:10-13...); or he invoked the fulfillment of the prophecies made by himself, so that when it happened they would believe in him (John 14:29; 13:19; 16:4; Matt. 24:23-25...); or as a sign by *antonomasia* he appealed to the greatest miracle—*his own resurrection* as a sign that was given to an unbelieving and adulterous generation (Matt. 12:38-40; 16:1-5).¹

66. Because of the miracles the Apostles and disciples believed (John 2:11; Matt. 14:33; John 3:2; 11:47; 12:11...); likewise the Apostles, while preaching the mission and work of Jesus, invoke as a witness to the Jews the fulfilled prophecies and the resurrection of Jesus, because God fulfilled what he had foretold through the mouth of all the prophets, namely, that the Messiah would suffer (St. Peter: Acts 3:18...); and the Israelites, ignoring Jesus and the words of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath, fulfilled the judgment of God... fulfilling everything that had been written about

1. M. Tual wrote about the apology of Jesus Christ himself, *Jésus-Christ son propre apologiste* (Paris 1924).

him (Acts 13:27-29). Thus St. Paul preached to the Jews, announcing the promise which had been given to their fathers, since this is what God fulfilled for their children by raising Jesus from the dead... Acts 13:32f.). When the Apostles preached this to the Gentiles and to all peoples, the Lord worked with them and confirmed their words by the following signs (Mark 16:20).²

The apostolic Fathers insist on the fulfillment of the prophecies of the O.T. concerning the Messiah and concerning the New Covenant or plan of salvation.

67. *The following apologists*, in the second century, which has been called the *apologetic century*, had to concentrate on the same points, especially against the Jews, for whom this argument was especially effective. But also the calumnies of the Gentiles had to be refuted, namely that the Christians would be atheists, if they did not worship the visible gods; that they were dangerous to the State and to the Emperors, whom they refused to worship as gods; that they committed abominable crimes, that they ate the flesh of children, that they hated the human race, that they adored a crucified man... These charges and other similar ones had to be refuted. This is what the apologists did *with a correct exposition of the doctrine and a direct refutation of the calumnies*: the author of the Letter to Diognetus, St. Quadratus (*Apologia*, ca. 124), Aristides (*Apologia*, ca. 140), St. Justin, the skilful prince of apologists (*Apologia, Dialogue with Trypho*, the middle of the 2nd century), Tatian (*Adversus graecos oratio*, ca. 165), Athenagoras (*Ad Autolyicum*, ca. 181), St. Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses, Demonstratio praedicationis evangelicae*), Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, ca. 180-192), Tertullian (*Apologeticus*, a.197), Hermias (*Irrisio gentilium philosophorum*).

68. *Miracles also*, as in the apostolic period, are used for the proof. But because the miracles could be supposed by the Jews to have been performed by Beelzebub or by the Gentiles by magic of some kind, signs were developed whereby true and genuine miracles could be recognized, especially their effects and end.³ And not just physical miracles, but also *moral miracles* of the conversion of the world and the spread of Christianity, in spite of the persecutions, were able to be put forth as proof; hence there is the famous saying of Tertullian: "*We are of yesterday and now we have filled the world and all your things*—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market

2. On the apologetics of the Apostles, see M. Tual, *Les Apôtres Apologistes du Christ* (Paris 1926).

3. Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 22: R 278.

places, castles, the mob, courts, palaces, the senate, the forum: we have left for you only the temples....”⁴ And there is the argument of martyrdom and the holiness of Christians: “Crucify us—torture us—condemn us—destroy us! *Your iniquity is the proof of our innocence. For this reason God permits us to suffer these things.* In fact, by recently condemning a Christian maid to the pander rather than to the panther, you confessed that among us a stain on our virtue is considered worse than any punishment or any form of death... *We become more numerous every time we are hewn down by you: the blood of Christians is seed.*”⁵

Also *internal criteria* from an examination of the doctrine, from its sublimity and from the satisfaction of man’s desires are often put forward; the summary of these is found in the famous saying of Tertullian: *O testimony of the soul, which is by natural instinct Christian!*⁶

69. 3rd to 5th centuries. Among the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the 3rd to the 5th centuries the following especially should be mentioned:

Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150 to ca. 220), from whom there are the *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, *Paedagogus* (after the year 195), *Stromata* (ca. 210), in which, while he is fighting paganism, by making known its empty cult and not omitting the historical arguments from prophecies and miracles, he praises how the teaching of the philosophers is a guide to Christ, in whose religion is found full satisfaction and perfect joy.

Origen (185-254) wrote *books against Celsus* (a. 248), relying on the miracles of Christ and of Christianity and also on the prophecies.

Lactantius (+ ca. 320), as a Tullian Christian humanist well known for his eloquence, wrote *Divinarum institutionum libros VII* (305-310), in which he refutes the sects of the Gentiles and their philosophy.

Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 265-340), just as he is “the father of ecclesiastical history,” so has he also been called “the father of Apologetics”; for, everything solid which is wont to be proposed today can be found already in him. He wrote *Praeparationis evangelicae libros XV* (a. 315-320) and the *Demonstrationis evangelicae libros XX* (after a. 315-320).⁷

70. But St. Augustine (354-430) must receive special mention; for he wrote several outstanding apologetic works: *De vera religione* (a. 389-391),

4. *Apologet.* 37: R 279.

5. *Apologet.* 50: R 285.

6. *Apologet.* 17: R 275.

7. On some of the writers of this period, like Eusebius of Caesarea, Arnobius, Lactantius, Athanasius of Alexandria, Maternus see, Joseph-Rhéal Laurin, O.M.I., *Orientations maîtresses des Apologistes chrétiens de 270 à 361*. Doctoral dissertation (Rome 1954).

De utilitate credendi (a. 391-392), *De fide rerum quae non videntur* (a. 400), by showing the rational nature of faith and its necessity and values. But his major work which is called *The City of God* (in 22 books) (a. 413-426), where he examines the plans of divine Providence in the course of history and inquires into the causes of the ruin of paganism: For the abandoned pagan religion was not the cause of the fall of the empire, but the victory of the advancing City of God. Polytheism could not provide happiness and temporal prosperity, it was useless for this; and it was conquered by the City of God evolving itself against the City of the devil; these are two kingdoms opposed to each other. But with the help of God the City of God triumphs. It has grown in a marvelous way, and that alone is already a miracle, even if it had not been propagated by any other miracles; and the Church herself is an argument for her truth. St. Augustine, of course, knows and in fact uses very effectively the arguments from prophecies and the physical miracles; but in order to use them more efficaciously and to anticipate objections, which could be made from the deceptions of magic and from false miracles, he makes great use of the criterion from conversions and the effects of holiness, etc., which have been the result of the Christian religion.

71. The Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages the victory of Christianity had already been publicly secured. Hence the controversies are not so much against the pagans, as against particular sects, which are attacked, especially the Jews and the Mohammedans. St. Isidore of Spain (ca. 1033-1109) is eminent in this and also St. John Damascene (in the first half of the 8th century).

Among the scholastics, St. Anselm (ca. 1033-1109) recognized the theological function of justifying the faith to unbelievers, desiring *to show them rationally how irrationally they hate us.*⁸ Among the other scholastics apologetic moments are also found, especially when they explain the teaching about the faith and its certitude.⁹ But Apologetics as an independent science does not yet exist.

72. In St. Thomas¹⁰ apologetics or the defense of the faith it taken into consideration and is a theological function. Theology does not prove its own principles (which it receives from the knowledge of God and from revelation), but since it is a supreme science, as Metaphysics is, it is proper to it *to dispute with anyone who denies its principles, by arguing if the*

8. See *Epist.* 2,41: ML 158,1193.

9. Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, n. 90, has a bibliography on this matter.

10. Garrigou-Lagrange presents the teaching of St. Thomas, *De revelatione*⁵ I p.91-95.

adversary concedes something of those things which are had by divine revelation... (thus therefore if it has to do with Jews, Mohammedans... who admit some of the things that are had through divine revelation); but if the adversary admits none of them, there is still a way to answer the difficulties that he raises, by pointing out to him that they are false or not necessary....¹¹ The Angelic Doctor also demonstrates *philosophically the preambles of faith*, and he has confidence in that proof. His great apologetic work is contained in the *Summa contra Gentiles*.¹²

St. Thomas wrote the *Summa contra Gentiles* against the Averroists, who valued highly the philosophy of Aristotle. The holy Doctor uses the teaching of Aristotle in those things not contrary to the faith, and also with intrinsic arguments he demonstrates the philosophical preambles for faith; but he shows its credibility not in a negative way, because no truth of reason contradicts the truth of faith, but in a positive way from physical miracles, from the intellectual miracle in the wisdom and eloquence of the Apostles, and from the amazing conversion of the world to Christianity (Book I, ch. 6).

73. Among those fighting against the sects of that time, worthy of special mention is Raymundus Martí (+ 1286), who produced a famous work, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Iudaeos* (a. 1276-1278): there he defends the divine revelation made by Jesus Christ, in whom the predictions of the O.T. are verified and he proposes them excellently and abundantly.

This author, born in Subirats (Catalonia), because of a commission of the Dominican Chapter held in Toledo in the year 1250, studied the Arabic language, and afterwards was sent as a missionary to the Saracens in Tunisia. He understood Arabic, Chaldean and Hebrew, in which he was very proficient. Among his various catechetical works, the most famous is the *Pugio fidei* which was written in both Latin and Hebrew: in the first part he proves that God exists; in the second part against the Jews, that the Messiah has already come; in the third part that the faith of Christians is the faith of the prophets of the O.T.¹³ He was accurate in citing the doctrines he refuted, as even the Jews acknowledge.

Also we wish here to remember *the Jews converted to Christianity*, who wrote in favor of their new religion against Judaism. They were Paulus

11. I, q. 1, a. 8.

12. See N. Balthasar and A. Simonet, *Le plan della "Somme contre les Gentils" de S. Thomas d'Aquin*: RevNéoscholPh 32 (1930) 183-210.

13. There is also the edition of Lipsiae 1687. Already before Raymundus Martí, as an apologist against the Jews, mention should be made of St. Martinus, Legionensis (+ 1203). For more on him, see A. Viñayo, *S. Martin de Leon y su Apologética antijudía* (Madrid 1948).

Avarus Cordubensis, Petrus Alfonso, Hieronymus de Santa Fe, Paulus de Santa María (Salomón Ben Levi), who occupies a large part in the apologetics of that time.¹⁴

74. Among the apologists active at the time of humanism, one to be mentioned is Hieronymus Savonarola, O.P. (1452-1498), who in his book, *Triumphus crucis seu de veritate fidei* (a. 1497), extols the value of faith from its effects of holiness in the Church; in the 19th century Cardinal Deschamps made use of it to produce his own apologetics from the fact of the Church.

Afterwards Ludovicus Vives (1492-1540) composed his *De veritate fidei christianae libros quinque* (published in 1543).¹⁵

75. **From the reformation in the 16th century.** Against the reformers of the 16th century the defense and apologetics had to be about the truths denied by them and especially about the true Church of Christ (which they said ceased to exist) and the notes needed to know it; likewise concerning the traditional magisterium of the Church, relying of course on the Holy Scriptures, whose theological worth was acknowledged, and on the writings of the Fathers, especially those of the first four centuries, since—as they said—at that time the Church had not ceased; thus therefore the human worth of the documents of the Fathers was recognized. Hence the controversialists use these documents and, besides the dogmas denied by the Protestants, they insist on the apologetics of the Church and on the criteria for discerning which books are sacred. Among the controversialists the most famous was St. Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) who is the author of *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei*; another one is St. Francis de Sales (1567-1622).

76. In the middle of the 16th century Bl. John of Avila (1499-1569), an outstanding preacher and excellent ascetical author, developed especially in his *Audi, filia*, ch. 32-42, his *Christian* apologetics, by indicating the motives of credibility that are scientifically valid and at the same time can move the will to faith; among other motives, besides the miracles of the Lord, he cites other moral miracles known from the effects of holiness and from the spread of the Christian religion.¹⁶

14. Among the more recent works pertaining to this argument are the following: F.Cantera, *Alvar García de Santa María. Historia de la judería de Burgos y de sus conversos más egregios* (Madrid 1952); J.M Millás Vallicrosa, *Yehuda Ha-Levi, como poeta y apologeta* (Madrid 1950); L. Serrano, O.S.B., *Los conversos Don Pablo de Santamaría y Don Alfonso de Cartagena* (Madrid 1942).

15. See Pablo Graf, *Luis Vives como apologeta* (translated from German by J.M. Millás) (Madrid 1942).

16. See M. Nicolau, *La virtud de la fe en las obras del B. Avila*: Manr 17 (1945) 239-242.

The part that Melchior Cano, O.P. (ca. 1509-1560) played in the *organization* of the methodology of theology and in explaining its apologetic worth should not be forgotten; he wrote *De locis theologicis libros XII*,¹⁷ where he argued for the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, of the councils, of the traditions... and for scientific rules.

Other Dominicans also contributed very much to the development of Apologetics, like Ludovicus Granatensis (1504-1588) in his *Introducción del simbolo de la fe*, Bartholomaeus Medina (+ 1580), Domincus Bañez (1528-1604). The latter is also eminent in Ecclesiology.

77. Generally speaking, the scholastics of the 16th and 17th centuries advanced apologetics or they treated *the agents of divine faith*, in this theological treatise, while they had to show the properties of the act of faith, among which are its reasonableness and credibility.¹⁸ Thus these scholastics:

a) Insist strongly on the argument of the moral order, v.gr., of the conversion of the world and the spread of Christianity (after St. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, Book I, ch. 6) and on the consent of so many peoples; or by using the intrinsic arguments from the suitability and the sublimity of Christian doctrine, especially after Francis Suarez (1548-1617).¹⁹ Thus Gregory de Valentia (1549-1603) extols the credibility of faith by using both arguments.²⁰

And this is not surprising: for, when they do it, not immediately to demonstrate the fact of revelation, but to show that the doctrine proposed by the faith is credible, it is helpful to begin with the considerations that are connected with the doctrine. Likewise they want to show what moves the will to command assent, and these moral motives push more strongly. The example of St. Augustine and his influence was present so that the scholastics at this time acted in this way.

b) These authors often proceed in the demonstration of credibility by considering the *convergence of the arguments or evidence*, whether certain or probable. Thus often they do not press the force of the argument so that in each case they come to full certitude, but they are content with probability. For, with the solidarity of the arguments and their mutual strength they demonstrate unanswerably the credibility, which must be

17. On this work A. Lang wrote, *Die loci theologici des Melchior Cano und die Methode des dogmatischen Beweises* (Munich 1925). And recently on the nature of Theology according to M. Cano, E. Marcotte, O.M.I., *La nature de la Théologie d'après Melchior Cano* (Ottawa 1949).

18. See F. de B. Vizmanos, *La Apologética de los escolásticos postridentinos*: EstEcl 13 (1934) 418-446.

19. *De fide* d.4 s.3 n.2.

20. See J. Espasa Signes, *El proceso apologetico según Gregorio de Valencia* (Valencia 1946).

given to faith necessarily from divine Providence; therefore they readily finish with the words of Richard of St. Victor: "Lord, if there is an error, we have been deceived by you; for, these things have been confirmed in us by such signs and prodigies that could be accomplished only by you."²¹

78. The development of recent Apologetics. In recent times, under the influence of the apologies for Christianity against the deists (*E. Herbert Lord Cherbury*, + 1648), against naturalism (*Spinoza*, + 1677) and indifferentism, that is, those attacking the basis itself and foundation of religion and the fact of supernatural revelation, Apologetics came of age. Thus, after the labors of theologians concerning the credibility of the object of faith, it developed into our scientific *systematic presentation*.

79. The form of a more recent science of Apologetics, now autonomous, is found in the 17th century. In the year 1679 Hugo de Groot (1583-1645), a Protestant, published a book in Paris called *Sensus librorum sex, which he wrote for the truth of the Christian religion in Holland*, and he made reference to a former work published in Amsterdam.

Michael de Elizalde, S.J. (1616-1678, published in the year 1662 in Naples the work, *Forma verae religionis quaerendae et inveniendae*.

80. In France in the same 17th century P.D. Huet (1630-1721), in his book *Demonstratio evangelica* (a. 1679) explains the historical arguments in favor of Christianity, especially from the prophets. Bossuet (1627-1704), in the second part of his book, *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* (1681) developed apologetically the history of the Christian religion. B. Pascal (1623-1662), in his work *Les Pensées*, proposes a proof from moral doctrine, from theoretical doctrine, from miracles, from prophecies... insisting that the unbeliever, by first hearing the arguments that prove the beauty and goodness of the Christian religion, is led to desire the truth of religion; and then other arguments from miracles, etc., should be presented to him... The same Pascal insists that we are led by the tendency of the heart to admit these truths.²²

Many other books were written in the 17th and 18th centuries in favor of religion, especially against naturalism, indifferentism and rationalism.

21. *De Trinitate* 1.1 c.2: ML 196,891.

22. Julien-Eymard D'Angers, O.F.M.Cap. wrote about Pascal especially and about his predecessors, *L'Apologetique en France de 1580 à 1670. Pascal et ses précurseurs* (Paris 1954).

81. The 19th century. Among the apologists of the 19th century those who should be mentioned are: F.R. Chateaubriand (1768-1848), who considers the aesthetic and more external importance of Christianity, together with the sublimity of doctrine in his work, *Le Génie de Christianisme* (1802). Augustus Nicolas (1807-1888) pays more attention to the philosophical motives, although at times he is under the influence of traditionalism; he wrote *Etudes philosophiques sur le Christianisme* (1842) and *L'Art de croire* (1866).

The famous preacher H. Lacordaire, O.P. (1802-1861), extolled the social and moral importance of Christianity in his conferences (*Conférences de Notre-Dame*, Paris 1835ff.); similarly, J. Félix, S.J. (1810-1891) stressed cultural progress (*Le progrès par le Christianisme*, Paris 1860ff.).

82. In England the best known authors are Cardinals Wiseman, Manning,²³ Newman.²⁴ The latter, like the scholastics of the 16th and 17th centuries who used the convergence of arguments and experiences, with a similar argument of converging probabilities with the logical foundation from the principle of sufficient reason, proves for certain the credibility of the Christian religion.²⁵

83. In Spain Iacobus Balmes (1810-1848) produced an outstanding apologetic work; he wrote *Cartas a un escéptico*,²⁶ *El protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilización europea* (1841-1844), just as before he had written a small book, *La religión demostrada al alcance de los niños*. And important apologetic arguments are not lacking in his *El criterio* (ch. 21: Religión) (1845) and in his other writings.²⁷ Also, Donoso Cortés should be mentioned (1809-1853), whose main work was, *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo* (1851). Others excelled in apologetics, like J.M. Cuadrado, Thomas Aguiló, J. Rubió y Ors....²⁸ At a later time there was J. Mendive, S.J. (*La religión católica vindicada de las imposturas racionalistas*⁴, 1888), Ioannes Mir, S.J. (*El milagro, La profecía, Armonía entre la ciencia y la fe*, 1881), and also M. Menéndez Pelayo, especially in his *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*.

23. *The Grounds of Faith* (London 1852).

24. *Grammar of Assent* (1870); *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London 1845).

25. Recently A. Alvarez de Linera wrote about Newman, *El problema de la certeza en Newman* (Madrid 1946), especially p. 43-55, 167-182. Likewise U. Smeets, O.F.M., *L'apologetica del Newman secondo J.H. Walgrave*: *ScolCatt* 79 (1951) 435-449.

26. They appeared in the magazine, *La Sociedad* (March 1843 to September 1844).

27. On the Balmesian apologetic work, see especially I. Casanovas, S.J., *Balmes, su vida, sus obras y su tiempo* (Barcelona 1942) t.2 c.3-6; *Apologética de Balmes* (Barcelona 1953).

28. See R. García y García de Castro, *Los apologistas españoles* (1830-1930) (Madrid 1935).

84. In Germany a famous name was obtained by A. Moehler,²⁹ Doellinger,³⁰ F. Hettinger,³¹ A.M. Weiss, O.P.,³² P. Schanz,³³ as well as some others already mentioned, like Gutberlet, Ottiger... in the general bibliography of fundamental Theology.

In Italy also mention should be made of Manzoni,³⁴ Ventura, Perrone, Mazzella, Zigliara....

85. Cardinal Dechamps in *Belgium* praised the good-natured and psychological influence that the fact of the Church constituted for the demonstration of Catholic truth, as Vatican Council I later said clearly: "In fact, the Church by herself, with her marvelous propagation, eminent holiness, and inexhaustible fruitfulness in everything that is good, with her catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefutable testimony of her divine mission" (D 3013).

Dechamps says that we should pay attention to this fact which is external to us, and from it especially draw an apologetic demonstration; it is not that another traditional way (from the demonstration of the truth of Christian revelation and of the notes of the true Church) is useless or obsolete, but because paying attention to the contemporary reality is very visible and the proof based on it is easier and more evident.

However, for this proof to be successful, *the disposition and preparation* (not a true proof) will be excellent, if someone considers his own internal needs and his own difficulties in obtaining knowledge of the good and the true, but especially with regard to its exercise. In a parallel and correlative line the Catholic religion is found, which gives the answer to these problems and to these needs, which the conscience of each person bears witness to.³⁵

86. Among more recent authors the *so-called method of immanence* has gained ground and there are the following levels:

1) Some proceed in such a way that they adapt themselves to the conditions and prejudices of the time (*the method of adaptation*), but later

29. *Die Einheit der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus* (Tübingen 1825); *Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten* (1832-1847).

30. *Heidentum und Iudentum* (1857); *Christentum und Kirche* (1868).

31. *Apologie des Christentum* (Freiburg 1863-1867).

32. *Apologie des Christentum vom Standpunkte der Sittenlehre* (Freiburg 1879-1889).

33. *Apologie des Christentum* (Freiburg 1887-1888).

34. *Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica* (1834).

35. Hence he says: "Il n'y a que deux faits à vérifier, un en vous, et un hors de vous. Ils se recherchent pour s'embrasser et, de tous les deux, le témoin c'est vous même" (*Entretiens sur la démonstration catholique de la révélation chrétienne* [1857] epigraph).

See also M. Becqué, C.S.S.R., *La méthode apologetique de Cardinal Dechamps*: *NouvRelTh* 69 (1947) 137-150.

in the traditional way they demonstrate the fact of revelation from miracles and prophecies. Thus Ollé-Laprune (1839-1898) and G. Fonsegrive (1852-1917). We begin, they say, from contemporary and familiar ideas, so that man may be disposed to admit the intellectual arguments of the old method; we begin with man himself and his life by showing the tendencies and the moral and intellectual needs that he has, and also the laws whereby his higher moral and intellectual life is governed. But at the same time his impotence to lead a worthy life appears and the need he has for help. Where is the answer to this difficulty? Where is the help? In the Christian religion which teaches the reality of original sin, redemption and grace... Therefore we eagerly engage in the study of religion, we experience it and we prefer it to all other things.³⁶

2) Other promoters of this apologetics of immanence want to demonstrate the fact of revelation only with *subjective criteria*, rejecting the traditional method from miracles as inept, because it suffers from *extrinsecism, historicism and intellectualism* (see treatise II [*De revelatione*] n. 138-141).

3) Finally, other defenders of the method of immanence are the Modernists who, perverting the true notion of religion and revelation, even pervert the true concept of apologetics. On this see the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 2103, 34th edition. See the treatise *De revelatione* n. 138-140).

36. See later the treatise, *De revelatione* n.138; and Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.101f.; Lercher, I n.98.

TREATISE II
ON CHRISTIAN
REVELATION
OR
ON THE TRUE RELIGION

By

Michaelae Nicolau, S.J.

Special bibliography for the treatise “On Christian revelation”

1. See the authors who treat all Theology or who develop a complete Apologetics mentioned above in the Introduction to Theology n. 35-37.

But special books *on the true religion* or *on Christian revelation* have been published by:

Bainvel, I.V., S.J., *De vera Religione et Apologetica* (Paris 1914).

Dieckmann, Hermannus, S.J., *De revelatione christiana tractatus philosophico-Historice* (Freiburg Br. 1930).

Grandmaison, Léonce de, S.J., *Jésus Christ*, 2. T. (Paris 1928).

Lahousse, Gust., S.J., *De vera religione praelectiones theologicae traditae in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi S.J.* (Louvain 1897).

Müller, Josephus, S.J., *De vera religione tractatus theologicus*² (Innsbruck 1914).

Muncunill, Johannes, S.J., *Tractatus de vera religione* (Barcinone 1909).

Pinard de la Boullaye, Henri, S.J., *Conférences de Notre-Dame de Paris 1929-1937*).

Pohl, Wenceslaus, *De vera religione quaestiones selectae* (Freiburg Br. 1928).

Ponce de León, José M., S.J., *Jésus, legado divino fundador de la religión revelada* (Buenos Aires 1935)

Tromp, Sebastianus, S.J., *De revelatione christiana*⁶ (Rome 1950).

Wilmers, Gulielmus, S.J., *De religione revelata libri quinque* (Ratisbon 1897).

Moreover, in order to prove the part especially of the mission and divinity of Jesus, see the authors listed in Book III and for the historiography of Jesus which is presented in n. 769-775 of this volume.

B O O K I

THE THEORY OF RELIGION AND REVELATION

2. Since in this treatise we must treat *the true religion*, and so *revealed religion*, it is necessary first to determine, inasmuch as its relations with revelation must be clarified or their study prepared for. Moreover, the concept of *religion* is so commonly used, since conversation so frequently concerns a religious man, the religion of the people, the philosophy of religion... that such a concept must be said to be truly fundamental and so one that should be treated.

C H A P T E R I

On religion

A R T I C L E I

ON THE NOTION AND NATURE OF RELIGION

S.Th. II-II, q. 81; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.120-176; Brunsmann, *Lehrbuch der Apologetik* I² (1930) 32-139; Descoqs, *Theologia naturalis* I,158ff.; E. Magnin, *Religion*: DTC 13,182-2306.

3. **The notion of religion.** The concept of religion can be grasped: 1) by the way of etymology, b) by the way of philosophy, 3) by the way of history, 4) by the way of psychology.

A) **By the way of etymology** the different opinions about the root of this word are examined. Thus there is a *nominal definition* of religion. The following opinions are classical:

Cicero derives the word from a careful re-reading (*relectio*) of those things that pertain to the cult of the gods:

“... but those who diligently think again and as it were re-read everything that pertains to the cult of the gods are said to be *religious* from the word “re-reading” (*relegete*), like the choosers from choosing, like the lovers from loving, and the knowers from knowing; for in all these words there is the power of reading the same thing, which is the case with religion.”¹

1. *De natura deorum* 2,28.

Lactantius gets the origin of the word from a *binding* or *fastening* (*religatio*) to God.

“With this bond of piety we are tied and *bound* (*religati*) to God, and from this religion itself gets its name... [and so he rejects the opinion of Cicero]... because the name of religion has been derived from the bond of piety, namely, God has bound man to himself and confined him with piety; for, it is necessary that we serve him as Lord and obey him as a Father.”²

St. Augustine was also familiar with the preceding etymology:

“Tending to the one God, I say, and *binding* our souls to him the only one, hence the said religion is believed, and we lack all forms of superstition.”³

But elsewhere he derives the word from *the repeated choice of God* (*iterata electio*), which takes place through religion; for, we have to choose God again, whom we have lost by our negligence:

“... therefore *choosing him again*, from this then the word religion is taken; we tend towards him with love so that when we arrive we may rest.”⁴

But he preferred the prior etymology.⁵

4. Therefore the first and second etymologies, from the way they are explained, seem to be better founded; but, whichever one is finally accepted, regarding the concept of religion in the final analysis *it says a relation to God*, which St. Thomas explains beautifully:

“However, whether religion takes its name from frequent reading, or from a repeated choice of what has been lost through negligence, or from being a bond, it denotes properly a relation to God. For it is He to whom we ought to be bound as to our unailing principle; to whom also our choice should be resolutely directed as to our last end; and whom we lose when we neglect him by sin, and should recover by believing in Him and confessing our faith.”⁶

5. B) By the way of philosophy, or from the philosophical consideration (metaphysical) of God and of human nature, we can proceed in this way to

2. *Divin. Instit.* L.4.28: ML 6,536f.

3. See *De vera religione* c.13 n.111: ML 34,171.

4. *De Civitate Dei* 10,3,2: ML 41,280f.

5. *1 Retract.* C.13 n.9: ML 32,605.

6. II-II, q. 81, a. 1. H. Pinard de la Boullaye also treats the name of religion, *L'Etude comparée des religions*³ (Paris 1929) t.2 c.1 n.304-309.

form a notion of religion:

God, who was the object of consideration in Theodicy, is the supreme being, being from himself, the first cause and creator of all things, and also the conserver and the concurring cause with all other entities, a personal being, also the last end of all things, endowed with infinite majesty and power and every perfection, by his providence disposing all things firmly and sweetly, and always to be revered....

But *man* is a dependent being, contingent, from another, that is, from God, created, always needing God and tending towards Him, needing to be made happy by Him.

This dependence of man on God and the dominion of God over man derive *from the fact of creation*. Thus man, in his total reality, and at every moment, always depends on God, always is a servant of God, always has this real, intrinsic and transcendental (i.e., essential to him) relation of dependence on God. Therefore it is truly ontological and not merely depending on the consideration of the mind. *Therefore the whole idea of religion is based on this relation of dependence of man on God.*

But since man is an intellectual being, included in the moral order, which he must follow freely with his acts of intellect and will: that ontological relation to God requires that man be joined to God with the bonds of intellect and will, and not just according to one faculty but according to all of them. *This moral bond, namely, with the activity of the intellect and will, joining the whole man to God—this is what we call “religion.”*

6. Divisions of religion. 1) Religion can be considered *objectively* and *subjectively*.

If religion is considered *objectively*, or in itself, it is a complex of truths, duties and rites, whereby man is bound to God and in practice acknowledges His supreme excellence and dominion.

If religion is considered *subjectively*, or according as it is in a subject, it embraces the acts of intellect and will and other acts by which a man acknowledges theoretically and practically his dependence on the supreme being. Thus it is a *general virtue*, comprehending all others. Thus one speaks about a man being not very or very much religious, a good religious man or a bad one, according as he gives signs of virtue that are more or less, good or bad (see Jas. 1:26f.).

As a *particular moral virtue*, religion (considered subjectively) is the habit inclining a man to render due *worship* of God as the supreme principle of things and his last end. The motive of this *moral virtue* is the goodness

that is reflected in the submission and reverence shown to God.⁷

7. 2) Religion, by reason of its origin, can be *natural* and *positive*.

Natural religion is a complex of truths, duties and relations to God, which can be deduced from the fact of creation and hence from the essential relation of human nature to God. Worship is determined by the individual or by the public authority, whether domestic or political.

Positive religion is that which by a positive and free disposition and intervention of God or of man is added to natural religion. If his free disposition in the institution of some religion is from God, then the religion is *positive-divine*; but if it is conceived as merely coming from the leader of some natural society, then it is *positive-human*.

In actual positive-divine religion there is added to the relation and foundation of creation, whereby we are *servants* with reference to God, a new relation to the Father of being *an adopted child*, whose real foundation is sanctifying grace.

This sanctifying grace is the root of the intuition of God and of the joyful love resulting from it, which we will have in heaven; and since these surpass the capacity and requirements of all created nature, it follows that this grace is a supernatural reality. But the religion that is ordered to this supernatural grace is called *supernatural*.⁸

Furthermore, divine revelation also is added to the natural religion, which de facto is ordered to this supernatural end of man. But this is also another reason why the actual positive-divine religion, founded on this revelation, is called *supernatural*.

8. 3) *True* and *false* religion.

Having taken into consideration the fundamental religious fact, religion is divided into *true* and *false*, according as it carries out correctly or incorrectly the fundamental and essential dependence of man on a personal God.

But the religion that is fundamentally, or as to its substance, true, can be less correct or false inasmuch as it contains errors about other religious questions (v.gr., the Protestant religion errs about religious authority and the use of the sacraments); and since "any defect makes something bad," such a religion is said to be *false*.

9. Whether there can be several true and legitimate religions.

Natural religion must be one everywhere: for it is founded on human nature alone, which is the same in all men and has the same relations of dependence on God. Hence all religions must contain this natural religion

7. See E. Amann, *Religion (Vertu de)*: DTC 13,2306-2312.

8. On the concept "*supernatural*," see below n. 50f.

as a quasi part and foundation.

Positive religion, depending on the differences of time and place, can be thought to be different, but not in those things that it must contain from natural religion nor in affirming opposite dogmas, but in a variety of positive rights and duties. *De facto*, however, as will be demonstrated, there is only one true positive religion.

10. The elements of religion in the subject. With regard to the subject, there must be in the subject a *recognition* of the excellence of God and of his supreme dominion and likewise a recognition of his own dependence with reference to God. Such recognition is the *intellectual and absolutely essential element* in the moral bond of a *rational* man, which is religion. Historical investigation and psychological investigation into the act of religion also show this.

But this recognition is also a profession, at least internal, of this dependence of man related to God and it includes the *tendency of the will* of man towards God. Therefore this tendency is not a purely practical or pragmatic voluntarism, but a moderate voluntarism, presupposing the act of the intellect.

This act of the will, as a substantial *devotion* to God, is found in every act of the virtue of religion, in adoration, prayer, sacrifice... It is an *essential* act in religion and religion (considered in the subject) consists *formally* in this act. But the act of the intellect, or the always concomitant recognition, is presupposed or *fundamentally* essential.

From these acts of intellect and will there follow in man acts of rational sentiment and acts of the lower faculties (memory, external modesty, gravity, sensible joy, pain, words...); for it is of the nature of religion to ordain the whole man and his acts towards God. Therefore acts of this sort are *connatural* in religion. But are they necessary and essential?

11. If we speak about the concept of religion and pay attention to its *metaphysical essence*, certainly such acts are not necessary and essential, therefore per se a man can be thought to be essentially and radically religious, without abounding in acts of this kind of sentiment and of the sensible faculties.

But if we pay attention to the *physical essence* of religion in man, or as de facto religion is found in him, in a man are found the external manifestations that naturally follow from internal acts, and an external worship in him is necessary; therefore such acts in him are necessary and physically essential.

All of these elements are present if we consider religion *theoretically*. However, in the recognition of dependence on God considered *practically*, practical conformation of life with that recognition of the excellence of God and of our dependence on him must be found. Thus religion considered *practically* includes the *recognition* of God and *de facto the submission of oneself* to God.

12. C) By way of history, the investigation into religion takes place by examining *in a historical and ethnological way*, that is, with the help of the comparison of languages, cultures, social forms..., the relations of men to the supreme being and to superior beings, on which one professes that he is dependent and with whom he wishes to cooperate.⁹

Therefore this being (whether one or many) must be *personal* and distinct from man, for otherwise it would not be possible to enter into communication with him. Hence *pantheism* is not a form of religion.

Totemism is also not a religious form, since a *totem* is something in whose power the members of the same clan participate.¹⁰

13. The following religious forms are found: Lower forms: Animism.¹¹ In this religious form the main idea is the animation and personification of nature and its powers; hence there are myths, theogonies and legends about gods and goddesses...; or also there is the conviction that everything has a soul or spirit (demon). And from that different activities are to be explained that take place in nature and in man.

Fetishism is like animism, inasmuch as it attributes to purely human

9. On the history of religions, W. Schmidt, S.V.D., treated the primitive religions excellently in his work, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee* 7 vol. (Münster 1926-1940); and by the same author there is a compendium on the theories about the origin and formation of religions, *Manual de Historia comparada de las religiones*² (translated from German) (Madrid 1941). Likewise for a description of religions, P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia delle religioni*⁴ 2 vol. (Torino 1954); briefly and solidly J. Huby, *Christus. Manual de historia de las religiones* Barcelona 1947) (translated from the fifth French edition, *Christus. Manuel d'Histoire des religions* [Paris 1927]). Recently F. König, *Christus und die Religionen der Erde. Handbuch der Religionsgeschichte* 3. vol. (Vienna 1951); N. Turchi, *Storia delle Religioni*, 2 vol. (Rome 1954); M. Brillant-R. Aigran, *Histoire des religions*, 5 vol. (Paris 1953ff.). The work should also be mentioned, though it is by a non-Catholic, P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, 4 edited by A. Bertholet-E. Lehmann (Tübingen 1925). N. Marin Negueruela explains at length the theories about religion, *Lecciones de Apologética*⁶ (Madrid 1944) p.1 c.1-4. For the ancient time of Christianity, see K. Prümmer, S.J., *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der altchristlichen Welt* (Freiburg Br. 1941). – H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., clearly explains the method for the comparative study of religions and its history, *L'Etude comparée des religions*² 2 vol. (Paris 1929). – Among ancient works looking at the study of religion worthy of mention are F. Fernández Valbuena, *La religión a través de los religiones* 3 vol. (Madrid-Barcelona 1918); E. Morena Celada, *Historia descriptiva y filosófica de las religiones* 2 vol. (Barcelona 1871); J. Mir Noguera, S.J., *La religión* (Madrid 1899); J. Bricout, *Où en est l'Histoire des religions*, 2 t. (Paris 1911-1912).

10. On totemism, see P. Bougnicourt, *Totemisme*: DAFC 4,1726-1740.

11. See P. Bougnicourt, *Animisme*: DAFC 1,128-146.

instruments extraordinary and superhuman powers, as if a spirit were in them; or it is like magic, inasmuch as it attributes an impersonal power to such instruments.

Manism is the worship of the spirits of the dead (household gods, ghosts of the departed).

Magic is the opinion that attributes extraordinary power whether to things and facts or to men, whereby they can overcome the powers of nature and also take the place of the gods.¹²

Superior forms: Polytheism is the worship of several superior beings.

Henotheism worships one god, as the one god of the people, but not of the whole world.

Monotheism recognizes theoretically and practically only one God for the whole universe.

Therefore, from the preceding historical and ethnological consideration a concept of religion can be expressed as: *the complex of doctrines, duties and institutions towards some supreme being (one or multiple), on whom man declares himself to be dependent and with whom he wishes to be in communication.* This notion of religion, the result of historical study, agrees with the notion arrived at philosophically.

14. This notion of religion can be proved to be *objectively founded*, or at least such as to be strongly confirmed¹³ from the *universality of the religious fact or from the agreement of all peoples.*

For, the investigation into the religion of all peoples shows that the conviction about the existence of a personal supra-sensible power is valid everywhere, and that it is to be revered, placated and invoked. Towards it faith and certain duties are to be fulfilled, and rites and ceremonies are found everywhere whereby the cult of this numinous power is exercised. In a word: everywhere among the nations there is a complex of truths, duties and institutions that are the rule for man's relations with the Supreme Being; everywhere this moral bond brings man into contact with this Being.

But such a universal conviction demands a universal cause, which can only be the objective foundation of the matter and the objective truth of it.

For, this universal conviction, from among all the reasons which can be advanced with verisimilitude, cannot be explained,

a) through ignorance of natural causes, whose effects are attributed

12. See F. Bouvier, *Magie et magisme*: DAFC 3,61-74; L. Gardette, *Magie*: DTC 9,1510-1550.

13. See Pedro Descoqs, S.J., *Praelectiones Theologiae naturalis* I (Paris 1932) I.1 c.2: "To put forward the argument for the existence of God from universal agreement" a.3: "by itself alone does not seem to be an apodictic argument in order to prove the existence of God," p. 198-212.

to spirits (A. Comte), for, when the ignorance has been overcome, the conviction still remains;

b) nor can it be explained by the deprivation of nature seeking and finding delight in a religious culture (Feuerbach), for there are truths about God the lawgiver, judge and vindicator that are less apt to please the senses and which make up a large part of religion;

c) nor is a vague fear of some superior power able to explain religion (Fr. Paulsen), for fear alone and terror, *independently of the idea of a personal God and of the idea of causality*, would create a kind of fatalism, but not a personal God;

d) finally, that universal conviction could not be acquired by teaching and education *alone* by prescindng from the truth of the matter, for those teachers or progenitors who fashion these ideas—repressing human freedom—afterwards, when the truth of the matter has been seen, easily would be open to derision.¹⁴

Therefore that conviction must be acquired because of the perceived objective truth of the matter.

15. You will say that there are atheists, especially in our time, and many others who fight against this conviction about the existence of God.

Response. There are *practical* atheists, i.e., those who live as if there were no God, and many of them; but *theoretical* atheists, i.e., who are persuaded about atheism, are also given and many of them *in name only*, and they imprudently proclaim their unbelief; but in reality and internally such people are not sincere, since the knowledge of a personal God readily presents itself to a man who considers his own nature, and so per se no one can persist in positive atheism for a long time, *except culpably* at least in the beginning; also it does not seem to be possible *per se* to continue through one's whole life in ignorance of the existence of God or in negative atheism.¹⁵

16. Explanations of the universal religious fact. In order to explain this universal religious fact there are different schools and theories. Several are aprioristic and, fashioned in the 19th century, they try to explain things according to the assumptions of naturalism, rationalism, materialism, evolutionism....

Thus the *positivist school* (A. Comte) postulated this order in religious evolution: fetishism, polytheism, monotheism.

The *ethnological school* (J. Lubbock) wishes from primitive atheism through fetishism, idolatry... finally to arrive at theism.

The *animist school* (E.T. Taylor) contends that animism is the principle

14. On this argument treated briefly, see Lercher, *Theologia fundamentalis* n.17.

15. See also on this matter P. Descoqs, *Theologia naturalis* 2 (Paris 1935) s.6 c.1 a.4 th.18 p.466ff.

of religion.

The *manistic school* (H. Spencer) places the origin of religion in worship of the souls of dead parents.

Others, like J.H. King, wanted to explain the origin of the life of religion *through magic*.

Therefore all of these, obviously, postulated religious evolution from lower forms to higher forms.

17. But *A. Lang* (1844-1912) against Taylor, whose animism he had previously embraced, established theism and monotheism as the origin of religion and that in religious evolution there was perversion or devolution to what is worse.

William Schmidt, S.V.D., confirmed the same idea, not with an a priori method by a posteriori, that is, *by the historical-cultural method*, by collecting religious facts from ethnology and the study of cultures and by comparing data with other religious facts in peoples of the same or different culture.

18. Conclusions from the comparative study of religions.¹⁶

1) *There is no people without religion or atheistic* (i.e., without a God in some sense personal). There are some who kept their worship secret and hidden; but this is to be explained from the fact that some visitors narrated the contrary, because doubtless they did not see the worship because they spent very little time with them...

2) *The idea of monotheism and the worship of one God* (God as the author of the world and God as father) *are universal and primitive*. Therefore they are found in peoples of a primitive culture; corrupt religious forms are fewer as the culture is more primitive.

3) *Lower religious forms are not primitive, but coming from abroad*; for, they represent a perversion of the primitive religious idea. This perversion is observed everywhere, not only among primitive peoples, but even more among cultivated peoples (Greeks and Romans); and also among the people of Israel, by its nature prone to polytheism, and among the religions separated from the Catholic Church.

4) *The origin of primitive monotheism is in human nature, inquiring by way of causality, and in a primitive revelation*; this, while proceeding in a scientific way, is a plausible hypothesis.

5) *From all of this, the rational nature of religion is the result, not a sentimental one, from the idea of God as the cause and the father*; hence

16. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione christiana* n.137-142, who explains this matter at great length.

there is personal and rational communication with God: prayer and sacrifice take place in primitive cultures, so that the complete dependence on God is expressed; this is the fundamental idea of religion.

19. D) By way of psychology or from observation or a psychological analysis of religious acts in individuals (not here in clans and peoples, as occurs in history) we can come to a knowledge of the real nature of the religious act.

It is obtained a) *from descriptions* left concerning these acts, v.gr., by St. Augustine, St. Ignatius, St. Teresa of Avila..., distinguishing them by analysis and by explaining them¹⁷; but anyone who wishes to proceed scientifically in this matter must guard against a subjective interpretation coming from prejudices of any kind.

b) It can also be obtained *from investigations* which can be made by careful observation and analysis of *past* religious acts in a rather large number of subjects.¹⁸

c) Finally, *from experiment*, by repeating these religious acts in a laboratory¹⁹; but rightly there is some doubt about these psychological experiments, namely, whether the subjective element has been avoided, and whether the spontaneous intimate nature proper to the religious act has been preserved.²⁰

If with these methods the analysis and observation of religious acts is carried out correctly, without doubt it leads to the proper understanding of the religious act, just as we have explained it above (n. 10).

20. False opinions on the nature of religion. 1) *Kant* erred on the nature of religion by prescind from the recognition of God and from the

17. See G. Wunderle, *Einführung in die moderne Religionspsychologie* (Munich 1922), where he explain in the first part the history of religious Psychology from the written descriptions.

18. A. Bolley proceeds in this way, *Gebetstimmung und Gebet, Empirische Untersuchung zur Psychologie des Gebets, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Betens von Jugendlichen* (Düsseldorf 1930). The author from a collection of questions and responses studies those that favor prayer and determine it; it appears that prayer is an act of the will and at attitude of the *ego* with reference to God, that it is really *a function whereby someone hands himself over to God*. The conclusions seem to be obvious after so many investigations and examination; however, their importance seems to lie in the fact that experimentally and by the positive scientific method they find verified in man what a sound Philosophy and Theology teach about him in opposition to the sentimentalism of the Modernists.

A.M. Wachsmann uses the same method to determine the influence of religion on the life of men, *Das religiöse im Gesamttauf des Seelischen* (Paderborn 1935).

19. For example, K. Girgensohn*, *Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Erlebens. Eine religionspsychologische Untersuchung auf experimenteller Grundlage* (Gütersloh 1930) where you will find an appendix by W. Gruhn* with an extensive bibliography on these studies: *Forschungsmethoden und Ergebnisse der exakten empirischen Religionspsychologie seit 1921*.

20. See E. Raitz v. Frentz, *Das religiöse Erlebnis im Laboratorium*: Stimm 109 (1925) 200-214.

devotion or personal handing over of man of himself to God.

According to Kant, as is known, moral obligation does not proceed from God commanding what must be done, what must be avoided, but from the practical reason of man himself commanding him through an a priori form that something must be done absolutely (*the categorical imperative*: do this, you must do this). Hence the moral obligation is conceived primarily without respect to God and without religion.

And it is not surprising that Kant acts in this way. For, in his system the existence of God cannot be known by pure, theoretical reason; reason attains only the phenomena of things, not the noumena or the very essences; therefore we do not know—he says—things as contingent nor can we argue from them to the certain knowledge of a necessary being, and therefore we cannot arrive at a certain knowledge of our dependence with respect to God. So agnosticism about the existence of God must be professed.

At the same time an examination of internal immanent experience—he says—leads to an admission of the existence of God, as a postulate of practical reason; namely, the existence of God is an indemonstrable proposition, but supposed for a practical end. Of course the categorical imperative (you must do this) *requires freedom of the mind* (if you must, you can); it also *requires the immortality of the soul*, for in this life, because of the struggle with sensibility, the greatest moral perfection and the greatest holiness to which you are tending and to which you are bound by the categorical imperative cannot be realized; finally, *it requires the existence of God* because, since the greatest holiness also requires the greatest happiness (which is not had by holiness alone), some supreme and omnipotent being is required that can produce this happiness.

21. Therefore in this system: a) besides *agnosticism* about the existence of God; b) religion is reduced to a *certain autonomous moralism*; and c) the foundation of religion *is not drawn from the true and ontological relation of dependence on God*.

Furthermore d) it admits a *postulate that is not demonstrated theoretically*; and e) such a moral obligation from autonomous reason, as it is proposed, *would not be a true obligation*: for, there would not be any necessity of acting because of a connection with an end that must absolutely be obtained, that is, with the last end, God; but I would only have to do something in order to respond to a categorical imperative imposed on myself by myself; f) *but the moral order cannot be established independently of God*, for a true moral order looks at human nature by paying attention to all relations and duties

which are derived from it in reference to other things; and human nature truly has an intrinsic and transcendental relation to God from which are derived the duties related to Him: therefore the true moral order looks also to God and cannot be established independently of Him. Moral atheism is impossible.

22. 2) Others consider religion *as a mere special sentiment*, or at least they attribute the most important aspects to this sentiment.²¹

Thus *F.E.D. Schleiermacher* (1768-1834) places the essence of religion in the *feeling* of absolute dependence on the infinite.

A. Ritschl (1822-1889) places it in the *experience* whereby someone feels that he is satisfied by his more sublime tendencies.

W. Wundt (1832-1920) places it in the *feeling* of unity with the suprasensible world.

The Modernists, in general, say that religion comes not from intellectual knowledge, but *from the need of the divine*, which is in the subconscious mind and produces a *religious feeling*. Dogmas and theological propositions are late reflections on this feeling. The teaching of the Modernists is very clearly explained in the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" of St. Pius X in 1907 (see D 3475ff.).

23. Therefore common to these errors is, a) in addition to the *agnosticism* derived from Kantianism, b) that they presuppose a certain *previous feeling about God*.

However, in order to have some feeling about God it is necessary that *an intellectual idea about God precedes it*, as is certain from a balanced and approved Psychology examining the nature of sentiment or feelings. If such an idea has preceded, then indeliberate acts of the will with the accompanying feelings and with the acts of the sensitive appetite can take place; such religious affections can be a great help for a religious life. But we know from experience, especially regarding those individuals whose psychological type is more intellectual, that the religious life of many persons does not begin or always end with affections; but it is directed primarily by judgments of the intellect and by the reasonable submission of the will. On the contrary, there are some who perceive vague religious feelings, of course preceded by some intellectual idea, but they refuse the intellectual assent of faith and submission of the will to God. Therefore mere religious feeling does not constitute the totality of religion nor even a principle part of it.²²

21. See H. Pinard de la Boullaye, *Experience religieuse*: DAFC 1, 1846-1864; and Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.166-172; Lercher, *Theologia fundam.* n.34.

22. For other opinions of lesser importance, see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.166-171.

ARTICLE II

ON THE OBLIGATION OF RELIGION IN GENERAL

S.Th., II-II, q. 80ff.; 3 CG 119; P. Richard, *Indifference*: DTC 7,1580-1594; Lercher, *Theologia fundam.* n.23-31; Dieckmann n.176-180.

24. On the necessity of religion. The necessity of religion can be understood in two ways: the first is the necessity that says *obligation*; and the second is the necessity as the quasi *absolute condition (conditio sine qua non)* required in order to obtain in this life that to which we necessarily tend, that is, *beatitude*. Now we will have to treat both necessities, which are intimately connected with each other, after we have considered the notion and true nature of religion in the previous article. After we have considered both necessities of religion and how they have been developed by Apologetics, then men are more readily disposed to consider the points that are going to be made in the next section.

25. Man has a grave obligation to embrace and practice religion. A *moral obligation* is the necessity of placing (or omitting) an action because of the connection of the action with an end that absolutely must be obtained.

Concerning the notion of obligation, as the name indicates, it is to be a *tie* or bond that necessitates; but it is not a physical bond or physical coercion, nor is it a subjective, necessary, physical tendency, as brute animals are necessitated to perform their actions: all of these involve some physical necessity. An obligation is a *moral necessity*, which obtains its effect through rational knowledge like moral causes; but it is not a hypothetical necessity, that is, on the hypothesis that I may wish to obtain an effect for myself that is not absolutely necessary (v.gr., health, and in order to obtain it a surgical operation is required); but it is an *absolute* necessity, which is wont to be expressed in these words: this must be done, I must, I am bound to do this. However, the necessity to do something is absolute if it absolutely must be obtained and does not depend on a mere choice. Such is our last end to which we are necessarily tending willy-nilly, or such is also that which is the related and necessary means in order to obtain that end.

The obligation of some action is said to be *grave*, if its omission gravely injures the moral order and implies the loss of the last end.

To embrace religion means to hold the dogmas and to have the initial will of observing the precepts that are proposed in religion.

To practice the religion means the actual observance of these precepts; often it refers to the observance of the precepts of worship.

Since now we affirm the grave obligation of practicing and therefore

embracing religion, we are going to treat the complex of acts whereby religion is practiced, including the initial will to observe them without any doubts, but not establishing anything concerning the obligation to perform individual acts.

26. Those who deny the foundation of religion *deny this obligation*, such as atheists, pantheists, agnostics... Likewise those who, like Kant, confuse religion with an autonomous moral law.

But here those deserving of special mention are the *indifferentists (absolute)*, who think that religion is harmful or useless, or those who say that religion is merely useful, not obligatory, whether for man or for the state (*Eudaemonists, Machiavellians*).

Our proposition clearly is in the magisterium of the Church, v.gr., in the Encyclical "*Mit brennender Sorge*": AAS 29 (1937) 148-150; and it is contained implicitly in many documents.

27. *Demonstration.* The acts whereby we embrace and practice religion (assent to the existence of God and to divine truths, hope, love of God, keeping of the natural law established by God, worship of God in adoration, prayer, thanksgiving..., penance if we have offended Him... etc.)—these acts have in themselves *so much* intrinsic goodness and are so in conformity with the rational nature of man, that the omission of these acts in their totality *certainly gravely injures the moral order*, and therefore the most holy God cannot not wish absolutely to command them, and indeed he does so *under punishment of the loss of the last end*. Therefore the complex of these acts, and doubtless the embrace itself of religion, is gravely obligatory.

28. On the obligation of external worship and of public or social worship. *Worship* is the showing of honor. *Internal* worship is constituted by internal acts; but *external* worship uses external sensible acts in order to signify the internal worship.

Public worship is in contrast with private worship. Here it is not taken as if it were exercised in an open and visible place; but in the sense that it is done by a society or in the name of a society. The society or community that is being considered here is civil society and domestic society.

The obligation of external and social worship has been *denied* by: a) many *rationalists*, who ridicule external and social worship, by appealing to John 4:24; *God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit*

and truth¹; b) *socialists*, who want an atheistic state, and *many liberals* who limit the role of the state in religious affairs.

The doctrine of the Church in this matter is clear, v.gr., D 600-601 (on the veneration of images), D 2234 (on acts that are not just internal, against Molinos).

29. Man is obliged to offer external worship. For, worship is an act of a reverent person and should be performed according to his nature.

But a) the nature of man is such that *the internal senses work together with the external manifestations* and they cannot be hidden for a long time, unless great diligence is deliberately at work.²

b) On the other hand, *when the external cult is neglected gradually the internal cult is diminished and extinguished.*

c) Man not only according to his soul, but also *according to his body has everything from God* and in all things must serve him and show him reverence.

Therefore a worship that is also external must be rendered to God by man.

This is confirmed from the history of religions, which shows that external worship is universal and therefore comes from the very nature of man.

30. Man is obliged to offer public and social worship. 1) *God is the supreme author, ruler and last end of both domestic and civil society as such.* Therefore the activity of these societies must be subordinated to him, acknowledge him and worship him.

This worship, obviously, cannot be just internal, because *social activity takes place by a common effort, which cannot be merely internal.* Thus, for example, in the domestic society the education of children pertains to social activity, which requires (regarding religion) that the children be instructed in religion and introduced to the worship of God.

In civil society, work to acquire public and temporal prosperity pertains to social activity as the proximate end. But this *work must be subordinated to the last end*, and thus it must be moderated so that public prosperity is subordinate to the last end; therefore it is to be obtained by licit means and by the preservation of public and private uprightness of morals. Hence many obligations flow from this for aristocrats and magistrates regarding the exercise of religion, for example, to protect the right of the freedom of

1. With these words Jesus does not condemn external worship, since external worship must be done in spirit and truth, certainly if it proceeds not merely externally but from an internal spirit.

2. See 3 CG 119.

true religion and to pass laws that defend good morals, etc.

31. 2) Just as man needs domestic and civil society for his suitable material and temporal development, no less *does he need society for his suitable religious development*; therefore man also from the religious point of view is a social being, that is, he is helped by society in religious exercise and he needs this society.

But *the testimony of history confirms this*; for, men coalesced in societies for the exercise of religion and they had *priests for this*, who both rule them and represent them in matters of religion.

Moreover, there are some vivid religious experiences, which help very much to give meaning to life and so to move the will, which are acquired only in large religious congresses, such as Eucharistic Congresses, pilgrimages to famous shrines (Lourdes, Fatima, Jerusalem...); that is, they are experiences that can be obtained only in a social way.

32. Scholium 1. *In external social worship the tendencies of a community manifest themselves*, and as they are forms of worship which it prefers, thus the religious character of that society is made known. Thus sometimes the religious customs in southern countries are quite different from those that are in some northern countries. Therefore it is true that the national character manifests itself in the social worship. However, this should not be so exaggerated that the religious forms must be accommodated to and applied to the different nations without reference to the common religion. But from religious history it is certain that the historical form of the religions is not necessarily tied to a particular country.³

33. Scholium 2. *Religion and the happiness of man.* Religion is also necessary for man, because without it he cannot obtain happiness in this life; this is certain *from a consideration of the object of the faculties*, which cannot be satisfied without religion.

Thus man's intellect *seeks the true*; but God is the supreme and eternal Truth; man's will *seeks the good*; but God is infinite goodness and holiness. Man's heart *longs for love*; but God is immense Love and the object of unfailling love and the only one that satisfies.

3. On this point, see Ch.M. Schroeder, *Rasse und Religion* (Munich 1937).

ARTICLE III

ON THE OBLIGATION OF POSITIVE RELIGION

34. It is an evident question because of the supreme dominion of God over man that man must embrace the positive religion, which God manifests to him and commands. Therefore this is a consequence from the already stated necessity of exercising religion; in fact, Vatican Council I expressed this corollary in these words: "Since man is totally dependent on God, as upon his Creator and Lord, and since created reason is absolutely subject to uncreated truth, we are bound to yield by faith the full homage of intellect and will to the God who reveals" (D 3008). The same Council condemned those who say that "human reason is so independent that faith cannot be enjoined upon it by God" (D 3031).

Hence man cannot be satisfied with a merely natural religion, if he is certain about the will of God manifesting a positive religion. Nor can he be satisfied if he is only probably certain about the will of God for him; this point will be proved in the following thesis.

Thesis 1. Man is bound to inquire into a positive religion that with the appearance of truth presents itself as manifested by God and prescribed for him.

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.180-186; Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.75-80; P. Richard, *Indifference religieuse*: DTC 7,1580-1594.

35. State of the question. 1) In this thesis *an objective moral obligation* of intellectual investigation into a religion probably manifested by God and prescribed for him is established for the adult person. However, in order for there to be a subjective obligation, it will be necessary that this objective obligation is known for certain.

2) The case is considered in which the manifestation of the divine will is not yet known for certain. That religion is said *to be offered with the appearance of truth*, which presents a true and solid probability of its truth, that is, that it was revealed by God and prescribed for such a man. But the case is otherwise if a religion seems to be absurd from the beginning, or if it contradicts natural religion, or offers no proof to show that it was revealed.

But the Catholic religion will easily present itself with the appearance of truth to the man who considers it. For it is, today especially since there is such ease of communication between peoples, a fact sufficiently manifest as a supernatural society—so spread out in the whole world, since it remains one in government, in the doctrine of the faith, in sacrifice and in the sacraments—so ancient in uninterrupted succession from the

Apostles—flourishing with such great heroic sanctity and charismatic in the miracles that are performed—teaching a sublime doctrine and purity of morals—embracing in her bosom very learned men in great numbers.

3) In a common way it is sufficiently certain about the possibility of this manifestation and prescription of God for men; but this point will be considered later in a scientific way (n. 62-68). Moreover, concerning this present matter, this possibility becomes probable from the fact that almost all religions appeal to this manifestation and prescription. If someone does not admit this, then the thesis would have a hypothetical meaning: namely, if this divine manifestation is possible.

36. Adversaries. *Indifferentists*, either those who say that all religions are equally useless or harmful (*absolute indifferentism*); or those who say that all religions are equally good and legitimate (*universal indifferentism*, see D 2916f.); or those who restrict this legitimacy to some religions, v.gr., Christian religions (*particular indifferentism*, see D 2918). For, if the matter is indifferent, there is no reason why a person is obliged to inquire into it.

Liberalism, extolling the independence of man, says that man has the right to profess any religion he chooses (see D 2915).

Modernists, as we have said, hold religion not so much as the fruit of an intellectual inquiry, but as the manifestation of a feeling, and that it is substantially the same in all religions; therefore there is no obligation to inquire, but only to explore by sentimental experience what is agreeable to each person.

37. Doctrine of the Church. The teaching of the thesis is proposed *explicitly* by Pius IX in his Letter “*Qui pluribus*”: “Indeed, human reason, lest it be deceived and err in a matter of so great importance, *ought to investigate diligently the fact of divine revelation so it can know with certainty that God has spoken* and so render to him, as the Apostle wisely teaches, a rational obedience” (D 2778).

An infidel who does not believe will not be excused for his infidelity, since he has been guided by a less probable opinion (D 2104). This therefore is said, not because he should follow a more probable opinion, since certitude about the fact of revelation is pre-required (see n. 117f.). Therefore a probable knowledge of revelation includes the obligation of

inquiring.¹

This necessity of inquiry in some way is contained *implicitly* in the necessity imposed on all of professing the faith commanded by God, because “we are bound to yield by faith the full homage of intellect and will to the God who reveals” (D 3008); hence it is readily apparent that man is bound to the necessary means (inquiry) so that he can adhere in a reasonable way to the faith.

Theological note.² Since the doctrine proposed in the documents above is taught and accepted in the Catholic Church, and since it does not have a higher qualification, like being *de fide*, rightly it can be said to be *Catholic doctrine*, and therefore this can be said to be the theological qualification of the thesis. For, in this qualification, although sometimes it is vague, those things that the supreme magisterium of the Church wishes to teach are comprehended (therefore they are taught *authentically*), but they are not proposed for belief: like the important ideas in an Encyclical (as above: D 2778), or propositions contrary to those condemned and proscribed, not precisely as heretical (see above: D 2104), or also what is contained in the chapters of Councils and it is not certain that it has been defined, or what is deduced from them by a process of reasoning (as above we concluded from D 3008-3009). For, all of these things are taught in the whole Catholic Church; without doubt they are those points of doctrine “that are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions, so certain that opinions opposed to these same forms of doctrine, although they cannot be called heretical, nevertheless deserve some other theological censure” (D 2880).

38. Proof. 1) *Man, as a servant of God, is bound to the exercise of the religion which is revealed and prescribed for him by God. Otherwise it*

1. “An infidel guided by a less probable opinion, if he fails to inquire, as he is bound to do, sins gravely by not believing, namely, because of his culpable negligence and ignorance, in which the infidelity itself is interpreted to be deliberate...” (D. Viva, S.J., *Damnatae theses...*t.1 [Patavii 1723] p.2 prop.4 Innocent I, n.VII p.200 b). R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi*² (Louvain 1950) p.91-93, recounts, in this obscure matter, different opinions and his own concerning the motives for the condemnation of this proposition (D 2104).
2. On this study of qualifying theologically opinions and propositions it helps to listen to John Maldonado, S.J., a well-known professor at the University of Paris: “[A teacher] like a balance or scales attributes the just weight to each one, and after having evaluated the importance of the arguments, he makes a judgment about the opinions: what is faith, what is opinion, things pertaining to faith, things pertaining to opinion are taken into consideration, what is a heretical proposition, what smacks of heresy, what sounds bad, what is temerarious, what dangerous, what new, what probable, what true. For, this is a judgment in which anyone who excels is a true teacher... Finally, he will form in the minds of his hearers the same judgment that we said must be in the teacher himself. For this is the greatest fruit of hearing, that the student can be a teacher, which will now take place, since he will have a formed and mature judgment; for in this way especially a teacher is distinguished from disciples” (*De ratione Theologiae docendae*; Monum. Paedag. S.J., p. 866).

would detract from the knowledge and veracity of God by not believing; and from his dominion by not doing it.

Therefore man is bound to the means necessary for this exercise. For if one is bound or directed to an end, he is bound also to use the necessary means.

But the means necessary for the exercise of the religion which God has revealed and prescribed for man is to inquire into the religion that with the appearance of truth presents itself as manifested by God and prescribed for him. For this is characteristic of nature—that often it grasps things not suddenly with certitude, but gradually.

Therefore man is bound to inquire into the religion that with the appearance of truth presents itself as manifested by God and prescribed for him.

39. 2) *A subject is bound to inquire with proportionate diligence into the existence of a probable law.* For, there is a certain general law of inquiring *with proportionate diligence* into the probable will of the legislator; for man is obliged to know the law, so that it can have its effect of binding the will, which takes place through the intellect; but the necessary and ordinary means to acquire this knowledge is a proportionate inquiry. Otherwise, if there were no such obligation, anyone could refuse to listen and so never or almost never would the will of the superior be made known to him for certain. Also, reverence towards the merely probable or hypothetical will of the legislator demands this.

But a positive religion manifested and prescribed by God would be a true divine law.

Therefore man, a subject of God, is bound to inquire with proportionate diligence into the positive religion that with the appearance of truth presents itself as manifested by God and prescribed for him.

But this diligence will not be proportionate if a man does not inquire absolutely into a religion probably mandated by God. Because, since it is concerned with obtaining absolutely the last end, the diligence is not proportioned, unless a completely safe means is chosen. But the only safe means in this case is to inquire into the existence of such a religion. Therefore....

40. 3) This is confirmed by the tendency of men eagerly to investigate manifestations of divine knowledge and will: oracles, prophecies... (today, occultism, theosophism...); it is also confirmed from the tendency of man to direct himself to the obtaining of his religious end, and so psychologically

a man strives to solve his doubts about religious matters.

41. Objections. 1. Sometimes counsel is given prudently lest Protestants and the Orthodox are disturbed in their religion in which they persevere in good faith. But, if that takes place prudently, Protestants and the Orthodox are not bound to inquire into a religion (Catholic) which presents itself to them with the appearance of truth. Ergo....

I distinguish the major. This counsel is given prudently, if Protestants and the Orthodox continue with good faith in their sect—and also take the necessary means for salvation (faith, baptism, charity), and a warning were perceived to be harmful, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. Such counsel would be given imprudently from what has been proved in the thesis; for, if they have doubts about the truth of their own religion and perceive the Catholic religion as probably prescribed for them, then they would be bound to investigate it.

2. A doubtful law is not binding. But a religion that presents itself only with the appearance of truth would be a doubtful law. Therefore it would not obligate a man to inquire into it.

I distinguish the major. A doubtful law does not obligate someone to *follow it*, after inquiry has been made into it with proportionate diligence, *conceded*; man is not obligated to *inquire into it* with proportionate diligence, *denied*. A religion only probably prescribed is a doubtful law; but there is a *certain* law, which requires a person to inquire with proportionate diligence into a doubtful law (religion).

3. A law not promulgated is not binding. But a religion probably revealed and probably prescribed has not been promulgated. Therefore a religion probably revealed and prescribed is not binding.

I concede the major. I bypass the minor and deny the supposition of the minor. That is, the minor supposes that the obligation of inquiring is derived from a merely probable law and not yet fully promulgated, as would be a religion only probably revealed and prescribed; but we derive the obligation of inquiring from the *certain* law of inquiring into a probable religion.

4. Where there is no knowledge of God, there is no obligation. But many people do not know God. Therefore they are not bound to inquire into religion.

I bypass the major. Certainly the knowledge of the existence of God as a legislator imposing precepts is pre-required in order to know a perfect and true obligation; there would be no other obligation, except from decency and suitability with a rational nature.

But *I distinguish the minor.* Many people do not know God, or are atheists verbally or *in practice*, *conceded*; many do not know God or they do not know God *theoretically*, *I subdistinguish: culpably* after they have suppressed knowledge of God in their injustice (Rom. 1:18f.), *I bypass or concede*; inculpably, *denied*. Knowledge of God, at least in a confused way, by way of causality is easy, as is certain from the history of religions, and it is *per se* obvious to men, and it cannot be ignored for a long time without guilt. St. Thomas speaks about it in this way: “There is a certain common and confused knowledge of God, which in some way is present in all men... because by natural reason a man can come immediately to some knowledge of God; for, when men see natural

things operating according to a certain order, since there is no directing things without a director, they perceive that in most things there is a director of the things we see" (3 CG, 3,38).³

5. At least those who have not yet come to a knowledge of God are not bound to inquire.

Response. In this hypothesis they are not bound by any moral law, but *per se* this does not happen.

6. God, by his providence and the circumstances in which he wills that each person be born and live, has already sufficiently declared which religion each person should embrace. Therefore man is not bound to any further inquiry.

I distinguish the antecedent. God has declared it, that is, permitted it *with his permissive will*, at least for a time, *conceded*; God wills it with his will of good pleasure, *I subdistinguish*: if it has to do with the religion that he himself revealed and decreed for these men, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*.

7. Religion consists essentially in internal acts and in the adoration of God in spirit and in truth (John 4:23f.). Therefore nothing must be sought in a positive religion imposed externally.

I distinguish the antecedent. The essential acts of religion are the internal acts of intellect and will (recognition of God and devotion, which always must be present and are the quasi foundation of the others—the metaphysical essence of religion), *conceded*; they are the only necessary acts in religion, as if religion did not imply connaturally and essentially for man an external worship and a will ready to seek and follow the good pleasure of God regarding an external worship, *denied*.

42. Scholium 1. *Why it is not valid to apply probabilism here.* The reason is that it does not deal directly with a doubtful or merely probable law, but with the *certain* law of inquiring into a doubtful law, that is, into a probable religion.

Then, *related to this doubtful law* (a religion probably revealed and prescribed), in a doubt the first thing is to get out of the doubt, by using the diligence proportioned to the gravity of the law.

Moreover, while the doubt remains, probabilism is for doubt about the law, whether I am bound by this law or not; but in doubts of fact, which do not change into a doubt about the law, and *where it has to do with the means necessary for salvation*, probabilism cannot be applied and thus expose oneself to the danger of not obtaining the end. Thus it is not permitted to use probabilism where the concern is with obtaining the certain validity of a sacrament, when the doubt is, for example, whether the matter is valid or not: matter that is certainly valid must be used; unless this doubt concerning

3. L. de Grandmaison, S.J., speaks about the knowledge of God that is "spontaneous, almost intuitive, and sensible in its resonance, emotional..., an act of knowledge arriving so quickly with the result that it gives the impression of being an intuition" (*L'élément mystique dans la religion*: Rech ScRel I [1910] 197).

the fact changes into a doubt about the law—whether it is permitted in such extreme circumstances to expose the sacrament to the danger of nullity. The same point holds regarding the means used for salvation.

Also, it is not permitted to use probabilism where a certain right must be kept inviolate: thus, for example, a hunter must not shoot into a forest, because probably he is shooting at an animal and not at a man; for the right of a man to his life must certainly be protected.

Briefly: Except that the case has to do with a certain law of inquiring, it is not licit to apply probabilism where the situation has to do with absolutely obtaining and securing a certain end, as is the case with the last end of man.

43. Scholium 2. *Who must inquire.* There is a place and obligation of inquiring into a religion probably meant for oneself for those who have not yet heard about a divine revelation or who have not yet recognized it as certain, as can happen, for example, to pagans and rationalists, when they consider the Catholic Church; or for those who prudently doubt a revealed religion that they have until now practiced, v.gr., Jews or Muslims or Protestants who move to a Catholic country. For, in these persons their own ignorance or doubts are reconcilable with the probability with which the new religion presents itself to them as revealed and obligatory.

But those who erroneously and merely subjectively are certain about their own religion as prescribed for them, but without there being any objective truth or certitude—they do not grasp the probability whereby the new religion places itself before them as revealed and obligatory, and therefore they do not experience any obligation of inquiring into it and embracing it. But if at any time they admit such probability, their subjective certitude ceases and they are bound to make the inquiry.

But there cannot be any place for such an inquiry, if someone knows for certain (although only with a common certitude) that he has the true and only religion willed by God (thus those who are properly educated and instructed in the catechism and know that the Church is the sign raised among the nations [Isa. 11:12; D 3013-3014, 3036]; or if someone doubts imprudently or is only tempted in his faith). For then one's own certitude in revealed and obligatory religion excludes the probability of another religion and is incompatible with it.

But you will say: Therefore we establish a different norm for Catholics than for non-Catholics.

That is surely so. Because “the condition of those who by the heavenly gift of faith have embraced the Catholic truth and of those who are led by

human opinions follow a false religion is by no means the same. For, those who have received the faith under the teaching authority of the Church can never have a just reason to change this same faith or to call it into question” (D 3014, see D 3036). For these are helped *by the objective truth of the matter*, which daily shines more clearly in their minds, and also *by the subjective assistance of grace* of a beneficent Lord, who daily confirms them and does not abandon them unless he is abandoned. But it is different for the others: they do not have the objective truth of the matter, nor does the grace of God confirm them, but rather draws them back from their own false religious ideas.

CHAPTER II

On revelation

44. To demonstrate the fact of obligatory divine revelation, which is proposed by the Christian religion, the preparatory step was the treatment of the previous chapter, where we examined the notion and nature of religion and its obligation for us. Now in like manner a further learning step, *a treatise on revelation*, will be presented: for if the concept of revelation should be shown to be a contradiction, if its impossibility were demonstrated, if it were made known to us as something unknowable... in vain would be begin the search concerning the fact.

And since the Catholic religion, which presents itself as probably true to anyone even casually considering it, has *a concept about revelation as primary*, it is necessary to examine this concept and establish its rational legitimacy.

To demonstrate the fact of divine revelation and to show the very possibility of revelation we will have to explain the facts themselves from the things we know from Genesis to the book of Revelation about the divine locutions to men; we do this of course by admitting as proved, from the Introduction to Holy Scripture, the historicity of the books of the Old and New Testaments. But in the light of the evidence, in order to anticipate the difficulties that can be raised against it, and so that the abstract speculation can be applied more easily afterwards to the concrete order: we prefer to begin by explaining the theory itself of revelation.

ARTICLE I

ON THE NOTION OF REVELATION

S.Th., II-II, q. 171-174; *De verit.* q. 12; Suarez, *De fide* d.8 s.4; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.188-220; Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* I c.4; Vatican Council I, sess. 3, ch. 2.

45. As in Ontology the object is the more universal nature of *being* (which is considered in every object of the other parts of Philosophy) and of its causes, so in fundamental Theology the object is the more universal nature of *revelation*, which is considered in every object of the other parts of Theology; for, all parts consider their objects as revealed by God and known by faith.

We are treating revelation as the Church understands it; for, we are dealing with proving the fact of revelation proposed by her. However, this requires that we first legitimate philosophically in this article and the following one the concept of this fact, that is, the concept of revelation that the Church has.

46. 1) **Revelation** signifies *etymologically* the removal of a veil or the manifestation of a hidden reality.

In the New Testament revelation is mentioned with the words ἀποκάλυψις, Φανερούν... to signify the manifestation of a salutary truth (the messianic kingdom, the mystery of Christ...) made by God through Christ or through the Apostles.¹

In ecclesiastical use it is the manifestation of a hidden truth made to man by God (D 2775-2777, 3004).

Thus revelation both in the New Testament and from the use of the Church is *the speaking of God to men* (Heb. 1:1; D 3004).

47. 2) This is the divine revelation which we are considering. If the manifestation of truth is made by a man, then it is a *human* revelation.

If it is made by an angel, it is taken to be *divine*, because angels in their relations with men reveal inasmuch as they constitute one cause with God; for God either commands it or positively permits it. *Per se there is no such thing as demonic* revelation, because, since they are lying spirits, properly and per se they tend to communicate no truth.

48. 3) Divine revelation can be considered *actively* or in the action of God revealing; or *passively* in the perception of the thing revealed or in the created sign whereby God directly manifests his mind to another; *objectively* or in the truths or objects that are revealed.

If the nature of revelation, considered actively, is sought, then it must be said that it is like *the nature of an action of God outside of himself (ad extra)*: whether the concern is with his creative action, if God in revealing creates something; or the concern is with his educative action, if, as often happens, he educes something from the potency of matter.

By these actions *God is not changed intrinsically*; but *extrinsically and in a terminative way* he is said to be actually creating, educating, and similarly *actually revealing*, if we have these actions more probably as formally (not just virtually) transient.²

1. See Zorell, *Lexikon Graecum* for those and related words; G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 3,565-597 at the word ἀποκάλυψις; Also Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.195.

2. Therefore in this opinion revelation *formally* as such, like creation formally as such, and like any educative action of God, is considered as *formally transient and extrinsic to God*. This last and formal way of naming God as actively revealing, just as similarly actually creating, actually educating, should be carefully distinguished from the decree of God and will and power of revealing, just as also similarly of creating and educating: for this decree, this will and this power are formally immanent in God, but they cannot be said to be actual revelation, creation, education, but only revelation, creation... *in a radical way or virtually*, because they rightly imply formal revelation in time or the actual changing of something in time. The authors treat this question more at length when they explain the opinions about the nature of creative action, or in general about action and passion. See Ludov. De Losada, *Cursus Philosophicus: Physica*, tr.3 d.1 c.3 (Barcinone 1883) t.6 p.186-191; F. Marxuach, *Compendium Theologiae naturalis* (Madrid 1929) n. 157,III. Similarly F. Suarez, *Disputat. Metaphysicae* 20 s.4; I. Hellin, *Theologia naturalis* (Matriti 1950), th.92.—Urráburu, *Cosmologia* 1.1 d.2 c.2 a.3, while discussing the nature of creative action (p. 205-219), he cites authors who hold that formal creation is *formally transient*, as something distinct from a created thing, like the mode of some thing, as a predicamental educative action. Thus, besides Suarez and Losada, Molina, Rhodes, Hurtado, Arriaga...who are mentioned there.

On the efficient cause of revelation. According to Catholic doctrine, divine revelation is a *work of God ad extra* (outside of himself), and therefore it is done by the three divine persons together. But sometimes *it is attributed to the Father* (1 Cor. 2:10: “God has revealed to us through the Spirit”; Matt. 16:17: “Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven”); *but sometimes it is attributed to the Son* (Matt. 11:27: “And no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him”), since he is the wisdom of God enlightening every man; *sometimes finally divine revelation is appropriated to the Holy Spirit*, like all the works of God proceeding from his love (thus 2 Pet. 1:2: “Men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God”; and in the Creed it is said about the Holy Spirit: who spoke through the prophets).

49. 4) Divine revelation can be *natural* or *supernatural*. *Natural* divine revelation is the manifestation of truth about God that comes to a man from God as the author of nature, through created nature itself (see Rom. 1:19; Ps. 19:1).

And since we are going to consider *supernatural* revelation and the mention of this concept recurs often in this treatise and in the following ones, it is necessary at the beginning to explain in detail and define the concept of the *supernatural*. However, a fuller knowledge will be left to the treatises *On God the Sanctifier* and *On the Grace of Christ*.

50. Explanation of the concept of the supernatural. The *supernatural* is said to be that which surpasses what is *natural*.

But the *natural* is that which pertains to nature.

Nature is understood etymologically as *that which is born*; in reality it supposes: a) for the *substance as it is the principle of operations*; b) for the *essence of something* (thus one speaks about “the nature of accidents”); c) for the *totality of all created things*.

But a thing pertains to nature or is natural,

1) Either *because it constitutes the nature itself* (v.gr., it is natural for a man to have a soul, a body and its integral parts);

2) or *because it proceeds from nature itself* (thus the powers of the soul and everything that nature itself can accomplish by its own powers);

3) or *because it is demanded by nature itself* lest it or its powers are frustrated (v.gr., the means necessary to obtain the last end, air, food in general, for organic life; family, society, authority, for social life;

conservation, divine cooperation, the providence of God...).

These things are natural, certainly because *they are either a part of nature, or that which proceeds out of nature as its effect, or to which nature has a claim.*

The *supernatural* indicates something positive which surpasses nature,

1) Either because it perfects nature by constituting it on higher level (thus sanctifying grace, which as an accident is superadded to created nature, by making it a partaker of the divine nature);

2) or because it surpasses the powers and active capabilities of a created nature (thus, v.gr., to see God);

3) or because it surpasses the claims of created nature (v.gr., to see God himself, to have perfect control over concupiscence—in a bodily creature—so that it does not oppose a command of reason; likewise immortality and the impassibility of the body).

Therefore the *supernatural* can be defined as: *that which is neither a part of nature, nor proceeds as effect from nature, nor can be claimed by nature.*

Thus, looking at the nature that is elevated, or *the terminus from which (terminus a quo)* the change takes place, the supernatural is something not due to elevated nature; but looking at the nature according to what it is raised to, or *the terminus to which (terminus ad quem)* the change takes place, the supernatural is a participation in a higher nature.

51. Divisions of the supernatural. 1) The supernatural can be *simply such* or *in a certain respect*.

The *simply supernatural* is had with reference to every created or creatable nature; therefore it is that which surpasses the capacities and claims of all created nature, and therefore it looks at something properly divine, like the intuition of God and the love resulting from it. Thus the *simply supernatural* can be known by its relation to the beatific vision and to the last beatitude of man, such as it is in this order of providence. Therefore, sanctifying grace, the theological virtues, the gifts of the Holy Spirit... are simply supernatural beings.

The *supernatural in a certain respect* or the *preternatural* is had with reference to only some created nature. Thus, what for one nature is supernatural, can be natural for another higher nature; v.gr., it is supernatural for a man to understand something without discourse or reasoning, which for an angel is natural. For the sensitive nature of man there are preternatural gifts, or gifts supernatural in a certain respect, like integrity or perfect

control over concupiscence, immortality and impassibility.

2) The supernatural can be *intrinsically supernatural* or *as to its being*, and supernatural *by analogy of external attribution* or *as the cause or effect*.

The supernatural *as to the being or intrinsically supernatural* is a perfection by way of an accident inhering in a created substance: sanctifying grace, the gifts of the Holy Spirit....

The supernatural *by analogy of external attribution* is said to be something in itself natural, v.gr., a sacrament (matter and form), the Church, etc., which is the cause or the effect or the sign of *something supernatural as to its being*; this of course is the primary analogate.

3) *Supernatural according to the thing (substance) and supernatural according to the mode*. The supernatural according to the thing is something intrinsically supernatural. The supernatural according to the mode is said to be, *by the analogy of proportion*, something in itself natural, v.gr., restoration of sight in a blind person, but by reason of the way in which it is done it is supernatural, v.gr., if it happens suddenly by the utterance of a word; thus the nature of a certain proportion is preserved.

52. Supernatural revelation is the manifestation that is made by God to a man in addition to his natural needs and abilities.

It can take place a) *through a miraculous fact*, if v.gr. God by working miracles manifests the holiness of a servant of God, or the riches of his glory and goodness.

b) *through the infusion of knowledge*, if someone v.gr. suddenly knows something new through knowledge received from God.

c) but in the proper sense and strictly it is understood as *the manifestation that is made known to man from God through speech properly so-called* (D 3004; Heb. 1:1).

53. Speaking properly so-called is *an action whereby an intelligent being immediately and directly manifests his mind to another person*.

Note: a) Interjections, like sounds uttered mechanically, are not speech, because then man is not acting *as intelligent*. For sometimes animals express their feelings in this way.

b) If a person manifest something (v.gr., a beautiful voice in singing), but *indirectly*, he is not therefore said to be saying it. Thus the attributes of God manifested through creation, and also the exemplary ideas of the divine mind that are known through creatures, God is not speaking; because God is not directly saying these things, nor do these actions tend to bring it about that God manifests them directly and immediately.

An objective medium is excluded *from which (ex quo)* by deduction his mind is known; but a subjective medium is not excluded (mouth, ears) or an objective medium *by which (quo)* (sound, a letter).

c) It is required that the speaker manifests *his own* mind; otherwise he is said to be rather an interpreter than a speaker.

d) The speaker must manifest his own mind to the other as person to person, not through a mere infusion of light or of species. Therefore this *otherness* must be given, and therefore revelation, since it is the manifestation of God with this otherness, is also an act of the love of God towards us by communicating his own thoughts.

Revelation is not *the infusion of knowledge*, which per se directly is only the communication of some object, not precisely as being of the mind and knowledge of the one who causes the knowledge (consider, for example, if someone leaves behind a writing that someone reads; it is not therefore a letter or conversation). – Nor is revelation *an enlightening grace*, because in such a case per se nothing is said about the divine mind.

54. Speech can be *teaching*, if it tries to bring it about that another *knows* things because of the internal reasons; and it can be attesting, if it tries to bring it about that he *believes* those things because of the authority of the speaker. God does both in his speech to us; but *primarily* it is and is understood to be attesting (D 3008). This is so also because the primary object of divine revelation is the mystery hidden for ages in God,³ which is made known only by the testimony of God.

Knowledge is the response to the speaking of a teacher; *faith* is the response to speaking that attests to something.

Therefore the primary purpose of revelation is that man believe hidden truths because of the authority of God who speaks.

55. Authority is the moral power by which someone exercises influence on another.

It can be *doctrinal and scientific*, which consists in the known science and in the truthfulness of a witness; and it can be *moral* or justly requiring some action, v.gr., assent to what has been said.

In God authority is both, that is, it is *full* authority. He has doctrinal and scientific authority, because he is infinite wisdom and has supreme love of truth; therefore he is the first truth in knowing and speaking to which created reason can and must show obedience by assenting to his word. He also has moral and juridical authority, because he is the supreme Lord who can command assent.

But faith as such is not given because of the moral and juridical authority of the speaker, but immediately because of his knowledge, that is, because of his known knowledge and veracity. For, to give assent immediately because of this scientific knowledge of God is proper to the virtue of *faith*; but to give it because of his moral authority is immediately proper to the

3. See Col. 1:26.

virtue of *obedience*.

56. Divisions of supernatural religion. 1) *By reason of the person who receives a revelation*, the revelation is *immediate* if a man receives the revelation directly from God speaking to him; it is *mediated* if a man receives the revelation through some other person who is commissioned by God.

Through angels it is thought to be immediate. Revelation made to the Apostles by Jesus is immediately divine, since the actions of Jesus are divine.

2) *By reason of the power that is immediately affected in the one who receives a revelation*, revelation can be *sensible* (the voice at the baptism of Jesus; the words Mene, Tekel, Parsin at the banquet of Belshazzar), *imaginary* (Jacob's ladder), and *intellective*. Intellective revelation can be either *purely intellectual*, if no phantasm is involved; or otherwise, *not purely intellectual*.

However, in revelation *an intelligible light* is always required in order to make a judgment about the matter received; because, since it is a speaking, it is necessary to understand that God is speaking.

3) *By reason of the intended receiver*, revelation is *private* if it is directed to particular persons; it is *public* if it is directed to be believed by the whole human race (D 3004), or at least to a whole people (v.gr., Israel) or to a perfect society.

Concerning private revelations, it should be noted that those to whom a certain revelation is not directed are not held *by a positive act* to hold and affirm that revelation *by divine faith*, even if they know that the revelation was made; but those who have received these revelations and to whom they are directed can and must hold them by divine faith, if they are certain that God has spoken to them; others who have arrived at the same certitude about the divine locution can also give it the assent of divine faith. Private revelations of this kind should be judged prudently according to the norms for the discernment of spirits and of a balanced historical criticism, neither rashly accepting them nor rejecting them with obstinate opposition.

The revelations made to St. Margaret Mary about worship of the Sacred Heart were *private* revelations; for, public revelation was completed with the last Apostle, as is said expressly in the treatment of the magisterium of the Church. But *the worship of the Sacred Heart was certainly directed by the intention of the Lord to the whole human race*. Therefore also private revelations, like other charisms, not rarely *have a social function*, and are directed not just to the particular good of a few persons.

On the approval of revelations. Private revelations are not approved by the Church *with a canonical approbation*, which concerns public revelation (contained in Holy Scripture and tradition); but surely that can be approved with a *permissive approbation*, if their acceptance is permitted; or with a *negative approbation*, if before the beginning of the process of beatification of a servant of God it is declared that there is nothing in his or her writings contrary to faith and morals; or finally with a *positive approbation*, if the divine origin of a revelation is taught clearly (v.gr., about the revelations made to St. Margaret Mary, concerning which they are often spoken about and affirmed, v.gr., by Pius XI in his Encyclical “*Miserentissimus Redemptoris*,” that is, in a document of the magisterium; and also others, such as those of the Bl. Virgin at Lourdes). In these positive approbations de facto the supreme and absolutely infallible magisterium of the Church is not operative concerning the reality of the revelations; however, it would be temerarious and imprudent to deny them without sufficient reason.⁴

4) *By reason of the truths that are revealed*, revelation can be *supernatural as to the manner*, if the truths revealed are pervious to reason and therefore can be known naturally; and *supernatural as to substance*, if the truths revealed are naturally unknowable.

5) *By reason of the object revealed* it is said to be *formal* and *virtual*, according as the revealed truth immediately or in a mediated way is known by way of a conclusion.

57. On the supernaturalness of revelation. a) Concerning divine revelation in the proper sense, through speaking, it cannot be said that it pertains to human nature either as a part or as an effect or as something to be claimed. Hence, *it is not something natural for man, but supernatural*.

b) Moreover, all revelation in the proper sense by a locution, since it is a free intervention of God, recognized by some extraordinary sign by the one who receives it, *supposes some event outside of the ordinary course of nature*, that is, it is something miraculous (see. 147-153).

c) It can be asked whether this revelation is *simply supernatural*, i.e., surpassing the capacity and exigencies of all created nature or saying an order to the beatific vision; or whether it is *supernatural in a certain respect*

4. Hence one cannot give the assent of Catholic faith to private revelations, even if they have received the approval of the Holy See; therefore those who did not receive them will hold the revelations with human faith according to the norms of prudence, or out of a spirit of fidelity and obedience towards the Church. For, “what pertains to faith, we are built up on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets with Jesus Christ being the cornerstone (Eph. 2:20), and no one can establish any other foundation” (Cardinal Bona, *De discretione spirituum* c.20 [On revelations and their discernment]: Opera omnia [Antwerp 1723] 187).

or preternatural, so that it does not necessarily say some order to the beatific vision.

It seems necessary to respond that revelation *according to its own concept* is not necessarily ordained to the beatific vision, and therefore it is not of its own concept simply supernatural; because it can be easily understood that God can propose some truths to be believed as a certain kind of trial. Indeed even the revelation of mysteries, which surpass every created intellect, does not seem to some by its very concept and nature to be simply supernatural.⁵ *De facto, however*, the revelation about which the Church speaks is ordained to the beatific vision and is therefore simply supernatural. The Church speaks about revelation which has a connection with the last end of man that is simply supernatural; for, at Vatican Council I the Fathers talk about supernatural revelation without any additions: it pleased God *to reveal himself in a supernatural way* (D 3004) and revelation is said to be *supernatural* (D 3006); where the supernatural is mentioned without any addition, in the same Council what is simply supernatural is understood (D 3005-3008).

58. The distinction between revelation and the other divine operations.

1) *Revelation is distinguished from inspiration* because revelation is *the speaking of God*; hence the one who receives a revelation, is not only raised up to the perception of divine things, but also he has awareness that God is speaking to him and is manifesting something to him. But inspiration is only *the action of God principally causing the writing of a book*, for which what is sufficient in the hagiographer is a supernatural enlightening of the intellect, a movement of the will and actually writing what God wants to be written; but an awareness of that supernatural influence is not necessarily had, just as an ordinary awareness of the enlightenments and motions of grace is not had.

But inspiration is had in order to write what God wants to be communicated, and therefore everything that is inspired is the word and opinion of God for us; hence God manifests something to us through that writing. Therefore this word of God is revealed to us, at least in a mediated way, if we are certain that it was written for us by a legate who received an immediate revelation.

Therefore for the act of inspiration it is not required per se that it be revelation; but everything that is canonically inspired contains mediated revelation for us.

2) *For prophetic inspiration or prophecy* the awareness that God is speaking or revealing is not required, if it has to do with a mere prophetic incitement (Caiphaz); but it is otherwise if it has to do with a true prophet in the full sense, that is, with someone who speaks at the instigation of God and in the name of God; then there is revelation.

3) Strict prophecy, if it is accepted from God speaking, is *revelation about the future*; therefore it is distinguished from revelation as part of a whole or as a species from

5. Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.208. See however below n. 129.

a genus, because revelation can be not only about the future, but also about something past and present.

4) A prophet who speaks in the name of God is a true *legate of God* or someone sent by God (n. 416); but not every legate is a prophet.

5) Revelation taken objectively is distinguished from the *supernatural light* whereby someone knows the divine origin of infused knowledge, because this light is not the accepted knowledge itself, but the principle by which it is known; and it is not a permanent principle, but a transient quality.

6) *In infused knowledge* per se God does not speak or testify as he does in revelation; therefore in infused knowledge things are manifested, not to the extent and inasmuch as they are in the divine mind.

7) *In divine assistance* God does not speak nor move someone to speak, but he is only present lest one err.

8) Revelation is distinguished from *the intuitive vision of God*, inasmuch as by revelation the mind is not raised to the divine order, as happens in the intuitive concept of God; but the mind remains in the order of analogical concepts.

9) Revelation is a *vision* (either intellectual, or imaginary, or sensible); but not every vision is revelation, that is, if the meaning of the vision is not understood (v.gr., Dan. 5:5f.; Acts 10:10-17 where St. Peter is said to have had a vision whose meaning and therefore revelation he received later).

59. False notions of revelation. Generally they exclude from it every truly supernatural aspect. Thus, usually, rationalists, who admit nothing supernatural, take it as surpassing reason: they say that everything must and can be explained by reason.

The older rationalists (Reimarus, Lessing...) understand by the word "revelation" *natural knowledge about some religious object*.

Kant understands revelation as *the voice of conscience*....

Liberal Protestants and Modernists understand by revelation *religious experience*, which underlies the special feeling whereby we apprehend God, especially if this experience is more vivid and as it were passive.

60. The modernist notion of revelation. On modernism, regarding its history and many different forms, see J. Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Eglise. Etude d'histoire religieuse contemporaine* (Paris 1929); also J. Rivière, *Modernisme*: DTC 10,2009-2047; A. Gisler, *Der Modernismus*⁶ (Einsiedeln 1913); an article written by several, *Modernisme*: DAFC 3,591-695; on what pertains to the present matter, especially *Foi et dogme*, c.618-637; for the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" c.637-695.

Modernism signifies a modern tendency, that is, at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, *of explaining and interpreting many things in religion from an immanent subjectivism and from relativism*, while presupposing as its foundation a radical evolutionism and agnostic subjectivism. There are several forms of

modernism, whether regarding religion itself and its essence and notion, or regarding the inspiration of the sacred books and their interpretation, or regarding religious history and the evolution of dogma, or regarding faith and revelation and their defense and apologetics. Hence *modernism* can be *philosophical, exegetical, dogmatic...*

A summary of all the modernist teachings systematically proposed, and done very clearly, is found in the *Decree "Lamentabili"* (July 3, 1907) (D 3401-3465) and in the *Encyclical "Pascendi"* (September 8, 1907) (D 2072-3500; EB 257-282 [250-275]).

The main modernists are the following: Alfred Loisy⁶ who wrote *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (1902), *Autour d'un petit livre* (1903). George Tyrrell (1861-1909) and Edouard Le Roy (*Dogme et Critique*, 1907), but he did not leave the Church.

We treated the *modernist notion of religion* above, n. 22-23. *Religion* according to the modernists must be explained not from an intellectual concept of God, but as a vital phenomenon experienced in the life of man. But the first motion of every vital phenomenon must be sought in some kind of need or in a certain movement of the heart which is called *feeling*. Therefore faith, which is the beginning and the foundation of any religion, must be located in a certain intimate feeling, which arises from a need for the divine. But this need is found in the subconscious and it bursts forth from there (D 3477).

61. Having supposed these ideas of religion and faith, the modernists easily pervert the notion of *revelation*.

Revelation, according to the modernists, is not an *intellectual* manifestation of some truth coming *from the outside*, but it is something that comes *from within* a man *from his religious sentiment*. Revelation, of at least the beginning of revelation, is the religious sentiment appearing in one's consciousness, or a religious experience whereby God is felt and manifests himself in a man (D 3478). Thus men who have such religious sentiment more developed and more lively religious experiences are said to have revelations. Therefore they say that "revelation can be nothing else than the consciousness acquired by man of his relation to God" (D 3420).

But since revelation is confined to the consciousness of men and evolves with it, *it is subject to progress and change*; therefore public revelation was not closed with the last Apostle (D 3421), but it is perfected in the consciousness of the faithful.

Since the religious man *thinks* his own faith, and by reflection develops his own thought, he arrives at religious formulas and at *dogmas*; and these

6. On Loisy see also M.J. Lagrange, O.P., *M. Loisy et le modernisme*.

are not immutable, but it is necessary that they be perfectible and capable of development (D 3422, 3482).

Revelation, therefore, is something *natural*, proceeding from nature and evolving itself with nature; in no way, therefore, is it supernatural. Revelation is something coming to man from within himself; therefore *the criteria of it must be sought not from the outside*, but internally and subjectively.

ARTICLE II

ON THE POSSIBILITY AND HARMONY OF REVELATION

Since we have explained the idea that the Church has about revelation, now we have to prove above all the possibility of such a notion.

Thesis 2. Divine supernatural revelation whether immediate (I) or mediated (II) is possible.

Tromp, *De revelatione* l.1; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.221-276; Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* l c.10.

62. Definition of terms. A *possibility* is the capacity for existence. *Internal* or *metaphysical possibility* consists in the agreement of the notes that constitute the essence or definition of the thing that is said to be possible.

External possibility is the capacity for existence because of the external nature of the efficient cause, which can bring that thing into existence.

This possibility is called *physical*, if the physical powers and conditions are present, which are required so that the efficient cause can place the thing in existence.

Possibility is called *moral* if, according to the usual way of acting, there is not present such difficulty that would prevent the existing physical power from being reduced to act.

63. The state of the question. In God there can be no question about the great difficulty to accomplish something, since he is omnipotent; therefore there can be no question about a moral impossibility, unless it is *in a translated sense*, that is, whether the difficulty and repugnance arises because God cannot have worthy ends and an ultimate reason in revelation, i.e., whether the revelation is unsuitable for God. Concerning this non-repugnance and suitability of revelation, or concerning its moral possibility, both for God and for man, although several aspects of it will be treated in this thesis, we will consider it in a special way in the following thesis.

With regard to the physical possibility of revelation, it will be sufficient to prove that it is metaphysically possible or that it is not repugnant; because if there is certainty about this, it is easy to prove that it can be done physically by God.

Therefore now we are dealing directly and especially with the metaphysical possibility of revelation, although certain aspects of its physical and moral possibility will also have to be treated.

But since the elements that enter into the definition of revelation are the divine efficient cause and its way of acting, the human subject (rational, living) receiving it, and the object that is revealed: all of these aspects must be considered so that any repugnance is excluded from all of them; but if repugnance is positively excluded, then the possibility is positively demonstrated (see n. 110).

64. Adversaries. They deny the possibility of revelation: 1) *On the part of the agent or of God* all those who deny either his existence, or that he can speak, or that he de facto speaks with men. Thus *atheists, materialists, pantheists, deists* (God does not act in the world with an activity different from the first creation); and in general *naturalists* and all who deny a supernatural order.

2) *On the part of the passive subject* or of man, *rationalists* deny the possibility of revelation (D 2903f.); according to them human reason is the only fount of human knowledge; but all revelation from outside would destroy the vitality of our reason and would take away its autonomy.

According to the *modernists* vital experience is the only fount of religious knowledge, hence faith cannot be imposed from without (D 3477f.).

65. Doctrine of the Church. Talk *about the fact of revelation* recurs often in the documents of the Church (v.gr., D 3004-3007). Therefore *implicitly* revelation to us is said to be possible, both mediated and immediate, which is presupposed in mediated.

Furthermore, the possibility of revelation is solemnly defined *explicitly*: “it is possible... for man to be taught through divine revelation” (D 3027). If revelation is taken here for mediated revelation, the fact is implied in this and therefore the possibility of immediate revelation.

In the Creed the possibility of mediated revelation is affirmed, since the Holy Spirit “spoke through the prophets”; and the whole magisterium of the Church and the preaching of the word of God is founded on the revelation given to us, and it is implicitly affirmed.

Theological note. *Solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith*: D 3027 and in the Creed. For, it is not to be doubted that the matter is contained in divine revelation (Heb. 1:1...) and therefore that it pertains to divine faith—something that is presupposed in every doctrine that is a matter of divine

and Catholic faith¹; and there is no doubt that the Church in the Creed and in her ordinary magisterium proposes this doctrine as revealed by God.

66. Proof of part I. 1) *A posteriori*: it will be proved from the given revelation.

2) *A priori*: by excluding the repugnance that would come from the part of the elements which are considered in revelation.

For since the possibility consists in the sociability or non-repugnance of the notes or elements that enter into the definition of the matter, the way to demonstrate a priori this possibility will be in the exclusion of *any* repugnance that can be found in associating these elements. Thus the sociability of these notes or the possibility is proved *positively*, even though the way is *by exclusion* (see n. 110).

However, immediate revelation would be repugnant a) either from the part of the efficient cause and from the way in which it takes place, i.e., from the part of God; b) from the part of the subject in whom the revelation is received, i.e., from the part of man; c) or from the part of the object or of the thing revealed.

1. Those truths are said to be believed *with divine faith* "that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down" (D 3011; CIC cn.1323 § 1 [1917]). A contrary proposition is called *an error in faith*. Those truths are said to be *of divine and Catholic* "that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment [then they are *defined* truths] or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed" (D 3011; CIC cn.1323 § 2 [1917]). Truths of this kind are *dogmas* of faith; "but nothing is understood to be declared or defined dogmatically, unless it is clearly established" (CIC cn.1323 § 3).—The denial or doubt about some truth to be believed with divine and Catholic faith is *heresy* (see cn.1325 § 2).

"To pronounce *a solemn judgment of this kind* [concerning truths of the faith] belongs properly both to an Ecumenical Council and to the Roman Pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra*" (cn. 1323 § 2). In other cases it is known that the Church proposes something as revealed and to be believed, if it concerns matters "transmitted as divinely revealed by the ordinary Magisterium of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world and, for that reason, held by the universal and constant consensus of Catholic theologians as belonging to the faith" (D 2879).

Regarding the dogmatic value of the canons and chapters of the Constitution *Dei Filius* of Vatican Council I, which will be quoted often in our treatise, J.M.A. Vacant considers this problem, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile Vatican I* (Paris 1895) introduction a.5 p.41-44: The doctrine to be believed with Catholic faith is defined in the canons; in the chapters there is a manifest intention of the Church to propose her doctrine definitively and peremptorily, so that the formulas have what is placed at the beginning of the chapters and the introduction (D 3000): *The holy... Church believes and confesses* (D 3001); *The same Holy Mother Church holds and teaches...* (D 3004); *The Catholic Church professes...* (D 3008); *The perpetual common belief of the Catholic Church has held and holds...* (D3015).—Thus the chapters of the Council propose *infallible* doctrine *positively*, but the canons do it *negatively*; but that which is taught in the chapters can be not divine and Catholic faith, but only to be held merely assertively and infallibly; indeed, if the words are merely reasons adduced and arguments, which are not proposed as the doctrine of the Church, then of themselves they are not infallible.

And it is not correct to say that it was necessary to have the signature of all the bishops at the end of the Council in order for the Constitution to be promulgated; such promulgation was not necessary. For, both all the Fathers approved the work and the Supreme Pontiff, who presided in person, by his apostolic authority defined and confirmed the *decrees* and the canons of the Constitution, and all of them were pleasing to all (*ibid.*, t.2 doc.25).

But none of these things can be said: A) For, *on the part of God* and of his attributes it would be repugnant, if a) God lacked the knowledge which he would reveal – or b) the power by which he would reveal – or c) the means by which he would reveal – or d) the end for which he would reveal.

But God a) *is all wise*; – b) *he is all powerful*, nor is there any obstacle in the fact that the order of nature previously established, resulting from the laws of nature, must be changed; for, laws of this kind are not absolutely necessary, like the laws of metaphysics and mathematics, but hypothetically necessary; hence no violence is imposed on a creature, if that creature, whose intimate nature it is to be subject to its Creator, is subject to his preternatural will²; – c) God *has also the way of communicating with men* either by external locutions or by internal locutions through phantasms or immediately in the intellect, but God can always use the interior light so that the intellect understands the divine origin of the received ideas,³ otherwise God would be in a condition inferior to that of men, who can communicate with each other. – d) *Finally, God has worthy ends for revealing*: in order to show clearly his glory, as in every action of his *ad extra*; for he can show his omnipotence and wisdom, and his love for men... for by revelation the human race can be helped, since it needs the special help of God in order to know in a fitting way even natural religion.⁴

It happens that *God is supremely communicable*, first of all because he is *supremely being*, hence also *he is supreme truth* irradiating in all directions; then because he is the *supreme teacher*, not just endowed with knowledge and the ability of accommodating himself to the minds of his disciples, but also he is very eager to teach them and—especially—by using his great authority to get them to assent to his words.

Negatively. God can communicate himself with men: because concerning God only that can be denied which involves an imperfection. But freely to communicate himself involves no imperfection. For, to communicate himself supposes that he is in act and diffuses what is his own good (his knowledge). But God is always in pure act and being the greatest good he tends to diffuse himself. If man can communicate with others, why can't God do it also?

And by his revealing God is not changed, just as he is not changed by creating and conserving things and by producing other effects. For, from eternity he decided to do this in time, and he receives nothing intrinsically from these effects outside himself, but rather communicates.

B) *On the part of man* repugnance is excluded by considering the properties of man, because he is a) an intelligent being – b) rationally developing – c) living – d) personal.

2. See n. 5.

3. On the manner of prophetic knowledge, see S.Th. II-II, q. 173; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.205.

4. See below n. 76ff.

But a) there is no *repugnance because a man cannot understand something that is proposed by God*: for the object of the human intellect is all being, provided it is rightly proposed to him; but since he has an idea of being, an idea of truth, of substance, of accident, of person and other similar ideas... he can understand all truth, if it is properly proposed to him. Moreover, if man can receive something in his mind from other men, why can he not do the same from God? For he can either coordinate the intellectual species of a man or infuse new ones, and strengthen the intellect with light so that he makes a certain judgment about them.

b) It is not repugnant *because the harmony of the development of the human intellect would be disturbed*: because it would also be disturbed by human teaching and by human faith; on the other hand, it pertains to the concept of a supernatural being (which is what revelation is) to perfect nature.

c) It is not repugnant *because man is a living being and therefore acting in an immanent manner*: because man can passively receive an infused species or the divine action, just as he receives from the outside a determination to know something, but afterwards he can actively react by cooperating with the knowledge and producing it. In the judgment also about the meaning of the represented thing and about its divine origin there is only the vital reaction that is proper to a man.

d) It is not repugnant *because man is a personal being, acting in his own right and having the autonomy of reason*: because this autonomy, howsoever it is conceived, must seek conformity with the truth, which is had in a special way through the divine manifestation of truth. Moreover, a healthy autonomy of reason takes place in adults after they have received several truths based on the teaching and authority of witnesses.

C) *On the part of the thing revealed* revelation is not repugnant, *if a man does not already know the thing revealed*; for he learns what he did not know. *But if he already knows the matter*, then at most a repugnance can be thought and examined, not about the revelation itself, but about the extent of the things revealed. Moreover, also concerning things known we can speak and listen to someone speaking about them, and so affirm them with a new act and with a new motive of certitude.⁵

Therefore, *repugnance is excluded*, if the concern is with the knowledge of natural truths acquired either by way of a demonstration or by way of authority. With regard to *mysteries*, this matter will be considered later on more carefully and in detail (n. 90ff.).

Therefore immediate divine revelation is possible.

5. On this point also see A. Cotter, S.J., *Theolog. fundam.*² p.29, where he presents a bibliography.

67. Proof of the part II, by excluding repugnance on the part of the things that must be considered in mediated revelation.

a) *There would be no repugnance on the part of God*: For God can exercise his right of proposing revelation through others, if he so pleases; especially since it belongs to divine providence to govern lower things by the higher and to lead men with the help of other men, not because of a lack of power, but because of his own goodness. God can also provide the help whereby the truth is not altered.

b) *On the part of the legate* there would be repugnance if he could not be recognized as a legate; but he could do this with credible signs. Or if the truth were corrupted in the transmission; but the truth can be protected by documents, especially with the divine assistance.

c) *On the part of the intended receiver* there is no obstacle: for anyone can receive truth from other men, if there is certainty about their knowledge and veracity, and this can be established by divine signs; then it will be the quality of a wise person to believe.

d) *On the part of the truth* which is transmitted there will be no repugnance: since the truth, which is communicated in order to secure the salvation of men, will also be accommodated to human intelligence, whether the truth is understood from the internal reasons or from authority. It can also be preserved incorrupt by the divine assistance.

Therefore, having excluded the repugnance on the part of the things that appear in the definition as peculiar to mediated revelation, it follows that mediated revelation is possible.

ANOTHER WAY: *In order for mediated divine revelation to be possible* it is necessary only that the revealed matter can be transmitted faithfully, and that it can be made certain to others that revelation in the name of God is being proposed.

But it is possible that men can rightly understand a truth that they have received from God, and rightly and truthfully tell others what they have understood, especially if in a long series of transmissions they are assisted by the divine help. Moreover, it is possible that other men in the right circumstances for certain recognize the knowledge and veracity of the witness, especially if God signs with his own seal as his legate the one who proposes the revelation.

The same incorrupt handing on of naturally known truths takes place in human science; but for revealed truths it suffices that they can be handed on with certitude about the fact of revelation. But this historical fact can be known from testimonies or from other new signs of credibility.

Therefore, mediated divine revelation is possible.

68. Objections. *On the part of God.* 1. Revelation is impossible, if God is changed by revealing. But God is changed by revealing. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. Revelation is impossible if God is changed intrinsically and entitatively by revealing, *conceded*; if he is changed extrinsically and in a terminal way, *denied*. I also distinguish the minor in the same way.

2. But God by revealing is changed intrinsically. *Proof:* Extrinsic and terminal change implies in the agent the acquisition of a new act and intrinsic change. Therefore God by extrinsic and terminal change from revelation is changed intrinsically.

I deny the subsumed minor and distinguish the antecedent proof: A terminal change of the agent implies a new act and intrinsic change in a created agent, *conceded* (because in order to act he must be activated); in an uncreated and infinite agent, *denied* (because he always has in himself the fullness of act).

3. A revealing action is either eternal or temporal. If the first, the revelation must be eternal; but if it is temporal, God is changed when he moves from not-revealing to actually-revealing.

I respond: The will of God to reveal in time is eternal and immanent to God and is identified with his essence; but actual and formal revelation is in time, and it is an action not only virtually transient, but (more probably) *formally transient*, like the physical mode of education inhering in the thing educated, or the physical mode of creation inhering in the thing created. Modes of this kind (which we accept as more probable⁶) designate God as revealing, as Creator *extrinsically*.

Therefore *I distinguish the second part of the disjunction.* When God passes over from not-revealing to actually-revealing he is changed intrinsically, *denied*; he is changed *extrinsically* and in a terminal way, *conceded*.

4. If the will of God revealing is identified with his essence, revelation is necessary. But the actions of God *ad extra* cannot be necessary. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. If the will of God revealing is identified with his essence, revelation, i.e., the will of God to reveal, is necessary entitatively, *conceded*; formal and terminal revelation is necessary, *denied*. I concede the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.

5. But formal and terminal revelation would be necessary. *Proof:* A being supremely good is supremely diffusive of itself. But what is supremely diffusive of itself, must necessarily reveal formally and in a terminal way. Therefore.

I deny the assumption, concede the major of the proof and distinguish the minor. What is supremely diffusive of itself must necessarily reveal, i.e., with a necessity of pure harmony, so that the contrary would not be unbecoming, *conceded*; so that the contrary would be unbecoming, *denied*. And with this distinction I also distinguish the consequent; or I simply deny the minor.

6. If God reveals in time, by changing the order established by creation he changes his mind. But to change his mind is contrary to the wisdom of an infinitely provident Being. Therefore.

I deny the major. God by revealing does not change his mind; but from eternity he

6. See above n. 48, note 2.

resolved to reveal in time. And the ability to intervene in his own creation, of which he is the Lord, must not be denied to God.

7. This revelation in time would suppose an imperfect creation. But an imperfect creation would suppose some imperfection in God. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. Revelation in time would suppose an imperfect creation, i.e., that creatures are capable of further perfection, *conceded*; that creatures in their own nature and in the order of nature were badly made, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* An imperfect creation, because the creatures were badly made, would suppose imperfection in God, *conceded*; because they are capable of further perfection, *denied*. God always operates *in the best way*, but he is not bound to make *what is best*.

On the part of man. 8. Revelation and faith, which is a result of it, would destroy the autonomy of reason

I deny the supposition of such absolute autonomy; it is only relative, *because the intellect, also per se seeking the truth, must conform itself to the first truth*.

9. There cannot be proportion in a conversation between divine intelligence and human intelligence. Therefore revelation is impossible.

I distinguish the antecedent. There cannot be an entitative proportion, *conceded*; a proportion or adequacy in knowing that is at last analogical, *denied*.

10. Speaking with a man takes place in an articulated language. But God cannot speak in an articulated language. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. The speaking *of a man with a man* takes place with articulated language, *conceded* (because men must communicate meaning to each other by means of the senses and the bodily organs); the speaking of God to men, *denied*.

On the part of the revealed object. 11. Revelation would mix in false elements, because it is relative in man. Therefore it is impossible.

I deny the antecedent and distinguish the proof. Revelation is relative in man, i.e., *it is not absolutely perfect knowledge*, like divine knowledge, but is analogical, *conceded*; it is false, *denied*.

12. But it is false. *Proof:* Divine truths in revelation are reduced to the sensible order. But such reduction implies falsification. Therefore in revelation there would be falsification.

I deny the assumption and distinguish the major. Divine truths would be reduced to the sensible order, i.e., *they would be known often by reference to the sensible order*, from which also we draw our spiritual ideas, *conceded*; they would be known falsely, *denied* (they would be known truly, just as spiritual things are truly known, but in an analogical way).

Thesis 3. Divine revelation is greatly in harmony both with the divine goodness and wisdom (I) and with the rational nature of man (II); but for man it is very useful (III).

Muncunill, *De vera religione* c.1 a.4; Van Laak, *Repetitorium Theolog. fundam.* Tr.2 l.1 c.2 propos.5; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ last section, propos.11 p. 374ff.

After we have treated the possibility of revelation, the next question to be considered is its harmony and usefulness, which have already been implied to a certain extent in the previous thesis.

69. Definition of terms. That which is in accordance with the perfection of some nature is said to be *harmonious*, congruous, suitable. Thus with reference to God this fittingness of revelation is affirmed, so that the opposite is not disharmonious or unbecoming (as we say about creation); and therefore from this harmony no necessity of revelation is to be inferred.

The *useful* is what is appropriate and is a means to something else.

About God *the fittingness of his goodness* is affirmed, not the fittingness of usefulness as is the case with men.

70. Adversaries. *Deists*: besides creation all other things, which would suppose the intervention of God in the world, would be unbecoming to God; after creation the world must be sufficient for itself.

Rationalists: Revelation would be contrary to the wisdom of God, who would thus change the course already once established, as it were by correcting his own work. And attesting revelation would be contrary to the rational nature of man: for if it concerns something naturally knowable, it is useless; but if it has to do with the revelation of something supernatural, then it is dealing with an empty and unintelligible concept. Thus there is this among the errors listed in the Syllabus: "Faith in Christ is detrimental to human reason; and divine revelation not only is of no use but is even harmful to man's perfection" (D 2906).

71. Doctrine of the Church. It is clearly present for the second and third parts of the thesis in Vatican Council I, where it is defined that *it is helpful for man to be taught through divine revelation about God and the worship to be rendered to him* (D 3027). Moreover, in the same Council the usefulness of revelation is considered, because to it is to be attributed a suitable knowledge of natural religion, which de facto the human race had (D 3005); and faith is said to *free and protect reason from errors and provide it with manifold insights* (D 3019).

Theological note. In Holy Scripture and Tradition revelation is proposed, at least implicitly, as agreeing with man and with the goodness of God. Therefore the thesis certainly is in the word of God, and therefore must be held with divine faith. Moreover, in Vatican I it was solemnly defined for the second and third part of the thesis; but also with reference to God and to the first part of the thesis, the harmony or fittingness of revelation in God is, at least implicitly, in the ordinary magisterium of the Church when it proposes something as revealed (see D 3004). Hence the thesis is *divine and Catholic faith in all of its parts*.

72. Proof of the first part. a) The communication of good things *agrees with the divine goodness*, just as it is fitting for a rich man to give. But revelation is a certain communication of good things, since those who receive the revelation are perfected by this speaking of God; v.gr., by the knowledge of the divine perfections, by the acquisition of certain norms for a moral and religious life, and by loving and praising God, whom they know better through revelation... Therefore divine revelation is in agreement with the divine goodness.

b) *It agrees with the divine wisdom* to show us his own perfections so that it will move us to love him and so grow in our own perfection; because *it is the nature of a wise person to order things to their end*, and it is fitting for a wise artist to adorn his own work. But revelation shows us the divine perfections: certainly it shows us the divine *omnipotence* whereby there is preternatural action; and when he changes the pre-established course of nature he shows us the divine *independence* because of higher reasons; likewise he shows the divine *wisdom*, whereby there is speech; and *veracity*, inasmuch as we contemplate things now proposed for our belief... Therefore divine revelation is in agreement with the divine wisdom.

73. Proof of the second part. *Divine revelation is greatly in harmony with the rational nature of man:*

a) From the excellence and skill of *the teacher*, whom we acquire by revelation; so we learn more easily.

b) From the excellent and certain *motive of assent* to the truths that are communicated by revelation, that is, because of the authority of God revealing; so we learn in a more certain manner.

c) From the greater *subjection of our faculties to God*, whom to serve is to reign, and so more harmony and elevation is had in our personality. Also our reason is brought more in conformity with the supreme norm of

truth, which is the uncreated intellect, in spite of what the defenders of the autonomy of reason say; so we learn more securely.

d) *Human knowledge is perfected* by revelation; because revelation helps in the attainment of the knowledge that is the greatest for man: knowledge concerned with moral human acts and with divine things. Also it clarifies obscure things, and provides premises leading to further conclusions. For human knowledge divine revelation is “a guiding star, a safe norm and a foster-mother”; for children and the illiterate it is the clear manifestation of truths, which otherwise perhaps even the intellectuals do not know.⁷ So we learn more abundantly.

74. Proof of the third part. *Revelation is very useful for man.*

a) There are advantages for which we showed above the agreement of revelation with the rational nature of man, inasmuch as he is rational.

b) Revelation helps to foster union and friendship with God, since it is *the word and sign of friendship* and of very gentle charity, whereby a man becomes a partaker of divine secrets.

c) Through revelation and the certain authority of God *security and firmness in perceiving religious and moral principles*, both theoretical and practical, is acquired; in religious and moral education, if it is going to be truly efficacious and so seek to form students for heroism, is of the greatest importance. Through the fluctuation and diversity of human opinions nothing solid will ever be obtained.

75. Objections. 1. God by speaking with me would make himself common. Therefore revelation is not becoming for God.

I distinguish the antecedent. If this conversation of God with men were to take place *out of indigence* and necessity or if it implies some danger to his own dignity, *conceded*; if the conversation takes place *out of love and without any danger* to God's dignity, *denied*.

2. If God by revealing demands faith in his words, in a practiced manner he renounces dominion over the human intellect. Therefore revelation is not fitting for God.

I deny the antecedent. God by revealing not only does not renounce dominion over the human intellect, but *he exercises the right to demand faith*; certainly he does not force one in a despotic manner to believe and elicit an act of faith, just as he does not force men to observe his other precepts.

3. The advantages mentioned above, derived from revelation, could be obtained by exceptional and wise men, who would hand on their teaching to their posterity. Therefore revelation is not suitable for rational human nature.

7. See D 3019 and the systematic index of the same “*Enchiridion Symbolorum*” the *Mutual relation between revelation and reason*.

Response. a) *I bypass the whole objection*; but also they will be obtained more efficaciously through divine revelation.

b) *I deny the antecedent.* Those wise men *would not have the right or the moral prestige* to impose their opinions; for, experience teaches how great the fluctuation is and the diversity in human opinions.

4. Through revelation from the outside the harmony of the evolution of human genius from within is disturbed. Therefore.

I deny the antecedent. Both evolution from within and revelation from without are the work of God, whose works cannot conflict with each other; revelation would be *like an excellent branch inserted into a tree*, whose fruit turns out to be much better (*a graft*). But the scientific and moral human perfection, acquired with the help of revelation, is so great that the rationalists themselves hold this as the excellent fruit of human evolution.

5. Scientific freedom would be confined and destroyed by knowledge gained from the external norms of revelation.

I deny the antecedent. It would not be *confined*, but it would be *guided*, lest it work in vain.

6. It is more perfect and joyful to seek the truth by one's own efforts, rather than just to possess it.

I deny the antecedent, because it is more perfect and joyful to be at the desired *destination*, than to be *on the way to it*.

7. By seeking the truth by one's own efforts the intellectual powers are increased; but by accepting the truth merely through testimony they are weakened. Therefore.

I distinguish the antecedent. Within definite limits, *conceded*; generally and absolutely speaking, *denied*, because often it helps to guide the work of the intellect so that the solution of the problem is pre-known even in a way whereby the solution can be found, especially in a fundamental matter *lest you work in vain for a long time, perhaps for a lifetime*. Revelation is a help in this matter. Moreover there is no hindrance from the data of revelation to seek more knowledge through the study of Theology, as faith seeking understanding; certainly the powers of human genius have not been made sluggish because of the work of theologians.

8. The assent to natural truths, derived from evidence or demonstration, would be obscured or corrupted by the faith that revelation demands.

I deny the antecedent. Such assent would not be obscured, but would be *confirmed*. In addition, faith can be primarily about truths not known naturally.

9. Through revelation there would be an interruption in the history of human accomplishments.

I deny the antecedent. This revelation *pertains also to human history*.

10. Revelation imposed by precept fosters intolerance and fanaticism. Therefore it is not useful for man.

I distinguish the first member. It fosters intolerance of error, *conceded*; it fosters intolerance towards persons with a lack of charity and a lack of prudence in relations with others, *denied*.

I deny the second member. For, obligatory revelation does not therefore will that revealed religion be propagated illegitimately and imprudently.

ARTICLE III

ON THE NECESSITY OF REVELATION

Thesis 4. Supernatural divine revelation in the present condition of the human race is morally necessary for a suitable knowledge of natural religion.

S.Th. , I CG 4; I, q. 1, a. 1; II-II, q. 2, a. 3f.; Ottiger, *Theologia fundament.* I § 14 p.91-148; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.315-356; CL 7,134-138, 523-525; Vacant, *Etude sur le Concile Vatican I* c.2 a.65f.

76. We have seen that divine revelation is not only possible, fitting and useful for the human race; now, taking a new step, we will show its necessity for the same human race. Thus minds are more easily disposed to accept the fact of this revelation.

77. **Definition of terms.** *Supernatural divine revelation* is understood here especially as that which is proposed and affirmed by the Catholic religious society, which says that it has been revealed and possesses divine revelation, which it also communicates through a living, authentic and perennial magisterium.

78. *Moral necessity* is opposed to physical necessity. *Physical necessity* is the necessity of an action or fact because of physical laws and *maintains that there is a physical incapacity for the contrary to take place*, that is, *it maintains the incapacity that arises from the lack of the physical forces or conditions which, according to the physical laws, are necessary so that something can take place*. Thus eyes, hearing are physically necessary in order to see, to hear (necessary physical *powers*); not to have the feet bound is physically necessary in order to walk (a physically necessary *condition*).

Moral necessity is the necessity of an action because of the laws of the order of morals, either psychological or according to the accustomed way of acting. Here it is not taken as an imposition from the moral law, which gives rise to an obligation, but as *the necessity that maintains the moral incapacity to do the contrary*.

The moral incapacity, which corresponds to this moral necessity, does not consist in the lack of the powers or physical conditions to act, but a) in the *great difficulty* which is present in order to do something, b) *so that*, looking at the human way of acting according to a prudent estimation, the physical power never or almost never will be put into act.

Hence moral incapacity not only consists in great difficulty (for then all things really difficult would be morally impossible), but it requires a

new element, a designation, namely, of a prudent judgment that can be made, so that someone may say: the thing will not be done or hardly will be done. Really, the physical powers are present at the given moment, but, considering the human way of acting and taking human psychology into account, someone can say for certain that the thing will not happen or hardly happen.

If the thing never happens, then *strict moral incapacity* is had; if the matter is thought to happen hardly or rarely, then *broad moral incapacity* is had.

Therefore this prudent judgment about the human way of acting can be fashioned either from the history of the human race, or from the experience of men and life, or (and more effectively) from the divine prescience and the revelation manifesting it.

Examples of moral incapacity: When it is said, for example, that it is morally impossible for a young man afire with passions to preserve purity, if, being given over to vice, he frequents dances and even greater dangers, this is known from the difficulty of something natural, and also from a prudent judgment based on human experience. Likewise it is morally necessary that a typist writing for a long time (even though he has the necessary talent, as is to be supposed) will make some mistakes. Another example: A man will not keep the whole natural law for a long time, not even as to its substance (i.e., he will sin mortally), without the help of God's grace; this is known from human experience and also most certainly from divine revelation or prescience. Likewise: No man without a special privilege from God will be freed for a long time from venial sins (indeliberate); this is also certain from prudent experience and from divine revelation.

79. *Congruous or suitable knowledge of natural religion* cannot be determined mathematically, and so it admits of grades; just as it cannot be determined mathematically how much food a man needs for a suitable maintenance of life. But this fittingness of knowledge is required so that at least the principal truths of natural religion may be known. They are not only the knowledge of a personal God, but also of his main attributes: namely, the paternal providence of God, mercy, justice, that he is the end and Lord of man; also knowledge of natural the moral laws and duties towards God and others, at least the fundamental and main ones; likewise a knowledge of the immortality of the soul and of a future sanction....

Furthermore, this suitable knowledge requires that all of these attributes be known "with facility, with firm certitude, and with no admixture of error" (D 3005). Hence certitude, security and opportunity (at the right time) and facility are required in order to know them. But when more truths are required for this congruous knowledge, there will be less possibility that the human race per se will acquire them.

80. State of the question. The thesis considers the present state of *the human race*; therefore an affirmation is not being made about individuals separately or about some classes of men. And we are speaking about the *strict* moral incapacity for *the human race*; but if we were speaking about individuals, we would be referring to *broad* moral incapacity.

Likewise the thesis is considering the *present* conditions in which the human race finds itself in this plan of providence. Therefore it does not have an absolute meaning nor is it meant for every possible state in which the human race could find itself. Therefore the thesis proceeds *hypothetically and disjunctively*, that is, in the hypothesis that this present state is not going to be changed by some special or preternatural divine assistance. Such assistance would be, v.gr., an abundance of men of outstanding genius, of great authority, doctrine and probity, who in the course of the centuries would always both teach and draw others to their sane doctrine; or it could be some other assistance, like the infusion of preternatural knowledge, etc.

If the concern is with the knowledge of religion of the supernatural order and in the hypothesis that man must freely tend to the proposed supernatural end, then divine revelation would be *absolutely and physically necessary*: for man, in order freely to seek a supernatural end, first must know about it as possible, which is something he cannot know from creatures by way of causality, because such an end surpasses the exigencies and powers of creatures; therefore it has to be known through revelation. Moreover, a man has to know such an end as proposed to him, and what it is and how it is to be obtained. All of these things require that they be made known by God by a positive intervention, that is, they require divine revelation as absolutely and physically necessary.

81. Adversaries. *Rationalists*, who deny all necessity of revelation (D 2903f.); especially the so-called *progressionists*, who hold that man of himself by way of progress can and must arrive at the possession of all that is true and good (D 3028).

Traditionalists, by excess, deny that man has the physical power to know natural religion, unless he is aided by divine revelation.

The advocates of the method of immanence in Apologetics attribute too much to the needs of nature, as if revelation *were demanded* by it so that it would be absolutely due and necessary, not only hypothetically and disjunctively (see D 3501 [34th edition] and below n. 138ff.). From a consideration of the human nature it is clear that there is a need of some assistance for the human race, but it is wrongly concluded that this help *must be* supernatural revelation.

82. Doctrine of the Church. According to the doctrine of Vatican Council I (D 3005), it is to be attributed [de facto] to *supernatural* divine

revelation [that is, the revelation mentioned in the previous number 3004] that *such truths among things divine that of themselves are not beyond human reason* [namely, truths of natural religion, like those treated in ch.1 (God's attributes) and in ch.2 (God as the beginning and end, D. 3004) and duties towards God] *by everyone* [therefore it is a matter for the whole human race] *with facility, with firm certitude, and with no admixture of error* [therefore congruously] *in the present condition of mankind* [this concerns the present state of fallen man because of sin¹ and expresses the hypothesis that God will not provide some other extraordinary means] *can be known*. Therefore, without this supernatural divine revelation, the human race could not know natural religion in a fitting manner. But if it cannot do it without revelation, revelation is necessary; furthermore, this is known from the repeated vain and unsuccessful attempts of many men to know religion. But this necessity is not to be understood as physical or absolute, because it is certain from the Council and from reason that man has the physical capacity to know religion, contrary to the traditionalists: *It is, however, not for this reason that revelation is to be called absolutely necessary* (D 3005).

Therefore, supernatural divine revelation must be said to be morally and hypothetically necessary in order to obtain suitable knowledge of natural religion.

But for the knowledge of the end and of supernatural religion, in the same place supernatural revelation is said to be absolutely necessary (D 3005).

Theologians at Vatican Council I commented on the proposed schema in such wise that they extolled "the absolute necessity of revelation regarding supernatural dogmas"; but they desired that "no one should think that the necessity regarding all religious truths and morals has been declared to be the same."² Therefore they said: "Besides the supernatural dogmas, about which we have spoken so far, in supernatural revelation truths pertaining to God and to the natural law are also contained, which *per se can be known* from the natural manifestation of God. Therefore an *absolute* necessity of supernatural manifestation or revelation for the knowledge of these truths is not necessary; if indeed it has to do in itself not only with the manner of the knowledge, but only with the knowledge itself. However, for the human race in its present condition in order to attain these truths in due time, with sufficient clarity and firm certitude without the admixture of error there are some difficulties, so that the physical power generally is not able to act without some special assistance. These difficulties constitute *a moral incapacity*, to

1. Thus R. Gasser, Bishop of Brixen, Secretary of the Council: "For when we speak about the present state of man, we are thinking about man as fallen through sin," CL 7,525.
 2. CL 7,525.

which corresponds *the moral necessity* of assistance. But this special assistance in the normal providence of the present order of elevated nature consists in supernatural revelation itself. Therefore this revelation regarding those truths also that are per se rational in the present order must be thought to be *morally necessary* for the human race (see S.Th., I, q. 1, a. 1; II-II, q.2, a. 4; 1 CG 4; *De verit.* q.14, a. 10).³

And in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" it is stated expressly: "...that divine 'revelation' must be considered *morally necessary* so that those religious and moral truths that are not of their nature beyond the reach of reason in the present condition of the human race may be known by all men readily with a firm certainty and with freedom from all error" (D 3876).

Theological note. The thesis is contained expressly in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*," and for this reason it is *Catholic doctrine*, since it does not seem to have been defined.

The thesis also agrees completely with the teachings of Vatican Council I, which, even in the chapters, are considered as peremptory definitions, unless they are dealing with the reasons and arguments which are not proposed as the teaching of the Church (see n. 65, note). But since the thesis itself, as it is worded, does not appear expressly as defined, and since it is not deduced from the words of the Council without some reasoning, we prefer to qualify it as a doctrine that is accepted and taught in the whole Church, but without having the higher qualification as being a matter of faith (*de fide*). Therefore we say that the thesis is *Catholic doctrine*.

83. It is proved in the first place *a posteriori* from the prudent judgment made from the *history* of errors in religious matters wherever human beings have lived.

A) *Examination of the errors and facts.*⁴ a) Consider from the history of religions and from the comparative study of them the law of religious devolution and depravity, so that the worship of God and religion are not found to be more pure with the passage of time, but just the opposite.⁵

b) In the Hellenistic culture itself, which we know better and was more perfect than others, consider the crass errors concerning God and the worship of Him, which in great part are mentioned in the book of Wisdom, chapters 13 and 14.

3. CL 7,524.

4. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.332-339, 345-346; N. Iung, *Révélation*: DTC 13,2608-2612.

5. Above n. 17f.

Now we are taking this book not as inspired, but *as historical*.—It is called *The Wisdom of Solomon* to give it more authority; it was composed in Egypt in the 1st century before Christ under the domination of the last Ptolemies and under the influence of Hellenistic culture. It was written in Greek by a Jew familiar with Jewish ideas, as is apparent in the book, and he had imbibed Hellenistic culture. The author wishes to console other Jews who were in the diaspora or dispersion and were oppressed with hardships, and at the same time to comfort them in their temptations because of the influence and corruption of a material and pagan civilization. Therefore he wants to raise up the mind of his readers to the true wisdom and civilization, by showing (ch. 1-5) the stupidity of the false culture and the values (ch. 6-9) that are found in the true wisdom, and (ch. 10-19) the things that wisdom has accomplished in the course of history. Chapters 13 and 14 show how far those have strayed who have followed not wisdom but idolatry.

1) Thus, first *the errors concerning God* are described, where diverse inferior religious forms are found.⁶

Therefore various forms of *animism* were thriving: nature worship, since *they considered as gods either fire or spirit or swift air or the circle of the stars or turbulent water or the sun and moon as rulers of the earth* (Wis. 13:2). And this nature worship among the Greeks and Romans extended itself to the worship of natural powers; among the Persians it assumed the form of sun worship, which later was taken over by the Romans as the feast of the invincible sun (today replaced by the feast of the Nativity of the Lord); among the Egyptians there was the cult of the earth and the Nile River....

Thus also *fetishism* thrived by attributing divine and absolute worship to human artifacts. For, they were miserable *who give the name of "gods" to the works of human hands, gold and silver fashioned with skill, and likenesses of animals, or a useless stone, the work of an ancient hand...* (Wis. 13:10...)⁷

The worship of men, *manism*, was actively practiced (men gods, the spirits of men), while *a father, consumed with grief at an untimely bereavement, made an image of his child, who had been suddenly taken from him; and he now honored as a god what was once a dead human being, and handed on to his dependents secret rites and initiations* (Wis. 14:15). Likewise, *at the command of monarchs graven images were worshipped... and... they made a visible image of the king whom they honored, so that by their zeal they might flatter the absent one as though present... and now regarded as an object of worship the one whom shortly before they had honored as a man...* (Wis. 14:16-20).

6. Above n. 13.

7. *Ibidem* ch. 13:11—14:2, the author wittily and beautifully describes the stupidity of fetishism.

Religious mysteries as sacred rites, secret, with superstitious vigils (by abstinence, intense light, ecstasy...), promising liberation from guilt and hope of life, were commonly practiced. Wis. 14:23 perhaps alludes to these things when it mentions *frenzied revels with strange customs...*; thus there were the orgies of the Syrian cult, the Eleusian mysteries (Athens),⁸ and the cult of Mithras, which was introduced into the Roman Empire in the 3rd century.

The Romans, by either accepting or assimilating or adopting these religious forms of diverse character and origin, gave birth to a sterile *syncretism*.

It was also *a worship unworthy of God*: human sacrifices, sacrifices of bulls,⁹ sacred prostitution, black magic... (see Wis. 14:23ff.).

2) *Moral errors* were connected with the religious errors; some of these are listed in Wis. 14:12.23-27, and especially in Rom. 1:18.21-32. And profane history confirms this about the morals and culture of the time: for, moral principles were lacking (on the divine authority and sanction, without an open acknowledgement of freedom and human dignity, with doubts about the immortality of the soul); there were many vices against chastity, contempt for manual labor, praise of suicide, slavery, "bread and circuses," cruel wars, *men without mercy* (Rom. 1:31).¹⁰

84. c) But also the nation that possessed monotheistic religion, the people of Israel, was not exempt from this law of religious degeneration, without the special help of God. The continuing history of Israel demonstrates how prone the people were to idolatry, and again and again abandoned the Sinai covenant and, having abandoned Yahweh, worshipped the gods of the neighboring peoples. Monotheism, if it was preserved in its pure form, was maintained by the *prophets* speaking in the name of God; that is, from what was thought to be divine revelation.

d) Also in our times peoples, who say that they are Christian, but abandoning the religion which they hold as revealed and despising the magisterium of the Church that formerly they had embraced, have fallen into a series of errors, so that we may justly ask what still remains of primitive Christianity.

e) Modern philosophers and men of profane culture, having rejected the Christian doctrine which they had held as revealed, have fallen into the most shameful religious and moral errors, often by reviving ancient errors. They have built the foundations of ethics and social and international relations on shifting sand.

f) In missionary countries, even after the introduction of the Christian religion,

8. From the city Eleusis (ἐλευσις, arrival), because of the arrival of Ceres, the goddess of agriculture, in that place, that is, in the region of Attica.

9. That is, by sprinkling the blood of animals.

10. See later the treatise *On Revelation* n.674, where the change of morals introduced by Christianity contrasts with the previous Roman culture.

which is revealed, there are still many errors concerning the things that have to do with natural religion!

85. B) *A consideration of facts and errors.* Since that is the case, it is quite certain that very many nations have not had a completely pure idea of God and of religious and moral matters, and there is found in this the *universality of the fact* among those peoples that they do not have a religion like what has been revealed.

And this happened *even though there was the desire of all peoples to know religion* (for they worshipped gods, they tried to foretell the future, religion was highly esteemed, they inquired eagerly into the oriental “mysteries,” so that new philosophical systems arose—Neo-Platonists, Plotinus...).

And in spite of the efforts of several philosophers. Even they were not able to cure this situation, v.gr., by pointing out the worthlessness of the gods... (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Seneca...).

But *all of these facts suppose a universal cause, namely, in human nature*, because the fact is morally universal. But this cause must be *a certain incapacity* whereby nature itself alone cannot attain the full religious truth; *but what never takes place, in spite of desires and attempts, supposes some incapacity.*

But this cannot be a physical incapacity, since it is certain that man has the physical powers to know naturally and to demonstrate natural religion; for this it suffices to have an intellect and to apply it to the arguments and proofs that are proposed in Philosophy (Theodicy, Ethics...).

Therefore it must be a moral incapacity, that is, it is the great difficulty that is found in human nature in order to know suitably natural religion; and this difficulty, now known because of a prudent judgment based on history, will not be overcome without some special assistance from God.

Therefore in the present condition of the human race some divine assistance, namely, supernatural revelation (which Christians invoke) is morally necessary for a suitable knowledge of natural religion.

86. It is proved in the second place *by a psychological argument*, as it were a priori, from a consideration of human nature in its present condition; not by considering purely in the abstract order, but to a certain extent in the concrete, according as men de facto would be or are: needy, slothful... Therefore the proof in a certain way proceeds also historically.

A suitable knowledge of natural religion would be obtained for the human race, either 1) by the proper investigation of each person, or 2) by

the teaching of others.

But in neither way can the human race have suitable knowledge of natural religion.

Therefore another way, divine revelation in the present order of providence, is morally necessary for a suitable knowledge of natural religion.

The minor: 1) That suitable knowledge *would not be obtained by the proper investigation of individuals.*

For a) *few* are able to carry out this task: many from the human race are hindered whether because of their own mental indisposition—or because of the necessities of family affairs and the lack of leisure—or because of sloth.

b) For these few *a long time* would be required for the investigation of such truths: because of their profundity, which demand and pre-require a prolonged exercise of intellect and the knowledge of many other truths (a consideration of almost all Philosophy). Moreover, during the time of youth the soul is agitated by the impulses of the passions and is not apt for a profound knowledge of truths, but when it quiets down it becomes prudent.

c) Furthermore, often *falsity gets involved* in human investigation because of the weakness of intellect and the mingling of phantasms; and because many are deceived by the false scientific authority of others.

Therefore the human race would not obtain by the proper investigation of each person a suitable knowledge of natural religion.

2) *It would not be obtained by the teaching of others.* For, there would hardly be such teachers, who would have this knowledge. Then, even given, but not conceded, that they could be found in sufficient numbers, they would have to want to teach others, and especially the common people.¹¹ Likewise they would have to have the authority and jurisdiction for this task; finally, they could not demand firm assent to their words, often from a lack of certain knowledge, and because of a difference of opinions, which easily takes place among men even in obvious things, especially in moral matters which are directed to controlling the passions. Therefore many reasonably would have doubts and they would not give firm assent to the propositions of the teachers.

“Wholesomely, therefore, divine clemency has provided that also those

11. “There are few good and learned men in comparison with others, and of those few, most seek rest from their past labors...” St. Ignatius Loyola in the Preface to Part IV of the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* where he is treating the need to form Jesuit seminarians. And not many learned professors want to break bread with children and ignorant people. The view of Horace is well known: “I hate the common crowd and I avoid them...” *Odes* III, 1.

things, which reason can investigate, should be held by faith” (1 CG 4).

87. Corollary. Therefore, as is certain psychologically and historically (also from recent history), a people or society, who reject all revelation, and want with their own powers and philosophy to exercise religion, do not attain even natural religion itself, and much less do they practice it. For supernatural revelation is morally necessary.

88. Objections. 1. If divine revelation is necessary for the human race, then it is demanded by human nature. But divine revelation cannot be demanded by human nature. Therefore divine revelation is not necessary for the human race.

I distinguish the major. If divine revelation is necessary *with physical necessity* for the human race in order to obtain its essential end, it is demanded by human nature, *conceded*; if it is necessary *with moral necessity* for a suitable knowledge of natural religion, it is demanded by nature, *I subdistinguish*: if it is necessary *absolutely*, *conceded*; if it is necessary *disjunctively*, *denied*. *I concede the minor. I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*

2. If revelation even morally and disjunctively is necessary for a suitable knowledge of natural religion, human nature was created defective and imperfect. But that would be contrary to the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. Human nature was created defective and imperfect, inasmuch as God worked *in an imperfect way*, *denied* (God always works *in the best way*); it was created defective, inasmuch as nature is susceptible of greater perfection, *conceded*. *I also distinguish the minor.* It would be contrary to the wisdom of the Creator to work *not in the best way*, *conceded*; it would be contrary to the wisdom and goodness of the Creator to work *not in the best way*, *denied* (God is not held to make the very best things).

3. God is held to so form nature that it can obtain its end. But if revelation is necessary for nature, nature was not so formed that it could obtain its end. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. God is held to form nature *with the physically necessary natural means* so that it can obtain its end, *conceded*; with natural means *only*, not using supernatural means, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* If revelation is physically necessary, human nature was not so formed that it could obtain its final end, *conceded*; if it is morally and disjunctively necessary, and *God is prepared to offer the supernatural assistance of revelation*, *nature was not so formed that it could obtain it end*, *denied*.

4. If this supernatural assistance of revelation is necessary, all would have to accept it. But not all peoples or persons have accepted it. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. All had to accept this help *either by themselves or in their predecessors*, *conceded*; precisely in themselves, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor in the same way.*

5. This supernatural assistance, made to predecessors, has been obscured among many peoples. But if that is so, God has not provided sufficiently for these peoples. Therefore.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. God has not provided sufficiently for these peoples so that *in some way* they can obtain the supernatural end, *denied*; he has not sufficiently provided *for suitably obtaining* the supernatural end, that is, through congruous knowledge of natural religion, *I subdistinguish*: before the sins of men, *denied* (for God provided sufficiently for this); *after the personal sins of men*, and because of these sins, *I subdistinguish again*: God has not provided sufficiently, as if he were held to do more, *denied*; he has not provided more abundantly, *while permitting ignorance of religion* because of his higher ends, *conceded* (see the Scholium).

6. The present human race cannot be punished for the sins of its predecessors. But peoples and persons *de facto* not having revelation are punished because of the sins or predecessors. Therefore the human race of any time must have revelations.

I distinguish the major. The human race cannot be punished for the sins of its predecessors *in the privation of a naturally due perfection*, *I bypass the major or concede it*; in privation of gifts *that are not due*, such as revelation, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor in the same way.*

7. The human race for the most part has not known revelation. Therefore the human race for the most part has been abandoned by God.

I concede the antecedent and distinguish the consequent. It was abandoned by God so that on the part of God men could not obtain their end, and God did not have a *sincere and operative will* to bring them to their final end, *denied*; it was abandoned, inasmuch as *more abundant means* were not given to them, as was given to the people of Israel and, after Christ, to the Christian people, *I subdistinguish*: as if God were held to do more, *denied*; but God *permitted* this for his own just and wise reasons, *conceded*. For this is true: *Righteous art thou, O Lord, and right are thy judgments* (Ps. 119:137).

8. But the revelation itself which, as is supposed, was given to Jews and Christians, was not able to remove all errors (v.gr., among schismatics, Protestants...) and produce holiness of life in the whole human race. Therefore supernatural revelation does not necessarily have to be added.

I distinguish the antecedent. Revelation was not able to remove all error... *and this proves that the free cooperation of man is necessary and that other helps are necessary* (the grace of God and the living magisterium of the Church...), *conceded*; hence it is proved that revelation is useless and not necessary, *denied*.

9. If revelation is necessary for the knowledge of natural religion, then errors about God cannot be imputed to peoples that do not have it. But they can be imputed to them (from Rom. 1:19-21). Therefore.

I distinguish the major. If revelation is necessary for a congruous knowledge of natural religion (namely, so that the truths of natural religion are known easily, for certain and with no mingling of errors) any invincible error about God cannot be imputed to them, *conceded*; gross errors about God cannot be imputed, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor in the same way.*

10. According to St. Paul (Rom. 2:14) the Gentiles *do by nature what the law requires*. Therefore by nature they know God as the legislator and teacher of the law. Therefore revelation is not necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Gentiles, *who do not have the law*, do by nature what the law requires, that is, they do, without a written law, and know by natural reason *some of the things* required by the natural law, *conceded*; they know *suitably* and do *everything* required by the law and that has reference to God, *denied*. In the same way I distinguish the last consequent. Therefore revelation is not necessary for some knowledge about God and the natural law, *conceded*; it is not necessary for a suitable knowledge, *denied*.

89. Scholium. *The agreement between the moral necessity of revelation and other truths.* It is certain, from what was said in the argument where we considered the psychological roots of universal religious ignorance, *that there is a weakness and infirmity in human nature* with regard to the knowledge of natural religion: that there is a state of confusion in many, that many are distracted with other occupations, that many do not have the time... and also they are agitated by their passions and the heat of temperament, so that they do not slow down and they are not prepared for a peaceful contemplation of truth; and in all some falsity is always involved because of the weakness of intellect and the confusion of phantasms.

Hence the question is asked: *Could God create human nature with this weakness and infirmity regarding the knowledge of natural religion? Is it contrary to the divine attributes that the human race, being rational, is not able to know and fulfill its very reasonable duties—its religious duties?*

Certainly God could create man with this weakness, without any supernatural gifts: the state of pure nature. In this hypothesis, it is reasonably supposed, based on the goodness and providence of God, that God would give help (of the natural order) in order to know this natural religion; to suppose the contrary is difficult.

Hence also it is rightly *inferred that God gave some assistance to the first parents*. But in the course of history this help often is not apparent. Therefore it is rightly concluded (not for certain) that there was some primeval fault in the human race (original sin and personal sins).

But from the sources of revelation we know that God created man with eminent gifts and with eminent assistance, that is, with the supernatural gifts of grace, revelation, integrity... for Adam and for us: the state of original justice.

Adam, however, because of his originating original sin lost those gifts for himself and for us; hence human nature remained despoiled of those gifts and wounded in its natural powers, since it did not have the eminent gifts which it had in paradise: the state of fallen nature.

God gives a remedy for this situation by promising a Redeemer, by restoring grace, by conserving and increasing supernatural revelation for

the human race through Adam, the patriarchs, Moses, Jesus and others, prophets and apostles....

But there is this question: *Does God desire a remedy for the whole human race and did he provide one after the fall of Adam?*

Certainly God desires the supernatural salvation of all, and God provided sufficiently that each person may obtain his end in some way by elevation to the state of grace, through the signs of the primitive¹² and patriarchal revelation and through other means [this is theologically certain]. In addition also through an ordinary remedy whereby infants are freed from original sin and sanctified, doubtless, as probably is said, through the properly called *sacrament of nature* for those who were under the natural law alone¹³; it is like circumcision, which was for those who belonged to the people of Israel.

God also provided sufficiently so that individual persons suitably might obtain their end, inasmuch as he was not held to do more; however not completely congruously, after the personal sins of men, with reference to most of them.

Why did God not bring it about that *all suitably* would know the natural religion before the coming of the Redeemer? This response can be made: in order to show the necessity of the Redeemer and to stir up the desire for him; also to show the riches which we have in Him. And these words also apply here: *O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?* (Rom. 11:33-34).

12. This primitive revelation recently was treated by H. Heras, S.J., *La primitiva revelación en las escrituras indias*: EstBibl 11 (1952) 225-233.

13. See Sasse, *De Sacramentis* I p.13-16.

ARTICLE IV

ON THE REVELATION OF MYSTERIES

S.Th. II-II, q. 2, a. 1-3; 1 CG 3-6; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.277-314; Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* N.51-63; Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* I c.11f.; Vacant, *Etudes sur le Concile Vatican 2* c.4 a.120-127; Michel, *Mystère: DTC 10,2585-2599*; Scheeben, *Mysterien des Christentums*¹ (Freiburg 1951) c.1.

90. The existence of mysteries and the revelation of them must be treated separately, because in them there is a special difficulty *because of the object to be revealed*; and since the Church says that she has mysteries in her revelation, no one reasonably would embrace the Christian religion, if in this matter some repugnance were perceived.

Moreover, fundamental Theology, as an introduction to dogmatic Theology, which does contain mysteries, must *treat these in general*, by showing their possibility and existence. Hence three theses will be given: on the possibility of mysteries, on the possibility of the revelation of mysteries, and on the fact of mysteries in Christian revelation.

Thesis 5: The existence of mysteries cannot be shown to be repugnant.

91. Definition of terms. *A mystery*, from μύειν, *from the root of the word* is something closed up—a hidden truth. But a truth can be hidden because the subject is hidden, or the predicate, or both, or the connection between both of them.

The fundamental etymological meaning is known *from its use*. Thus, a) among pagans a mystery is: a sacred rite performed at night or usually carried out secretly—a doctrine hidden from the beginners; b) among the sacred authors: something secret or hidden; thus it indicates either a secret in general or a salutary secret or a sacrament.¹

92. Divisions of mysteries. A) *Natural mysteries* are those that belong to the things of nature, not to God; Thus they are:

- 1) things that are hidden only by a lack of manifestation, like interior thoughts;
- 2) things that are recognized as to their existence, but not as to their intimate nature: life, human freedom, the law of gravity....

B) The consideration of natural mysteries prepares the way for the

1. See Zorell, *Lexikon Graec.* at the word μυστήριον; J. de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot "sacramentum"* (Louvain 1924); Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.278-280; G. Kittel, *Theolog. Wörterbuch* 4,809ff.

consideration of *theological mysteries*. These are the ones that pertain to God. Three kinds can be considered:

1) Truths about God that naturally can be known for certain, but imperfectly and analogically, and they can be demonstrated certainly from internal reasons. They are called *mysteries in the broad sense*, v.gr., the immutability and freedom of God and other truths from Theodicy.

We comprehend these truths according to their existence and according to their essence, i.e., we know their existence and their internal reason, because we see that the predicate de facto agrees with the subject and we can demonstrate that. They are said to be mysteries inasmuch as we grasp them imperfectly and analogically.

An explanation of the analogical concept. Our concepts about some thing either are a) *immediate*, if they attain the object immediately (v.gr., the man whom I see), or they are b) *mediated*, if through the mediation of some means they attain the object (v.gr., God, angels, whom I do not see).

Every immediate concept is *proper*, because it represents the thing properly and from the characteristics of the thing itself.

But mediated concepts can be either *proper from the properties* or *proper from something else*.

Mediated concepts proper from the properties (derived from the characteristics) are said to be those that represent their object *positively* (not negatively) and *directly* (that is, not indirectly through some different thing, which does not agree univocally with the represented object); v.gr., the concept of man or of a plant that we have.

Mediated concepts, proper from something else, are said to be those that *negatively* or *indirectly* represent the thing; v.gr., the concept of the infinite, the concept of the cause of the world that we have. These concepts are said to be *analogical concepts*.²

2) Truths whose existence alone is made known by revelation, but later their essence and internal harmony of notes is perceived, v.gr., the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, the immunity of the Bl. Virgin Mary from all sin.

They are called *mysteries according to their existence*, but not according to essence, – or *preterrational mysteries*—or *mysteries of the second order*.

3) Truths whose existence alone is made known by revelation, and after their revelation still their intimate and internal reason and the harmony of their notes cannot be demonstrated, but only believed; v.gr.,

2. On the function of analogy in Theology, see Penido, *Le rôle de l'analogie en Théologie dogmatique* (Paris 1931).

the trinity of persons in the unity of the divine nature.

They are called *mysteries according to existence and according to essence*,

–*suprarational mysteries*, because their internal possibility is not understood by us, – *mysteries of the first order*, because they are especially such, –and *absolute mysteries*, because they surpass the natural capability of every created intellect (D 3016).

93. State of the question. Since in this thesis we are speaking about mysteries, we are speaking about them as the Church understands them, that is, in this last strict sense, about absolute mysteries and according to their existence and essence, as has been explained (see D 2853-2857, 3015f., 3041...).

These mysteries, although they can be positively illustrated, which takes place especially in scholastic Theology (see D 3016), cannot be positively demonstrated by internal arguments, that is, by showing their internal possibility through internal reasons. The negative demonstration, which can be made for them, consists in the fact that the difficulties that can be raised against them are answered.

It is precisely concerning these mysteries that we now wish to demonstrate that no repugnance can be found in their existence. For, regarding preterrational mysteries or those of the second order, it is easily understood that there are truths of this kind: For it is certain that God knows and comprehends about himself and about his free decrees more than a created intellect is able to know; and therefore that there are truths concerning God whose existence a creature would not be aware of unless it were revealed to him by God, but there does not seem to be a difficulty that at times their intimate nature can be understood and so can be demonstrated.

94. Adversaries. Besides the *rationalists*, who say that everything can be known and penetrated by natural reason³;

And besides the *modernists*, for whom the dogmas (mysteries) taught by the Church are only interpretations and human formulas concerning former religious experience (D 3422, 3487), which therefore can be understood naturally;

Now the more immediate adversaries are the so-called *semi-rationalists*, who contend that the divine mysteries (at least those in God that are necessary) can be demonstrated after the fact of revelation from their internal reasons, and so are no longer absolute mysteries. Before

3. See above n. 64, in the thesis on the possibility of revelation.

Vatican Council I such views were held by G. Hermes (1775-1831),⁴ J. Frohschammer (1821-1893),⁵ A. Günther (1783-1863).⁶

Rosmini comes close to semi-rationalism; he taught that after the revelation of the mystery of the Trinity its existence can be demonstrated by speculative arguments, both negative and indirect, so that that truth is referred to the philosophical disciplines (D 3225).

The ontologists also are led logically to the denial of mysteries; for since they claim to have immediate knowledge of God in this life (D 2841f., see D 3236), it happens that “we have knowledge implicitly of every being, under whatever aspect it is knowable.”⁷

It does not seem that Raymund Lull (Lulius) should be numbered among the adversaries.⁸

95. Doctrine of the Church. It was defined solemnly and explicitly at Vatican Council I that there is given in divine revelation *true and properly said mysteries and that all the dogmas of faith cannot be understood and demonstrated by natural principles* (D 3041). And from the way of speaking it is certain that they mean absolute mysteries, but in the chapter corresponding to this canon the meaning of the word “mystery” is explained more at length: “For divine mysteries by their very nature so exceed the created intellect that, even when they have been communicated in revelation and received by faith, they remain covered by the veil of faith itself and shrouded, as it were, in darkness as long as in this mortal life we are away from the Lord” (D 3016). Therefore from the definition of the Vatican Council I it is certain that there are *absolute* mysteries. Therefore if they are given, it is said implicitly that their existence is not repugnant (see D 2855f.).

Theological note. The thesis is proposed at least implicitly in revelation through the New Testament, and by the Fathers, as will be shown below (n. 113f.); moreover, it has been defined solemnly by the Church as a doctrine implicitly revealed. Therefore the thesis is *solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith* (D 3041).

4. See D 2738-2740.2775ff.

5. His teaching is rejected in D 2851f.

6. His teaching is rejected in D 2826ff.

7. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.290.

8. See E. Longpré, *Lulle*: DTC 9,1122-1126; Mirales Sbert: *RazFe* 100 (1932) 106; Sureda Blanes, *El Beato Ramón Lull* (Madrid 1934) 158ff; Carreras Artau, *Filosofía cristiana de los siglos XIII al XV* t.1 (Madrid 1939) p.514-523.

96. Proof. For the human intellect to show that theological mysteries are repugnant, it must show that it can know infinite being, God, in a perfect way, that is, by understanding fully its quiddity or essence; for if it shows this, then certainly there are no mysteries in God.

But the human intellect cannot show that, since it knows God very imperfectly:

1) *Because of analogy in knowing.* Our concepts of God are had by way of affirmation (God is the cause of the world), or of negation (God is infinite and im-mense...), or of eminence (God is wiser than all wisdom...); therefore they are analogical concepts (obtained in an indirect or negative way) and very imperfect; i.e., we do not have concepts of God that are proper from his properties. Moreover, the material object of our intellect is all being rightly proposed to it, but the formal object in the state of union is *the quiddity of a material thing or the intelligible in the sensible*. Therefore we have ideas about God only through reference to a sensible thing. Hence if in these objects proper to us some divine perfection is not found, this perfection is not attained, and therefore we cannot say that we know the whole reality of God or have essential knowledge about him, which touches all of his essential predicates. This is *the logical reason why the order of mysteries is not repugnant*.

2) It arrives at knowledge of God *in virtue of a conclusion from created effects*. Indeed, if these effects are not equal to the power of the cause, from them a creature cannot know perfectly the whole reality of God. And *this is the ontological reason of the mysteries*, that is, because creatures do not represent exhaustively the whole reality of God.

97. A different way. For someone to demonstrate that mysteries are repugnant, he must demonstrate that all truths can be understood from their internal reasons. But that cannot be demonstrated; rather, the contrary seems to be the case. Therefore it cannot be demonstrated that there are no absolute mysteries.

The minor. Rather, the contrary seems to be the case. For, a demonstration or knowledge from internal principles is based on proper and quidditative knowledge or the essential notes of the thing being considered. But we do not have fully essential knowledge of many things.

98. Objections. 1. Every being has its own sufficient reason. But a mystery does not have its own sufficient reason. Therefore a mystery is not a being.

I concede the major and deny the minor. A mystery has for *the divine intellect* its own *intrinsic* sufficient reason, and for us in this life an *extrinsic* sufficient reason.

2. According to the principle of sufficient reason every being is explicable. But a mystery is inexplicable. Therefore it is not being.

I distinguish the major. Every being is explicable whether to its essence or to its existence, *conceded*; it is explicable as to its essence always and by all, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor:* it is not explicable as to its existence, *denied*.

3. A mystery is called a truth that cannot be penetrated by us. But every truth can be penetrated by us. Therefore it is repugnant for there to be mysteries. *I concede the major and deny the minor.*

4. *Objector insists, proves the minor.* Every truth is a being. But every being is an object of the human intellect. But what is an object of the human intellect can be penetrated by us. Therefore every truth can be penetrated by us.

I concede the first proposition and distinguish the second. Every being is an object of the human intellect if it is properly proposed to it, *conceded*; if it is not properly proposed, *denied*.

5. A mystery to be believed is properly proposed to the human intellect. Therefore it can be penetrated by it.

I distinguish the antecedent. A mystery to be believed is properly proposed to the human intellect, *as to its existence* or as to whether it is, *conceded*; it is properly proposed as to its essence or as to why it is such, *denied*.

6. A mystery also as to its essence can be properly proposed to the human intellect. Therefore.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the next life, *conceded*; in the pilgrim state of life de facto it is proposed as to its essence, *denied*.

7. The human intellect also in the pilgrim state of life is indefinitely perfectible. Therefore in the pilgrim state of life it can arrive at the penetration of mystery.

I distinguish the antecedent. It is indefinitely perfectible within the limits of its object, *conceded*; beyond all limits, *denied*.

8. The human intellect knows the infinity of God. But if it knows the infinity of God, it knows everything about God or it is perfectible beyond all limits. Therefore finally it will be able to penetrate mystery.

I distinguish the major. It knows the infinity of God *with a proper and intuitive concept, denied*; with an analogical concept, *conceded*. *I also distinguish the minor in the same way.*

9. What does not have understandability does not have being. But a mystery does not have understandability. Therefore it does not have being.

I distinguish the major. What *does not have absolutely any* understandability neither by God nor by man, does not have being, *conceded*; what has understandability as to whether it exists, and by God is known as to why it is such, does not have being, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

10. All things that are in God are good. But if they are good, they are diffusive of themselves and communicable. Therefore all things that are in God can be communicated and found in creatures and can be known.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. *The proper goods that are in God* are communicable, *I request proof of this*; other goods, *I subdistinguish:* they can be communicated, but do not necessarily have to be, *conceded*; must be communicated and necessarily found in creatures, *denied*.

99. Scholium. *Whether the existence of the order of mysteries positively may be demonstrated by philosophical arguments.*

S.Th., 1 CG 3; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.307-313; Pesch, *Theolog. Fundam.* n.165; Lercher, *Theologia fundam.* n.56; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, n.57; Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* I c.11.

State of the question. 1) It concerns, as is clear, a positive demonstration, i.e., not merely negative, such as we proposed above by showing that it is not repugnant and cannot show any repugnance, but *positively*, by establishing with positive arguments that mysteries truly exist.

2) These arguments must be *philosophical*, i.e., not theological, in order that there may be proofs for the fact that it is theologically certain that there are miracles.

3) The concern here is *with absolute mysteries* or those of the first order, not with mysteries of the second order or according to their existence only.

100. The *argument* to prove the existence of absolute mysteries *cannot be derived from the infinity of God or from the fact that there must be an infinite and essential distance between the created and the uncreated intellect.* For, from this it is rightly argued that a created intellect cannot by its own natural power comprehend all the divine ideas taken *collectively* or comprehend God; but why can he not attain them taken *distributively* according as they appear or are deduced from the effects of creation, and thus arrive at the point that he understands, analogically of course, their intrinsic nature?

But if God does not want to produce some effects, and therefore reserves to himself some of his other divine properties and consequently their knowledge, until he himself decides to reveal them, why would it not be possible later to penetrate those creatures as to their internal reasons, even though they are understood with analogical concepts?

101. Garrigou-Lagrange argues from the fact that God cannot be known from creatures positively according to the intimate nature of the Deity, that is, “God according to that which is most proper to himself, because [*the Major*] God is known from creatures only according to the perfections which are *analogically and evidently common* to himself and to creatures (being, good...), but regarding that which is proper to himself he is known *negatively and relatively* (infinity, immutability, absolute being, supreme wisdom...).

[*The minor*] But the objective means whereby a created intellect must know naturally is only through creatures.

Therefore a created intellect cannot know God according to that which is proper to him, that is, under the intimate nature of Deity.”

I respond: *I distinguish the second part of the major:* God, according to what

is proper to himself *is known from creatures negatively and relatively*, i.e., *he is not known by a concept that is proper from his properties, conceded*; God according to what is proper to him cannot be known by a concept proper from something else or analogical, *I subdistinguish: if what is proper is understood to be peculiar to himself and is not in any way revealable even as to its existence, conceded*; if what is proper to him *is nevertheless revealable*, I ask for proof why it cannot be known and understood by analogical concepts and so be demonstrated from its intrinsic reasons.

I concede the minor and distinguish the consequent. Therefore a created intellect cannot know God, with regard to that which is proper to him, *with proper concepts from the properties, conceded*; with negative and relative concepts, i.e., *analogical, I subdistinguish: if that proper concept it not revealable even as to its existence, conceded*; if it is revealable, *I ask for proof.*

Wherefore, just as the human intellect cannot demonstrate that it can fully understand God himself, so we are not able to demonstrate positively that we could not understand or demonstrate *with analogical concepts* (negative and relative) what he reveals about himself. But this last point *would be recommended.*

102. *The teaching of St. Thomas* (1 CG 3): “*It is most clearly apparent that there are some divine ideas that totally exceed the ability of human reason.*”

In the first place because “things that do not fall under the senses cannot be grasped by the human intellect, except inasmuch as their knowledge is gathered from the senses. But sensible things cannot lead our intellect in such a way that in them the divine substance may be seen as to *what it is*, since they are effects that do not equal the power of the cause. Our intellect is led from sensible things to divine knowledge, so that it may know about God *that he exists*, and other things of this kind, which must be attributed to the first principle; but there are some things that absolutely surpass the power of human reason.”

Secondly from the grades of intelligible things: “For two of whom one sees things with his intellect more acutely than the other, the one whose intellect is more acute, understands many things that the other absolutely cannot grasp.” Therefore the divine intellect, equal in its power to his own substance, perfectly understands about himself what he is and knows everything that can be known about himself; but an angel or a creature does not know about God what he is, because the substance of an angel or of any other creature, by which it comes to knowledge of God, is an effect that does not equal the power of the cause.”

Thirdly “from the defect that we experience daily in coming to the knowledge of things. For, we do not know many of the properties of sensible things, and concerning their properties that we do grasp with our senses, in many of them, we are not able to grasp perfectly their nature. Therefore, it is even much more the case

that human reason is not able to investigate all the intelligible aspects of that most excellent substance.”

Conclusion. According to this teaching of St. Thomas, which is *most clearly apparent*, it is certain that there is in God an order of ideas that surpass the capability of a created intellect, and they are *at least mysteries of the second order or with regard to existence*; and, as many ancient Thomists thought, they are *convinced* that there is also in God an order of ideas of things that, even after they have been revealed, cannot be understood from their internal reasons.⁹

9. Suarez says: “But it is very true that a theologian cannot demonstrate that the principal supernatural mysteries of the faith are possible... from the evidence of credibility the evidence of possibility does not follow” (*De fide* 4 s.2 n.9; ed. Vivès 12,118f.). Muncunill speaks in favor of the thesis: “probable reasons are not lacking for their existence” (mysteries) (*De vera religion* p.55). A.Cotter: “There are positive reasons which persuade us that there are mysteries in God in the strict sense” (*Theolog. fundam.*² p.46).

Thesis 6. The revelation of mysteries cannot be shown to be repugnant.

103. State of the question. We suppose as demonstrated that the fact of revelation in general is not repugnant, indeed that it is possible; now we will treat the special case of the object to be revealed: the revelation of mysteries, *if they exist*.

104. Adversaries. Besides those who indirectly deny the matter (see n. 64), there are now the *rationalists*, who deny the possibility of any revelation, and a fortiori if it concerns mysteries, which are said to surpass the capability of reason. Against the revelation of mysteries in particular it is argued that they would be *like an algebraic formula for an illiterate man*, objects fully unintelligible and beyond human knowledge: therefore their revelation would be something contradictory. Thus O. Pfeiderer¹ and agnostic modernists. However they do retain the word “mystery” as a symbolic formula (D 3422, 3487).

105. Doctrine of the Church. If in divine revelation, as Vatican I solemnly defined, there are true and properly so called mysteries (D 3041), their revelation is said *implicitly* not to be repugnant. Likewise see other places (v.gr., n. 95), from which it is certain that there are mysteries in Christian revelation.

Theological note. *Solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith* (D 3041).

106. Proof. *By examining the elements in the revelation of mysteries.* The repugnance that would be present in the revelation of mysteries, or the metaphysical impossibility of the same, seems to be able to be excluded by examining all the elements involved in this concept. But on the part of the elements that concern revelation in general there is no difficulty (from what was proved above): there can only be a difficulty 1) on the part of the special object now to be revealed; and 2) whether this object physically can be understood by a man; and 3) whether it can morally be revealed by God, that is, whether he can have suitable reasons and worthy ends in such a revelation.

But 1) *it is not repugnant on the part of the thing to be revealed.* For, a mystery is a being, namely, we have proved that its impossibility cannot be demonstrated or that it is something chimerical. Therefore nothing is shown to be repugnant on the part of the thing to be revealed.

2) *Nothing is shown to be repugnant on the part of the man receiving*

1. *Religionsphilosophie* 2,421; see Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* (1927) p. 46.

the revelation of such an object. For a man can accept and apprehend with concepts at least analogical the ideas of the subject and predicate of a proposition of mystery, if it is proposed to him (v.gr., God one in nature and three in persons); he can also accept the connection between the subject and the predicate and, if he is certain about the authority of the one affirming this connection, the man will also be able to believe and affirm the same connection, without being able to perceive the intimate essence of the matter that is revealed.

3) *Nothing is shown to be repugnant on the part of God revealing.* For God can physically propose the existence of this truth or being to the human intellect, just as he can propose a revelation of any kind; and *it seems* that he can have the reasons for doing this, for example, by declaring some aspects of his life or the secrets of his decrees and in order to test a man's faith and also to reward him.

A different way: Whatever has the nature of being can be known by the human intellect, at least with a proper concept of something else, if it is fitly proposed to him.

But a mystery, if there is such, is a being and it can be fitly proposed by God to the human intellect.

Therefore a mystery can be known by the human intellect.

Therefore it can also be revealed by God.

107. Another proof. The revelation of mysteries would be repugnant to the extent that a) they would be for man like a fully unintelligible formula, or b) their revelation would be able to confer nothing useful.

But neither alternative can be said.

Therefore the revelation of mysteries cannot be shown to be repugnant.

I prove the minor, since, regarding the major, the things indicated in the disjunction are the main points of repugnance advocated by the adversaries.

a) The revealed mysteries would not be for man like a fully unintelligible formula, or like an algebraic formula for an illiterate man. For, a mystery is a being, and whatever is contained in it is being. But all being is the object of the human intellect, at least as known analogically, if it is rightly proposed to him. Therefore if a man understands the meaning of the subject and predicate of a proposition, he understands the meaning of the proposition affirming or denying composition or the division of both of them, even if he does not understand the intimate reason why it is so. Therefore a mystery will be an object of the human intellect at least as known analogically, if it

is suitably proposed to him.²

b) Revelation of mysteries can bestow benefits on man. In general, there seems to be usefulness in revelation: so that man can come to know deeper truths about the intimate life of God and his will, and therefore to be seized by greater admiration and to give greater thanks and praise to God.³

Thus mysteries also increase our knowledge by making known things that otherwise, without revelation, we would not know, for example, the Trinity. Then they also perfect the knowledge about the things we know naturally, for example, the nature of person, of substance, of accident... And although these suppose that the fact of the revelation of mysteries has been demonstrated, and therefore the usefulness of such revelation has not been established *for certain and a priori and positively*; but the contrary also is not proved, with the result that a repugnance might appear in such a revelation.

108. Objections. 1. Just as sense cannot represent an incorporeal substance, so our intellect cannot represent the divine substance or something supernatural. Therefore the revelation of theological mysteries is impossible.

I deny the parity. Sense cannot properly represent a spiritual thing, because it is *in a completely other order*, but it can offer elements whereby the intellect analogically forms for itself a concept of such a spiritual thing; thus our intellect cannot intuitively and properly represent to itself the divine substance, and also cannot know divine things analogically as *demonstrable*, if it has to do with mysteries; but it will be able analogically to represent them to itself as *credible*.

2. Revelation of things that cannot be perceived by reason is repugnant. But a mystery cannot be perceived by reason. Therefore revelation of it is repugnant.

I distinguish the major. Revelation of things that cannot be perceived by reason, i.e., *absurd and chimerical*, is repugnant, *I bypass the major*; those things that cannot be perceived by reason, i.e., *above reason*, is repugnant, *I subdistinguish*: if they are to be apprehended *univocally and with a concept that is proper from the properties*, *I bypass*; if they are to be apprehended *analogically*, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

3. The human intellect is more distant from God than sensation is from the intellect. But sensation cannot know intellectual things. Therefore our intellect cannot know divine things.

Response. 1) If the objection were valid, it would prove that we do not know divine things in any way.

2) *I distinguish the major.* The human intellect is more distant from God *entitatively* than sensation is from intellect, *conceded*; with a proportion *to know analogically* or intentionally, *denied*.

2. Note that this knowledge does not imply knowledge about *why it is so*. For, we can understand the subject and predicate of a proposition, and see the agreement between both of them by the external evidence, but we do not therefore understand the agreement from the internal reasons.

3. See D 3016.

4. In the revelation of mysteries either the agreement between the subject and the predicate is known evidently, or it is not known. If it is known, then there is no mystery; if not, then the revelation is useless.

Response. I choose the first member with a distinction. It is known evidently with extrinsic evidence, but not with the intrinsic agreement between the subject and the predicate.

5. If there is no intrinsic evidence in mysteries, an organic union between subject and predicate cannot be formed; but that is required by the rational nature of man.

Response. This organic union can be formed, which theologians acquire when they search zealously, piously and carefully, both from an analogy with the things they know naturally, and from the connection of the mysteries between themselves and with the last end of man (D 3016).

6. God will either at some time reveal the internal reasons of the mysteries or he will not reveal them. If he does reveal them, now he is confusing us with enigmas and he is deceiving us; if he does not, he is not satisfying the just desire to know in the rational nature of man.

Response. God at some time will reveal the internal reasons of mystery, when we see him as he is in the beatific vision. But also having bypassed this, I deny that he deceives us with enigmas in this life; rather, he wills to test our faith, so that we offer him the submission of our intellect.

109. Scholium 1. *The revelation of mysteries seems to be simply supernatural.*

Mysteries are revealed immediately for the sake of faith, namely, that we offer the submission of our intellect to God because of his infinite knowledge and veracity. Therefore, faith is a religious act whereby we profess our dependence on God. But in this recognition and glorification of God there is for man a participation in the divine intellectual life, where he comes to know truths that only God knows. But since man's intellect naturally desires to understand the internal reasons and to see the things he knows, *it is not to be believed that God wants to oppose this natural tendency*: hence faith in the mysteries seems, not now de facto, but at some time and according to its very concept, to tend naturally towards the beatific vision, since the objects of theological mysteries are in the divine order.

Therefore the revelation of mysteries seems in a mediated way to be ordained by its very nature to the beatific vision and to be therefore simply supernatural.

Dieckmann thinks otherwise.⁴

4. *De revelatione* n. 208.

110. Scholium 2. *Whether the proofs made for the possibility of revelation are positive or negative.*

Revelation in general, not being restricted to mysteries, seems of its very concept to be positively possible and that it is made certain by a *positive demonstration*; for, the given demonstration (n. 66-67) does not proceed negatively, by solving difficulties or by showing that there is no repugnance or that a repugnance cannot be shown (as we did in n. 106-107 while treating the revelation of mysteries); but by considering directly the matter itself, namely, revelation, both the concept of the matter itself and all the elements that enter into its definition, so that we might positively *exclude* all repugnance that might occur in bringing those elements together. Hence, having excluded any repugnance, there is an internal reason why revelation in general is possible, and this possibility is arrived at positively. Certainly the road was negative, because it is necessarily through the exclusion of repugnance, but at the end something positive is attained; it is almost like the way in which we attain some predicates about God by way of a negation (im-mensity, in-finite...), but the matters attained are completely positive.

This is the view of Dieckmann⁵ and Tromp.⁶

You will say: that the possibility of a simply supernatural being, such as revelation is, cannot be proved positively.—But note that revelation is indeed *de facto* simply supernatural, but *according to its concept* in general, which we are considering now (and not precisely the revelation of mysteries), it is only preternatural (see n. 57).

The revelation of mysteries cannot thus be said to be positively possible like revelation in general: 1) because the existence itself of mysteries is not demonstrated as positively possible; 2) because it is not clearly and evidently certain a priori that God can have a sufficient reason to reveal mysteries. Therefore in our argument we say only that there does not seem to be any repugnance in this revelation, and that such repugnance cannot be demonstrated, having considered the various parts, which *seem* to pertain to the matter. In making this proof we rely especially on those things that are known from the revelation of mysteries which have been demonstrated a posteriori.—Therefore the proof is negative because, besides the negative manner, it does not attain the matter clearly and certainly by giving an intrinsic and adequate reason why it is possible.⁷

5. *De revelatione* n. 229.

6. *De revelatione*⁶ l.1 prop.4 part 2 p.76.

7. See also Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ *ibid.*, part 3 p.78.

Thesis 7. In divine revelation true and properly so called mysteries are contained.

111. If *de facto* it is shown *a posteriori* that absolute mysteries are given in revelation, *a fortiori* it is shown that neither the concept of mystery nor their revelation is repugnant. But this demonstration, so that it can be useful in fundamental Theology, as a preparation for the consideration of particular mysteries in dogmatic Theology, in no way is apologetic, because it rests on what must be proved, namely, on the value of the ecclesiastical Magisterium and of the dogmatic sources.

112. Doctrine of the Church. See above n. 95-104; for there it has already been explained: D 3015f. 3041, in Vatican Council I, session III, ch.4. – D 2854-2856, Pius IX against the teachings of Frohschammer.

Theological note. *Solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith:* D 3041.

113. Proof. 1) *From tradition*¹: The Fathers opposed the Monarchianists, who taught a monarchy or denied the Trinity in God, and they opposed the Eunomians,² who also denied the Trinity because it could not be explained by Philosophy: the Fathers do not say that we can understand it from its internal reasons, but they stressed the imperfection of our knowledge and that the mysteries are above reason.

Concerning the testimonies of the Fathers, see R, the Theological Index at the end, n. 150: *The Holy Trinity is a mystery*; likewise at n. 381: *The Incarnation is a mystery*, where you will find references to the Fathers.

Pius IX appeals to this teaching of the Fathers in his *Letter to the Archbishop of Monaco* (December 11, 1862) about Frohschammer: D 2856-2857, where there are quotes from the Fathers in a note.

114. 2) *The argument from Scripture* is taken from the texts which Pius IX refers to in his just mentioned letter (D 2855) and occur in Vatican Council I (D 3015-3016).

These texts clearly prove that there are truths of God which, unless they are revealed by God, cannot be known.

Matt. 11:25ff. and parallels; v. 27: *And no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.*

John 1:18: *No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known.*

1 Cor. 2:7ff.: St. Paul, wishing to protect Christians against the wisdom of this world, says: *We impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God... None of the rulers of this*

1. Now we are presenting the argument from tradition first, because we think in the present case that it has more clarity and efficacy than the argument from Holy Scripture.

2. Named after Eunomius, the leader of the faction of Anomians (ἀνομιός), who said that the Word is dissimilar to the Father and not God, because he is generated.

age understood this... but God has revealed it to us through his Spirit.

But how will we prove that Scripture is dealing here with *absolute* mysteries, or that the mysteries remain after their revelation and that they cannot be demonstrated by their internal reasons? — On this point it should be noted that St. Paul in the text just quoted is speaking about the knowledge of the wisdom of God in mystery, which is had through faith and by the grace of the Holy Spirit (v.4f., 10ff.) But faith according to the same Apostle is surrounded by fog in this mortal life and *is contrasted with clear vision: For we walk by faith, not by sight* (2 Cor. 5:7); and faith is *the conviction of things not seen* (Heb. 11:1). Therefore, a fortiori since faith is about mysteries, it is dealing with revealed truths which, while we journey away from the Lord are covered with fog and we do not see them. Fittingly, therefore, what is excluded by the Apostle, when the concern is with mysteries, is the knowledge of the matter through the internal reasons, which we are able to have sometimes about spiritual things, although they are known analogically.

ARTICLE V

ON THE PROPOSITION OF THE FACT OF REVELATION
BEFORE FAITH

S.Th., 3 CG 154; II-II, q. 1, a. 4 ad 2; q. 2, a. 1 ad 1; q. 171, a. 5; Suarez, *De fide* d.4 s.2-5; on the proposition of the object of faith necessary and sufficient in order to believe, see Vivès, t.12,115-135; Harent, *Foi*, VI Préparation rationelle de la foi, le fidéisme: DTC 6,171-237.

Thesis 8: In order to embrace revelation with faith (or the religion founded on it), certitude about the fact of revelation is pre-required (I); but moral certitude suffices, even the common kind (II).

115. Definition of terms. *Certitude*, as a *subjective state of mind*, consists in the firmness of assent that excludes all prudent fear of error.

As a property of judgment, certitude consists in the intrinsic necessity of the judgment as being true (*formal certitude*). This property and necessity in judgment is therefore had because it is placed on account of the seen objective motives, which have a connection with truth. Then *objective certitude* is had, which is to be distinguished from *purely subjective certitude*, which is present when only adhesion of the mind is had, but without objective motives.

This firmness of assent admits varieties and grades, according as the motives of assent are known. Hence, if the motives are in the metaphysical order and are based ultimately on the principle of contradiction, the certitude will be *metaphysical* and absolutely infallible; if the motives are in the physical order and are based on the physical constancy of the laws of nature, without there being any suspicion of an exception, then *physical certitude* will be had; if the motives are in the order of morals and are based on the psychological constancy of the human way of acting, or on the fact that it is wont to take place according to a prudent judgment, then *moral certitude* will be had; this is so if there is no suspicion of an exception in this case.

Both physical certitude and moral certitude are not absolutely infallible, unless they are reduced to metaphysical; but they exclude all prudent fear of error. For in this negative element of certitude, certitude does not admit grades, but consists in one form only.

The motive whereby someone would know that divine revelation had taken place would be in the physical order for the one who directly receives the revelation, but for others it would be mainly through testimony; hence it would be in the moral order and the certitude that is then had would be

moral certitude.

Common certitude is opposed to *scientific*, and it is that which is had without examination of the motives (which surely are present) and therefore it is not reflex.

Whenever certitude is present, the *evidence* is present (whether intrinsic or extrinsic of the matter), that is, clarity in the knowledge of the agreement between the subject and the predicate. But sometimes the evidence is *so clearly perfect that it necessitates the intellect* and excludes even imprudent fear of error, which happens in the more simple mathematical truths. But sometimes that clarity, although sufficient for a prudent and firm assent, is not so great that it necessitates the intellect and excludes the possibility of an imprudent doubt. Hence there is the case when the will, having seen the motives, freely commands a certain assent of the mind; this is a *free certitude*, such as is had in a longer series of syllogisms about further metaphysical truths, or in the application of laws whereby the moral activity of men is regulated in particular cases, v.gr., this food is not poisonous, this man is my friend, my father....

Part one. Certitude about the fact of revelation is pre-required.

116. Adversaries. G. Estrix (1624-1694) thought that it is possible in certain cases to combine supernatural faith with mere probability or also with some doubt about the fact of revelation (see D 2121).¹

Fideists and Semi-fideists said that faith itself is pre-required in order that faith might be had about the fact of revelation. See D 2751-2756 (Bautain), 2811-2814 (Bonnetty).

Modernists falsely said that the assent of faith is based *ultimately* on an assembly of probabilities (D 3425)

Newman's position is very different. In his book, *Grammar of Assent*, he deals with the argument from the convergence of probabilities; but this convergence, by resting on the principle of sufficient reason, finally attains *certitude* about the fact of revelation, and the assent of faith rests *ultimately* on this certitude.²

Similarly Eusebius Amort, who argued from the greater probability of the Catholic religion instead of the Protestant against the Protestants in his book, *Demonstratio*

1. See A. Sohier, A.M., *La foi probable. L'acte de foi d'après Gilles Estrix*: Gregorianum 28 (1947) 511-554, especially p. 532-542; and R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi* (Louvain 1950) p.94-102.

2. Certitude in Newman was treated recently by: A. Alvarez de Linera, *El problema de la certeza en Newman* (Madrid 1946); he defends him from the accusation of Modernism regarding the assembly of probabilities, *ibid.* p.81-94. Likewise F. de B. Vizmanos, S.J., *Newman, su estela a la largo de un centenario*: Pens 1 (1945) 405-412. On the convergence of probabilities, see also Suarez, *De fide* d.4 s.3 n.12: Opera (Vivès) 12,125.

critica religionis catholicae (Venice 1744), but *ultimately* it rests on the certitude coming from the principle that God could not attribute objective and greater probability to a false religion compared with the true religion.

117. Doctrine of the Church. It is had *explicitly* in the Letter “*Qui pluribus*” (D 2778... *so that it can know with certainty that God has spoken*; see also D 2780).

Moreover, *the supernatural assent of faith* is not supported *with only probable knowledge of revelation* (D 2121); therefore certitude is pre-required.

It is had *implicitly* where faith is said to be *a reasonable obedience* (D 3009); but it would not be reasonable if there were no certainty about the fact of revelation.

See also the propositions cited above, which Bautain and Bonnetty had to subscribe.

Theological note. *Catholic doctrine*, based on the preceding documents of the Church.

118. Proof. If there is not certitude about the fact of revelation, the acceptance of that revelation (and religion) *cannot be firm, prudent and irrevocable*. But the acceptance of revelation (and religion) by faith must be firm, prudent and irrevocable. Therefore certitude about the fact of revelation is pre-required so that anyone may embrace by faith a revelation or religion.

I prove the major. If certitude about the fact of revelation is not had,

a) at most probability will be had, which exists with a prudent fear of error; and therefore the foundation of that faith and religion will not be firm.

b) Then that religion and faith, which should be a very firm assent to the truths proposed by God in that religion, and similarly the acceptance of that religion, is something imprudent and not orderly.

c) In addition, someone who believes imprudently is easily deceived and is subject to inconstancy and doubts, and therefore his faith would not be irrevocable.

I prove the minor. The acceptance of revelation (and religion) by faith must be *firm*, because faith is, as we have said, a firm assent to the truths proposed by God, to whose words the greatest adhesion must be given (see n. 125, objection 1); moreover, in order fittingly to lead and continue a moral life based on religion, constancy in its principles is absolutely necessary.

It must also be *prudent*, because God does not will imprudent things.

It must also be *irrevocable*, first of all because faith is most certain, and secondly because stability in religion and in the true faith is also very important in order to foster a religious life.³

119. Objections. 1. Few persons arrive at certitude about the fact of revelation. Therefore this is not generally required.

I distinguish the antecedent. Few persons arrive at *scientific* certitude, *I bypass the antecedent*; to certitude that is *at least common, denied*.

2. Children and unrefined persons come to faith without having true, formal certitude, from a valid motive, and they do not have even common certitude about the fact of revelation. Therefore such certitude is not required.

Response. 1) According to some (see n. 127) children and unrefined persons have *this formal certitude, although it is common*, about the fact of revelation, from a valid motive, although it is perceived in an obscure way.

2) If we admit that they have *only purely respective certitude* (see n. 128), *I distinguish the antecedent*: children and unrefined persons come to faith without having true, formal certitude about the fact of revelation, *because for them this is the only prudent way, conceded*; as if it could be a rule designed *for everyone* and is *per se valid, denied*.

3. Just as the probability of positive religion suffices for the obligation of inquiring into it, so the probability about the fact of revelation suffices in order to embrace it.

I deny the parity. These are two different things, and therefore it is not valid to establish the same conditions. *Inquiry into a religion* is prudent and due, from what has been proved (see n. 34ff.), if the probability is present about the religion; but *the acceptance of the religion by faith*, i.e., with a firm and irrevocable assent, is not prudent and is not due, unless certitude about the fact of revelation is present. Likewise from what has been demonstrated.

4. Alms is given prudently to a poor man who is probably such. Therefore also prudently we embrace revelation and a religion probably from God.

I deny the parity. Acceptance of revelation and religion by faith is based on *an act of the intellect* which, in order to be prudent, firm and irrevocable, pre-requires certitude about the fact of revelation. But to give an alms is *the act of a moral virtue*, which looks at the goodness of the object; but in no way is it not a good act to give alms to a poor man thought to be only probably such.

5. According to D 2104, a non-believing infidel, guided by a less probable opinion, will not be excused of infidelity. Therefore he must follow a more probable opinion, but not a certain one.

I deny the consequence. The consequent is according to what has been proved (n.37-40.117f): therefore, *he must inquire and not remain indifferent in his probability*, which he has about his own false religion, but he must strive to arrive at certitude about the true religion; and he is not excused *because he failed to inquire* (see n.37).

3. It is certain that faith is irrevocable also from dogmatic considerations (see Gal. 1:8f...), just as also dogmatically one speaks about the firmness of faith above all things.

6. Just as practical certitude often is inferred from only a speculative probability and often that is prudently believed which appears to be only probable; so anyone prudently embraces a religion if he knows the fact of revelation only with probability.

I deny the parity. Sometimes that happens prudently and should take place in human affairs which admit of changes in already made judgments. But in divine faith, which has not merely practical certitude, but *speculative, and which is irrevocable and cannot be firm without this theoretical certitude*, in no way is that the case.

7. Man has free choice. Therefore according to his own will he can believe in an object in whatever way it is proposed.

I deny the consequent. A man according to his own will can believe in an object proposed to him *as not true, denied*; proposed as true, *I subdistinguish*: believe with probability, *I bypass that*; believe *firmly indubitably, prudently and irrevocably* an object in whatever way it is proposed, *I subdistinguish again*: if this object is proposed as certain, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*.

8. There is more merit and respect towards someone to believe him, if one knows his statement only with probability rather than with certitude. Therefore certitude about the fact of revelation is not required.

I distinguish the antecedent. There is more respect to believe someone if it is only known with probability about his words, provided it is certain that he actually said them, *conceded*; if it is not certain that he said them, *I subdistinguish*: it is a sign of more respect to believe him with probable assent, according as there are probable and convincing reasons proving that he did say them, *conceded*; it is a sign of more respect to believe him with a firm and irrevocable assent, if the reasons only probably prove that he did say them, *denied*.

9. Many persons, not perceiving the certain power of individual arguments that are used in Apologetics, in order to believe have only *a mass of probabilities* about the fact of revelation. But a mass of probabilities does not produce certitude. Therefore many persons in order to believe do not have certitude about the fact of revelation.

I bypass the major, which would be true *for some only*, but not for all. *I distinguish the minor.* A mass of probabilities generally does not produce certitude, *I bypass that*: if the *principle of sufficient reason* is taken into account, showing for certain that the convergence of probabilities *must be attributed to the objective truth of the matter*, or if another principle is introduced *from the consideration of divine Providence*, which will not permit such a convergence of probabilities except for the true religion, *denied*.

10. When a doubt about the fact of revelation remains, and much more when death is imminent, men must be prepared to believe *if God has revealed something*. Therefore the probability alone about the fact of revelation is sufficient for belief.

I deny the supposition, namely, that this act of the will moved to believe on the condition, *if God has revealed something*, is an act of faith strictly so called; it is only (at most, if it takes place because of God himself) an act of love wishing to please God even on the hypothesis that he commanded that something should be believed; or it is a general disposition of the intellect to accept whatever God wishes to communicate to us; this disposition, even in the hypothesis that God never revealed anything, must always be present, and not just in doubts about the fact of revelation.

120. Scholium 1. 1) As certitude about the fact of revelation is required before someone firmly and definitively adheres to a revelation or to a religion based on it, so *certitude about the fact of a divine precept for that man is required* so that someone is bound to embrace that religion. For a doubtful law is not binding. In other words: certitude is required in the judgment of credibility and in the judgment of the obligation to believe. For, although probability alone of the fact of revelation and of the precept is the foundation for the obligation of *inquiring*, it is not sufficient for the foundation of the obligation to *embrace it*.

Therefore it is not required, as the fideists have asserted, that someone accept faith by believing and blindly sacrificing his intellect, as a leap into the unknown, so that through the experience of faith someone might acquire faith. In no way; but what is *pre-required is a certain judgment of the credibility and*, in order to establish a certain obligation to believe, *also a certain judgment that one must believe (credentitas)*.

2) Therefore, *the obligation of faith begins where someone apprehends revelation certainly made by God and a certain obligation to believe*. This requires due subjection and reverence towards God when he speaks and witnesses; otherwise someone would act immorally by ignoring God when he speaks.

Anyone must perform all of these acts as soon as he has acquired the use of reason, for then it is necessary for him to direct himself to his last supernatural end; but the supernatural end, which must be obtained consciously and in a human way, requires first of all knowledge that it exists, that is, by supernatural faith.

121. Scholium 2. *Concerning the object of certitude required before faith* it seems to Fr. F. Schlagenhafen⁴ that certitude about *the judgment of the obligation to believe* is sufficient (n. 77); for thus a) the will now has a motive to firmly command the assent of faith; b) in respective certitude, which is sufficient for some persons before faith, only the evidence of an obligation to believe is present; and c) because objectively the fact of revelation follows from the obligation to believe.—But other authors, whom he cites in the same place, speak about certitude *concerning the fact of revelation*.

It seems necessary to say, in order for faith in a revelation to be imposed *as an obligation, that certitude about both aspects is pre-required: about the fact of revelation and about the obligation to believe* or about the precept imposed on me that I must accept that revelation.⁵ And we do not think the mind of P. Schlagenhafen is to attack what the common way of speaking and the documents of the Church (D 2778, 2780, 2121) recommend concerning the pre-required certainty about the fact of revelation. But also in the certain judgment about the obligation to believe—as the same author says—certitude about the fact of revelation is implied.

And surely: a) the will cannot prudently and firmly command assent, unless intellectually the fact of revelation is known with certitude; b) in the respective certitude of children and unrefined persons, certain knowledge about the obligation to believe is pres-

4. *Theologia fundamentalis* n.76f.80.

5. This precept given me about revelation is to be so understood, not that I am not bound to hold as true what God said to no matter who, if I am certain that God said it; but in the sense that I am not bound to inquire into what God said in a concrete case, so that I may explicitly give adherence to it.

ent, and also certain knowledge (respective) about the fact of revelation; c) if the fact of revelation follows objectively from the obligation to believe, that is because certain knowledge about that fact is implied in the knowledge of the obligation. Therefore, certain knowledge about the fact of revelation is always presupposed and therefore pre-required.

Concerning the scholastic authors on this question, Suarez clearly speaks about the certitude of credibility concerning the fact of revelation, for he requires⁶ that the object proposed for belief *be evidently (certainly) credible* and *evidently (certainly) more credible* than any other object; accordingly he admits⁷ that, if different sects or ways to God are proposed that offer him suitable worship, the one should be followed that *evidently (certainly) appears to be more credible*, since that must be believed which has the greater appearance of truth, especially in the matter of salvation, in which every moral danger must be avoided.

Part two. Moral certitude, even the common kind, is sufficient.

122. Adversaries. *Certain pseudo-mystics* who require an internal experience or private inspiration (D 3033); as if physical certitude were required.

Also *those who require a previous philosophical demonstration* of all dogmas or require scientific certitude (D 3036; see also D 2738).

123. Doctrine of the Church. It is contained in the condemnation of the preceding errors. Therefore revelation must be made credible not by the internal experience alone of each person or by some private inspiration (D 3033). Therefore revelation can become credible also by external criteria, which per se *are known with moral certitude*, but also at times with moral certitude that is non-reductively metaphysical. Therefore moral certitude suffices.

A scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of faith is not required by Vatican Council I (D 3036). Therefore common certitude is sufficient. Furthermore, the Church supposes that those who have this common certitude must not change their faith (D 3013-3014); therefore scientific certitude is not required.

Theological note. The thesis is *at least* theologically certain, as a deduction from the preceding definitions of the Church,⁸ that is, by speaking *about moral certitude in general*, that is, as pertaining to the historical

6. *De fide* d.4 s.2 ass.3s: Opera (Vivès) 12,117f.

7. *Ibid.*, ass.4 p.118f.

8. A truth is said to be *theologically certain* which, although it is not clearly taught by the magisterium of the Church, in the theological schools is deduced from premises formally revealed (or immediately from some definition of the Church) and from a second premise that is known naturally. For, a theologically certain truth is connected with what is formally or virtually revealed, whether by presupposition or finally.

order, and by speaking *about not precisely scientific certitude*, but the common kind; that is, *for the theological qualification*, we are prescinding from the question, which has been debated for a long time among Catholics, *about the three essentially different certitudes* and whether a mere moral certitude, which is not reductively metaphysical, suffices.

124. Proof. Moral certitude, even the common kind, since it is true certitude, excludes all prudent fear of error and therefore it has such firmness by which a man can give his assent to God revealing—an assent that is complete and reasonable and prudently irrevocable. Therefore it suffices.

Furthermore, no other certitude is possible or can be presupposed for the act of faith except this moral certitude (sometimes purely common), which corresponds to the *historical fact* of revelation. Therefore a greater certitude is not required nor does God demand it.

125. Objections. 1. The assent of faith is firm above all things. But it would not be firm above all things, if a merely moral certitude about the fact of revelation and of a precept from God sufficed as a presupposition for faith. Therefore.

Response. The assent of faith is said to be firm above all things inasmuch as the intellect by faith adheres to God *with an appreciably great adhesion*, that is, prepared to abandon any judgment if it is found to be contrary to the assent of faith and by judging the faith to be a better intellectual good than other intellectual goods. This adhesion is had 1) *because of the command of the will*: and therefore it is commanded by the will because of the nature of the good that is found in such assent as a means to reach beatitude; and because of reverence and piety towards God when he speaks, which is a motive of faith. This firmness in the assent of faith is called firmness *because of the certitude of adhesion*.

2) Moreover, since the motive of the assent of faith is the authority (knowledge and veracity) of God speaking, in whom there is absolutely no falsehood, it is necessary that the assent of faith be also firm above all things by reason of the infallibility, which it has from the source of its formal object or *of the motive as that which (motivum ut quod)*. This firmness in the assent of faith is said to be firmness *because of the certitude of infallibility*. But from the source of judgments which show that God has spoken and this often with moral certitude only, or from the head *of the motive of faith as that by which (motivum fidei ut quo)* (according to many authors a *condition* that the “motive which” achieve its effect) it is not necessary that by reason of the certitude of infallibility the assent of faith be said to be firm above all things.

Therefore *I distinguish the major*. The assent of faith is *firm above all things* by reason of the certitude of adhesion, *conceded*; by reason of the certitude of infallibility, *I subdistinguish*: because of the motive *which (quod)* of faith, *conceded*; because of the motive *by which (quo)* or because of the condition of the judgments which establish the

fact of revelation and the obligation of embracing that faith, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

2. Moral and common certitude are not absolutely infallible. Therefore anyone who embraces revelation or religion, being led by such certitude, does not have security that he will not be deceived. Therefore this certitude is not sufficient.

I distinguish the antecedent. Moral and common certitude are not absolutely infallible if they are reduced to metaphysical, *denied*; if they are not reduced to metaphysical, *I subdistinguish*: they are not absolutely infallible, *but they suffice in order to act prudently and firmly* even in matters of great importance, *conceded*; but by following them one would be acting imprudently, *denied*. *I distinguish the first consequent in the same way.*

The complex of apologetic arguments produces *metaphysical and absolute certitude*, even though the individual arguments perhaps at times do not. But also anyone led by one true and certain apologetic argument (although certain with moral and common certitude only) would be acting prudently if he firmly accepted that faith and religion; and then the theoretical possibility that he would perhaps sometime have been deceived must be prudently rejected, just as happens in other human affairs. But it is not to be believed that divine Providence will permit such error; that is even more the case, if there is an accumulation of certain and probable arguments, whose convergence produces *reductively metaphysical certitude*, even though they pertain to the moral, historic-philosophical order. Moreover, in the hypothesis of moral certitude about the fact of revelation and in the full meaning of this certitude, the fear, that one has been deceived, is excluded absolutely and prudently.

Thesis 9. Respective certitude sometimes suffices in order to elicit a true assent of faith.

126. Definition of terms. *Respective certitude* means, as the name indicates, *related* to some, that is, to children and unrefined persons. But it is an adhesion of the mind to a judgment because of a motive *of itself* insufficient to exclude error and therefore insufficient *of itself* to adhere to something firmly and prudently (v.gr., the testimony of one man, of parents, etc.), but nevertheless *sufficient per accidens for some* for them to act prudently.

The respective certitude of children and unrefined Catholics, who have heard, v.gr., a pastor, a teacher..., is distinguished in this, from the mere respective certitude of non-Catholics for their religion, *that the motive of assent in the child or in the unlearned Catholic adult is founded on the one who teaches the child*, although it is grasped by him imperfectly, so that he does not know the opposite and therefore that error has been positively excluded. Therefore, *per se* there is a possibility of a future doubt, but it is not yet perceived.

Respective certitude must not be confused with the *common* kind,

because in the latter objectively valid motives are present for assent and they are recognized as such, although not reflexively and scientifically; but in respective certitude the motive as known is not per se valid.

127. Adversaries. Among Catholic authors there is a dispute about whether such respective certitude suffices for the act of faith. Those who deny it (Wilmers, Dorsch, Pesch, Garrigou-Lagrange, Lercher, Tromp...), and require formal certitude because of a motive of itself sufficient, must defend that children and unrefined persons in their act of faith apprehend, at least in a confused manner, a valid motive for eliciting faith, v.gr., the fact itself of the Church, which makes them certain about divine revelation.

These authors conceive the matter like this: Children who are educated in the Catholic Church gradually get to know the Church herself, that it is spread out over the whole world, for they hear about missionaries; they also know about the saints of the Church and about the miracles that have happened; likewise they know that she is one in the same Creed and in the celebration of the same Mass and in administering the same sacraments throughout the world; that all are subject to the Pope, whom all everywhere venerate; for he is the successor of St. Peter and continues the succession of the Apostles... They also hear in sermons during the year and in school about the miracles of Jesus Christ, his resurrection, his goodness and wisdom..., that many have suffered and died for him... Thus it happens that gradually they are led to perceive a valid motive of credibility for the faith...

We do not deny these points—in fact we admit them; but it still seems necessary to say with many other authors⁹ that merely respective certitude about the fact of revelation suffices for the act of faith.

128. Proof. 1) *From experience it is hard to conceive* how children, who must elicit an act of faith, namely for their first communion, etc., perceive a motive completely valid and sufficient. The very same thing must be said about uneducated adults whom at times you must briefly prepare for their first confession and communion and to teach the truths about the necessary means of salvation and other more simple truths...; or about a pagan who hears *one* holy and penitential missionary preaching to him.

2) Such assent given because of a motive that is of itself insufficient, but because of the authority of parents, of a wise and holy man... *in children and uneducated adults is a prudent assent*, and in daily life even in more

9. A catalogue of ancient authors concerning this matter is offered by Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, n.85; see also the article *Foi*: DTC 6,223-227. You will find the opinion of Suarez in *De fide* d.4 a.5 n.7-10: Opera (Vivès) 12,134-135.

serious affairs (v.gr., for the recognition of parents) they act totally in this way—and prudently. For they ought to act in a prudent way, *and God wants them to act in this way* virtuously, and without doubt he is ready to confer on them his grace.

3) *To anticipate objections from dogmatic theology.* From this divine grace, which would not be given to a heterodox child, the qualities would have to be explained which are proper to the act of faith: such assent will be *necessarily true*, because it takes place with the help of elevating grace; it will be *firm and irrevocable* also because of the assistance of grace, whose task it will be to watch over the religious development of children and unrefined adults and lead them to maturity and to full and formal certitude, since he does not abandon them unless he is abandoned (D 3014).

Thus the faith of a heterodox child or unrefined adult will only be a human faith, perhaps subjectively elicited in a prudent way; but it will not be supernatural faith (if the concern is with his specific errors), and it will be a matter of grace to withdraw those well disposed from their own subjective conviction and to show the objective motives of truth which are found in the Catholic faith.

ARTICLE VI

CRITERIOLOGY OF REVELATION

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.357-430; Tromp, *De revelatione* 1.1 s.5; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fund.* n.95-102.

129. After we have treated in general the possibility, suitability and necessity of revelation, and have considered the special case of the revelation of mysteries, the next question that must be treated is *the recognition of revelation*. For, in immediate revelation, whether public or private, and especially, with regard to our present concern, in testified and mediated public revelation it is necessary to have some sign whereby the fact is established that God has spoken.

Hence the treatise *on the criteria of revelation*, not indeed in the objective or material sense of revelation, as if we were considering criteria to establish *what has been revealed*; but in the formal sense of revelation in order to establish criteria by which *the historical fact itself of divine speaking* and witnessing must be proved.

But just as in the introduction to Philosophy or Epistemology there is a consideration of the criterion of truth or certitude, so now there will be a treatment of the criterion of revelation. In this matter the advice of St. John has great value: *Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world* (1 John 4:1).

The negative part

Thesis 10. In order to prove the historical fact of public revelation, subjective and internal criteria are not primary.

130. The question about the criterion of revelation or religion in recent years, especially at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, has been hotly debated; and not everything that has been proposed can be proved. Hence first of all, by proceeding negatively, we will reject those criteria which cannot be admitted as primary for public revelation.

131. **Definition of terms.** *A criterion*, from κριτέριον, in the logical order is that by which the mind distinguishes one thing from another.

Thus the *criterion of revelation* is the reason or note by which the divine origin of a revelation can be discerned

Other names also are used indiscriminately to signify the same thing, although formally they suggest something else. It is called a *sign* of revelation, inasmuch as by its knowledge it leads the mind to the knowledge of something else, that is, to the knowledge of a divine locution¹; it is called a *mark* of revelation, inasmuch as with its help the fact of divine revelation is known; the *argument* of revelation inasmuch as it demonstrates the motives of credibility (D 3009, 3537-3542); a *motive of credibility*, inasmuch as it moves the intellect to affirm the credibility of that revelation.

132. **Divisions of the criterion of revelation.**² 1) A criterion is *positive* if it concludes certainly or probably that revelation de facto has taken place. It is *negative* if it concludes either that revelation did not take place (v.gr., because it contradicts natural reason) or that there is no obstacle to the fact that it could have happened.

2) A *primary* criterion is one that takes precedence over others, because it demonstrates the matter *certainly, easily and in a way accommodated to all*, so that a public recourse to that criterion is clear. Other criteria are said to be *secondary*.

3) A *sufficient* criterion is one that per se alone suffices to demonstrate the divine origin of a revelation. A sufficient criterion is not the same

1. A miracle, since it is a sign of revelation, as it often is, is not a mere sign *in general*, but a *natural* sign and especially apt, because of the connection with it; for, although a connection of this kind is not a connection of cause and effect, it is a *final connection*, because the theology of a miracle is directed necessarily to the moral order (see n. 163).

2. There is no small difficulty in this question because there is a diversity of terminology among the authors (see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.379, listing the opinions).—In our division we explain the matter by speaking about revelation that is *public and publicly demonstrated*.

formally as a primary criterion, because something can be sufficient per se, without prevailing over others; objectively, however, if the concern is with a per se sufficient criterion *in order publicly to demonstrate a public revelation*, certainly it is equivalent to a primary criterion: for then it would not be sufficient unless it proved the matter certainly, easily and in a way accommodated to all.

4) *With respect to a subject weighing a revelation*, the criterion is divided into subjective and objective.

A *subjective* criterion is found in a subject evaluating a revelation or accepting it, v.gr., spiritual experiences, internal inspirations and immanent tendencies in the subject.

This last criterion or an *immanent* criterion (apologetics of immanence) argues from the tendencies and needs of the subject according as they are in conformity with truth that is said to be revealed. This criterion is reduced to the preceding criterion (subjective).


An *objective* criterion is had outside of the consciousness of the one considering the revelation and it is a fact independent of his subjective feeling, v.gr., a miracle (extrinsic to the examiner), prophecy.

5) *With respect to the doctrine revealed*, a criterion can be internal or external.

An *internal* criterion consists in the internal examination of the doctrine that is said to be revealed. But the doctrine can be examined a) *in itself*, or b) *in the effects that it produces*. The first pays attention to the internal notes and characteristics of the doctrine itself (to its harmony with rational truths, to its sublimity, purity, to its aptitude for satisfying tendencies). The second pays attention to the effects that flow from that doctrine as they affect men (fruits of joy and peace, fulfillment of tendencies, holiness).

An *external* criterion of doctrine is an extrinsic sign of revealed truth, bringing with it divine testimony confirming the revelation; thus miracles that are external to the examiner, fulfilled prophecies.

133. Here is an outline of the criteria³:



3. Therefore the criterion of holiness differs from the preceding subjective criteria, because it is not considered now so much in the subject evaluating the revelation as it is in the many persons who have accepted it.

134. A) Subjective criteria (testimony of the Holy Spirit, spiritual insights, etc.) are not primary.

Adversaries. *Older Protestants*, with Calvin, established an internal inspiration of the Holy Spirit as the criterion of the genuine word of God: thus—they themselves said—by listening to the preaching and by reading the Scriptures they know that it has been revealed.⁴

In the 19th century F.E.D. Schleiermacher (1768-1834) considered religious experience (feeling) as the criterion of revelation, understood also in a subjective way, like the Modernists.⁵

135. Doctrine of the Church. In Vatican I the teaching was condemned according to which men must be moved to faith solely by internal experience or by personal inspiration (D 3033). Therefore if internal experience *alone* is excluded or men must be led to faith by personal inspiration, the reason is because there are other wholly valid external criteria. And it is precisely these criteria that the Church considers to be primary and ordinary (see n. 150). Wherefore personal inspiration *alone* or internal experience, while prescind from external criteria, is not accommodated to all and is not given to all. Therefore it is not the primary criterion.

Theological note. The thesis seems to be *theologically certain*.

136. Proof. These subjective criteria, since they are supernatural and individual inspirations and movements from God, spiritual experiences and consolations, *cannot be said to be generally a certain way accommodated to all* of discerning revelation, because a) they are easily subject to illusion; b) such motions are not discerned with certainty except by men of great and tested discernment of spirits; c) Montanists and other sects appealed to this criterion while contradicting each other.

All persons do not have these experiences and they are not permanent, so that recourse to them is readily available; *and much less recourse to them on the part of all*. Therefore in no way are they the primary criterion.

However, they will be a sufficient criterion, if they accept the reason of a miraculous fact in the subject receiving the revelation, or he himself

4. See Calvin, *Institutiones christianae religionis* I.1 c.6f. (see Pesch, *De inspiratione S.Scripturae* n.215); Wilhelmus Witaker (1595), *Disputatio de S. Scriptura contra huius temporis papistas* (Cambridge 1588) q.3; *Pro auctoritate atque ἀποπιστία S.Scripturae...*(Cambridge 1594) I.1 c.1 (see Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.265 p.258); Iohannes Gerhardus, *De locis theologicis* loc.1 c.3 (see Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.226). For the interpretation of Scripture, J. Slavicek, *El "testimonium Spiritus Sancti" como criterio de interpretación: XIII Semana Bíblica Española*, p.49-70.

5. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.169f.

arrives at certitude concerning the divine motion: he indeed would be bound not to resist it.

137. You will cite some words from Holy Scripture as an objection (used by Protestants):

1) 1 John 2:20: *But you have been anointed by the Holy One, and you all know.* Therefore the criterion of revelation is the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Response. These words in St. John *suppose the faith already accepted*; therefore this criterion cannot be primary.

2) Also, before faith is accepted there is internal testimony of revelation: John 7:17: *If any man's will is to do his will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own authority.*

Response. Here he is speaking about the *moral disposition* for faith.

3) 1 Thess. 2:13: *When you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God, which is at work in you believers.* Therefore the criterion of the word of God and of revelation is the activity of the Spirit, for the actual acceptance of faith.

Response. The Holy Spirit indeed works in believers, but *it is not said in a causal way exclusively*, as if because of that it were the only criterion in order to discern the word of God.

4) 1 Cor. 12:6: *And there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one.*

Response. He is speaking about the divisions of graces, but *he supposes faith as already accepted.*

138. B) Immanent criteria are not sufficient; (or equivalently:) the Apologetics of immanence, taken in an exclusive sense, cannot be admitted.

Blondel, *L'Action*² (1937); Taymans D'Eypernon, *Le Blondelisme* (Louvain 1933); Tonquédec, *Immanence*³ (Paris 1933); A Valensin, *Immanence*: DAFC 2,579-612; Roig, Gironella, *La Filosofía de la acción* (Madrid 1943) c.16; B. Romeyer, *La philosophie religieuse de Maurice Blondel. Origine, évolution, maturité et achèvement* (Paris 1943).

State of the question. These criteria do not inquire into spiritual experiences and inspirations related to doctrine that is said to be revealed, nor into its internal characteristics, nor into the effects that it produces in the subject accepting it, nor into some extrinsic criterion, but rather into the

faculties themselves of men, into their tendencies and needs, so that this method can be called *psychological*. *The Apologetics of immanence*, as it is called, is based on this method. However, among its advocates there is some diversity and there are various grades of it (see treatise I, *Historical outline of Apologetics* n. 86).

1) Some proceed in such a way that they adapt themselves to the conditions and prejudices of the time (*method of adaptation*), but afterwards in the traditional way they demonstrate the fact of revelation from miracles. Obviously, this method of mere adaptation is not to be rejected, but it is not dealt with in theoretical Apologetics; it belongs in practical Apologetics.

2) Other promoters of the Apologetics of immanence want to demonstrate the fact of revelation *only with subjective criteria*, that is, *by rejecting the traditional method from miracles as inept*, because it seems to suggest extrinsecism, historicism and intellectualism. For real apologetics the foundation must be taken—they said—from the real principle of immanentism, since modern men have been affected with Kantianism and subjectivism. Therefore the method of vital immanentism must be cultivated, by inquiring into internal subjective experience and into moral dynamism, that is, into the internal dynamic tendency for a moral life. However, they do not accept philosophical immanentism, since they admit the existence of things outside of the subject; they want only to conquer immanentism with its own weapons. This is the Apologetics of immanence taken in an exclusive sense. M. Blondel and L. Laberthonniere adopted this position.

3) Some advocates of the method of immanence are *Modernists*, who defend a strict immanentism, so that religion begins with a religious sense or feeling and it remains in the area of conscience (see the Encyclical "*Pascendi*," D 2103 [34th ed.]). But these authors are speaking about religion and revelation in a sense different from our meaning, and therefore they will not be refuted here.

Adversaries. Maurice Blondel (1861-1949) studied internal experience (*l'action*). This "action" is life and our immanent reality, always in motion, striving for further progress and essentially incomplete; it is internal experience and at the same time an option or tendency. The examination of this "action" shows our impotence to lead a moral life worthily, as we would like to do. For, coming from the recesses of our mind there is a strong desire for something supreme and divine, which is not satisfied in the natural order and in the efforts of our will to realize its own aspirations. Therefore, we find a huge deficiency, a gap, an emptiness, which requires a complement and a divine gift. For, there is no proportion between the aspiration and *ideal* end of man and his external action; but there is a tendency for the possession of Supreme Being. Therefore, there

must be cooperation of this Supreme Being and his helping assistance, because we need essentially a teacher and a savior.

Thus the necessity is apparent of some divine supernatural assistance (*surcroît*), enlightening the intellect and strengthening the will (revelation and grace). The Christian religion, which responds to this tendency and necessity, will have to be embraced.⁶

Thus a transition is made, by the method of implication, from immanence to transcendence, from subject to object, and the road is open to go from autonomy to heteronomy; for an intimate connection is given between the internal and the external state.⁷

In order to form a fair judgment of Blondelism it is necessary to keep in mind the more recent works of Blondel himself, in which his philosophy is contained.⁸ In the second volume of a more recent work Blondel again treats *L'Action*,⁹ which he had already treated in his thesis in the year 1893, "L'Action," and in the later explanations which he had given (1897).¹⁰ According to the exposition and explanation of his system approved by Blondel,¹¹ after revelation and faith we apprehend lacunae, which are in nature, precisely to be filled in the supernatural order; but before faith we do not know what is contained in those lacunae and needs.

More recently Maurice Blondel began a new trilogy about the relations between *Philosophy and the Christian Spirit*.¹² There he treats (in volume I) the philosophical enigmas concerning God and contingent things, concerning the destination and end of men, concerning the mediation necessary for them, concerning sins to be repaired and

6. But the error was in saying that the assistance must be supernatural, and that hence the Church must be admitted.

7. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.103.

8. *La pensée* (1934); *L'être et les êtres* (1935); *L'action I* (1936); *L'action II* (1937).

9. *L'action II: L'action humaine et les conditions de son aboutissement*.

10. *Lettre sur les exigences de la pensée contemporaine en matière d'Apologétique*.

On the most recent work, *L'action II*, here is the judgment of P.J.P. Grausem: "In the work of his youth the objectivity of the whole work seemed to be led only by a definitive decision of the will (an option) for the supernatural. This often censured too practical position now disappears because of the connection with the preceding works, and also in this new exposition it is sufficiently avoided. The first "Action" stressed too much the necessity of the supernatural for the perfection of the human will itself, so that the gratuity of the supernatural order and the possibility of a purely natural order did not seem to be sufficiently defended. But in this matter the new treatise rightly responds to the requirements of dogma. Supernatural perfection appears only as a hypothesis about whose realization and concrete possibility Philosophy has nothing to say; a purely natural order can well be thought as in accordance with human nature and the wisdom of the Creator... As in the preceding works there are also in this one some places which seem to be not all too clear. Thus, censors will find an abundance of things to criticize, unless they lose courage and put down their arms..." (Schol 14 [1939] 259; translated from the German).

11. F. Taymans D'Eypernon, *Le Blondelisme* (Louvain 1933) p.IX. Also treating Blondelism, explaining it and defending it, are Blaise Romeyer, *La philosophie religieuse de Maurice Blondel. Origine, évolution, maturité et achèvement* (Paris 1943); Auguste Valensin, *Maurice Blondel et la dialectique de l'action: Et 263* (1949) 145-163.

12. *La Philosophie et l'esprit chrétien*. Tome I: *Autonomie essentielle et connexion indéclinable* (Paris 1944); Tome II: *Conditions de la symbiose seule normale et salutaire* (Paris 1946).

expiated, and how these things are satisfied in the Christian mysteries and in the historical realization of the supernatural order...; likewise (in volume II) he proposes the glorious and final mysteries of Christianity, and those of the Church and of the Christian life in the Sacrament, and how in the Christian religion there is the answer to the problem of the union between immanence and transcendence.

Thus (in the first volume) while he studies the relations between philosophy and Christianity, between reason and faith, and between the natural and the supernatural, rightly he brings out their *incommensurability*, but without excluding their *symbiosis*... Explanations of this kind, although at times one would desire in them a more accurate theological precision, in no way are opposed to the transcendence of the given revelation, had through the supernatural order, and they are very useful to dispose the minds of modern men to hear the voice of the Church... and the first volume seems to be a model of useful apologetics.¹³

L. Laberthonniere defended and explained the Blondelian theory of “action” by considering human action in the concrete, according as it is actuated *de facto* under the supernatural influence of God; hence he said that the exigency of the supernatural is found in it—not that nature justly demands it, but *de facto* inasmuch as nature is penetrated by the grace of God, and therefore by examining nature a supernatural exigency—he said—will be found...: and that this exigency is necessary and sufficient so that the “gap of nature” may be filled by revealed truth....¹⁴

139. Doctrine of the Church. Pius X in the Encyclical “*Pascendi*” not only rejected modernist apologetics, but he also complained bitterly that there are among Catholics those who, although they reject the doctrine of immanentism, nevertheless use it in apologetics, and they do it so carelessly that in human nature they seem to admit not only the capacity alone and the suitability for the supernatural order, but also a true exigency for it (D 2103 [34th ed.]).

Theological note. *Catholic doctrine.*

13. *Epistola Substituti Secret. Status I.-B. Montini* (December 2, 1944) *ad M. Blondel* with reference to his first volume: *La documentation catholique* 42 (1945, June) 498f.

14. ...les exigences [au surnaturel] n'appartiennent pas à la nature en tant que nature, mais elles appartiennent à la nature en tant que pénétrée et envahie déjà par la grâce (p.171-172)... Par conséquent, en faisant la science de l'action humaine, puisque cette action est en même temps notre action et l'action de Dieu, on devra trouver en elle l'élément surnaturel qui entre dans sa constitution. En fait l'action humaine postule le surnaturel. Assurément cela ne veut pas dire qu'on trouve dans l'action la vérité surnaturelle sous sa forme précise et dogmatique. Mais cela veut dire que dans l'action qui, informée par la grâce, postule le surnaturel, on trouve ce qui nous permet de recevoir cette vérité et de lui donner un sens quand elle est révélée... Quoique venue du dehors, [la révélation] elle n'est plus étrangère, parce que du dedans on va vers elle, et parce qu'en la recevant on a en soi un principe organisateur qui y correspond et par lequel on peut s'en emparer, se l'assimiler et la faire sienne...” (*Essais de philosophie religieuse* [1903] p.171-174.

140. Proof. a) Although immanentism rightly concludes that there are lacunae and necessities in human nature, and therefore the *need of assistance* for man is perceived; and although it is rightly proved that divine revelation is suitable for man: nevertheless it is not rightly concluded that precisely this help of revelation is absolutely, without qualifications, *necessary*, and much less *supernatural* revelation. Therefore these immanentistic criteria (explained under n. 2) are not sufficient, that is, the method of immanence, taken in an exclusive way, must be rejected.

b) And this method does not show what is primary in Apologetics—the foundations of divine faith. For, divine faith is given because of the authority of God revealing; but that requires that the historical and external fact of divine revelation and attestation be demonstrated with certainty; but this *cannot be proved directly by purely subjective criteria*. For, with these criteria it would be proved only that dogmas must be affirmed because they agree with the nature of man, not because God has revealed them.

But the fact of divine revelation could not be demonstrated *indirectly by way of a conclusion*: because *from the tendencies of nature* we could not deduce anything in order to establish *supernatural revelation*, and much less the revelation of *mysteries*.

c) The concept of the supernatural order is destroyed, if a true necessity and exigency of the supernatural order for man is defended.¹⁵ By that very fact it would not be supernatural (see D 2103 [34th ed.]).

d) And from subjective needs alone it could not be resolved which religion is true among those that have some elements of revelation (v.gr., Christian religion, Islam...).

e) Moreover, subjective tendencies of this kind on a higher level than other subjective criteria would be an indefinite and variable criterion; for, each one would choose that revelation which was more pleasing to himself and his tendencies; and therefore in no way can this be the primary criterion of revelation, demonstrating the matter *certainly, easily and in a way accommodated to all*.

141. Objections. 1. (*Laberthonniere*)¹⁶: The movements that men, even infidels, have towards the supreme being, de facto take place by the influence of grace and are ordered to it; i.e., they are de facto supernatural. Therefore from them, that is, from nature so elevated and supernaturalized, because of what is implied in them, we can conclude to the existence of a supernatural being.

Response. Supernatural motions of this kind, as such, ordinarily are not known

15. This argument proceeds conditionally (*if it were defended*) in the sense of a pristine supposition, which was attacked: and it has force for a Catholic.

16. *Essais de Philosophie religieuse* (Paris 1903) p.171-174; above n. 138. This work was placed on the *Index*.

psychologically in awareness as if they took on a special supernatural structure, even though ontologically they may be such, since they take place with elevating grace; therefore in the order of knowledge we cannot argue from them. And also in the apologetic order one cannot demonstrate the matter by relying on dogmatic principles involved in such a demonstration.

2. The human soul is naturally Christian (Tertullian).

Response: i.e., a man, because of his nature, readily knows God and his obligation to practice religion (see n. 41,3); hence he is easily led to the knowledge of Christianity, *conceded*; from the nature of the soul we can conclude to the existence of Christianity, *denied*.

142. C) The internal criteria of doctrine are not primary.

First: Investigation of doctrine in itself.

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.405-408.

Adversaries. H. Schell¹⁷ especially is an adversary; he exaggerates the value of the internal criterion over the external criteria. You will find his arguments in the objections.

Doctrine of the Church. See what we say in n. 150.

143. Proof. a) By examining the internal notes and the characteristic of a certain doctrine they will not appear *to be revealed*, because this is a historical fact *extrinsically denominating* revealed truth. Therefore an internal criterion by itself alone cannot suffice to discern any revelation, even a private one; and much less is it a primary criterion.

b) Moreover, this internal investigation *often* would prove only that nothing prevents it from being truly revealed, i.e., often it would be a *negative criterion*, which by itself alone is not sufficient to establish *for certain* the fact of revelation. For, if mysteries are proposed, reason alone will be able to show that there is no repugnance to reason; and if truths accessible to reason are proposed, they could be thought to be the fruit of some great genius, for the criterion according to which we measure what the powers of human genius by themselves can accomplish is difficult to determine. Therefore often the fact of divine revelation *with certainty* will not be proved or will hardly be proved.¹⁸

c) Moreover, it is not an *easy* thing for all to examine and know the internal

17. H. Schell (1850-1906), born in Freiburg in Breisgau, a priest, professor of Apologetics and the History of comparative religions, was a theologian of great influence, although *objectively* he was not always orthodox; his books were on the *Index*, but he wanted to live in the Church (see LTK at the word *Schell*).

18. See however n. 648ff., where *sometimes* (therefore not often) we believe that it is proved with *moral* certitude. But certainly this is not easily done by all.

characteristics of a doctrine, v.gr., its conformity with rational truths and with the noble aspirations and tendencies of men, and also the sublimity and transcendence of that revelation over others, especially if long comparisons have to be initiated. In fact these studies are not done *readily* even by wise men, since many accurate studies are required. Thus, much less will public recourse to this criterion work and also it is not *accommodated to all*.¹⁹

d) Add to the above that there is an *undetermined* and *variable* criterion (what grade of sublimity and harmony is required in the doctrine?) dependent on the diversity of men, inducing the danger of subjectivism and rationalism (for what pleases these, displeases those; many want that to be true, which is in their heart). Therefore, also for this reason, such a criterion proves the matter neither certainly, nor easily, nor in a way accommodated to all.

144. Objections. 1. The criterion of some thing must cohere with the thing to be discerned. Therefore the criterion of revelation must cohere with the revealed doctrine.

I distinguish the antecedent. The criterion must cohere with the thing to be discerned internally or externally, *conceded*; precisely internally, *denied*. And *I also distinguish the consequent*. And note here that it is not a matter of discerning immediately a revealed doctrine, but of *discerning the fact* of revelation.

2. A criterion must be equivalent in gravity with the thing to be discerned. Therefore the criterion of revelation must be sought primarily in the revealed doctrine.

I distinguish the antecedent. The criterion is equivalent in gravity to the thing to be discerned, if the internal connection is always given between the criterion and the thing to be discerned, *I bypass the antecedent*; otherwise, *denied*.

3. The primacy of ideas and doctrines must take precedence over any facts. Therefore the internal criteria of doctrine are primary.

I distinguish the antecedent. The idea must take precedence over the facts, in the nature of a criterion, *denied*; otherwise, *I bypass the antecedent*.

4. An external criterion, namely, a miracle, is approved after the consideration of the doctrine of the miracle worker (see n. 173). Therefore the external criterion depends on the internal criterion of the doctrine, which is primary.

I distinguish the antecedent. It often happens in this way, by considering as a *negative criterion* whether the doctrine of the miracle worker is in conformity with right reason (or with faith, where from Apologetics it is established with certainty about the credibility of faith), *conceded*; it always happens in this way, as if the internal criterion is positively definitive, *denied*.

145. Second: Investigation of doctrine in its effects.

Adversaries. *Pragmatists*, for whom that revelation or religion must be accepted that satisfies the exigencies of life or promotes Ethics.

19. See the thesis on *the incapability of the human race to obtain suitable knowledge of natural religion*, n. 76ff.

Likewise *Modernists*: a revelation that promotes a religious feeling can be accepted.

Doctrine of the Church. See what we say in n. 150.

146. Proof. a) This criterion by the investigation of effects cannot be primary, because *it cannot take care of all*: for, it supposes faith as already accepted, and it comes after faith; therefore it cannot help those who have not yet experienced that revelation, and it can be asked by what criterion they were led who were the first to accept it. Therefore it is not a criterion accommodated to all.

Likewise it would not be accommodated to all, since it is *undetermined* (what level of peace, joy, satisfaction... is required?) and *variable* (for religious belief is inconstant and different things please different persons and give satisfaction: the Law of Moses to Judeo-Christians, Montanism to Tertullian).

b) Moreover, such effects of doctrine in individuals—joy, peace, satisfaction of desires—are difficult to discern so that one can conclude *certainly and easily* to their supernatural cause; the supernaturalness of peace and joy often is known only in a conjectural manner. Also, similar effects and the satisfaction of desires can come from natural causes, or from the praxis of some truths of natural religion.

In addition, there can be some revealed religious truths, which of themselves are not apt to promote a religious sense (v.gr., the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and from the Son as from one principle*).

c) Similar things must be said, if the concern is with the effects of doctrine because *they fulfill all desires* (in the family, nation, in the human race). For such fulfillment of tendencies with difficulty would be proved *certainly*, because the fact is difficult to establish regarding a multitude, and also it would have to be proved that the satisfaction did not come from natural religion alone; and such a proof would not be *easy*. And it would also have to be proved in that case, if many accepted the revelation, that they did not find satisfaction in it because of their depraved tendencies.

Therefore the investigation of a doctrine in its effects per se is not the primary criterion of that revelation.

d) But if criteria of this kind from the effects and fruits of joy, peace, sufficiency... *per se* cannot generate certitude proved without difficulty for many persons concerning the fact of revelation; criteria from the fruits of holiness, martyrdom, extraordinary virtue in a large multitude... more

easily can generate such certitude, if from them one can conclude to the intervention of a preternatural or miraculous cause manifesting itself externally.²⁰ Therefore it can happen that the study of the doctrine in its effects sometimes *accidentally* generates certitude demonstrated easily for all. But this criterion is like a miraculous external criterion.

The positive part

147. Preliminary note: *The ultimate criterion of divine public revelation is some extraordinary divine sign, either internal or external.*

It helps to remember that certitude about the fact of divine revelation rests *ultimately on some extraordinary sign*. Ultimately, I say, because many persons are certain from the mediated testimony of other men. But such testimony must be based on some *sign outside of the created natural order*, whether *external* (v.gr., a sensed miracle), or *internal* (i.e., not sensed, v.gr., an extraordinary insight).

148. *The reason is* because we cannot know the fact of revelation or the divine locution itself by looking at God; – nor by deducing it from natural creation, because that revelation is something preternatural; – nor by a conclusion from metaphysical principles, because it is something contingent and not necessary; – nor by human authority, which of itself alone will not give certitude about this divine fact; – nor by divine authority, since that is precisely the question at issue. Therefore, ultimately some extraordinary divine sign is required.²¹

Thesis 11. The primary criterion for proving the fact of revelation must be placed in miracles and prophecies.

149. Adversaries. Those, already cited, who attribute to subjective and internal criteria the same or more power as they do to objective and external criteria; namely, the defenders of the apologetics of immanence taken in an exclusive sense.

150. Doctrine of the Church. According to the doctrine of *Vatican Council I* one must hold the primary and sufficient value which is proper to miracles and prophecies; D 3009: “... God willed... that *exterior* proofs of his revelation, viz., divine facts, especially miracles and prophecies, should be joined to the interior helps... they are the most certain signs of

20. Thus v.gr. in the holiness of Jesus Christ, in the holiness of many in the Church, in the martyrdom of so many, in the spread of Christianity.

21. Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundament.* n. 98.

the divine revelation *adapted to the intelligence of all men.*” Therefore they demonstrate with certainty, easily and in a way adapted to all, and therefore they prevail over others; consequently, according to the teaching of the Church they are the primary criteria (see D 3033f).

The same teaching is contained in the *Oath against Modernism* (D 3537-3542).

This teaching also permeates the life and preaching of the Church and it is in its magisterium.

Regarding the rejection of the apologetics of immanence taken in an exclusive sense, see D 2103 (34th ed.).

Theological note. This primary and sufficient worth of miracles and prophecies is *at least Catholic doctrine.* I say “at least” because it seems to be contained implicitly in Tradition and in Holy Scripture, since the Church, Christ the Lord and the Apostles appeal so often to the criterion of miracles.

151. Proof. Such criteria, namely, perceptible miracles and fulfilled prophecies, which produce the testimony and confirmation of revelation, *per se* do not require a highly developed intellect, as is needed for the internal criteria of doctrine, but only a healthy mind and healthy senses *in order to attain certainty about them.* For, often it can be established that nature is surpassed and that something is done by God in order to demonstrate something else.

Furthermore, they are palpable and manifest things, not exposed to subjective illusion like the subjective criteria. Thus, *an easy recourse* to these criteria is obvious; and, since they can be transmitted with certainty by testimony, *they are adapted to the intelligence of all.*

Therefore, miracles and prophecies, external and objective criteria, *per se* alone are sufficient and they take precedence over other internal and subjective criteria.

The thesis *is confirmed* by the universal appeal to miracles and prophecies.

152. Objections. 1. Many do not admit miracles. Therefore it is not the primary criterion, because it is not adapted to all.

I distinguish the antecedent. Many unreasonably never admit miracles, *conceded*; reasonably they do not admit them, *I subdistinguish*: if there is no certainty about them, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*.

2. But miracles are not proved with certainty, because all religions, also false ones, appeal to miracles. Therefore.

I deny the assumption and distinguish the added reason. All religions appeal to

miracles whether true or false, *conceded*; to true miracles, *denied*. This indicates that we must be careful in accepting miracles, as we are in accepting money; but it does not follow that all such claims are false or cannot serve some purpose.

3. At least they do not *easily* prove miracles, because they require a long investigation.

I deny the assumption and distinguish the added reason. Sometimes they require a difficult investigation, *conceded*; always, *denied*. But an even longer investigation is required for the other criteria.

153. Scholium. *On the criterion of an immediate revelation: it is also a miracle.*

In Jesus Christ there was the *beatific vision*, whereby immediately he saw all the works of God and his speech: *For all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you* (John 15:15). Therefore he was certain with this intuitive vision which, although it was due to him, for a simple created nature is always above the order of nature.

In others, besides the illumination of the mind and the infusion of species or besides an extraordinary combination of species already possessed, that is, besides the material communication of God, there must be some sign by which they are certain that God is speaking to them. This sign can be the *illumination of the mind* or the *infusion of a communication*, inasmuch as it is perceived as something transcending nature or as miraculous action on the intellect or there are *extraordinary mystical movements*, known as coming from God; or *miraculous actions within the subject* (like the sudden conversion of St. Paul) or *outside of the subject* (like the burning bush seen by Moses).²²

Therefore, just as the universal criterion of certitude is the evidence, so the universal criterion of revelation, both public and private, is a miracle.

The complementary part

154. On the positive value of subjective and internal criteria.

We already know the true value of these criteria, which many have praised excessively, confusing scientific apologetics with pastoral practice. But here the question is raised about the *scientific value* of these criteria, not precisely about their psychological and pastoral advantages.

Thesis 12. Subjective and internal criteria have their own importance and usefulness.

155. Doctrine of the Church. The doctrine of the thesis is mentioned in the Encyclical of Pius IX "*Qui pluribus*" (November 9, 1846; D 2779);

22. Lercher-Schlagenhafen, *Theolog. fundament.* n. 99.

where these criteria are listed among the valid criteria in favor of the Catholic religion.

Theological note. The thesis contains *at least certain doctrine*.

156. Proof: A) *The usefulness of subjective criteria.* a) *Internal movements* in favor of some teaching or revelation, if they are extraordinary and take on the nature of a miracle, taking into account the conditions for a true discernment of spirits, will be a sufficient and primary criterion *for the person who has them*. But if these movements are not extraordinary, but affect the soul with some kind of ordinary consolation with respect to some doctrine or religion, they can be an indication not to be spurned and from their repetition it could turn out to be a criterion.²³

b) *Agreement with the legitimate aspirations of man* can be an indication of a true revelation, but its objective value is less because of the mutability of subjects and tendencies. But if there is *an extraordinary fulfillment of all desires this can induce a man to pursue a further examination of the teaching*; but if the tendencies of a man are surpassed in a wondrous way, this can be a moral or intellectual miracle.

But the psychological value of this criterion can be very great, if from the legitimate, intimate and strong desires of the heart and of the human intellect minds *are disposed* to seek moral perfection and the knowledge of religious things. – It can also serve as a good *confirmation* of the accepted faith and a more abundant explanation of it.

157. B) *The usefulness of internal criteria.* a) *An examination of the internal character of some doctrine* and the agreement resulting from it with natural religion shows not only the negative possibility of a revelation, because of the absence of a contradiction with truth and holiness (a negative criterion); but also *it can show the positive possibility* of the revelation of that doctrine, by demonstrating its truth and holiness. But this possibility by itself alone is not an argument, not even a probable one, of revelation, unless for other reasons the incapability of man of arriving at such knowledge without preternatural assistance is demonstrated. However, we know the

23. In a private revelation the criterion to recognize a revelation can be the revealed knowledge itself with the accompanying and following circumstance, namely, 1) if it happens suddenly in the intellect, without an act of the imagination preceding it, for the normal way of knowing among men presupposes the actuation of phantasms; 2) if it teaches much in a brief space of time, for God can do this easily; 3) if it so draws the attention of the mind and will that a person absolutely cannot not heed it, for the one God and Lord absolutely can do this; 4) if it strengthens the person to do and suffer great and difficult things, for this is an indication of an extraordinary grace. See the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* n. 175.330.336, for the sudden action of God on the spirit, and n. 176.183, on how to obtain certitude from the experience of consolations.

moral incapacity of *the human race* of arriving at a suitable knowledge of natural religion (see n. 76ff.); therefore *the more complexity of the truths found in some doctrine*, which is said to be revealed, *which are seen to agree with known principles from reason*, the greater is the difficulty that those truths are gained by natural reason alone; thus the possibility increases, and also the probability, of their preternatural origin.

If the assembly of truths of a certain religious doctrine, compared with the doctrines of other religions, is so sublime and elevated and seems to be profound, so that its preternatural origin is demonstrated, an argument of intensive and extensive “transcendence” will be had, which would be an intellectual miracle.²⁴

b) *In the examination of the doctrine by the fruits produced*, if a disproportion is shown between the faculties of man and the effects produced in the intellect and will, *those fruits can take on the nature of an intellectual or moral miracle* manifesting itself externally; and therefore sometimes a valid argument can be deduced from it. Indeed, it is a *primary* argument, but *per accidens* (see n. 669).

Moreover, these criteria can be useful even before the acceptance of faith, if the peace found in a revelation leads to a further investigation. Likewise, if the moral fruits, already obtained, give solace and confirm and attract the individual to the study of the true revelation.

158. Corollary. If we want to summarize the value and utility of the subjective and internal criteria, we can say the following:

The subjective and internal criteria prove the fact of revelation inasmuch as they show that the fact is a miracle; and they will be primary criteria to the extent that the miracle *manifests itself externally and with certainty and it is easily established in a way that is adapted to all*.

They are useful inasmuch as they are *disposing, enticing, confirming*.

And they are most useful inasmuch as they show *the nature of goodness*, which is found in revelation and faith, and so move the will to consider the matter and to command the act of faith; for the will, as has been pointed out, is moved under the aspect of the good.

159. Therefore, apologetic praxis will consist primarily in this, that revelation and religion to someone who does not yet believe as *desirable*: how in them the answer is found to many questions, which the mind and the heart of man rightly propose to him...: namely, where life is going, why there are sufferings and evils, when there will be a just

24. But also the argument deduced from that for the Christian religion, namely, from the sublimity of its doctrine, some authors think is only advisory. See n.651.

retribution... but questions of this kind each one asks himself depending on the level of his education and on the extent to which he suffers various tribulations. – Apologetics shows how through religion an answer can be given to these questions...; likewise how through religion encouragement can be given to the more noble tendencies of man, namely, to the desire for love among men and union with God, to the desire for the forgiveness of sins, to the desire for moral integrity... really to those things which, according to the current state of the man, he is most concerned about.

Thus through immanentistic criteria and through the internal criteria of doctrine, as enticing and disposing, an unbelieving man can be led (with the help of divine grace) to a satisfying study of religion (Would that it were true! – he will say) and he will be more readily disposed to grasp the arguments for the religion of Christ. But those arguments should be selected and proposed to him that are more adapted to his personality.

ARTICLE VII

ON THE PRIMARY CRITERIA

A. On miracles

S.Th. I, q. 105, a. 6-8; 3 CG 98-105; Benedict XIV, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione* I.4 p.1 c.1-7; A van Hove, *La doctrine du miracle chez Saint Thomas, et son accord avec les principes de la recherche scientifique* (Brouges-Paris 1927); Lépicié, *Le miracle, sa nature, ses lois* (Paris 1936); Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.430-487; J. de Tonquédec, *Introduction à l'étude de merveilleux et du miracle*³ (Paris 1923).

Thesis 13. Miracles are possible.

160. On the notion of miracle. A *miracle*, according to its etymology from *wondering* (*mirando*), indicates something new, outside of the ordinary, mysterious, which produces admiration or amazement. Other names by which the same reality in Holy Scripture is designated are δύναμις (power), σημεῖον (sign), τέρας (prodigy).¹

In miracles “one thing is that which is done: this is something surpassing the faculty of nature, and in this respect miracles are called *virtues*. The other thing is the purpose for which miracles are wrought, namely the manifestation of something supernatural, and in this respect they are commonly called *signs*: but on account of some excellence they receive the name of *wonder* or *prodigy*, as showing something from afar (*procul*).²

For the present matter, that is, for *apologetics* and in general for something demonstrative for men, a miracle can be defined as: 1) *a sensible event*, b) *contrary to the normal course of nature*, c) *worked by God*.

161. a) A sensible event either in itself or in its effects. This is required so that it can be discernible and a criterion of revelation (or the manifestation of some thing: of the holiness of a servant of God, of the divine goodness... which God wishes to show to men).³

162. b) Contrary to the normal course of nature.

The course of nature is that which results from the laws of nature.

1. See Zorell, *Lexikon Graecum* at these words.

2. S.Th. II-II, q. 178, a. 1 ad 3.

3. Therefore the transubstantiation of bread into the Body of the Lord in the Eucharist, *for apologetics* is not a miracle, because it is not sensible. The same holds for charismatic visions which do not manifest themselves externally. St. Thomas makes a distinction: there are miracles “which are the object of faith” and “the Lord wished these to be more hidden, that belief in them might have greater merit. Whereas other miracles *are for the strengthening of faith*: and these it behooves to be manifest” (III, q. 29, a. 1 ad 2).

Law, in general, is a norm “whereby man is induced to act or is restrained from acting.”⁴ And *the laws of nature* are constant inclinations put into things by the Creator.

Such an inclination is said to be *a law in the first reality (in actu primo)*; the act coming from that inclination or the exercise of it is called *a law in the second reality (in actu secundo)*.

Since through a miracle an exception is made in the course of nature or in the laws of nature, an exception concerns the law in the second reality, but not in the first reality; for, the inclination for the act and the exigency for it remains, since it pertains to the essence of the matter.

The fact then is miraculous, if it takes place not only beyond the powers of the thing, but also contrary to its exigency; thus the creation of the human soul, the concursus and conservation by God, are not miracles, because, although for these things there are no powers in nature, still there is an exigency for them.

According to St. Thomas “it is not enough for a miracle if something is done outside the order of any particular nature... for a miracle it is required that it be against the order *of the whole created nature*. But God alone can do this, because whatever an angel or any other creature does by its own power, is according to the order of created nature; and thus it is not a miracle. Hence God alone can work miracles.”⁵

But according to the same holy Doctor “since we do not know all the power of created nature, it follows that when anything is done outside the order of created nature by a power unknown to us, *it is called a miracle as regards ourselves*.”⁶

Benedict XIV, together with others, thought that “unusual and amazing effects, which exceed the powers and faculties *of the visible and corporeal created nature known to us*, are miracles; although they do not exceed the powers and faculties of the invisible and incorporeal created nature....”⁷ Therefore, making a distinction, he said: “*major miracles* exceed the powers of all created nature, and *minor miracles* exceed the powers of nature that is only corporeal and visible.”⁸

But since a) in practice it is difficult at times to know whether something marvelous could have been done by God or also by a creature; and b) for apologetics, which

4. I-II, q. 90, a. 1.

5. I, q. 110, a. 4 c; see q. 114, a. 4; *De potent.* 6 a. 2.

6. I, q. 110, a. 4 ad 2; see 3 CG 103 at the end.

7. *De servorum Dei beatificatione* I.4 p.1 c.1 n.14; see c.6 n.5ff.

8. *De servorum Dei beatificatione* I.4 p.1 c.1 n.17.

considers a miracle as a sign of revelation, and likewise c) for the effects of the canonization of saints and for the manifestation of the goodness and divine wonderful works; i.e., since in almost every consideration of miracles, miracles are admitted as absolutely true and fitting, even though they surpass only sensible nature⁹; therefore with Benedict XIV it seems that a distinction can be made between *major miracles* that surpass the powers of all created nature (v.gr., resurrection of the dead...) and *minor miracles* that surpass sensible nature only.¹⁰

163. c) Worked by God. 1) For God must be the *efficient cause* of a miraculous event, *either physically or at least morally*.

If God is the physical efficient cause of a miracle, he can be either the *unique* efficient cause, if the miraculous event physically is done by him alone (although creatures are the petitioning causes); or God can be *the principal efficient cause*, if he accepts the cooperation of creatures as instruments, whether a person (angel, man) or a thing (v.gr., dirt).¹¹

If a creature by its own power, whether natural (v.gr., spirits having influence on local motion, etc.) or habitually given by God, performs a marvelous work, then for a true miracle it is required that God be the *moral cause* of that marvelous event, that is, either by commanding it, or encouraging it or approving it, and so forth.

2) But in every miracle God must also be the *final cause*. For a marvelous event, for it to be a true miracle, must contribute to the glory of God (*the last end*) and also show some ordination of God, whether a revelation, or the holiness of a servant of God, or the riches of his goodness... (*the proximate end*).

Therefore if a supramundane cause should cause a marvelous thing in the world for an evil end, it would not be a true miracle: it would not be performed by God, neither finally nor efficiently in a moral manner: for, God would not approve of it.¹²

164. Divisions of miracles. 1) *By reason of the perceptibility of the event*, a miracle is divided into *physical*, if the event is perceptible in itself, and into *spiritual or psychic*, if in a mediated way only it is perceptible in its effects. Such a miracle can be *intellectual*, if it concerns the intellectual

9. *Ibid.*, c.6 n.5ff.

10. A review of the authors for both ways of conceiving this matter is given by Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.442-443.

11. Creatures can be *instruments as disposing*, if God uses them *to communicate the divine power* so that something miraculous happens; then they act with a certain exigency that God perform the miracle.

12. The general function of God's physical concursus does not suffice that God be said to be the principal cause of the effects. The history of the concept of a miracle is treated by J. A. Hardon, S.J., *The Concept of Miracle from St. Augustine to Modern Apologetics*: Theological Studies 15 (1954) 229-257. The notion and finality of miracles is treated by F. Taymans, S.J., *Le miracle, signe du surnaturel*: *NouvRevTh* 77 (1955) 225-245.

order (marvelous wisdom, gift of tongues, prophetic knowledge...) or *moral*, if it concerns the order of morals (sudden conversion or amazing change of heart...).

2) *By reason of the order of nature that is bypassed or surpassed* there can be physical miracles: *by reason of the substance of the fact or by reason of itself*, if that which takes place surpasses the powers of nature (v.gr., endowments of a glorified body); or finally they can be *by reason of the manner*, if that which happens takes place by the powers of nature, and indeed in such a subject, but not in such a manner (v.gr., the sudden restoration of health in a diseased organ).¹³

3) *By reason of the opposition to the natural exigency*, miracles can be above nature, contrary to nature or beyond nature. In miracles *above nature* a form is introduced by God which nature cannot introduce, or at least it cannot do it in that state. In miracles *contrary to nature* there remains in the subject the contrary disposition to the effects that God produces through a miracle, v.gr., if fire cools; miracles *beyond nature* are the effects that nature could produce, but not in that way.¹⁴

4) *By reason of its surpassing the whole or only the sensible created nature*, a miracle can be *more or less*, as was explained above (n. 162), or *absolute and relative*.

5) Miracles can be *suspensive* of the law, and *intensive* of the law.

165. Adversaries. 1) *Indirectly* are all those, like materialists, pantheists, deists, rationalists, who deny the possibility of any supernatural being.

2) *Directly* are those who a) either deny the mutability of physical laws by attributing to them an absolute rigidity, like the *determinists*; or

b) those who deny the existence of such laws, like the *contingentists*: Hume, Stuart Mill and some recent authors among physicists, for whom a miracle is a putative exception from a law that is also putative, or from a law that has no other value but statistic.

Spiritists and *theosophists* attribute miracles to spirits or to natural communication with God, as if they are not beyond the order of nature.

For *modernists* a miracle is an event that is not yet explainable, but attributed to God from religious feeling (see D 3417, 3494-3497, 3539).

166. Doctrine of the Church. The ecclesiastical idea about a miracle agrees with the definition given above, since miracles according to Vatican

13. S.Th. I, q. 105, a. 8.

14. S.Th., *De potentia* q.6, a. 2 ad 3. There is a dispute whether this division coincides with the preceding one; certainly it seems more or less to coincide. See Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* 2 c.19 a.1 § 5 p.43.

Council I are *divine facts* that manifestly display the omnipotence of God (because they are worked by the omnipotent God changing the course of nature), and they are *exterior signs of his revelation* (therefore sensible) (D 3009).

In the same Council anyone who says that *miracles are not possible* is condemned (D 3033).

See also D 3032, 3537-3542.

Theological note. *Solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith* (D 3033).

167. Proof. 1) *a posteriori* from actual miracles.

2) *a priori* by paying attention to the concept of a *physical* miracle depending on the physical laws: A miracle would be impossible (with internal or metaphysical impossibility), if it were repugnant a) on the part of the exception that is made to the physical law; or b) on the part of God making this exception. For, these two elements are contained in the definition of a miracle being considered. But

a) *it is not repugnant because of the exception that is made to the physical law.* For, the order of nature, besides what takes place, is not absolutely necessary, since it depends on physical laws,¹⁵ which God can suspend either by denying his *free concursus*, or because of his omnipotence by producing a marvelous effect that surpasses the ordinary effect or even contradicts it.

b) *And it is not repugnant on the part of God working an exception.* For, something can, in the way that has been said, take place physically, since it depends on the *free omnipotence of God*; for God is not bound by some antecedent necessity to a certain order of nature or to some laws, nor is he bound by consequent necessity; *and therefore he is not changed* because he works an exception determined from eternity.

Now *the moral possibility*, that is, the sufficient reason or the reasonable end in God to work an exception can well be thought to be present *in order to show his omnipotence*, as what is not tied to the determined course of nature; to show his *wisdom*, since the mark of a wise man is to order things to an end, but God would order lower beings and exceptions in them in order to obtain higher ends (v.gr., to authenticate revelation); also to manifest his *goodness and the riches of his heart* in the effects of his mercy to be obtained beyond the normal order (as was the case in the miracles of Jesus Christ).

15. In physical miracles the concern is with physical laws. If we were directly treating moral miracles, we would have to give heed to psychological and moral laws, to which less stability is attributed than to physical laws. However, all effects, both physical and moral, are subject to the efficacious and pleasant disposition of God.

N.B. In this argument, with an apparently negative form, we conclude to something positive, namely, the possibility of a miracle, by demonstrating it positively, because positively *we exclude* any repugnance (see n. 110).

The possibility of moral miracles is easier to demonstrate, since the constancy of psychological or moral laws, whereby the normal activity of men is regulated, enjoys less rigidity than the constancy of physical laws. However, God can, with his totally free and omnipotent will and with his efficacious foreknowledge, obtain any effect he desires, and of course it is free and as an exception in the normal way of acting that is proper to men.

168. Objections. 1. A miracle would be an exception to the laws of nature. But the laws of nature cannot have an exception. Therefore a miracle cannot happen.

I deny the minor. To prove this minor, all the objections known from Cosmology against the mutability of the laws of nature could be brought forward.

2. *Proof of the minor.* What is immutable cannot have an exception. But the laws of nature are immutable. Therefore.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. Laws in the first reality are immutable, *conceded*; laws in the second reality, *I subdistinguish*: are immutable usually and without a reason, *conceded*; they cannot be changed *ever* and *by an exception*, *denied*.

3. What necessarily flows from the determined essences of things is always immutable. But the laws of nature (even considered in the second reality) necessarily flow from the determined essences of things. Therefore the laws of nature (even considered in the second reality) are always immutable.

I distinguish the major. What flows with *metaphysical necessity* or as a *merely logical accident* (i.e., only according to our way of thinking) is always immutable, *conceded* (v.gr., risibility flowing from the essence of man as a property); what flows *only with physical necessity* from the essence of a thing is always immutable, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

4. Operation follows being. But the essences of things are absolutely immutable. Therefore the operations of things or laws in the second reality are absolutely immutable.

I distinguish the major. Operation follows being, that is, operation is *in the same order and essence, spiritual or material* as the essence is, and it is not beyond the properties of the essence, *conceded*; the operation has absolutely the same notes and properties as the essence: it is a substance, both eternal and immutable, as essences are said to be, *denied*.

5. The things of nature must always operate in the same way. *Proof:* The essence of a thing has the result that the thing necessarily operates in this or that way. But it does not necessarily operate in this or that way, if an exception is made for it. Therefore.

I deny the antecedent. I distinguish the proof of the major. The essence of a thing has the result that it operates in this or that way according to exigency, *conceded*; according to its exercise, *I subdistinguish*: that it operate in such a way with physical

necessity, *conceded*; with metaphysical necessity, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

6. *Objector insists*: But a determined way of operating follows with metaphysical necessity from the essence. *Proof*: What is essential to a nature is absolutely and metaphysically necessary. But a determined way of acting is essential in things. Therefore a determined way of acting in things is absolutely and metaphysically necessary.

I deny the objection and distinguish the proof of the major. What is essential to a nature *as constitutive* of that metaphysical essence is absolutely necessary for it, *conceded*; what is necessary *as a property* flowing from the essence, *I subdistinguish*: if it flows from it with metaphysical necessity, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor*. A determined way of acting in the first reality or according to its exigency is essential, *I bypass or concede the minor*; a determined way of acting in the second reality or according to its exercise is essential, *I subdistinguish*: as constitutive of the essence, *denied*; as a property flowing from the essence, *I subdistinguish again*: as flowing with physical necessity, *conceded*; as flowing with metaphysical necessity, *denied*.

7. But in no way can God impede the exercise of the laws of nature. *Proof*: God by impeding the exercise of the laws of nature would be doing something inordinate.

I deny the antecedent and distinguish the proof. God would be doing something inordinate related to the universal order, *denied*; related to a particular order, *I subdistinguish*: if it happens often and without reason, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*.

8. But even related to a particular nature he would be doing something inordinate. *Proof*: An artificer doing something against the work produced by himself could be accused of error and imperfection. Therefore the divine artificer acting against the nature made by himself could be accused of error and imperfection.

I deny the assumption and distinguish the proof. An artificer acting against the work produced by himself, if his art and operation is evolved and confined *adequately in the work produced*, could be accused of an error, *conceded* (really it would be such if he intended to make only that artifact); if his art is not confined adequately in that artifact, but *is subordinated* to a higher order, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*

9. But also with an inadequately developing art in a nature, it would be against the divine wisdom to make an exception in the laws of nature. *Proof*: To act against the laws made by himself is against the wisdom of a legislator. But God making an exception in the laws of nature would be acting against the laws made by himself. Therefore.

I deny the assumption. I distinguish the proof of the major. To act against the laws made by himself is against the wisdom of the legislator, if it happens *indiscriminately* and without reason, *conceded*; if it happens by way of a privilege, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

10. But such an exception would be contrary to the wisdom and providence of God. *Proof*: because the certitude in physical things would be taken away, since it supposes the constancy of the physical laws.

I deny the assumption and distinguish the proof. Certitude about physical things would be taken away generally, *denied*; sometimes, *I subdistinguish*: if there is some suspicion that there will be an exception to the law, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. But

these are not contrary to the wisdom and providence of God. Moreover, note that the constancy of the physical laws, which is supposed, is not absolute, by hypothetically and physically necessary.

11. The laws of nature are decrees of God. But the decrees of God can never allow an exception. Therefore the laws of nature can never allow an exception.

I distinguish the major. The laws of nature are hypothetical decrees of God, *conceded*; absolute, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

12. But even hypothetically there cannot be an exception. *Proof:* God necessarily wills what he necessarily understands as real. But necessarily he understands as real this course of nature. Therefore necessarily he wills this course of nature, which therefore is absolutely immutable.

I deny the assumption; I concede the proof of the major and distinguish the minor. God necessarily understands as real this course of nature with its exceptions, *conceded*; without the exceptions introduced by himself, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*

13. Just as the order of justice necessarily is willed by God without exceptions, so also the order of nature is without exceptions. Therefore.

I deny the parity. The order of justice depends on the holiness of God, but the order of nature depends on the omnipotence of God; for the former an exception willed by God is absolutely repugnant, but for the latter it is not repugnant, but sometimes it is most fitting.

14. A miracle either is foreseen by God, or it is not foreseen. If it was not foreseen, it is not possible, but if it is foreseen, it was already in the course of nature. Therefore there would be no miracle.

I concede the disjunction and distinguish the second member. A miracle if it was foreseen, already was in the extraordinary course of nature, *conceded*; it was in the ordinary course, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*

15. *Against the existence of necessary laws.* A miracle supposes the existence of physical laws. But such laws are not given. *Proof of the minor:* Law is an ordination of reason (St. Thomas I-II, q. 90, a. 4). But a physical law is not an ordination of reason. Therefore it is not a true law.

*Response.*¹⁶ *I distinguish the major.* Law in the legislator (actively considered) is an ordination of reason, *conceded*; law in the legislation (passively considered) is an ordination of reason, *I subdistinguish:* a moral law, *conceded*; a physical law, *I subdistinguish again:* inasmuch as it says an order to the ordination of reason which is in the legislator, *conceded*; as if in the subject himself where it is a rational faculty it must be given, *denied*.

169. 16. From modern quantum mechanics (*quantum* from Planck) we know the impossibility of determining in the microcosm of molecules the micro-mechanic course of the ultimate elements (electrons, protons); hence we perceive only the micromechanical total result in the mass coming from the statistic frequency in the course of the elements, determined by a calculation of probabilities. But this statistic and probable

16. This difficulty is proposed in order to make clear the concept of law.

frequency admits of exceptions according to the order of nature. Therefore such exceptions and supposed miracles would be given according to the order of nature. Therefore they would not be true miracles.

Response. 1) The total result in the mass, which is observed macromechanically, has its own rigidity which supports the physical constancy and certain determination of the physical laws in the macrocosm, although it may be conceded that we cannot for certain determine the composition of the movements of the elements. Therefore, what is valid for the microcosm cannot be transferred to the macrocosm; just as it is not right to say that the testimony of a multitude produces only a probability because the individual witnesses give a testimony that is only probable. For, because of the principle of sufficient reason the value of the testimony is changed, according as it concerns one witness or many who have the same knowledge and veracity. Therefore, it is illogical to transfer to the macrocosm what is valid only for the microcosm.

2) Although from “the relations of uncertainty” (by Heisenberg) it is rightly concluded to the distinction *with regard to us (quoad nos)* between certain laws (causal and dynamic) and between laws that appear statistical in the motion of the elements—laws based on probability; nevertheless, in no way can it be supposed that there is some kind of *free determination* in the ultimate elements, but rather that the reason for such and such motion in the microcosm is *unknown* to us.¹⁷

3) It is also to be noted that, although from modern mechanics we do not know how to determine the *quantity* of the motions and courses of the ultimate elements, the

17. In this sense, see J. Muñoz, S.J., *Causalidad filosófica y determinismo científico. Revisión del contenido y de la forma del saber físico-matemático de Galileo Galilei a M. Planck*: Greg 27 (1946) 384-416.

The same point is clearly indicated and proved in the work by J.A. Perez del Pulgar, S.J., and J. Orland, S.J., *Introducción a la filosofía de las ciencias físico-químicas* (Conferencias dadas en la facultad de Filosofía del Colegio Pignatelli, 1934-1935). Ediciones I.C.A.I. (Lleja):

The statistic law is called “la ley aue ha sido determinada por procedimientos estadísticos, esto es, por una serie de puntos. Ley dinámica llamanos a la determinada por observación directa ye continua, con asignación de límites” (p. 17).

“Para nosotros, el adjetivo *estadístico* no indica un carácter estadístico de la ley, sino que califica simplemente el proceso experimental mediante el cual hemos llegado a formularle.”

“Para el *relativismo crítico*, las leyes que ellos llaman estadísticas expresan que los hechos fuera de nuestro entendimiento están indeterminados al menos hasta el momento en que ocurren, existiendo *a parte rei* sólo una probabilidad de que se determinen de un modo o de otro. De modo que el relativismo crítico atribuye también a la palabra *probabilidad* un sentido objetivo, en tanto que nosotros sostendremos, como vamos a demostrar más tarde, que la palabra *probabilidad* se refiere sólo a nuestro *conocimiento*, o mejor, a la *ignorancia* en que estamos de la ley efectiva que liga entre sí a los hechos, y aunque nosotros no la conozcamos con exactitud, podemos llegar a adquirir certidumbre absoluta de su existencia” (ibid., p. 18).

“En la ley determinada por puntos, no hay ley, sino una serie de hechos que hace pensar en la existencia de una ley y no da una cierta probabilidad de que luego vuelva a ocurrir tal fenómeno” (ibid., p. 18).

“La ley estadística es un procedimiento para averiguar una ley, pero ella por sí no es ley dinámica” (ibid., p.61). — Statistical laws and laws in the universe are treated by J.M. Riazza, S.J., *Ciencia Moderna y Filosofía* (Madrid 1953) n.169-171.

R. Puigrefagut, S.J. treated this matter historically, *Del determinismo clásico a la indeterminación cuantista*: Pens 1 (1945) 413-446. And by the same author, *A propósito de la leyes estadísticas de la Naturaleza. Su existencia. Sus caracteres*: RazFe 124 (1941) 297-313. Recently D. Stefanizzi, S.J., *Causalità e indeterminismo nella Fisica moderna*: CivCatt 104 (1953 I) 503-516.

On the mind of Pope Pius XII concerning this matter, see his *Allocutio ad Pontificiam Academiam Scientiarum*: AAS 35 (1943) 69-79; translation and commentary in Pens 1 (1945) 357-368.

same does not therefore hold concerning their *qualitative* reactions; v.gr., that heat is produced by the flow of electricity in metal wire; this is a *certain* qualitative reaction, although perhaps the quantity of it and the law by which it is regulated is not known.¹⁸

4) The exceptions, which are had in statistical laws, are much more frequent than the exceptions that are had in physical laws through miracles; moreover, since a certain exception takes place in a physical law because of a miracle performed, usually the ultimate reason and teleology why the exception occurred is known.

5) Although the motion of the individual elements *is known* only by an uncertain calculation and in the molecules the motion of the elements is truly chaotic, all these things cannot give an ordered result, in fact a very ordered one, without a wise organizer who rules them in a way that agrees with their nature, that is, by the constant inclinations placed in them, although for human calculation *the way in which the same disposition always results is completely unknown*. For, if this constant disposition which is in nature were known from the calculation of probabilities in possible combinations from the motions of the smallest elements, the mathematical probability (given the nature of the number of elements to be combined¹⁹) would be absolutely nil.

Thus, to the objection, I concede the first member: we know the impossibility of determining with certainty the individual movements of the elements. *I distinguish the second member:* we perceive only the total result of the mass, i.e., we do not know the way of determining the direction of the ultimate elements in the microcosm, *conceded;* therefore they act *freely* or they have no laws determining their movement, *denied*.

Objector replies to response 4). If exceptions in statistical laws (v.gr., concerning criminality) are only more frequent than exceptions in the laws of nature through miracles, more or less does not change the species. Therefore statistical laws and natural laws are not different in species.

I distinguish the antecedent. If the nature of the difference between both laws were derived *only according to more or less* as to the frequency of the exception, *I bypass;* if besides the nature of the difference is in the fact that the statistical laws, mentioned above, suppose *a subject acting freely*, and when there is an exception in the law of nature through a miracle its *final reason* is known, *I deny* that both laws do not differ in species.

18. See A. Due, S.J., *Theses Cosmologiae* p.14.

19. "Si admitimos en virtud de un cálculo aproximado, que la cantidad total de electrones es un numero que habría de escribirse *con ochenta cifras*, a lo que se inclinan los astrónomos, y variamos indefinidamente su posición en el espacio, distancias mutuas y actividades diversas que pueden ejercitar unos en otros, no solamente obtendríamos cifras aterradoras, sino matemáticamente infinitas por varios titulos acumulados, es decir, infinitos multiplicados varias veces por infinitos... Sin salirnos de los principios elementales del cálculo de probabilidades, la probabilidad de que procedan [los agentes naturales] con la constancia uniforme y universal que presenciamos, estaría matemáticamente expresada por una fracción cuyo numerador fuese la unidad y el denominador el infinito múltiple antes mencionado: es decir, no solamente nula, sino con nulidad multiple, del mismo grado que ese infinito" (A. Due, *La acción de Dios y la ciencia* p.85f.).

Thesis 14. Miracles as a criterion of revelation are knowable.

170. State of the question. 1) In Cosmology there is also a treatment of the knowability of miracles, but *not as a criterion of revelation*; there it is treated only as an event surpassing the course of nature.

2) We are not saying that every miracle by anyone whatsoever is knowable, but that *generally a miracle can be known* by those for whom it takes place, given the necessary attentiveness.

3) In order to be certain about a miracle as confirming a revelation, there must be certainty about its historical, philosophical and relative truth.

a) *Historical truth* means that the fact which is said to be miraculous really did happen, and just as it was narrated.

This truth corresponds to the note of a sensible event, which is in the definition of a miracle.

b) *Philosophical truth* means that in the narrated fact the definition of a miracle, which we gave above, is fulfilled.

In this definition there are two aspects which must now be considered (besides the first one—that it is a sensible event): the first is *that it has to do with an event surpassing the course of nature*; the other is *that it was done by God*. There are some authors who reserve and restrict “the philosophical truth of a miracle” to the real fulfillment of the first element, namely, if the wondrous event really surpasses the course of nature; and they say that “the theological truth” of a *miracle* is the fulfillment of the second aspect, namely, if the work exceeding the course of nature really was done by God.

c) *Relative truth* means that the miracle is really used by God to confirm the matter for which it was done; in the present in order to signify and confirm a revelation.

For this two things are required: the first is that *the miracle worker explicitly or equivalently invokes the miracle* in witness to his mission; the other is that *it is certain that the miracle was worked by God, at least approvingly*, for that purpose. That will be certain if the circumstances in which the miracle takes place present no reason to suspect that it is ordained or permitted for other hidden purposes. Thus is excluded the possibility of abuse in the hypothesis of a falsifier, who would distort the preternatural facts in order to promote a false doctrine.

171. Adversaries. 1) *Against the knowability of historical truth:* Hume, Strauss, Zeller... who speak in favor of it as manifesting the testimony of the moral order; but they say it is contrary to physical experience, that is, the physical certitude that surpasses the moral certitude of testimony.

2) *Against the knowability of philosophical truth:* Spinoza, Voltaire, Renan... who say that favorable conditions must be given, so that the miracle can be examined *scientifically*, v.gr., so that the miracle can be repeated at will in a gathering of wise men.¹

Likewise A. Harnack *and many others* who, because of rationalistic prejudices, maintain the impossibility of miracles, and therefore their philosophical unknowability. On Harnack's opinion see below n.477.

3) *Against knowability as a criterion of revelation:* all who do not admit external criteria. P. Rousselot required a supernatural light so that a subject could be certain about the objective value of a miracle in order to demonstrate the fact of revelation (see n.183).

172. Doctrine of the Church. Vatican Council I solemnly defined (D 3034) that *miracles sometimes can be known with certainty and that the divine origin of the Christian religion can be legitimately proved from them.* Therefore from Vatican I miracles are knowable as a criterion of revelation.

Straightforwardly also and implicitly the doctrine of the thesis is contained in the proposition subscribed to by L.E. Bautain (1840): "Proof drawn from the miracles of Jesus Christ, sensible and striking for the eyewitnesses, has lost none of its force with its brilliance with regard to subsequent generations" (D 2753).

The same doctrine is contained in the Oath against Modernism: "I accept and recognize the exterior proofs of revelation, that is to say, the divine works, mainly the miracles and prophecies, as sure signs of the divine origin of the Christian religion, and I hold that they are well adapted to the understanding of all ages and of all men, even those of the present time" (D 3539).

Theological note. The thesis is revealed, since in the Scriptures Christ the Lord, the Apostles, the prophets... appeal to miracles as to signs of authentic revelation; moreover, they are proposed by the Church as revealed (D 3009). Therefore the thesis is *solemnly defined divine and Catholic faith* (D 3034).

173. Proof. 1) *Knowability as to historical truth.* A miracle taken in a specific way (what is called a miracle) is *a sensible event*, from the definition we gave above. But a sensible event in the proper circumstances

1. "Un miracle à Paris devant des savants compétents" (Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, Introduction).

can be known with certainty by those present, that is, if their senses are healthy and they apply their mind to know the event; but those who were present and perceived the event can with certainty transmit the event, by their own testimony, to others and to posterity, namely, (from what is proved in Logic) if there is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the witnesses. Therefore others, contemporaries and later generations, under certain conditions and circumstances can know for certain that the event did take place and the way in which it took place; truly they will be able with certainty to know the miracle as to its historical truth.

2) *Knowability as to philosophical truth.* In a sensible event often certainty can be acquired about the things required for a true miracle according to the definition:

a) *that the event surpasses the powers of nature* left to themselves or employed by men, because, although we do not know the extent of the powers of nature, still often we can know with certainty *how far they do not extend* in certain circumstances; and that can be established by an induction no less valid than that of the other positive physical laws: thus, v.gr., we know for certain that a storm cannot be stopped suddenly *by a verbal command*, nor can a dead person be raised by a mere *word* or a seriously sick person be healed the same way. And, unless someone wants to fall into complete skepticism, it would be very *imprudent* in certain circumstances to think that occult natural forces are at work. Thus it can be established for certain that the event must be attributed to a supramundane cause.

b) Likewise it can be established that the event was *done by God*, or as some say, *it is possible to establish the theological truth* of the miracle. For, there are wondrous facts which, either by reason of the nature of the fact or by reason of the subject or by reason of the way in which it was done, *can be attributed to God alone*: v.gr., the resurrection of a dead person, since to no man has the power been given to snatch souls away from God, the rewarder and punisher, after the preparatory period of this life given in order to obtain the last end; and this preparatory period (considering the matter merely philosophically), fittingly is thought to be given in this life before death. Likewise, by reason of the way in which they are done, miracles must be attributed to God alone, if the wonderworker performs such a large number of miracles that he works them by a mere act of his will, without the need of any subject... These would be *absolute* miracles, which would require God as the efficient physical cause.

But other amazing facts, which can be thought to be done physically by other causes besides God, or also amazing facts that do not clearly seem

to be absolute miracles, still can be known as coming from God *as from their moral cause*, and as tending towards him *as to their end*; certainly it can be known whether they have been done morally by God and with a divine purpose. For, the care of men cannot be denied to the wisdom and goodness of God, so that they have a clear way of knowing whether an evil spirit, or some non-divine cause, has produced the amazing fact, or whether ultimately it must be attributed to God, who commands or gives his approval that supramundane causes act in a miraculous way.

“For since it pertains to divine providence to preside over this world, lest he [an evil angel] abuse his power over those things on which the natural order of the universe depends; or lest also the political governance of the human race be disturbed excessively, thus God controls things with greater power, and he does not permit that he [an evil angel] abuse his natural power in order to confirm a false religion or a false holiness through signs and miracles.”²

But the way in which such divine intervention can be known is possible *from a consideration of the wonderworker, – from his way of acting, – from the purpose he intends, – and from the effects that follow.*

Therefore certainty can be had about everything required that the definition of a miracle be fulfilled, or certainty can be had about the philosophical truth of a miracle.

3) *Knowability as to relative truth.*

It should be noted above all that a miracle is a most apt way of giving testimony for some revelation or doctrine or truth, because to change the course of nature is a work belonging especially to God, its author, and so we are all moved to consider a miracle as a divine seal.

In order to establish the relative truth of a miracle, there must be certainty a) that the wonderworker *explicitly or equivalently works the miracle* in confirmation of some revelation or doctrine; and b) *that this connection is approved by God.*

But there can be certainty about both points: a) first, just as with any historical fact; b) second, if from the circumstances (*of the person, of the way of acting, of the intended purpose, of the effects that followed*) there is not solid reason of suspecting fraud or that the miracle is ordained or permitted for other occult ends. For if in these circumstances, and after a man has exercised diligence in searching out the truth, God were to permit

2. Benedict XIV, *De servorum Dei beatificatione* l.4 p.1 c.6 n.6.

his deception, he would be depriving himself of an excellent means of confirming divine revelation and he would be a witness to falsehood by permitting the improper use of his seal.

174. Objections. *Against historical knowability.* 1. That a miracle has taken place is at most only morally certain; that a miracle cannot take place is physically certain. Therefore it should be held that the miracle did not take place.

I distinguish the second member of the antecedent. It is physically certain that a miracle did not take place, if there is no reason to suspect an exception to the law of nature, *conceded*; if a reason to suspect an exception to the law of nature is present, in fact if it is morally certain that an exception took place, *denied*.

For there to be physical or moral certitude two elements are required—one positive and the other negative: *the positive element* consists in the rigidity or the physical laws or the moral laws (of the psychological order according to the common way of acting); *but the negative element* consists in the lack of suspicion about the given exception or future exception to the law. Then I can and I must give assent without a prudent fear of error, and in this there is certitude; but it is otherwise if the negative element is lacking.

2. For certitude about the historical truth of miracles the testimony of many learned persons is required. Therefore often there can hardly be certainty about the historical truth of a miracle.

I distinguish the antecedent. Sometimes the testimony of many learned persons is required, *I bypass the antecedent*; often, in order to prove a sensible fact, *denied*.

3. Many give testimony that miracles do not happen; and there are few who give testimony that miracles do happen. Therefore always the testimony of the deniers must prevail.

I distinguish the antecedent. Many give testimony that miracles *generally* do not happen, *I bypass the antecedent*; related to a *particular fact* that is asserted, *denied*. *I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

Against philosophical knowability. 4. For certitude about the philosophical truth of a miracle there must be certainty that the *hidden* powers of nature are excluded. But that can never be established with certainty. Therefore.

I concede the major and deny the minor.

Often from the way of acting, with words and with an act of the will, without any manipulation or use of instruments, indeed at times with naturally contrary means, *it is sufficiently certain that the powers of nature are not at work*; unless someone wishes logically to embrace a skepticism about everything. Meanwhile it is also fully certain that in nature there are no powers to do some things, v.gr., to raise someone from the dead.

5. Also in the past it was believed that in nature there is no power to do some things (v.gr., radio, television, etc.), which however later were discovered to be quite natural. Therefore we can always fear lest the powers of nature truly extend themselves to what appears to us to be miraculous.

I distinguish the antecedent. Thus in the past it was rightly believed *for cases in which no instruments were available*, manipulations, special attention and study, *conceded* (and it was surely right to believe as they did); in the past it would have been so believed, *if they had seen contemporary instruments*, manipulations and artificial ways of acting, *I subdistinguish*: it would have been believed imprudently, *conceded*; prudently, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent.* We can fear lest the powers of nature extend themselves to something, if the reasons for suspecting it are apparent or that the powers are applied in this case, *conceded*; otherwise, *I subdistinguish*: I can fear it imprudently, *conceded*; prudently, *denied*.

Against relative knowability. 6. Every religion appeals to miracles. But if that is so, miracles cannot be the criterion of revelation. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. Every religion appeals to miracles *whether true or false or merely conjectured*, which require investigation, *conceded*; as if all miracles are to be rejected utterly, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor.* If that is so, miracles cannot be a criterion of revelation without investigation, *conceded*; they cannot be a criterion after a previous investigations, *denied*.

It is as if one were to say: There is counterfeit money. Therefore money cannot be of any use.—But there is true money, which by examination can be distinguished from the counterfeit.

7. Just as God can permit that someone abuse a special gift of grace possessed habitually, v.gr., the power of consecrating and absolving; so also the gift of performing miracles. Therefore we can never know that God has approved the performance of a miracle in favor of some false doctrine or revelation.

I deny the parity. For, if someone uses badly his priestly gifts and powers, still their end is not completely frustrated; but it is otherwise if someone abuses the gift of performing miracles and men could not know it, even after exercising diligence and consideration of the circumstances and other factors connected; because this error would be attributed to God who gives such power and permits the improper use of his divine seal, and so a miracle as a natural sign of something divine would be frustrated completely in its natural purpose.

8. The doctrine of a wonderworker or revealed doctrine is examined in order to prove the relative truth of miracles; and at the same time a miracle is said to be a criterion for revealed doctrine. But in this there is a vicious circle. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. The doctrine of the wonderworker is examined according as it is in conformity with rational truths and with revealed truths known from other sources as certain and credible, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

Van Laak gives more objections: *Repetitorium Theolog. fundam.*, propositions 8, 9, 10.

B) On prophecies

S.Th. II-II, q. 171-174; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundament.* I p.429-457; Lercher-Schalgenhaufen, *Theolog. fundament.* N.127-131; A. Michel, *Prophétie*: DTC 13,708-737.

Thesis 15. Prophecies are possible (I), and after their fulfillment they are knowable as a criterion of revelation (II).

Now we will treat another primary criterion, prophecy, which is a special kind of intellectual miracle.

175. Definition of terms. A *prophet*, from πρόφημι,¹ is understood as either one who announces things beforehand (*prae-dicere*) or one *who speaks for another*.² In this last sense it means the same thing as *interpreter*, and it can be used in a broad sense and in a strict sense.

In the broad sense it is said about someone who *speaks at the prompting of God* about divine things or things pertaining to God, not precisely hidden things³; *in the strict sense* it is used for the minister of God who manifests *something hidden* whether regarding the place (knowledge of hidden things, telepathy), or regarding interior thoughts and desires (reading hearts), or regarding time.

176. In the technical and apologetic sense, which we have to treat now, *prophecy is the knowledge and definitely certain prediction of a future free event.*

a) It is *knowledge*: not ranting and raving,⁴ but someone prophesies in a human way. This knowledge includes two things: representation of the matter and a certain judgment (at least for public revelation) concerning the meaning and the divine origin of the matter represented. Otherwise it is rather *a prophetic instinct* (see John 11:51 about Caiaphas saying that it was necessary that one man should die for the people, and S.Th. II-II, q. 173, a. 4).

-
1. Other authors derive it from προφαίνω, which appears in the presence of (since it is hidden).
 2. Aaron is called the *prophet* of Moses (Exod. 7:1).
 3. Thus in the O.T prophets are *those who speak in the name of God* (see Deut. 18:15-21 and passim) and in St. Paul it is a *prophetic charism*. On prophecy in Holy Scripture, see J. Enciso, *El concepto de profeta en el Antiguo Testamento*: RevEspT 1 (1940) 139-210; by the same author, *El modo de la inspiración profética, según el testimonio de los profetas*: EstBibl 9 (1950) 5-38; S. Muñoz Iglesias, *Los profetas del Nuovo Testamento comparados con los del Antiguo*: EstBibl 6 (1947) 307-337. Likewise concerning the concept and criteria of prophecy, H. Bacht, S.J., *Wahres und falsches Prophetentum*: Bibl 32 (1951) 237-262.
 4. In order to prophesy ecstasy is not required, as the Montanists claimed. God uses the prophet as an instrument according to his own reality, that is, in a human way, so that he knows the things he speaks; although it is true that perfect knowledge is not required (see S.Th. II-II, q. 173, a. 3).

b) It is a *definite* prediction: that is, it does not take place with ambiguous and equivocal words.

c) It is a *certain* prediction: that is, not out of conjecture or hesitation about the facts.

d) It pertains to a future free event, whether of God or of a rational creature. Therefore it does not have to do with a necessary event, v.gr., about a good harvest or about a famine, which by conjecture perhaps could be known by spirits. For us this would be a *relative prophecy*.⁵

177. Divisions of prophecy. 1) *By reason of the faculty* whereby the things are received *immediately* by a prophet, the prophecy can be: *bodily*, if it is received immediately by the external senses; *imaginary*, if immediately in the imagination; *intellectual*, if immediately and only by the intellect. But always, at least in a mediated way, the intellectual element is present, that is, a judgment about the representation of the matter and its divine origin. Otherwise, those who would merely perceive with their senses or imagination some representation (v.gr., Belshazzar at the banquet; Dan. 5) would be prophets.

2) *By reason of the way* in which the matter is represented, prophetic representation can be in a vigil, in an ecstasy, in a rapture, in sleep; according as someone is *awake*, and not sleeping, he accepts the matter, or in an *ecstasy*, that is, or in a gradual separation from the senses, or in a *rapture* or sudden separation from the senses, or finally in *sleep*.

3) *By reason of the future* which is foretold, a prophecy can be *absolute* or *conditional*, according as the matter is said to be absolutely future, or dependent on the fulfillment of some condition.

4) *By reason of its execution* a prophecy can be one of *threat*, *predestination* and *foreknowledge*; according as some threat or predestination or mere prediction of some future event is signified by the words of the prophet.⁶

178. Adversaries, besides those who reject all miraculous actions, the ones now directly opposed are:

a) Those *who deny any divine foreknowledge* of free acts, like M. Tullius Cicero, who “while he wishes to make them [men] free, made them sacrilegious”⁷;

5. Some authors also treat these *relative prophecies*, which can be signs if, just as we said about relative miracles, it is certain that they are worked by God, because God is their moral and final cause. If God only permits it, then it is not said to be a true prophecy, but a *divination*; this matter is treated in moral Theology.

6. See on this S.Th., *De verit.* q.12, a. 10 ad 9.

7. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 1.5 c.9: ML 41,150; and see Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.2.

b) on the other hand, *fatalists* who say that everything happens necessarily and that there are no free events.

c) Others, like *Protestant liberals and Modernists*, want to explain facts about which there is historical certainty as interpolations after the fact; or, like others, they want to explain the facts through poetic insight or nervous activity that induces some intuition; or, like the *Theosophists*, by the *natural* participation in the knowledge of a superior being.

179. The doctrine of the Church is expressed clearly in Vatican I (D 3009): prophecies are “divine facts” (therefore possible) and “the most certain signs of divine revelation” (therefore also knowable as a criterion of revelation).

See also the Oath against Modernism (D 3539).

Theological note. The thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*, because it is contained in Scripture, and in the magisterium of the Church it is taught as revealed, at least in the ordinary magisterium. See also D 3009: “And again *it is written...*”

180. Proof of part one: *Prophecies are possible.* God can reveal to man what he knows. But he knows all future free acts. Therefore he can reveal to man future free acts. Therefore man can know and foretell future free events.⁸

181. Proof of part two: *Prophecies are knowable as a criterion of revelation*, at least sometimes (as we said about miracles). For this it is required and suffices that one can be certain about their threefold truth—historical, philosophical and relative. But one can be certain about this.

1) *For certainty about historical truth* it is required and suffices that we know with certainty a) that a definite prediction was made, b) that the free event took place, c) that there is conformity between both of them. But we can know these things, like any other historical facts. Therefore there can be certainty about the historical truth of a prophecy.

N.B. It is not required that the prophecy is completely understood when the prediction is made, but it suffices that it be understood after the event has taken place. Although the prophecy of itself may be obscure, it becomes clear in the fulfillment. This is the case in some of the prophecies of the O.T and of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were

8. This proof of possibility, if it is not restricted to prophecy about a supernatural object, but is extended also to a preternatural prophecy, seems to be positive. See n. 110.

understood afterwards.⁹

2) *For certainty about philosophical truth* it is required and suffices that it is certain that the powers of nature are surpassed in the prediction. But this can be made certain

a) *if it has to do with a future free act* (and not previously manifested by its cause, if it concerns a free human event). For they are not known by a created intellect: *neither in themselves*, because they do not exist and creatures apprehend things as present in some way to themselves and as actual; *nor in a medium*, because this medium would be either the human will or the divine essence; but the human will is indifferent and it does not have a determination or necessary connection to the act and free event, but we do not see the divine essence naturally.

b) Also, there will be certainty about the supernaturalness of the prophecy, if the prediction is made *without rashness and probable conjecture*. That can also be made certain, if the matter is foretold with many circumstances and many prophecies; or depending on many circumstances, so that it is excluded that the same thing might happen by accident; or it is something supernatural or depending only on the divine will... For, thus rashness in the prediction or a probable conjecture is excluded, so that *certainty* can be established about the contrary.

N.B. We are not saying anything about *the theological truth* of prophecy, or what must be established for something to come from God, as we said in n. 170.173 about miracles. For, if there is certainty about the philosophical truth or if it concerns the true prophecy of a future free event, it always has theological truth or is known only by God.

3) *For certainty about relative truth* it is required and suffices that it be known

a) *that the prophecy is connected with a revelation as witness to it*. But that can be known, v.gr., if the legate appeals to the fulfillment of the prophecy given by himself or about himself; or if a legate coming in the future, distinct with his own characteristics, is foretold by other men.

b) Moreover, it must be known that *this connection is approved by God*.¹⁰ As is the case with miracles, this will be certain if there is no solid reason for suspicion about the falsity of the prophet. But this will be apparent from

9. See John 2:22; see St. John of the Cross, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* 1.2 c.19.

10. We require and examine this, because, although a genuine and strict prophecy is from the divine knowledge, still it does not seem per se to be excluded that someone with the gift of prophecy might misuse that gift, just as it is possible that someone might abuse the gift of miracles; although surely this will be excluded if it has to do with relative prophecies.

an examination of the circumstances (a holy person, an upright way of acting, a good purpose, salutary effects). For, in these circumstances God cannot permit abuse and cooperate in the fulfillment of false prophecies.¹¹ Also he would be depriving himself of an excellent and exclusive means (concerning future free events, which we are considering) of putting a seal on his own revelation.

It is not repugnant that at times God may make use of a false prophet, as was the case with Balaam (2 Pet. 2:15; Rev. 2:14) in order to utter genuine prophecies (Num. 23:1ff); but in the concrete circumstances it will be certain that in this case he is speaking from a divine impulse.¹²

Therefore there can be certainty about the relative truth of prophecies.

Therefore prophecies are knowable as a criterion of revelation.

182. Objections. 1. If prophecy is possible, predicted future events happen necessarily. But in this way one is not dealing with a free event. Therefore.

I distinguish the major. Events necessarily happen *with a necessity consequent upon* the exercise of the freedom foreseen by God, *conceded*; with a necessity preceding the exercise of freedom, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.*

2. The Gentiles also uttered prophecies. Therefore they do not take place by divine intervention.

Response 1). It is certain that Cicero considered them (of Apollo) to be either false or equivocal and ambiguous, or by chance as true.¹³

Regarding the prophecies of the sibyls, today they are considered to be interpolations after the fact.¹⁴

2) It is not repugnant, from what has been said, that the Gentiles had prophets.

3. Many amazing things are said and manifested also in spiritualistic meetings and by those placed in a hypnotic state. Therefore prophecy is something natural.

Response. In these sessions many things must be attributed to simple fraud carried

11. See, but merely as an illustration, not as an argument, Deut. 18:21.

12. It is not repugnant that a Gentile, v.gr., Virgil, was a prophet, as some of the Fathers and medieval theologians considered him to be.

But if we consider the fourth Eclogue carefully, which is considered to be *prophetic*, we will see that he is not dealing with a messianic prophecy, but with an age of happiness periodically returning and expected: "The last age of the song of Cumae is now returning—A new order of the ages is reborn completely." Nor is the expected son (of Pollio or of the emperor) the author and cause of this new age, but something accompanying it. See on the disputes about this matter, K. Prümml, S.J., *Die Heilserwartung der vierten Ekloge Virgils im Widerstreit neuerer Ansichten*: Schol 6 (1931) 539-568; 7 (1932) 239-257. More briefly in a book by the same author, *Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt* (Leipzig 1935) 1,201-208 (Die Heilserwartung der vierten Ekloge Virgils).

13. *De divinatione* 2,56.

14. St. Augustine also treats the prophecies of the Gentiles, *De civitate Dei* I.18 c.23. And see C. A. Lapidè, on Num. 22 and Exod. 7.

out in a hidden way or to illusion and cleverness at deception.¹⁵—Also to the abnormality of the psychic state, so that from previous thoughts aptly joined together are produced (like what was spoken in Hebrew from what the man heard as a child from a religious pastor as he read the Hebrew Bible in a loud voice).

Likewise the difference from Christian prophecies, even relative ones, is certain from the way of acting in genuine prophecies, which is holy, open, reverent towards God, not vain or frivolous...; in spiritualistic sessions the situation is completely contrary.

Hence, *if something wondrous is said, and if there is proof that it cannot be attributed to natural sensible causes* (we are speaking conditionally), sometimes one may suspect a superior influence of some spirit being involved in the course of the world, with God's permission.

4. At times also men are said (v.gr., some in Westfalia) to have the power of knowing what takes place at a distance (*zweites Gesicht; double vision*).

Response. Not all the powers of nature are sufficiently known (v.gr., telepathy). But if what is narrated takes place in only one region, it seems to suggest that it should be applied to a natural cause.

In many of these amazing things that are reported, often the historical and plain proof is difficult to establish, but *many things are confused in the popular mind and are often false*, especially things that concern the knowledge of future free acts, which are not known by conjecture or by chance. But *having supposed* the reality of the facts, we are saying that there does not seem to be total and absolute repugnance in the fact that men (not only pure spirits) know things done at a distance.¹⁶

15. See F. Palmés, *Metapsíquica y espiritismo*² (Barcelona 1950). There he treats fraud in "photographs of spirits" (c.7); likewise in "ectoplasmas" (c.9-16); fraud in "telekinesis" (c.17-22) and in "scriptesthesia" (c.23-27); diabolic intervention should not be easily asserted (c.46). On the same matter, see D.M. de Heredia, S.J., *Los fraudes espiritistas y los fenómenos metapsíquicos* (Barcelona 1946).

16. According to R.P. Schlagenhafen (*Theolog. fundamentalis* n. 131) "indeed also to be able to know future things, if they are already present in intention and volition, [does not seem absolutely to be repugnant]." — On the many phenomena, which at first sight seem to be wondrous, J. Surbled has much to say, *La moral en sus relaciones con la medicina y la higiene* (Barcelona 1937) (translation of the 13th French edition) l.3 c.15 (*double vision*) etc.

183. Scholium. Whether per se an interior supernatural enlightenment is required in order to know the fact of revelation with certainty.

S.Th. II-II, q. 5, a. 2; CL 7,526-531; Tromp, *De revelatione* l.1 prop.13; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundam.* n.132.

That a man be able to perceive the probative force of criteria for the fact of revelation, and so to be certain about the objective truth of the revelation, *per se*, i.e., from the nature itself of the matter and of the human faculties, it is required only that he pay attention to these criteria, which are an *objective light*. Therefore without an interior supernatural enlightenment or *without a subjective light*, provided he has the subjective disposition on the part of his faculties, man has the physical power to form a judgment about credibility and the obligation to believe (*credenditas*). But for this *it suffices to have an intellect and to attend to the motives* and the proposed criteria which prove with certitude.

Actually, as theologians dealing with faith teach, such judgments of credibility and the obligation to believe are ordained by God to the supernatural end, which he has established for man, and they are therefore *at least extrinsically supernatural acts*.

There is also a question as to whether these acts are also *de facto entitatively supernatural*.

For this it must be known that theological faith or the assent of the intellect to truth revealed by God because of the authority of God revealing (not a purely natural or scientific faith) is entitatively supernatural, and also that the command of the will directly commanding this assent is entitatively supernatural; since we cannot (D 377) by the power of nature [therefore physically elevating grace is required] choose something that pertains to the salvation of eternal life, nor can we give consent to the preaching of the Gospel without the enlightenment and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives to all *ease and joy in consenting to the truth* and in believing it. Therefore also this command of the will or the pious affection of credulity—as it is now usually called by theologians—must be an entitatively supernatural act, like every salutary act that leads *positively* to salvation.

However, this command of the will, like faith itself, *in no way is a blind impulse of the mind* (D 3010), but it is *obedience in harmony with reason* (D 3009); this of course presupposes a certain judgment of credibility or certain judgment about the fact of divine revelation, and a certain *judgment about the obligation to believe* or a certain judgment about the uprightness and need to believe.

Thus therefore the command of the will, whereby faith is determined,

supposes on the one hand *a very practical judgment of the need to believe* (now I must and ought to believe), and by this judgment the command of the will is determined. But since by this judgment something *is thought* that pertains to the salvation of eternal life, it cannot take place by the power of nature (D 377) and it is an *entitatively supernatural* judgment. And on the other hand it is truly fitting that the moving principle (morally) for the pious affection of credulity is in the same supernatural order as the affection of credulity.

Similarly—as is commonly affirmed—the same thing holds for *the last judgment of credibility* (this is now credible for me), which directs and positively leads to the pious affection of credulity. Therefore this last judgment of credibility is an entitatively supernatural judgment.

But also it is not repugnant (indeed it seems to be the case) that *prior judgments of credibility and remotely practical judgments*, as often as they are had in the order of providence as seeds and beginnings of faith, are also *entitatively, not at all extrinsically, supernatural*. The reason is that with these judgments something *is thought* that pertains to salvation (although remotely); and moreover Vatican I speaks about the *interior* helps of the Holy Spirit before faith (D 3009).

But it should be noted that this action of elevating grace surely gives supernatural value to the elevated act; but that it is not (generally) given immediately to consciousness, and hence the logical and normal psychological character of the act is not changed.

Conservative Protestants affirm the necessity of an interior light; they demand that interior enlightenment in order to know that there is an external divine offer of revelation through the Holy Scriptures.¹

The same view was held about 1700 by J.B. Gormaz and J. de Ulloa.

Likewise P. Rousselot taught that the motives of credibility, although they have the objective power to move to assent, still cannot be perceived as such without the assistance of supernatural grace.²

184. The doctrine of the Church supposes absolutely the physical power of man so that he can know with certainty the fact of divine revelation.

This is present in the propositions subscribed to by *Bautain* (D 2752-2756). The last one has this to say: “However weak and obscure reason

1. See CL 7,528; and above n.134 in note 4. Regarding the modern J. Gresham Machen, see Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ p.171.

2. Pierre Rousselot, *Les yeux de la foi*: RechScRel 1 (1910) 241-259, 444-475; see also 4 (1913) 1-36; 5 (1914) 57-69. – The opinions of Rousselot were criticized, among others, by A. Stolz, O.S.B., *Glaubensgnade und Glaubenslicht nach Thomas von Aquin*: Studia Anselmiana I (Rome 1933); José de Wolf, S.J., *La justification de la foi chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin et le Père Rousselot* (Brussels 1946). See also R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi*² p.451-470.

became through original sin [it is speaking, obviously, about natural reason, not as elevated], there remained in it sufficient clarity and power to guide us with certitude to [know] the existence of God, to the revelation made to the Jews by Moses and to Christians by our adorable Man-God.”³

Also in the letter of Pius IX “*Qui pluribus*” (November 9, 1846) this is openly taught, while treating the relations between faith and reason, that human reason can [and he is talking about reason as reason, as distinguished from faith] diligently inquire into the fact of divine revelation in order to reach certainty that God has spoken (D 2778); and after proposing various reasonable arguments to prove his point (D 2779), finally he concludes: “Human reason, *knowing clearly and distinctly from these most splendid and equally most strong proofs that God is the author of this faith*, can proceed no farther...” (D 2780). – See also D 2120 (34th ed.; Pius X, *De philosophiae munere*).

In the Oath against Modernism the text speaks about miracles as *most certain signs* of the divine origin of the Christian religion and adapted to the intelligence of all men (D 3539). The same thing was also decreed at Vatican I, which appealed to miracles as most certain signs of divine revelation and *adapted to the intelligence of all men* (D 3009).⁴

Therefore if these signs are adapted to the intelligence of all men, their power to change men’s minds is implied also without the interior assistance of grace; for it does not seem that they could be said to be *adapted to the intelligence of all men*, if some interior help were required in order to recognize their probative worth.

But the doctrine we are proposing is taught openly in the *Letter “Humani generis”*: “... the human intelligence sometimes experiences difficulties in forming a judgment about the credibility of the Catholic faith, notwithstanding the many wonderful external signs God has given, *which are sufficient to prove with certitude by the natural light of reason alone the divine origin of the Christian religion...*” (D 3876).

Theological note of the proposition we are defending: *Catholic doctrine*, since according to the preceding documents it is taught in the whole Catholic Church, but it does not have a higher qualification as being a matter of faith.

185. The reason for our assertion is in the fact that the Church supposes absolutely, from the preceding documents and from the whole

3. See CL 7,520.

4. See CL 7,528.

way of proceeding, the scientific and apologetic value or the criteria of revelation.

Hence the reasonableness of our faith and the obligation to believe can be demonstrated scientifically and rigorously to unbelievers. Also “the demons believe and shudder,”⁵ when they clearly see logically that it should be believed that God is attested by signs, and therefore they have a faith that is merely scientific, but not supernatural and theological; for it is something else for them *to wish to believe* and offer obedience to God, as is necessary for salvation: this they absolutely refuse. But for this the grace of God is also required.

Moreover, for our assertion an *internal reason* is present which was indicated above. For, in order for someone to form for himself judgments of credibility and of the obligation to believe, per se nothing more seems to be required but that a man has an intellect and applies it to the natural arguments (philosophical and historical) which prove those judgments convincingly and with certitude.

There are several objections to be found in S. Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ p.179-182.

5. Jas. 1:19.

B O O K I I

ON THE HISTORICAL SOURCES TO PROVE THE FACT OF REVELATION

186. Connection of the treatise. After the notions and controversies of the preceding book about revelation in general and its criteriology, now we will prove the fact itself of divine public revelation.

This divine revelation manifests itself in three stages—*patriarchal, Mosaic, Christian*¹; and although, by proceeding chronologically, in the first place and directly we could deal with the task of proving the fact of revelation in the Old Testament,² we prefer to take another route, shorter and more immediate to us, by proving the fact of Christian revelation, namely, the revelation which has been given to us by Jesus who is called the Christ.

Thus we will devote ourselves to inquiring into the fundamental fact of that religion which a) is our religion; and which b) to anyone casually considering it even at the first look presents itself with a true character as having been revealed by God (see n.35-43).

Therefore we are passing over other religions which claim to be revealed. We are doing this deservedly, *because of negative criteria*, since *the pagan religions* contradict Theodicy; *Mohammedanism* likewise, by defending fatalism, holy war and other evils..., does not agree with natural religion and contradicts Ethics. Finally *Judaism*, from which the Christian religion takes its origin, will be demonstrated to be antiquated, if the Christian religion is proved to be the only true religion.

187. But in proving the historical fact *it is most important and preliminary to know the sources*: to acknowledge that they are genuine, not spurious; integral, not corrupt; worthy of belief, not false. Hence it will be necessary, as the title of this book says, to consider the historical sources in order to prove the fact of revelation.

1. See S.Th. II-II, q. 174, a. 6 c.

2. Thus G. Wilmers proceeds in this way, *De religione revelata*, treating in Book II “De religionis christianae per religionem revelatam praevidiam praeparatione”; there he treats the truth of religion preceding Christianity, where the point is to confirm the divine legation of Moses and of other prophets. – In a similar way, Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* I s.2 c.1 (De existentia revelationis primitivae), c.2 (De existentia revelationis mosaicae) p.339-604. Briefly, Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* I p.3, de revelatione primitiva (s.1) et de revelatione mosaica (s.2). Lahousse, *De vera religione* in d.2 treats Mosaic religion, where he considers the authenticity of the Pentateuch (c.1) and the Mosaic religion (c.20. Zigliara, *Propedeutica...* I.3 c.7-11 treats revelation in the O.T.

On this point Leo XIII said: "Since the divine and infallible magisterium of the Church rests also on the authority of Holy Scripture, the first thing to be done is to vindicate the trustworthiness of the sacred records at least as human documents, from which can be clearly proved, as from primitive and authentic testimony, the Divinity and the mission of Christ our Lord, the institution of a hierarchical Church and the primacy of Peter and his successors."³

188. The relation of this book to the Introduction to the Bible. Since the historical sources to prove the fact of revelation are contained mainly in the Bible, therefore the treatment of them is handled in biblical studies, where the *General Introduction to the Bible* usually is treated at great length: for now it seems sufficient to omit that study here and to refer the reader to biblical studies. For, it is not necessary here to present a demonstration of what has already been proved scientifically in other disciplines; that is so because for scientific accuracy it is sufficient to accept and admit the conclusions that have been legitimately proved in other sciences.

Nevertheless it has seemed necessary to us, if we now propose the main conclusions from the biblical Introduction, that we consider *those things that are very useful for a close connection and logical demonstration of the principles of apologetics*; we will do this not with the intention of presenting an exhaustive treatment, *but only what is sufficient for our apologetic purpose*.

189. Indeed we often see that the treatment of biblical matters takes place, not only under the light of the dogma and magisterium of the Church, but also from dogmatic arguments that *intrinsically* constitute the debate; of course this way of proceeding is surely legitimate, and in fact it is necessary for a Catholic exegete and theologian. But in a treatise on Apologetics it is not allowed *to argue intrinsically from dogmatic sources*.⁴ Hence in order to avoid confusions which can arise from the mixing together of dogmatic and purely historical arguments, together with the great abundance with which particular matters sometimes are proposed, since they do not seem to be all that necessary, *with regard to Apologetics*: we will debate the following matters in such a way that we will try, while treating all the questions with brevity and clarity, to explain the questions in a solid and synthetic way; also, we will omit the longer historical and critical controversies, which would cause difficulties for beginning students of Theology and would obscure the whole treatment.⁵

3. Encyclical "*Providentissimus*": EB 116 [101].

4. This in no way prevents us from believing that it is opportune for an apologetic *theologian* to consider apologetic matters *under* the light of the dogma and the magisterium of the Church. (See *Introduction to Theology* n.52-56).

5. Therefore we will propose some things from the N.T., which obviously must be one, and also some things from the O.T.; the knowledge and the use of these points, especially when they have to do with the serious apologetic argument concerning the messianic prophecies, can in no wise be omitted.

190. Division of this book. A *source* is called that from which something is derived (a doctrine, an event...).

Historical sources are those that concern and are referred to history. Now we are dealing with the historical sources *in order to prove the historical fact of divine revelation*.

The sources containing revelation are those from which Christian revelation itself considered objectively, or revealed doctrine, is derived. They are Tradition and Holy Scripture, as will be demonstrated in the proper place and where they will be treated.

Therefore at the present time we are dealing with the historical sources, as historical, to prove the fact of divine revelation. Hence here revelation is not taken *objectively* (the doctrine or revealed object), but *formally* (regarding the fact itself of divine locution).

191. The historical sources to prove the fact of Christian revelation can be *profane* and *Christian*.

The profane ones are *Jewish* documents (Flavius Josephus, the Talmud) or *gentile* (Pliny the Minor, Tacitus, Suetonius...).

The Christian sources are: a) *Agrapha*, or the words of our Lord not written down in the holy books, but transmitted by the following sources:

b) *Apocrypha*, which were not accepted publicly, and therefore they are *secret*, as the name indicates; and they do not give the name of the author.

c) *Ecclesiastical*, which, having been composed by ecclesiastical writers, are considered in Patrology.

d) *Canonical*, which were put by the Church in the canon or rule of her own sacred books.⁶ The canon includes the books of the Old and the New Testament, which can be found in a listing of the sacred books (see D 1502-1505).

192. In the following chapters only a brief reference will be made to the *profane* sources, Jewish and gentile, and it is not necessary to give a full treatment of them. But we will make use of them according as they are proposed from history and profane criticism.

With regard to the Christian sources, the *apocrypha* will not be necessary; therefore we will not make use of them, but will omit them.⁷

6. On the intimate nature of a sacred book, and that a distinction is made between a sacred and a canonical book, see later on in the treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.16. The concept of a *canonical* book, above a *sacred* book, is that it has been handed over to the custody of the Church (see D 3006).

7. On the apocryphal books of the O.T and the N.T see, v.gr., Io. B. Frey, C.S.Sp., in Appendix I at the History of the Canon: *Instit. Biblicae* 1.2.

We will make frequent use of the *ecclesiastical* sources at the opportune places, especially the ones accepted by the critics and are considered in Patrology and in ecclesiastical history.

But especially now for our task the necessary documents are the *canonical* ones, namely, *the books of the Old Testament and the books of the New Testament*. But the most important sources and the ones used most frequently, as will be the case in what follows, are the *Gospels* and *the Acts of the Apostles*.

Hence it is easy to make clear that there is a threefold treatment of this book: *on the text and books of the O.T.* (ch.1); *on the text of the N.T.* (ch.2); *on the historicity of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (ch.3).

193. General bibliography. The authors who treat these matters in a special way will be mentioned at the proper place. For now let it suffice to list a few *general* treatises:

A) General works

Cornely, R.—Merk, A., S.J., *Introductionis in S.Scripturae libros compendium*¹¹ (Paris 1934).

Gil Uleucia, A., *Introducción general a la Sagrada Biblia* (Madrid 1950).

Hoepfl, H.—Gut, B., O.S.B., *Introductio generalis in Sacram Scripturam*⁵ (Naples, Rome 1950).

Instituiones biblicae scholis accommodatae. Vol. I *De Sacra Scriptura in Universum*⁶ (Rome 1951). E Pontificio Instituto Biblico.

Lusseau, H. — Collomb, M., *Manuel d'études bibliques*. T.1 *Introduction generale*² (Paris 1936).

Perrella, G., C.M., *Introduzione generale alla Sacra Bibbia* (Marietti 1948).

Robert, A.—Tricot, A. *Initiation biblique. Introduction à l'étude des Saintes Ecritures*³ (Paris 1954).

Simón, H.—Prado, J., C.S.S.R., *Propedeutica biblica sive introductio in uni- Versum Scripturam*⁶ (Turin 1950).

Steinmüller, J.E., *General Introduction to the Bible*⁶ (New York 1952).⁸

B) Special works on the Gospels

Gaechter, P., S.J., *Summa introductionis in Novum Testamentum* (Innsbruck 1938).

Hoepfl, H.—Gut, B., O.S.B., *Introductio specialis in Novum Testamentum*, ed. 5, which was edited by A. Metzinger, O.S.B. (Rome 1949).

Huby, J.—X. Léon-Dufour, S.J., *L'Évangile et les Évangiles*, new edition (Paris 1954).

8. Much information on recent works concerning a *general introduction to the Bible* is given by Félix Puzo, S.J., *La Introducción general a la Sagrada Escritura en el último decenio*: EstBibl 7 (1948) 229-251.

Leal, J., S.J., *El valor histórico de los Evangelios*² (Granada 1942).

Michl, J., *El valor histórico de los Evangelios*, translated from German by J. Corts (Valencia 1944).

Rosadini, S., S.J., *Introductio generalis in N.T. et in Evangelia* (Rome 1938).

Simón, H.—Dorado, G.G., C.S.S.R., *Praelectiones biblicae. Novum Testamentum, Introductio et commentarius in quattuor Iesus Christi Evangelia*⁷ (Turin 1951). [Liber I, isagogicus seu *Introductio specialis in quattuor Iesu Christi Evangelia*].

Steinmüller, J.E., *Special Introduction to the New Testament*⁷ (New York 1951).

Wikenhauser, Alfred, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg 1953).

N.B. In what follows we will not repeat that ample bibliography, which in the works recently praised can easily be found; but we will indicate those authors, dealing with special topics, which can be used profitably.

195. The importance of the biblical Introduction. Concerning the biblical treatise, which we now assume, and which we will treat later after the treatise on the Church and her Magisterium, it will help to quote the words of Leo XIII: "At the commencement of a course of Holy Scripture let the Professor strive earnestly to form the judgment of the young beginners so as to train them equally to defend the sacred writings and to penetrate their meaning. This is the object of the treatise which is called "Introduction." Here the student is taught how to prove the integrity and authority of the Bible, how to investigate and ascertain its true sense, and how to meet and refute objections. It is needless to insist on the importance of making these preliminary studies in an orderly and thorough fashion, with the accompaniment and assistance of Theology; for the whole subsequent course must rest on the foundation thus laid and make use of the light thus acquired."⁹

9. "Providentissimus": EB 104 [89].

CHAPTER I

On the text of the Old Testament

ARTICLE I

ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. Vaccari, *Instit. Biblicae* 11.3 c.1; Cornely-Merk, *diss.* 2 c.1.

196. On the language of the Old Testament. By far the greatest part of the Old Testament is written in the Hebrew language.

The books of *Wisdom* and *2 Maccabees* were written first in Greek. The parts written in Aramaic were Dan. 2:4-7.28; Ezra 4:8—6:18; 7:12-26; Jer. 10:11. And, since the original text has been lost, they are now preserved in the ancient Greek version: 1 Maccabees, Baruch, Judith, Tobias, some parts of Daniel and Esther; likewise also partially the book of Sirach, concerning which recently some Hebrew fragments have been found.

This Hebrew tongue is also called *the language of Canaan* (see Isa. 19:18), because the Israelites, after they left Egypt, adopted it from the inhabitants of Canaan. But it is called *Hebrew* because Abraham, when he crossed over the Euphrates, and arrived in Palestine was referred to in this way (see Gen. 14:13). Finally it was called *Jewish*, as the proper language of the Jews or Judeans.

This language belongs to the *semitic* family of the western branch. From the time of Moses it was cultivated and used for writing books, up until the Babylonian exile. In the meantime, the same language has continued, if you make an exception for the frequent *Aramaisms*, which were introduced gradually.

According to a probable tradition, the method of writing *with square letters* was introduced by Ezra after the exile, as Hebrew is now written. But in antiquity it was written with letters that were similar to the Phoenician letters.

197. Manuscript texts up to the 1st century. The first period of the Hebrew manuscript texts proceeds from the beginning up until the 1st century after Christ. From that time there were several readings and also versions of the text. And that is not surprising, since the authors themselves sometimes added something to their previous writings (Jer. 36:2-4.32); or

because whole collections had not yet been put together (v.gr., the Psalter); or because, since the canon had not yet been settled, the books had been copied with less care.

This state of the text consists a) in the diversity which is evident where some texts are repeated in parallel places (v.gr., Ps. 14 and 53; Ps. 40:14-18 and 70; Isa. 2:2-4 and Mic. 4:1-3);

b) likewise in the diversity that is noted in the order and disposition (of some chapters and verses) between the Massoretic text (MT) and the Septuagint (LXX).

c) in the differences between the MT Pentateuch and the Pentateuch of the Samaritans.

d) Flavius Josephus himself, who wishes to use the sacred books faithfully "by neither subtracting nor adding anything,"¹ and who often uses the Hebrew text instead of the Greek version of the LXX, sometimes uses a text different from what we now have.

But since the copies were made mainly on *papyrus*, which is easily corrupted, one can easily understand that many copies were made over time, and so the result was a certain diversity in the various copies.

198. Manuscript texts from the 1st century to the 6th century after Christ. From the first century the *version which is called Jamnian* (Jamnia) prevailed; the name comes from the place in Palestine where a famous council of the Jews was held. This version gained more authority than the others, and the present Hebrew texts comes from it.

From three codices, as they say, that were kept in the temple, after comparing texts, that reading was preferred in which two codices agreed.

Afterward the scribes or *soferim* divided the text into verses and numbered them, and they gave a summary... which is read at the end of the books.

Also from this period come the words which *are read* in the sacred text, *but not written*, or *which are written, but are not read* as they are written, but in a different way (*kere ketib*). But also doubtful words were designated with extraordinary points, and some corrections were made (18) where the words seemed to sin with irreverence towards God.

199. From the 6th century after Christ. Between the 5th century and the 7th century after Christ, when the reading of the text of the Hebrew O.T. was rendered more stable and easy, *vowel points* were added to the Hebrew words, which before were written only with consonants. In order

1. *Antiquitates iudaeorum* l.1 proem. N.3; Flavii Iosephi *Opera* (Didot) (Paris 1865) t.I,3.

to establish this *vocalization* the rationale of the written tradition was used (*masora*), which gathered together the critical observations concerning the text, as it was handed down in the rabbinical schools. This is the source of the name, *Massoretic Text* (MT).

At the end of the 15th century, after the invention of the art of printing, in the years 1477-1525 the Hebrew text was printed.

After these main editions, the most famous ones are the following:

In 1525 at Venice (the *Rabbinical Bible*) by Jacob ben Chaim from the massoretic manuscript, and this text became the *received text* (*textus receptus*).

The other main editions after that one are: in 1705 of *Amsterdam* (E. van der Hooght); in 1776 of *Oxford* (B. Kennicot) without the vowels and accent marks; the complement and correction of this in 1784-1788 of *Parma* in 4 volumes. Various readings of the O.T (Joh. Bern. De Rossi).

In 1906 in Germany R. Kittel published the *Biblia hebraica* with various readings from the previous work by De Rossi, from the ancient versions and from critical conjectures; in the year 1951 the *seventh edition* appeared, and finally a corrected edition (*ninth*) was published in 1954 in Stuttgart.

200. On the critical worth of MT. Generally the massoretic text is good, and it preserves the original words; but at times it disagrees with the LXX and with other versions which were produced from other Hebrew codices. Hence these versions, especially that of the LXX, can at times help to *correct the massoretic text*; surely, if the reading of the versions is certain and takes its origin from the presupposed Hebrew codex itself, then the meaning is clear; and on the other hand if it agrees with the context, etc.

Sometimes a *conjectural correction* can be made, i.e., from a conjecture about the original reading, since sometimes the corruption of the text is older than these versions.

201. The Pentateuch of the Samaritans. The Samaritans after the capture of Samaria became a people mixed together from Israelites and gentiles (2 Kings 17:24-33); and, disagreeing with the Jews (Ezra 4:1-23; John 4:9), from the sacred books they accepted only the Pentateuch of Moses. This Pentateuch, translated into Aramaic, has been preserved. It is independent of the version of the LXX; hence when the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX agree, their reading has great authority over against the MT.

ARTICLE I I

GREEK VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. Vaccari, *Instit. Biblicae* 11.3 c.3; Cornely-Merk, diss.2 c.4.

202. On the Greek version of the LXX of the Old Testament. This version is often found in the same codices as the New Testament; and so what we will say about the form of the books and the writings of the N.T (n.221f.) should be applied to this version.

This version is called the LXX, the Septuagint, from the number of scholars who worked on it long ago. It was produced in Alexandria, and it was a version of the O.T for Jews who were not familiar with the Hebrew language.

The translation began under Ptolemy Philadelphos, probably around the year 250 before Christ; a large part of it had been done by the middle of the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes II (171-117 B.C.), since the author of the Prologue and the interpreter of Sirach says that he found in the 38th year of the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes sacred books in Egypt already translated, to which he wanted to add the book of Sirach. Therefore, according to this, we can identify the completion of the whole translation about the year 100 before Christ. But if the author of the Prologue was referring to Ptolemy Euergetes I (247-222 B.C.), then the version would be still more ancient.

203. Other Greek versions. In the 2nd century after Christ Hellenistic Jews, noticing discrepancies between the LXX and the received Hebrew text, produced some new translations.

Among these versions there are three that have the names of the translators and include the whole O.T. They are called the version of *Aquila* (about the year 140), the version of *Symmachus* (about the year 200), the version of *Theodotion* (about the year 180); as St. Jerome says about them: "one (*Aquila*) translates the text word for word, the other (*Symmachus*) gives rather the meaning, the third does not differ much from the older versions."²

The other versions do not preserve the name of the translators and, as St. Jerome says, *they achieved authority without the names of the translators.*³ They are called the *fifth, sixth and seventh version*; and they do not include the whole O.T (only the minor prophets and the poetic books).

2. *Praefatio in lib. II Chron. Eusebii*: ML 27,223 n.2.

3. *Comm. in Tit* 3,9: ML 26,630.

204. Origen (185-255) took up the huge work of composing the *Hexapla*, that is, to place the sacred text in six columns: the Hebrew text in the first column; in the second the Hebrew text, but expressed in Greek letters; in the third column the Greek version of Aquila; in the fourth the Greek version of Symmachus; in the fifth the LXX version reviewed by himself; finally, in the sixth the version of Theodotion. Thus the Christians, when debating with the Jews, could know what was in the Hebrew text; and they also had a critical and uniform Greek text.

But what he added in his revision of the Septuagint (in the 5th column) to the Hebrew text, he indicated with a *critical mark* (*obelus*; †, ±); what was added from other versions he indicated with an *asterisk*.

A R T I C L E I I I

ON THE VULGATE VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. Vacarri, *Instit. Biblicae* I 1.3 c.7; Comely-Merk, diss.2 c.5; H. Quentin, *La Vulgate à travers les siècles et sa revision actuelle* (Rome 1926); J.M. Vosté, O.P., *De latina Bibliorum versione quae dicitur "Vulgata"* (Rome 1927); E. Mangelot, *Vulgate*: DB 5,2456-2500; A. Durand, *Vulgate latine*: DAFC 4,1943-1970.

205. St. Jerome (ca. 347-420) is the man whom God deigned to raise up as the *Greatest Doctor* of his Church in explaining the Holy Scriptures.⁴

Having made some correction to the N.T in Rome, as we will say in n. 228, when St. Jerome was in Bethlehem, beginning in 386, he corrected the protocanonical books of the O.T. from the Greek that was in the Hexapla of Origen, and he published some of them (Job, Ps., Prov., Eccles., Cant., Chron.); and in his *Commentaries on the Prophets* he incorporated the Latin version from the Greek Hexapla.

But in the year 390 he began a Latin translation from the Hebrew text. He was careful of course not to neglect elegance, but he paid special attention to render *faithfully* the meaning, and not necessarily to give a word for word translation; thus his concern was not for literalness, but for fidelity.

But he accomplished this either by the authority of the rabbis and also by using the versions of Aquila and Symmachus, or by using the version of the LXX, especially if he was in a hurry.

In order to obtain clarity sometimes he interpreted proper names according to their etymology (v.gr., Gen. 41:45; Prov. 30:1) and he used

4. See the prayer in the liturgy for St. Jerome. On St. Jerome and his life and works, in addition to the volumes 22-30 in ML, see also F. Cavallera, *S. Jerome, sa vie et son oeuvre* 2 t. (Louvain-Paris 1922).

vulgar or mythological expressions (v.gr., Isa. 34:14; Jer. 50:39)⁵; but he separated the sentences with periods and commas.

206. The translation of St. Jerome from Hebrew, since to many it seemed to be an innovation contrary to the LXX and “a rebuke of the ancients,” gave birth to adversaries; but, esteemed and used by the learned, it was also made famous by commentaries on it. Thus it happened that, according to the testimony of Isidore of Spain, it was used in all the Latin churches by the middle of the 7th century,⁶ and in the 8th century it was really *common* (*vulgata*).

Nevertheless at the end of this century the translation made by St. Jerome from the Greek Hexapla was used for the Psalter, and first of all in Gaul; hence it was called the *Gallican* Psalter, which almost everywhere was used in the collection of the sacred books and for the recitation of the Breviary.

But because of the old Latin versions, which were supposed to be abandoned, and because of the difficulty of finding and having all the codices of St. Jerome’s translation, it came about that all did not have the whole version from Hebrew, and also that interpolations from the old Latin were inserted into the version of St. Jerome; also glosses for explanation and easier reading were admitted. Consequently the version of St. Jerome became somewhat obscured in its clarity.

207. The diversity of readings brought it about that two main families or two kinds existed in the various versions of Jerome’s translation: one is the *Italian*, of which the best example is the *codex Amiatinus*, because it was preserved in the Abbey of Mount Amiatae, having been written formerly (ca. 700) in England based on a copy that came from Rome. Another of the main kinds is the *Spanish*, which follows the order of the Hebrew canon, and has its principal codices from the 10th century: *Toledo* (Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional), *Legionensis* (León), *Complutensis* (Madrid, University).⁷ The *Irish* and *French* copies are of less importance.

5. See A. Condamin, *Les caractères de la traduction de la Bible par S. Jérôme*: RechScRel 2 (1911) 425-440; 3 (1912) 105-138; *L’influence de la tradition juive*: *ibid.* 5 (1914) 1-20.

6. “All the churches everywhere use this Edition (of Jerome from Hebrew to Latin), because it is truer in meaning and clearer in its words” (*De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1,12,8: ML 83,748.).

7. On the Spanish version of the Vulgate, see J.M. Bover, S.J., *Origen del Pentateucho turonense* (G): Bibl 9 (1928) 461-463; *La Vulgata in España*: EstBibl 1 (1941-42) 11-40, 167-185. On the time of the Toledo codex: *ibid.*, p.38-40. T. Ayuso has done a lot of work on the history of the Vulgate in Spain, *La Biblia de Calahorra. El texto de la Vulgata. Los elementos extrabiblicos de la Vulgata*: EstBibl (1942ff); *La Biblia de Calatayud, de Lérida, de San Juan de la Peña, de Huesca*, Universidad (1941ff.); *La Biblia de Oña* (Madrid 1945), etc.; and recently, on the nature of the Spanish old Latin, *La Vetus Latina Hispana*, vol. I Prolegomenos (Madrid 1953).

208. The revision of Alcuin. In order to have the genuine text of St. Jerome amid the diversity and discrepancy of the codices, at the command of the emperor Charlemagne a more accurate revision was made by *Alcuin*, from York in England, Abbot of the monastery of St. Martin of Tours (in 801) and formerly teacher of letters at the palace. This royal revision, added to the *Amiatinus family*, was used far and wide.

209. The revision of Theodulphus. Subsequently, the Alcuinian revision having been corrupted because of interpolations from the old Latin versions, *Theodulphus* (+ 821), the bishop of Orleans, made a new revision at the bidding of the same Charlemagne. But this version, not widely disseminated, did not take the place of the preceding version of Alcuin.

A new version of the Vulgate took its origin from the Alcuinian revision; *in the 11th century in Italy* it seems that it was made *common* by Nicolas Maniacornia, a deacon of St. Laurence in Damasus (+ 1145).

210. Parisian Bible. For the convenience of students at the University of Paris, in the 13th century what is called the *Parisian Bible* was produced. In this revision the *current division of chapters* was introduced by Stephen Langton (in the year 1214); the result was the convenience of clear citations and uniformity for all the students.

Corrections. *Corrections* were introduced by the learned doctors into the text that was somewhat interpolated and corrupted; thus, either in the margin abandoned or corrected readings were added, or they were debated separately regarding the different readings.

These corrections were introduced especially by the Dominican Friars (like Hugo of St. Caro) and by the Friars Minor, at the prompting above all by Roger Bacon; but either because of the negligence of the secretaries or because of the great mass of corrections and a less apt disposition they did not contribute much to the production of a genuine reading.

211. Printings of the sacred text. After the invention of printing the Holy Bible was printed over and over again, so that in the 15th century there were about 100 editions, the first one being in the year 1452 at Mainz by Gutenberg.

The editions printed until the year 1510 can be said to be *non critical*, since they were made from recent codices and without a critical apparatus; until finally variations were noted in the margins. Thus gradually there was movement towards *critical editions* from the ancient codices: as in the *Complutensis Polyglot* (Alcalá de Henares) by the work of Cardinal

Jiménez de Cisneros (already made by 1514), and in the edition *Hittorpiana* (Cologne 1530), and in those produced by *Robertus Estienne (Stephanus)* at Paris in the years 1528, 1532, 1540, 1555. *The numbering of verses* was introduced in this edition.

212. The Decree of the Council of Trent. But since the Vulgate was looked down on, because some thought it was necessary to refer to the original text in order to know the genuine word of God; also since the Vulgate, having been corrected by what was thought to be the original text, was not easily recognized for its purity, and so new Latin versions were produced: it came about that the Council of Trent in its fourth session (1546), after it laid the foundation of the confession of faith and having established the canon of the Scriptures, published a decree on the *authenticity of the Vulgate*, by declaring and decreeing “This same ancient Vulgate version which has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries is to be regarded as authentic in public readings, disputations, sermons, and expositions, and let no one dare or presume to reject it on any grounds” (D 1506).

Likewise the Fathers desired “*that hereafter Sacred Scripture, particularly this ancient Vulgate edition, shall be printed in the most correct manner possible*” (D 1508).

213. In obedience to the will of the Council, Congregations were instituted by Pius IV (1561), by Pius V (1569) and by Sixtus V (1586); their purpose was to carry out this work of printing the Bible.

Sixtus V did not approve the excellent text prepared by the last commission of doctors; he himself proposed and decreed certain corrections, so that in the year 1590 the *sixtine edition* was printed. But, when the Pontiff died in that same year (August 27), that edition both because of the new numbering introduced by Sixtus V, and because the text prepared by the commission of doctors was not used, was displeasing; so it came about that the sale of the book was suspended and a new edition was prepared by a new commission (1591) with the advantage, according to Gregory XIV, *that what had been removed was restored, additions were removed, the unchangeable things were to be considered or corrected, the punctuations were to be carefully examined, and there were to be no changes unless necessity required them.*⁸

Finally, under Clement VIII, in the year 1592, with the collaboration

8. Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* I⁶ 1.3 n.124 p.340.

especially of Francisco de Toledo⁹ and Angelo Rocca, a new definitive printing was made, which is what we now generally use; it was reprinted by the Vatican Press in 1593 and 1598. It is called the *Clementine Edition*.

214. New works. But since the Clementine Edition, although sufficient, could not yet be said to be perfect, there were those experienced in the art of criticism who took pains to propose corrections or to assemble variations in the readings, as in the year 1618 was done by *Lucas Brugensis*; beginning in the year 1830 *Al. Ungarelli* and *C. Vercellone*¹⁰; afterwards *Th. Heyse* and *C. Tischendorf* (Lipsiae 1873), and *Jo. Wordsworth* and *Jul. White*.

Recently in the year 1907 (see EB 2829f. [285f.]), the Benedictine monks, were commissioned by Pius X to restore faithfully the original text of St. Jerome; since 1933 they have been working on this project in the Abbey of St. Jerome in Rome.¹¹

A R T I C L E I V

ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

215. Definition of terms. *Genuine* (from *gigno*) means that which really has the origin that it is assumed to have, whether with regard to the author (*genuineness of the author*), or with regard to the time in which it had its origin (*genuineness of time*).

Integral is said to be that which contains everything that it should have: that is, nothing has been lost from it that is necessary for it, and nothing bad has been introduced into it from the outside. It means the same thing as *incorrupt*.

Historical is said to be that which has value as a document that merits historical faith.

If something really is genuine, integral or incorrupt, and historical, then among historical documents it is that which it is really supposed to be, and it is said to be *authentic* (from ἀύθεντέω, to have full power over, to have

9. R. Galdos, S.J., treats the parts of Toledo in the Clementine Vulgate, *Méritos escriturísticos de Toledo*: ArchTG 3 (1940) 20f.

10. *Variae lectiones Vulgatae Latinae Bibliorum editionis* (Rome 1860-1864).

11. Up until now they have produced Genesis to the Psalms (1953) v.I-X. We will treat the authenticity and dogmatic authority of the Vulgate in the dogmatic treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.148-165.

authority) because it has the intrinsic worth or authority to require faith.

216. State of the question. The authenticity of the books of the O.T can be demonstrated *directly*. But this way, if it is pursued with scientific fullness, by mentioning all the controversies and adversaries concerning this matter, is surely too long. But *it is not necessary*, since the demonstration of authenticity can be accomplished from the testimony of Christ and of the Apostles and from the magisterium of the Church.

But since in this way only, that is *indirectly*, the authenticity and historical value of the books of the O.T is demonstrated, it is not licit to use them to demonstrate scientifically and apologetically the legation of Jesus of Nazareth or of the Church.

But it is our intention to establish a fully apologetic demonstration of the legation of Jesus; for, we do not want to omit the solemn and classical argument of Christian antiquity based on the prophecies of the O.T. Of course we will not carry out this demonstration to the extent that it is done in the Introduction to the books of the O.T.; for, it is not necessary here to indicate all the questions that can be raised about each book, much less to deal with them in detail; also we do not think it is opportune to do that now, since such a mass of details for beginning students of Theology would not so much show the way as it would be to obscure it.

However, a brief outline will surely be helpful.

217. On the authenticity and historical value of the Scriptures of the Old Testament A) In general, *the most ancient and solemn tradition of the people of Israel bears witness to this.*

Thus the following give testimony to their authenticity and historicity:

1) Flavius Josephus (born in 37 A.D.), who in his writing *against Apion* (after the year 93) says this:

“Therefore among us in no way is the number of books innumerable, disagreeing and fighting among themselves, but there are only twenty-two books, embracing the history of all time, which are rightly thought to be divine [δικαίως θεῖα¹² πεπιστευμένα]. Of these five are by Moses, which contain the laws and an account of all the things done from the founding of the human race up to the time of his death. This period of time covers about three thousand years. But from the death of Moses to the kingdom of Artaxerxes, who reigned in Persia after Xerxes, the prophets who succeeded Moses relate the things done during their time in thirteen books; the four remaining books are hymns in praise of God and they contain very useful precepts for the life of men. Moreover, from the kingdom of Artaxerxes down to our own time there are some individual

12. Thus in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1.3,10 this word is found, which also agrees with the context: MG 20,241.

writings, but by no means have they merited as much faith and authority as the books mentioned above, because the succession of the prophets was less carefully examined. Furthermore, in how great veneration we hold these books is evident from the reality itself. For, now after so many centuries, no one up to the present time has dared to add something to them or to subtract something or to change anything. But immediately from the time of birth this is implanted and innate in all Jews, that we believe these are the commands of God, and we constantly adhere to them, and because of them, if it is necessary, we will willingly endure death...."¹³

Although Flavius Josephus attributes less authority to the later books (deuterocanonical), "because the succession of the prophets was less carefully examined,"¹⁴ still the great authority which these other books (also those of lesser authority) claimed for themselves is certain.¹⁵ Moreover, the canon of these sacred books was defined afterwards about the year 100.

2) The absolute historical authority of these books is confirmed by the citations and by the absolute authority given to them by the *Jews listening to and accepting the words of Jesus of Nazareth and the Apostles* in the New Testament (v.gr., Matt. 21:42; 22:29; 24:15; John 5:39; 10:35...).

3) The books themselves of the O.T. appeal to *preceding collections of books*, which is a sign of their existence and historicity (v.gr., 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 14:6).

4) Since many of the things related in these books are not for the glory, but *for the disgrace of the people of Israel* and of their leaders and their kings, this cannot be explained except through the legitimate historical authority of these books.

218. B) In particular, the authenticity and historicity of these books is proved a) by appealing to their authors, as they are known from the solemn tradition of the Jews or from the sacred books themselves based on the internal evidence. Thus it is apparent b) that these authors could tell the truth and willed to do so.¹⁶

a) *The authors of the books of the O.T* as they are known from the books themselves.

Some parts of the Pentateuch are attributed to *Moses* (Exod. 17:14; 24:4.7; Num. 33:2; Deut. 21:9.22; 28:58); and, since this complex of books bears a strict unity, the whole work should also be attributed to him, according to the tradition of the Jews; this

13. *Contra Apionem* 1,8; Flavius Josephus, *Opera* (edit. Didot) (Paris 1865) t.2,340f.

14. But concerning these see also the *History of the Canon* in the treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.62.

15. For other places in Josephus concerning the books of the O.T.: *Antiquitates iudaeorum*, prooem. n.3 l.12,2,1. *Opera* (Didot) 1,2f.-434f.

16. This argument is developed briefly by Io. Brunsmann, *Lehrbuch der Apologetik* 1,234-240.

is very evident because an examination of the contents reveals a knowledge of Egypt (Gen. 46:28; 41:45; Exod. 1:11; 13:20; 14:2), but a lack of knowledge of Canaan (Gen. 23:2.19; 33:18; Deut. 11:10f.). Therefore these books must be understood to have been written before Palestine was occupied.

The book of *Joshua* was written while Rahab, who hid the spies, was still living (Josh. 6:25).

The book of *Judges* was written based on preceding sources (ch. 5); and probably by Samuel himself, since there was still a vivid memory of that time in which there was no king in Israel, but everyone did what he thought was right; for this saying recurs often, doubtless because of the recent change and vividness of the difference between the time shortly before and the present time (17:6; 18:1; 21:24).

The books of 1 and 2 *Samuel* were written a long time after the death of Samuel (see 1 Sam. 9:9; 1 Chron. 9:22; 26:29), and when Palestine was divided into two kingdoms (see 1 Sam. 27:6).

The books of 1 and 2 *Kings* refer to ancient sources (1 Kings 11:41; 14:29; 2 Kings 1:18); and they were composed during the first half of the Babylonian captivity (see 2 Kings 25:27-30).

The two books of *Chronicles* were written after the captivity (1 Chron. 3:19-24).

The books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (1 and 2 *Esdras*), based on what they contain, seem to have been written after the Babylonian exile.

But the two books of *Maccabees* were composed before the end of the second century before Christ (1 Macc. 16:23f; 2 Macc. 1:10).

The book of *Psalms*, although it has many authors, as the titles and contents indicate, for the most part must be attributed to David. The last Psalms come from the time of the Babylonian captivity, but the book was finished under Ezra and Nehemiah (see 2 Macc. 2:13).

The book of *Isaiah* was written by Isaiah, the son of Amoz, who lived under the king Hezekiah (Isa. 1:1); this prophet is mentioned in 2 Kings 19:2ff. (see Isa. 37-39) during the time of Hezekiah.

The book of *Jeremiah* is by the prophet who, under king Josiah, was called by the Lord to be a prophet (Jer. 1:1-10). The Lord commanded him to write down the words which he had heard from Him, and Jeremiah did this with the help of Baruch (Jer. 36). But the assemblage of all the parts of the book can be traced back to Baruch; and it was finished before the end of the captivity, otherwise there would have been some mention of the end (see Jer. 25:11; 29:10).

The book of *Ezekiel*, the son of Buzi, a priest in the land of the Chaldeans (1:3), contains the prophecies of this prophet, which he uttered and published during the captivity of the people of Israel, since he was among the captives beside the river Chebar (1:1), and in the transmigration he spoke to the sons of Israel (3:11.15); the last prophecy pertains to the 25th year of the exile (40:1).

The prophet *Daniel* appears as the author of the book under his name (Dan. 7:1f.; 8:1.26f.; 12:4). The style of speaking and the contents reflect the mores of the Babylonians; hence the book was written during the time of the exile, at which time Daniel

was living.

Regarding the other prophets, who will be mentioned in what follows, *Hosea* lived and wrote under the king Hezekiah (Hos. 1:1); Micah also lived and wrote under Hezekiah (Mic. 1:1; see 3:1.13 related to Jer. 26:18); *Haggai* belongs immediately after the return from exile, as the contents of the books show (see also Ezra 5:1; 6:14). The same holds for Zechariah (Zech. 1:1.7; 7:1.8; see also Ezra 5:1; 6:14). *Malachi* comes from a later time, since the temple in Jerusalem is referred to as reconstructed (Mal. 1:10; 3:10).

219. b) *These authors could and wanted to speak the truth.*

1) *They could speak the truth.* For they were a) eye witnesses of many of the things they narrate and they were able to observe them closely, and it is clear from the talent the authors demonstrate in writing that they were able to be good observers.

b) For some of the preceding events certainly *they had to make use of other sources*, which were trustworthy and available. For the oral tradition was strong, especially with regard to matters of great importance and well known by the people; this is very much the case with people in the east. But they could also use written sources and without doubt they did use them.

2) *The authors wanted to speak the truth.* For since a) these books *were received with great reverence*, when also the memory of the narrated events was vivid among the people and it was easy to prove them, is a sign that the authors produced a true account.

b) They were also authors, as is apparent in the sincere narration, religious men, who were seeking only moral goodness and truth and the glory of God; hence there is no fear of fraud.

3) *This is confirmed* by the wondrous, and daily more amazing agreement of things narrated by the O.T. with the things recently discovered in the history of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, and with the history of the culture of that time.¹⁷

17. For a brief treatment of this matter, see Brunsmann, *ibid.*, 238-240.

CHAPTER II

On the text of the New Testament

A. Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* I 1.3 c.2,7; Cornely-Merk, diss.2 c.2,5-9; J.M. Bover, *Novi Testamenti Biblio graeca et latina*³ (Matriti 1953) Prolegomena; P. Gaechter, *Summa Introductionis in N.T.*, pars prima n.6-39; A. Durand, *Le texte du Nouveau Testament: Etudes* 126 (1911,1) 289-312; 127 (1911,2) 25-51, 297-328; M.-J. Lagrange, *Introduction a l'étude du N.T. Critique textuelle* II (Paris 1935); for a further bibliography, *ibid.* p.Xf.

220. The books of the New Testament have a very special importance for the treatise on Apologetics. Therefore it should not be surprising if singular attention is given to each one of them. For the books of the O.T. are useful for Apologetics in order to prove the messianic prophecies, but the books of the N.T. with regard to their main parts are altogether required and necessary for Apologetics.

ARTICLE I

ON THE TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

221. On the language and material of the books of the New Testament. The books of the N.T. are found in the Greek language, and originally they were all written in this language (except Matthew). But that language was *common*, and at that time it was dominant in the East and it was derived from Attic Greek; thus the language of these books is the so-called Greek κοινή.

However, since at that time writing was done for the most part *on paper made from papyrus* (see 2 John 12), and this material could not be preserved for a long time,¹ it is not surprising that very few examples of these sheets of papyrus have been preserved.

Writing was also done on animal skins (see 2 Tim. 4:13) or *parchments*; but that was more rare, since it was more expensive to write on them, until the 4th century when the use of parchments became more common. So it is from this time that we have the most ancient codices of Holy Scripture; for the custom then was to fasten the parchments together in a codex, while the papyrus for the most part were put together into rolls. And it should not be surprising if sometimes, after the original writing on the parchment had been scraped off or erased, then new writing was put on it (*palimpsest codices*), since the parchments were very expensive, and the older uncial writing was more difficult to read.

1. Volumes made of papyrus could be preserved for about 200 years: according to Pliny, *Hist. nat.*

222. On the writing of the New Testament. This *uncial writing*, that is, in all capital letters, was used for parchment codices until the 11th century.

But since some of the letters were easily confused with each other (v.gr., the triangular letter A, Δ, Λ), but accent marks and spaces were not commonly used until the 8th century after Christ, and words and phrases were not ordinarily separated with commas and periods until later with the use of small letters, it is not surprising if at times doubts occurred about the interpretation of the codices; that is in addition to the already mentioned difficulty that arose from shorthand writing and tachygraphic abbreviations.

223. On the manuscripts of the New Testament. The New Testament is found *integral* in 53 codices, but *partially* in many other manuscripts. Manuscript documents of the N.T. up to a few years ago were: papyri 50, uncial codices 210, minuscule codices 2400, lectionaries 1610. Therefore there is a total number of 4270.

The *designation* of so many writings is made for the papyri by the letter *P* with a number attached to it (v.gr., *P*⁵⁰ (Manchester, Rylands Library) from the 2nd century, containing some words from John 18:31ff.; for minuscule codices the designation is made with a number; for the uncial codices an *O* is placed before the number, except for the first 45 codices which use *a capital letter for their sign*, as was used formerly by J.J. Wettstein (1751-1752).

This designation, introduced by C.R. Gregory, is used by P.A. Merk, S.J.² and by P.I.M. Bover, S.J.³ This system gives a catalogue of the principal Greek codices, where you will find, in single columns, both the symbol by which they are designated, and the century when written and the parts that they contain (gospels, Acts, Pauline letters, Catholic epistles, Revelation).⁴

H. von Soden had proposed another numeration, in which attention is paid to the century in which the codex was written, and also some other symbols; actually before each codex he placed an ε if the codices were gospels, an α if it is something else from the N.T., and a δ if from the gospels and from other N.T. codices: v.gr., ε 1100—ε 1199 stands for the codices of the gospels in the 12th century.⁵

2. *Novum Testamentum graece et laine apparatu critico instructum*⁷ (Rome 1951).

3. *Novi Testamenti Biblia graeca et latina critico apparatu aucta* (Matriti 1943); third edition, Matriti 1953.

4. *Ibid.*, Prolegomena LXVII-LXXIII.

5. Merk in the Prolegomena (p.22*-23*) explains the correlation between the different ways of designating the codices.

224. The principal papyri are the following, which because of the antiquity of the text are outstanding documents:

P⁵⁰, from the beginning of the 2nd century; it contains some words from John 18:31ff. and is preserved in Manchester (Rylands Library), and published in 1935.⁶

P³⁷, from the 3rd century; it contains Matt. 26:19-52; it is kept in Michigan (Ann Arbor).

P⁴⁵, from the beginning of the 3rd century; it contains much from the gospels and Acts; it is kept in London (Chester Beatty).

P⁴⁶, about the year 200; it contains the epistles of St. Paul; it is kept in London (Chester Beatty).

P⁴⁸, from the 3rd century; it contains Acts 23:11-19 and is preserved in Florence (Società italiana).

225. The principal codices are the following:

Vatican B (03), for the 4th century, containing the O.T and the N.T; it is kept in the Vatican Library.

Sinaiticus S (01), previously it was **Σ**, from the 4th century, containing the O.T and the N.T.; it was discovered in the monastery on Mount Sinai in 1844 by Const. Tischendorf; it was kept in Petrograd for a time and now it is preserved in the British Museum (London).

Alexandrinus A (02), from the 5th century; it contains the O.T. and the N.T; formerly it belonged to the Patriarch of Alexandria, but now it is in the British Museum.

Ephraem rescriptus C (04), from the 5th century; it contains fragments of the O.T., and almost all of the N.T.; it is later, 12th century, and it also contains the works of St. Ephraem; it is preserved in Paris.

Freerianus W (032), from the 5th century, containing the gospels; it is kept in Washington.

Bezae or Cambridge D (05), from the 6th century; it contains the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; formerly taken from a monastery in Lyons, it came under the control of Theodore Beza (1519-1605) and it was donated by him to the University of Cambridge, where it is preserved. This codex should not be confused with the following one, also D.

Claromontanus D (06). From the 6th century, containing the epistles of St. Paul; it is kept in Paris.

6. C.H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1935).

ARTICLE II

ON THE VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

226. Besides the codices mentioned above, the text of the New Testament is also known from the versions which were made from the Greek text.

1) **Among the Syrian versions** the first one was made by Tatian, a disciple of St. Justin. In the year 170 he made a concordance or harmony of the four gospels (hence the name: the *Tatian Diatessaron*, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον) carefully aligned, as it seems, in the Greek language. But then a Syrian version was made of this “diatessaron,” which was used by the Fathers of the Syrian church, like St. Aphraates (+ 367) and St. Ephraem (ca. 306-373).

Today the *Diatessaron* is contained in the Latin codex F (Fulda, 6th century) of the Vulgate.

Other Syrian versions, which are mentioned in the critical apparatus of the N.T., are: the *Old Syrian* (syv) which was made about the year 200 by using the diatessaron of Tatian. It is preserved in the Syro-Curetonian⁷ codex (syc) of the 5th century, now in the British Museum. Likewise a version is preserved in the codex Syro-Sinaiticus (sys), because it was found in the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai; it belongs to the 4th-5th century.

The Peshitta (syp) has the same value as the *vulgate* among the Syrians. It stems from the beginning of the 5th century, by correcting the preceding old version concerning the gospels, and by making a new version of the other books of the N.T. Now there are about 200 copies in existence.

There is also a *later Syrian version*, made about the year 508 from the Greek text and from the Antioch revision,⁸ which at the direction of Philoxenus, the bishop of Magubensis, was produced by the suffragan bishop Polycarp. Hence it is also called the *filoxeniana*.

A revision of that or a retraction was made in the years 614-615 at Alexandria by Thomas of Heraclea (Harkel), bishop of Magubensis, when he lived in Alexandria in exile. The name of this revision or version is *harclensis* (syh).

To these is to be added the *Palestinian version* made from the Greek in Palestinian Aramaic, perhaps in 5th or 6th century; and it is known from the lectionaries used in the liturgy. It is a Syrian version made from a Jerusalem revision; hence its symbol is (syi).

7. It gets its name from *W. Cureton* who published it in 1858.

8. See what we say later in n. 234.

227. 2) Among the Latin versions the following should be mentioned: *Old Latin* (vet lat) or pre-vulgate, that is, before the Vulgate of St. Jerome, which existed in the 2nd and 3rd centuries; and there was not just one version, but several, with an irksome variety of interpretations, which later was the occasion for the new version of St. Jerome, which was the Vulgate.⁹ For, as St. Augustine says¹⁰: “Those who translated the scriptures from the Hebrew language into Greek can be counted; but in no way can the Latin interpreters be counted. For, as in the first times of the faith the Greek codex came into the possession of someone and he thought he had some ability in both languages, he ventured to make his own interpretation.”¹¹

But based on an examination of the versions, the variety can be explained in this way—“that the individual books were translated into Latin by different interpreters, not that many integral versions of the whole Bible existed.”¹² “Therefore, from many partial versions one version was put together or a few total versions, and they were not adequately distinct among themselves.”¹³

The language was simple and popular; hence there is the value of these versions in order to understand the evolution of the Latin language into the new Latin ones. And a version was made from the Greek language, from which it retains words that pass over into Latin, such as *baptism*, *holocaust*, *mystery*. But the fidelity of the translation “is often so great, that a greater could hardly be desired, so that it verges rather on servility. For, they express the matter word for word, often by keeping the Greek words.”¹⁴ But in the exegetical interpretation “often they pay attention neither to the meaning of the Greek word nor to the context, being content with a mechanical translation.”¹⁵

The *Afra* (af) version was the main one in proconsular Africa and was used by *Tertullian* (ca. 160-223) and *St. Cyprian* (ca. 200-258).

The *Itala* (it) represents versions produced in Italy and in Europe.

The *Vulgate* (vg) is the one translated by St. Jerome which we will now consider.

228. On the Vulgate of the New Testament. Because of the different readings and their great number in the books of the N.T. (coming from the tendency of trying to harmonize the four gospels) it came about that St.

9. See his *Preface to the 4 Gospels*: ML 29,557f.

10. This also holds true for the O.T.

11. *De doctrina christiana* 1.12,16: ML 34,43.

12. This is also the case with the O.T., Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* I⁶ 1.3 n.95 p.311.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 312.

14. Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* I⁶ 1.3 n.96 p.312.

15. *Ibid.*, p.313.

Jerome, at the bidding of Pope St. Damasus, in the year 383 began to write a new version: so that he would produce a N.T. faithful to the Greek.¹⁶

He did this with such intention and deliberation a) that he did not use the codices from the recent revisions of the 2nd to 4th centuries, but rather the older Greek codices; b) and he corrected the Latin codices, if they departed from the Greek in *meaning*, but he did try to retain their *diction*.¹⁷ He did this in Rome; so that his version was added to the excellent family of codex B, and sometimes also to that of Caesarea (see n.232f.).

Also concerning the other books of the N.T., besides the Gospels, Jerome is thought to have made a version, which he in general often said he had corrected “the New Testament” according to the Greek¹⁸; also because the style of language and the love of moderation are the same in the version of these books of the Vulgate as they are in the version of the gospels.

And it does not seem to be important that for these books he omits a specific preface, which he does place for the others which he says he had interpreted. And it is also not important that in his commentaries on St. Paul that often he does not approve of the word of the version that is in the Vulgate, since he retracts the older words used by him in the version from Hebrew, or the words of the gospels in his own commentaries.

This version of St. Jerome was commonly accepted with joy and was accepted for ecclesiastical use.¹⁹

Now there are about 8000 codices of the Vulgate and they show different forms of the version: *Italian* (v.gr., codex F, Fulda, 6th century), *Irish* (Dublin codex), *Spanish* (Toledo codex, Leon codex, 10th century).²⁰

229. Other versions. a) *Among the Copts: Sahidica* (sa) 3rd century in Upper Egypt; and in Lower Egypt *Boharica* (bo) from the 5th century. They are close to the Alexandrian form; and they represent external forms, while in Middle Egypt other versions are found adapted to the dialects of the regions: *versions fayumica, achmimica* and *subachmimica*.

b) *Among the other versions: Gothic* (got) from the 4th century, made by Wulfila,

16. “For if faith is to be put in the Latin versions, they come down to this: there are almost as many versions as there are codices” (*Praefatio in 4 evangelia* [ad Damasum]: ML 29,558). – “I produced the New Testament faithful to the Greek” (*De viris illustribus* c.135: ML 23,757). See also *Epist.* 71,5: ML 22,671.

17. The codex used pertained to the Constantinople form, and concerning the pristine versions he corrected “the words that seemed to change the meaning... and we allowed the rest to remain as they were” (*Praefatio in 4 evangelia*: ML 29,559).

18. “I translated the New Testament according to the authority of the Greek” (*Epist.* 71,5: ML 22,671). – “And if you accept me, as you say, in my correction of the New Testament...” (*Epist.* 112: ML 22,929). – “I translated the New Testament faithful to the Greek” (*De viris illustribus* c.135; ML 23,757).

19. See St. Augustine, *De actis cum Felice* 1,3: ML 42,520.

20. See above n. 207. – For the history of the Vulgate in Spain, see the articles of Fr. J.M. Bover, which he cites in *Prelegomenis Novi Testamenti* LXXIX; and T. Ayuso and those cited above in n. 207, note 7.

an Arian bishop, from the Greek codex accepted in Constantinople;

Ethiopian (aet), which seems to be from the 5th century, from the Alexandrian text;

Armenian (ar), 5th century; it seems to come from the ancient Syrian;

Georgian (gg) in the Caucasus; it seems to have been made in the 5th-6th century, and supposes its basis from the Armenian version²¹

Arabic seems to belong to the 8th century and the *Slavonic* to the 9th century.

230. On the citations of the Fathers. The citations and allusions, which are found among the Fathers to different versions of the N.T., are a help in order to determine more accurately the time of their composition; and, at least with regard to the meaning (for often they cite them from memory) they can determine the reading that they had or that which was used in their region.

A R T I C L E I I I

HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

231. On the revisions of the text. For a critical study of the text or to establish the genuine text, a *convergence of readings* from different codices helps very much. But if all of the texts represent the same family or the same revision of the text, such convergence is not very important. But it is otherwise if the codices coming from different places and families of texts converge; or if they represent a family where the text has been well preserved. For then the probability increases or gives certitude about a certain reading; for, from a multitude and from the variety and independence of witnesses, if they are not suspect, the authority of the witnesses is brought together and established.

For the preceding reasons and because of the necessity of avoiding confusion in the study of so many codices, the codices are distributed in families, which manifest different revisions in the reading of the text of the N.T. Thus the following families are customarily distinguished.

232. H. von Soden²² distributed the variant readings according to three revisions:

1) *Revision H*, *Hesichius* (ca. the year 300), to which the more ancient

21. In the Armenian version, a twofold form is distinguished: the older one is from Syrian, and the more recent one from Greek. And there are those who believe or favor the opinion that it was originally in the Armenian language and then a concordance or diatessaron was made of the gospels, before a separate version was made of the gospels; just as among the Syrians and the Latins. See H. Vogels, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 76 (1951) 544f. and S. Lyonnet, S.J., *Les origines de la version arménienne et le Diatessaron* (Rome 1950).

22. *Die Schriften des N.T. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* 4 vol. (1907-1913).

uncial codices B, S, C pertain... and fragments from Egypt, whether parchments (059ff.) or papyri. This revision, which seems to be from Egypt, and is also called *Alexandrian*, is considered very highly: because it manifests a minimum of corrections necessary to achieve harmony or the parallel places or beauty of language; and it does not seek amplitude, but succinctness; therefore it seems to be striving for total clarity.

233. 2) *Revision I*, from Jerusalem, is had in the codices D, W. It is also called *occidental or western* because it was widespread in the West. It is close to the old Latin versions, hence it is recommended by its antiquity, but it has signs of a harmonizing tendency and of additions or even omissions, hence this family can seem to be more neglected.

Under this class I other codices have been placed by Soden, which seem to belong to another family and a revision, which stands in the middle between the two preceding types, approaching now to one and then to the other. This is found in codex Θ.

This revision presents the text of *Origen* (185-255) at the end of his life, and that of *Eusebius of Caesarea* (ca. 265-340); and, in general, it is the text which was dominant in Caesarea in Palestine in the 3rd century. Hence it is called the *Caesarean or Palestinian* revisions. The Armenian, Georgian, Syrian-Sinaitic and the Vulgate versions have some affinity with it; the style of writing of the Caesarean revision resembles that of the Alexandrian family, but in a moderate way.²³

234. 3) *Revision K*, κοινή, *Antioch-Byzantine*, is found especially in codex A. It contains the text that is used by the Fathers of the Church at Antioch; its tendency is for a polished language, to achieve clarity, to provide conformity of one gospel with the others, to obtain fullness (v.gr., regarding Luke 24:53, while D has *praising God*, and B has *blessing God*, A has *praising and blessing God*: so this revision is distinguished by its literary elegance.

The principal codices, distributed according to the revision to which they belong, are listed by P.I.M. Bover, S.J., in the Prolegomena of his edition of the N.T.²⁴

235. History of the text of the New Testament. From what has already been said

23. According to T. Ayuso, a pre-Caesarean form existed, similar indeed to the Caesarean, but already existing before it in the 2nd century, known especially in Upper Egypt and very closely related to the original text: ¿Texto Cesariense o precesariense?: *Bibl* 16 (1935) 369-415. The same author promotes the great value of this family, together with the so-called *occidental*, in order to detect the genuine text. See on this matter ¿Texto arrecensional, recensional o prerrecensional?: *EstBibl* 6 (1947) 35-90. There also you will find in the first part (p.35-54) a critical history of the text and a recent bibliography for critical studies concerning the text.

24. Page LXXIVf. For a description of these families, *ibid.*, XXVIII f.

about the various revisions, the history of the text will be more easily ascertained, and the way in which the primitive text was preserved in the different regions.

In Upper Egypt the text seems to have been preserved very carefully; the *Caesarea* text was changed very little in order to seek elegance of style; hence this form did not vary much from the original.

But the *occidental* form received a much wider distribution. From the citations of the first Fathers (Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria), and from the older versions (Latin, Old Syrian, sahidic) as well as from some of the papyri (P³⁷, P³⁸, P⁴⁸ in Egypt) it is certain that in the 2nd and 3rd centuries the occidental revision of the text was widely distributed.

Also, *Marcion* (+ 340) and *Tatian* seem to have used this rerevision.

236. But towards the end of the 3rd century the attempt was made to return in a more accurate way to the original form, especially at *Caesarea* through the work of the martyr *Pamphilus* (+ 309) and the bishop *Eusebius* (+ 340); but at *Antioch* it was done by *Lucianus* (+ 312), and from that work came the *Antiochian or Byzantine* revision on which many codices depend. Finally, at *Alexandria* *Hesychius* (+ ca. 300), who is quite unknown, produced the foundation for the Alexandrian revision, especially by removing everything that seemed to be dubious or had been added.

But the Antiochian revision was used throughout Syria, Asia Minor and the whole Byzantine empire, especially when Egypt and Palestine were stripped from the empire by the Arabic invasion. Hence in the Middle Ages everywhere the Antiochian revision was dominant; it was also called Byzantine or from Constantinople. Since the codices of this revision were easier to read and much easier to copy, the result was that, after the invention of printing, the Antiochian text reigned for a long time and was called *the received text*.

237. On the editions of the text of the New Testament. Cardinal Francis Jiménez de Cisneros (1436-1517) prepared the *first* critical edition of Holy Scripture; because of his effort and munificence the *Polyglotta Complutensis* (Alcalá de Henares), finished in the year 1514 and printed as to the N.T., finally was published completely in 1522.

But before that Desiderius Erasmus (ca.1466-1536) in the year 1516 published the Holy Bible based on the minuscule codices, but it was composed with less care than the Complutensis edition. Finally, in 1535 the printer *Robert Stephanus (Estienne)* in Paris published the fifth edition of Erasmus.

This Stephanus in 1550 put together, for the third (royal) edition of that work, critical observations from 16 manuscripts. The editions of Theodore Beza (1519-1605) depend on the edition of Stephanus (ς); one of these, often reprinted, had the result that the edition of Stephanus was spread far

and wide and was considered as the *received text* (*textus receptus*).²⁵

238. *Other polyglott editions*, besides the *Complutensis* (1522), are the *Antwerpian* or *Plantinian*, because it was printed in the printing plant of Christopher Plantin (Amberes) (1569-1575)²⁶; the *Parisian* (1620-1645); the *London* or *Waltonian* (from Walton) (1655-1657).

239. Some editors of the sacred books in the 18th century added to the received version many variant readings from different codices, and so they became quasi “critical editions.” These authors were Jo. Mill (1707, Oxford), who collected ca. 30,000 variants; Jacob Wetstein (1751, Amsterdam), who was the first to use the letters A, B, C... for the principal codices; Jo.Jac. Griesbach (1774, 1776, Halae; 1805, Lipsiae), who made a distinction between the families of codices—occidental, Alexandrian, Byzantine; Jo.M. Scholz (1830, Lipsiae), by adding the assistance of several codices, amplified the critical apparatus.

240. Finally, in the 19th century, the text was corrected according to the norms of the most ancient codices, as was done by Karl Lachman (1831, Berlin), and especially by Constantine von Tischendorf (1815-1874) who, having made trips to eastern libraries and searched through them, discovered many new things, and he made an excellent recension of the text with both a new and extensive critical apparatus in the eighth major critical edition²⁷; however, “although he was endowed with a right and sincere judgment, not rarely he was carried away by his love for the Sinaitic codex [which he had discovered].”²⁸

B.F. Westcott (+ 1901) and F.J.A. Hort (+ 1892) made a new edition (London, 1881), but without a critical apparatus; and although “they were endowed with a very acute critical sense, still they attribute too much authority to the Vatican codex and they are led by too much fondness for the shorter readings.”²⁹

Others dedicated themselves to these studies: Fr. R. Weymouth, B. Weiss, M. Hetzenhauer, O.M.C. (Innsbruck 1892-1900), F. Brandscheid (Freiburg Br. 1893). Eberhard Nestle published his editions from the year 1898 (Stuttgart), with the rationale that he would select what was pleasing to most (Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Weiss)...

241. In the 19th century the labors of Herman von Soden should be mentioned; a peculiar designation of the codices comes from him, but it is complicated; he gathered together as many variant readings as possible and distributed them in the families of H, I, K—as we said above. And “he is greatly to be praised because he presented so many new documents

25. It was so called in 1633 in the *Preface* of the second edition by the Brothers *Elzevir*.

26. *Arias Montano* worked very hard on this edition and the munificence of king Philip II was a great help.

27. *Novum Testamentum graecae ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit, apparatus criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit, commentationem isagogicam praetexit* Constantius Tischendorf. 2 vol. (Lipsiae 1869-1872). But the third volume, on the prolegomena, was written by C.R. Gregory (Lipsiae 1894).

28. J.M. Bover, *prolegomena N.T.*, p.XVIII.

29. J.M. Bover, *ibid.*

and made them commonly known, however he had too much fear of the imaginary influence of Tatian and the contamination of harmonizing readings, in addition to the fact that he did not give sufficient weight to critical principles and he did not always consistently observe them.”³⁰

Other editions are by H.J. Vogels (1920, 1950³) and by P. Augustine Merk, S.J. (1933¹, 1951⁷), who established the text with its own principles and, using many of the tools which had been usefully provided by the work of von Soden, he corrected some, added some new ones and he kept the notation introduced by Gregory.

242. P. Joseph M. Bover, S.J., recently (1943¹, 1953³) prepared a new critical edition,³¹ in which he put into practice the principles proposed before concerning the critical handling of the text,³² and so produced an elegant and accurate edition of the Greek Text of the N.T. and also of the Latin version of the Vulgate.

P. Bover wishes above all to separate those things about which all the critics are in agreement from those about which they disagree in order to retain the common element and to subject the variable to critical analysis. He takes into account all the disputed readings, even the marginal ones, which are based on even slight suspicions of the critics.

However, he does not seek the *criterion to determine the genuine reading* from the authority or the number of critics, so that the reading is determined by a summation of the disparate elements; but *he seeks it in the value of the ancient witnesses*. But since Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort more often followed the Antiochian (K) and the Alexandrian (H) recension, they really neglected the occidental (I); but it is necessary to make use of the nature of this form, since in this class many diverse elements are gathered together (the occidental form, the Caesarean form and others not yet noted...). Likewise it is necessary that the witnesses older than the Antiochian and Alexandrian be consulted in critical cases.

Hence the text approved by P. Bover is a resulting or *eclectic* text, not from an arbitrary mass of disparate data, but *from certain definite principles*: “No witness should be heard who cannot be reduced to the most antique form of the text available to us, namely what was used in the 2nd century, by some reason whether direct or indirect. For, not every ancient reading is therefore good; but none can be good that is not ancient. And for this reason it will be brought about that all witnesses can be estimated and numbered as of equal value. That being the case, it is necessary to see how the individual witnesses or classes of witnesses can be traced back to the 2nd century.”³³

30. J.M. Bover, *ibid.*

31. *Novi Testamenti Biblia graeca et latina* (Matriti 1943) (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas), Third edition, Matriti 1953.

32. *Critica textualis Novi Testamenti in crism revocata*: EstBibl 1 (1930) 329-353; *Critica de los criticos*: EstBibl 1 (1930) 301-312; *Harmonizaciones e interpolaciones en el texto del N.T.*: EstBibl 2 (1943) 121f.

33. *Prolegomena N.T.*, XXXV.

243. Reasonable norms for textual criticism.³⁴ Besides the established genealogy of the codices, in order that a dependence may be known of one from another and so that anyone can proceed to discover the primitive reading, the following norms can be given, which touch on the examination itself of the readings:

a) Among the various readings, that is to be preferred which appears to be more *original*.

b) *The hard and more difficult* reading should be preferred, because there was less probability of accepting it easily and erroneously; however, an absurd reading is not to be preferred.

c) *A non-harmonizing* reading, that is, one not in conformity with the parallel passage, should be preferred, because of the eagerness of making a harmony of these readings.

d) *The shorter and more unrefined* reading generally should be preferred, because of the desire that existed of polishing the readings.

e) The reading *that is more in conformity with the style of the writer* is to be preferred.

244. For it happens that the codices show various readings for the same text, and this is because of the imperfection of the human faculties involved in the transcribing; thus it happened, because of a defect of vision or because of faulty hearing and retention by memory that some things—whether letters or syllables or words or sentences are either omitted (*haplographia*, if there is a similarity with what follows) or duplicated (*dittographia*).

It is called *omoioteleuton* when the omission or duplication of the sentence takes place because of the similarity in the ending of both sentences; it is called *omoiarcton* if the similarity occurs at the beginning of the sentences.

Sometimes variations were introduced because of the poor understanding of the passage by the copyist, who because of his presumed knowledge decided to correct the passage, or he was influenced by the context,³⁵ or by the parallel passages, so that he then corrected and *harmonized it*.

245. Pius XII recently spoke about the usefulness and importance of textual criticism in his Encyclical “*Divino afflante Spiritu*” EB 547f.

In a special way we will consider the incorruption of the text of the N.T. later in n. 322-331.

34. See J.M. Bover, *ibid.*, XXXVII-XL.

35. V.gr., John 21:21: *discumbentium* because of the context; a reading very similar to the Vg *discentium*.

CHAPTER III

**On the historicity of the Gospels and
the Acts of the Apostles**

246. Among the books of the New Testament the greatest consideration must be given to the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, whose use in apologetic treatises will be immediate and absolutely necessary; therefore their historical reliability must first be demonstrated. With regard to the need to prove the historical value or authenticity of the other books of the New Testament, although it is helpful to consider it in course on the Introduction to the Bible, for our present purpose it is not as necessary as it is for the Gospels and Acts. Therefore we think it right to omit that proof for the present time, lest the matter become too burdensome or fatiguing. However, at the proper time we will consider their authenticity.¹

ARTICLE I

PREVIOUS NOTIONS AND A SURVEY OF THE ADVERSARIES

247. The word *Gospel* (*Evangelium*) etymologically signifies the *good or joyful news*. In the usage of the New Testament it is applied to the announcement *about the Messiah and the messianic kingdom*.²

Thus v.gr. Matt. 4:23; 9:35; Mark 1:14 (*preaching the gospel of God*); Matt. 24:14 (*this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world*); 26:13 (*wherever this gospel is preached in the whole world*); Mark 8:35 (*whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's*); 16:15 (*preach the gospel to the whole creation*)...; Luke 4:18 (*he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor*).... Likewise in *St. Paul*, where the word occurs fifty times, by designating either the origin of the good news (*the gospel of God*) or the main object (*the gospel of Jesus Christ, the gospel of the glory of God*), or some object of it (*the gospel to the uncircumcised*), or the person bringing it (*my gospel*...).

But since this message and this preaching were written down, then the scriptures themselves were called *gospels*. Thus, for example, St. Ignatius (+ 107): "There are some whom I heard to say, "Unless I find it in the documents, I do not believe in what is preached." Then I said, "It is the

1. See n. 188f.

2. Regarding the profane use of the word and its use in the O.T and N.T, see G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* at the word εὐαγγέλιον, t.2 718-735; also Zorell, *Lexicon graecum N.T.* at this word.

written word..."³ Likewise St. Justin (ca. 100-167): "...for the Apostles, *in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels*, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them."⁴

For other ideas concerning *genuineness, integrity, historicity* and *authenticity*, see above in n. 215.

248. The principal theories and adversaries against the historicity of the gospels.⁵ *In general*, all who deny supernatural facts; the *rationalists* consequently deny the historicity of the gospels and the sacred books, because in them supernatural things are contained and narrated.

But *in particular*, the various adversaries should be mentioned and their arguments considered.

249. Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677)⁶ wants to deny strict historicity to the miracles mentioned in the gospels: but he explains them as exaggerated narrations as is the custom of the easterners who attribute effects immediately to God, or who introduce the miracles out of a sense of religious fervor or pious fraud.

250. Others who say they are frauds are Voltaire (1694-1778), Diderot (1713-1784), Frederick II (1712-1786) and especially H.S. Reimarus (1694-1768), who is the chief proponent of *the so-called theory of "fraud"* in order to explain what is found in the gospels.

Hermanus Samuel Reimarus was a professor in Hamburg, who secretly composed a manuscript *Apologia for a Reasonable Worship of God*.⁷ The manuscript fell into the hands of *Lessing*, who published it in three parts in 1774, 1777, 1778. In the third part he dealt with *the purpose of Jesus and his disciples*.⁸ For him "Jesus Christ was a Jew, a mere man, who as a political Messiah wanted to free the people from the Roman yoke. But the people abandoned him both in Galilee and in Jerusalem; he died as a desperate rebel. Everything else that the sacred sources narrate is fiction:

3. *Ad Philad.* 8,2: R 60.

4. *Apolog.* 1,66 (a,150-155): R 128. See also *Didache* 8,2: R 5.

5. See on this matter L.CI. Filion, *Les étapes du rationalisme dans ses attaques contre les Evangiles de N.S. Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1911); M.J. Lagrange, O.P., *Le sens du Christianisme d'après l'Exegèse allemande* (Paris 1918); Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.503-526.

6. *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (Amsterdam 1670).

7. *Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes*.

8. *Vom Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger*.

the miracles, sacraments, foundation of a new religion. The disciples of Jesus faked his resurrection, after they had secretly stolen away his body; they announced his glorious second coming which was going to take place soon. All of this was a fraud, and they were aware of the falsity of their claims and their preaching. The reason for the fraud is this: that they might live a comfortable life paid for by their followers.”⁹

251. H.E. Gottlob Paulus (1761-1851) has a *naturalistic theory*, whereby he tries to explain miracles naturally..., not by simple fraud. And Ernest Renan adopted this view (see n. 256).

They do not deny some genuineness and some historicity of the gospels, indeed they admit the narrated facts. But they contend that they are to be explained as exaggerations; that the function of the critic is purge the facts of these exaggerations and to explain them naturally. Thus v.gr. Gottlob Paulus regarding the resurrection of Lazarus says¹⁰: “Christ did not think about performing a miracle, but he wanted to see his dead friend Lazarus in order to say goodbye to him. Martha tried to stop him, because *by this time there will be an odor, for he has been dead four days* (John 11:39). But she does not perceive a bad smell—thus Paulus—. But in her fear she merely surmises that, because she thinks that Lazarus is really dead. Jesus, however, praying to the Father in his usual way, and having doubts about the death of his friend, says within himself, ‘Perhaps he is still alive.’ They remove the stone; now Jesus gives thanks to the Father. Why? At his first look he sees that Lazarus, only apparently dead, is moving. He calls him. Lazarus comes forth. The crowd is astonished. This is how the report of the miracle could have arisen.”¹¹

252. Frederic Strauss (1808-1874) has a *mythical theory*¹²: namely, the supernatural elements in the gospels are myths—not indeed the work of fraudulent premeditation, but of fantasy and of a disposition favoring poetry; the myths were formed in the first generation of Christians to extol the image of Jesus as the Messiah. Thus the first Christians in their fervor and fantasy ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth *under the influence* of the O.T. the things that were said in the O.T. about the Messiah or about others; and in this way a certain ideal image of Jesus, but not a historical one, was formed.

Just as Moses, for example, gave the people manna and Elijah multiplied the flour...,

9. Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.507.

10. *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Heidelberg 1828) 1,260ff.; in Dieckmann, n.508.

11. Dieckmann, n.508.

12. *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*¹, between the years 1835-1840.

so also another legend took hold: that Jesus multiplied bread; however the disciples falsely understood the words of Jesus about the “bread of heaven.”

But since time is necessary for the formation of such myths, hence—he says—the *gospels were written in the middle of the 2nd century*. But since even recent rationalists concede that the gospels were written much before that in the first century, this mythical theory has been abandoned by the rationalists themselves.

253. Ferdinand C. Baur (1792-1860) is the author of the *critical school of Tübingen*,¹³ who says that everything in the gospels is distorted because of the influence of the tendencies of the primitive Church (Petrinism and Paulinism). And these gospels, so that these tendencies could be developed, he says, were written at the end of the 1st century or at the beginning of the 2nd century.

Therefore according to the *Tübingen school*, in the gospels traces are to be found of the tendencies which he supposes existed in the primitive Church. These tendencies—he says—were a *Judaizing Petrinism* and a *universalizing Paulinism*; he claims that these tendencies can be deduced from Gal. 2:7ff., where the *apostolate to the circumcised* is given to Peter, but the *apostolate to the Gentiles* is given to Paul.

But this is said in vain about mutually opposed tendencies. For, they were merely practical divisions of the work; and a question of discipline and not disagreement about doctrine is what was handled in the Council of Jerusalem. Paul indeed *resisted Peter to his face*; because Peter, not acting openly and sometimes giving in to pretense, *stood condemned* (Gal. 2:11). But Peter was *living like a Gentile and not like a Jew* (Gal. 2:14); and by baptizing Cornelius and other pagans he admitted them to the Church (Acts 10); but at the Council of Jerusalem Peter said that *God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe* (Acts 15:7).

Based on these prejudices and supposed tendencies, according to this school, the gospels, instead of being strictly historical sources, respond to the desire of reconciling these tendencies: the gospel of Matthew is the first attempt of conciliation between Petrinism and Paulinism, and it was written at the beginning of the 2nd century; but it was not successful in obtaining its effect. So a little later the gospel of Luke was produced (ca. 120-135); but it was not effective because of the prevalence of Paulinism. Finally, the gospel of Mark obtained the effect in the middle of the 2nd century, since it avoided taking a position between the two factions.

Some others agreed with this school, although they parted company on some par-

13. He wrote *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*² (Tübingen 1860); *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonische Evangelien* (Tübingen 1847). See Rosadini, n.192, p.246.

ticular points: Keim,¹⁴ Volkmar,¹⁵ Hilgenfeld,¹⁶ Holsten.¹⁷

254. Bruno Bauer (1809-1882), a member of the critical school of Tübingen, by denying completely the historicity of the gospels arrived at the point that he doubted the very historical existence of Jesus.¹⁸

255. *The recent liberal school* professes eclecticism, namely by joining together several elements: criticism (i.e., hypercriticism), with the study of comparative religions and with a psychological method; and it favors either a naturalistic explanation, or one of myths or of exaggerated accounts, with the result that it denies full historicity to the gospels.

256. Thus, according to Ernest Renan (1823-1892),¹⁹ the gospels are legends, since in them are found miracles and supernatural events; these legends were not actually written by the Apostles (Matthew, John) or by Mark and Luke, but were written according to the traditions which were said to stem from these men. Therefore, since they come remotely and in a very mediated way from these witnesses, they are historical *according to a certain kernel*, like the legends about St. Francis of Assisi; but much has to be peeled away... according to the explanations and methods of *Renan*.²⁰

There are others with a similar tendency: A. Sabatier,²¹ B. Weiss,²² A. Réveille,²³ A. von Harnack,²⁴ W. Wrede,²⁵ A. Jülicher,²⁶ and also I. Wellhausen, H.I. Holtzmann, and A. Loisy.²⁷

257. But the voice of the *Modernists* goes like this: that the historical Christ was changed into the ideal Christ by a natural process of transfiguration and deformation. But these authors, in their analysis of the synoptics, retain

14. *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (1867).

15. *Die Evangelien* (1870) (but he thinks Mark is older than the others); see Rosadini, n.192.

16. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1875).

17. *Die drei ursprünglichen Evangelien* (1883) (he thinks Luke is more recent than the others); see Rosadini, n.192.

18. See n.365.

19. *Vie de Jésus*⁴ (Paris 1863).

20. See v.gr. his explanation (à la Renan) of the *illusion* of the Apostles concerning the resurrection of Jesus, in n.546, not 15.

21. *Jésus-Christ: Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses* t.7 (Paris 1880) 341-401.

22. *Das Leben Jesu* (Berlin 1882) 2 vol.

23. *Jésus de Nazareth* (Paris 1897) 2 vol.

24. *Das Wesen des Christentums* (published from the year 1900).

25. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen 1901).

26. *Die Religion Jesu: Die Kultur der Gegenwart* I,4: 52-69 (Leipzig 1905).

27. *L'Évangile et l'Église* (Paris 1902); *Autour d'un petit livre* (Paris 1903); *Les Évangiles synoptiques* (Paris 1907-1908) 2 vol. On the errors of the Modernists, see D 3413-3418; and also the Encyclical "Pascendi" D 3494-3497; see 3475-3479.

the system of two sources (Mark and some sayings), in which some things were historical; but the later redactors mingled false things with the true (see n.349).

258. The more recent method of form criticism (*Formgeschichte*) maintains that these true elements have been found; this method strives to find the primitive elements in the narrations of miracles and the words of Jesus... Those using this method are M.K.L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius²⁸ and R. Bultmann,²⁹ who proceed merely by supposing that new elements were added through the passage of time and change in tradition..., and on the other hand by ignoring the eager desire of Christians to preserve accurately “what had been handed down,” and also by neglecting the contrary testimonies of tradition and the aptitude of Semites to preserve in memory what they had received....

Thus these adversaries, regarding the synoptics, want to relate these gospels to the realm of history; but not in the strict sense and—as they say—on the level of great literature (*Hochliteratur*); but rather on the popular level (*Kleinliteratur*), such as is found in golden legends or in other legends about the saints, so that many fabulous things are mixed in with the true from the tendency of simple people to heap honor on the saints.³⁰

28. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Giessen 1919).

29. *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*² (Göttingen 1931).

30. L.J. McGinley, S.J. recently published a criticism of the opinions of Dibelius and Bultmann regarding the cures recorded in the gospels, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives. A Study of the Theories of M. Dibelius and R. Bultmann* (Woodstock 1944); he denies the analogy between the synoptic healings and those of the Rabbinic literature and of Epidaurus... Before that, concerning the history of the Passion, E. Florit wrote, *Il metodo della "Storia delle forme" e sua applicazione al racconto della Passione* (Rome 1935).

ARTICLE II

ON THE AUTHORS OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

Thesis 16. The author of the first gospel is Matthew, an apostle of Christ.

E. Mangelot, *Mattieu (Evangile de Saint)*: DB 4,876-896; J. Knabenbauer, *Comment. In evangelium sec. Matthaeum* (Paris 1922) I,1-62: Introductio; Rosadini, n.108-132; Gaechter, n.68-89; Simón-Dorado, *Novum Testamentum* I 1.1 c.2 a.1; L. Méchineau, *Il Vangelo di S. Matteo secondo le riposte della Commissione Biblica* (Rome 1912).

259. State of the question. We are speaking about the gospels by designating them according to the order in which they are found in ecclesiastical catalogues, and so in the canon of the sacred books and in the editions that have been made of them and are being made.

These gospels are named *according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John*; we say that this must be understood and meant not *according to the preaching of Matthew, etc.*, but *what was written by Matthew, etc.*

If the gospel really has the origin from him to whom it is attributed, then it is *genuine (with the genuineness of the author)*; if it really pertains to the time in which it is said to have been written, then it will be *genuine with the genuineness of time*. See n.215.

260. The principal **adversaries** against this thesis are the *rationalists and liberal Protestants*, who deny the thesis, *at least about the gospel as it now exists*, since they contend that Matthew wrote down only the sayings (λόγια) of the Lord (see n. 268); they say that the present gospel, because it takes on universalism and “catholicizes,” was composed more recently (see D 3564); or because it contains prophecies about the destruction of Jerusalem that it was written after this event (D 3563).

261. The doctrine of the Church on the gospel of Matthew is given in the *responses of the Biblical Commission* published on June 19, 1911 (D 3561-3567). From these responses concerning the present matter special attention should be paid to this: *Bearing in mind the universal and constant consensus of the Church dating from the first centuries, which explicit testimonies of the Fathers* (see n. 263-271), *the titles of the manuscripts of the Gospels* (see n. 272), *the oldest translations of the sacred books, as well as the catalogues transmitted (to us) by the holy Fathers, ecclesiastical*

writers, supreme pontiffs, and councils, and, finally, the liturgical usages of the Eastern and Western Church clearly record, can and must be affirmed with certainty that Matthew, the apostle of Christ, is in truth the author of the Gospel published under his name (D 3561).

And the opinion must be considered as sufficiently supported by the testimony of tradition that holds that Matthew preceded the other evangelists in writing and that he composed the first Gospel in the native language then in use by the Jews of Palestine, for whom the work was intended (D 3562).

Theological note. Therefore the thesis must *be sustained with internal religious assent*.¹ See also D 3503 (EB 286 [279]) on the authority of the Biblical Commission, and EB 519).

262. Firstly, proof from extrinsic arguments, that is, by historical documents, whereby primarily the historical facts must be demonstrated.

“... it is clear that in historical questions, such as the origin and the handing down of writings, the witness of history is of primary importance and that historical investigation should be made with the utmost care; and that in this matter internal evidence is seldom of great value except as confirmation. To look upon it in any other light will be to open the door to many evil consequences....”²

Therefore, for our proof we cite the historical documents that are fully approved by the *universal and constant tradition* of almost all the churches and *from the first centuries*. Our way of procedure will be to arrange the testimonies so that in general we proceed from the more recent ones to the more ancient and primitive.

263. In the 4th century St. Jerome (ca. 347-420), who qualifies as the interpreter for several churches, like the *Roman*, the *Palestinian*..., had this to say:

“*Matthew, also known as Levi, an apostle after being a publican, first in Judea for the sake of those among the circumcised who had believed, composed the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words; it is not fully certain who it was that later translated*

-
1. Those truths must be held with internal religious assent, which are defined by the Church not infallibly, but are commanded in such a way that to them is due *an assent* that is not merely external and with obsequious silence, but truly *internal*; and indeed this is to be offered from a motive not of the infallibility of the Church, but *from a motive of religious obedience*; such assent, since it is commanded by the Church, is morally certain.
 2. Encyclical “*Providentissimus*”: D 3286; EB 119 [104].

it into Greek. Furthermore, the Hebrew text itself is kept until today is the library at Caesarea, which Pamphilius the martyr very carefully preserved. I also had the opportunity to copy it from the Nazarites, who used this volume in Beraea, a city in Syria.”³

And St. Augustine (354-430), *in the African church*, when writing against Faustus the Manichean, said:

“Therefore just as I believe that that book is by Manichaeus, since from that time, when Manichaeus lived in the flesh, through his disciples by a certain succession of your leaders it has been protected and preserved down to your time; so also believe that that book is by Matthew, which from the time when Matthew lived in the flesh, without interruption in the passage of times, the Church has preserved down to the present time with a certain succession of times.”⁴

Similarly St. Ephraem (ca.315-403), a deacon *in the Syrian church*, wrote: “Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, which afterwards was translated into Greek.”⁵

And other witnesses are not lacking from other churches. Thus St. John Chrysostom (344-407), *from the church in Constantinople and Antioch*:

“Next it is narrated that Matthew was asked by the Jews, who believed what he spoke to them in words, to leave them a record of what he said and to write the Gospel in Hebrew....”⁶

Likewise St. Epiphanius (ca. 315-403), *from the church in Palestine*⁷; St. Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 313-386) in his *Catechesis*.⁸

At the beginning of the 4th century testimony is found the testimony of the erudite Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 265-340), the father of Church History (which he wrote in the years ca. 303-325), who, after his own investigations, says: “Matthew, since he had at first preached the faith to the Hebrews, when he was about to leave them and go to other peoples, wrote down his Gospel in his native tongue; it seemed to him that henceforth this would take the place of his presence, so he supplied it in writing for those whom he was leaving.”⁹

3. *De viris illustribus* (written between 360-400) c.3: ML 23,643.

4. *Contra Faustum manichaeum* (in the year 400) l.28 c.2: R 1606.

5. *Evangelii concordantis expositio* (edit. Aucher) 286.

6. *In Mt homil.1*: MG 57,17.

7. *Haeres* 51,5: MG 41,896 A.

8. *Catecheses* (written in 348) 14,15: MG 33,844.

9. *Hist. eccles.* l.3 c.24: MG 20,265 A.

264. *In the 3rd and 2nd centuries* witnesses are found, also known for their erudition, who testify to the same thing:

Tertullian (ca. 160-223), the famous representative of *proconsular Africa*, was the first Latin to testify to this matter, and thus he proclaimed against Marcion, who was falsifying the gospel:

“We lay it down as our first position, that the evangelical Testament has apostles for its authors, to whom was assigned by the Lord Himself this office of publishing the gospel... Of the apostles, therefore, *John and Matthew first instill faith into us*; while of apostolic men, Luke and Mark afterwards renew it.”¹⁰

And straightforwardly the same Tertullian says about the first gospel: “*First of all there is Matthew, a most faithful author of the gospel, a companion of the Lord...*, who began his book in this way: The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.”¹¹

Origen (185-255), the most learned man *in the Alexandrian church*, proclaimed it like this:

“With his sacerdotal trumpet *first Matthew sounded forth in his gospel*; also Mark, Luke and John announced with their own sacerdotal trumpets... [alluding to their gospels, and afterwards referring to the other books of the N.T.]... Nevertheless John also added to this by sounding his trumpet through his epistles and the book of Revelation, and Luke did the same by describing the deeds of the Apostles.”¹²

And in his *Commentariis in evangelium Mt* he had this from the testimony of Eusebius:

“Among the four Gospels, which are the only indisputable ones in the Church of God under heaven, I have learned by tradition that the first was written by Matthew, who was once a publican, but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, and it was prepared for the converts from Judaism, and published in the Hebrew language....”¹³

Regarding Clement of Alexandria (150-215), there are documents that prove that he knew the gospel of Matthew:

Thus from the testimony of Eusebius: “Clement has set down a tradition which he had received from the elders before him, in regard to the order of the Gospels to the following effect. He says that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written

10. *Adversus Marcionem* (in the year 207-208) 4,2: R 39. See R 341.

11. *De carne Christi* c.22: ML 2,834 B.

12. *In Iesu Nave* homil.7,1 (in the years 249-251): R 538.

13. *Hist. eccles.* 6,25: R 503.

first....”¹⁴

And he himself says: “But in the Gospel according to Matthew which begins with a genealogy from Abraham....”¹⁵

Concerning the teacher of Clement, Pantaenus (+ 200), who before was the director of the catechetical school in Alexandria and had gone off to convert the peoples of India, Eusebius reports the same thing:

“Pantaenus is said to have traveled all the way to India and there to have found the Gospel of Matthew, which had preceded his arrival, among certain individuals already imbued with some knowledge of Christ: that is, Bartholomew, one of the apostles, according to tradition, had preached there, and had left a copy of the Gospel of Matthew written in Hebrew letters, and it is said that it has been preserved up to the present time.”¹⁶

265. But St. Irenaeus (ca. 140-202), the bishop of Lyons, is a well known witness, since he was an erudite man who knew the tradition *of the churches of Gaul and Rome and Syria*. He was a disciple of St. Polycarp,¹⁷ who was a disciple of John the Apostle.

But Irenaeus said: “Ο μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῆ ἰδία διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τύο Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἐξοδον,

Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτός τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου ηὑρισσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε....”

“Thus Matthew among the Hebrews published a Gospel written in their language, while Peter and Paul were evangelizing in Rome¹⁸ and establishing the Church. But after their departure Mark, a disciple and interpreter of Peter, also handed down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. But Luke, a follower of Paul, wrote in a book the Gospel that was preached by him. Later, John also, a disciple of the Lord, who reclined on his breast, published his Gospel while he was living in Ephesus in

14. *Hist. eccles.* 6,14,5: R 439.

15. *Strom.* I,21: MG 8,890 C.

16. *Hist. eccles.* 5,10,3: R 660.

17. “...whom [Polycarp] I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried [on earth] a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffered martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the Apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true. To these things all the Asiatic Churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time” (*Adversus haereses* 3,3,4: R 212).

18. Indeed while *they are actively preaching*; but this reason seems to raise a difficulty, since Matthew, according to his writing, worked among the Jews. Because this testimony of Irenaeus should agree with what follows *about the time of composition of Matthew*. Moreover, the words of Irenaeus concerning the time of composition should not be taken too seriously. See D 3563.

Asia.”¹⁹

And somewhat later he says: “So firm is the ground on which these Gospels rest, that the very heretics themselves bear witness to them, and starting from these [document], each one of them endeavors to establish his own peculiar doctrine. For the Ebionites, who use Matthew’s Gospel only, are confuted out of this very same, making false suppositions with regard to the Lord....”²⁰

266. The testimony of Papias. Now we come to the most ancient testimony of all—the testimony of Papias.

He was, even before the year 130, the Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and by Irenaeus he is said to be “an auditor of John, a companion of Polycarp, a very old man... who wrote five books.”²¹ Eusebius also mentions this work of his, Λογίων Κυριακών ἐξηγήσεως (βίβλιοι πέντε); he also seems to hint that Papias did not say that he was a spectator and auditor of the holy Apostles.²²

But from the fragments collected by Eusebius the testimony of Papias has been preserved for us. Here are the words of Papias, translated from the Greek, which show the desire of Papias to know the tradition of the ancients, especially that of the elders (τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), i.e., the Apostles, and also his diligence in carrying out the investigation.

“I do not hesitate, he said [Papias], to add to our interpretations the things *I learned well* (καλῶς ἔμαθον) long ago from the seniors and *committed well to memory* (καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα), so that their truth might be confirmed also by our affirmation. But I did not, as many are wont to do, follow those who are fluent with their words; instead, I followed those who teach the truth. I did not follow those who invent new and unusual precepts, but those who remember the commands of the Lord handed on with faith and coming from the Truth itself. – Whenever anyone came my way, who had been a follower of my seniors, I would ask for the accounts of our seniors: What *did Andrew or Peter say?* (ἀνέκρινον... τί... εἶπεν) Or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any of the Lord’s disciples? I also asked: What are Aristion and John the Presbyter (ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης), disciples of the Lord *saying* (λέγουσιν, in the present). For, as I see it, it is not so much from books *as from the living and permanent voice that I must draw profit.*”²³

267. “The presbyter also said: Mark, the interpreter of Peter, carefully wrote down everything he had committed to memory, not however in the order in which they were either said or done by the Lord (τά ὑπο τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα). For he

19. *Adversus haereses* 3,1,2: R 208.

20. *Adversus haereses* 3,11,7: R 214.

21. *Adversus haereses* 5,33,4: R 261.

22. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,296 A.

23. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,296f.: see Kch 45f.; R 94.

himself had never heard the Lord or followed him. But, as I said, he was associated with Peter afterwards and for the help of the hearers, not in order to conceal the history of the Lord's words, he preached the Gospel. Therefore Mark did not make any mistakes and he wrote everything down as he had repeated it by memory. He had one purpose and that was that he would not omit anything he had heard or add anything false."²⁴

268. Papias narrates these things about Mark. But about Matthew he says this:

"Indeed Matthew, he said, wrote (συνεγράψατο) down the divine sayings

(τά λόγια) in the Hebrew language (διαλέκτω): but everyone interpreted them as he was able."²⁵

Now *Matthew* cannot be anyone else but the Apostle: for no one else but the Apostle had that name; and Eusebius, knowing the whole work of Papias, understood him to be the Apostle Matthew.

In the Hebrew language, that is, the Aramaic language, which was the common language then among the Hebrews,²⁶ and which the Christians, who lived in Asia Minor and spoke Greek, interpreted as best they could when they translated it into the language of the people.

Τά λόγια says directly *pronouncements, oracles*, which are abundant in the Gospel of Matthew,²⁷ but it also says the *actions and deeds* of the Lord: because the books of Papias, under the title of λογίων κυριακών, contained both the words and the deeds of the Lord²⁸; and Papias, treating somewhat earlier the Gospel of Mark, namely, *the history of the sermons* (λογίων) *of the Lord*, understands about them *what had either been said or done by the Lord* (ή λεχθέντα ή πραχθέντα).

Moreover, he *wrote down* these oracles or put them in order with some others, which indicates the existence of a book.

269. On the worth of this testimony. Without doubt it is necessary to give great importance to the testimony of Papias: a) because it is the

24. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,300; Kch 48; R 95.

25. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,300; Kch 49; R 95.

26. See Acts 21:40 where St. Paul is said to speak to the people of Jerusalem *in the Hebrew language*. On the other hand, see what Gaechter says, n. 73 and 88 on the supposition that Matthew was directed primarily not to confirm the multitude in the faith, but to the non-believing Jews who were educated and who used a non-Hebrew and erudite language, just as in the 15th to 17th centuries many of our learned countrymen used Latin. But Origen says that Matthew was written *for the Jews converted to the faith*; in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6,25: MG 20,581 C. D 3562, and Rosadini, p. 119.

27. In Matthew there are five lengthy sermons of the Lord. See v.gr. Gaechter, *Introductio* n.68; below n. 274, in note 43.

28. V.gr. concerning the woman taken in adultery, as Eusebius reports, *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,300.

first explicit testimony attesting that Matthew was the author of the first Gospel; b) and it is the testimony of a man who diligently sought out words of the old seniors, namely, of the Apostles and the disciples of the Lord (*I learned well, I committed well to memory, so that their truth might be confirmed also by our affirmation...*); c) and this testimony, although it was written by Papias at the beginning of the 2nd century, still reports the words of “presbyter John,” spoken most probably at the latest towards the end of the first century.²⁹

270. *This “presbyter John,” from whom the tradition comes, more probably is John the Apostle himself.*

Now Eusebius has been interpreted as speaking about another John as the disciple of the Lord, because Papias used the name of John twice: first with the Apostles, then outside the number of the Apostles, and placing a certain Aristion before him; also because at Ephesus there were two tombs of John. He thinks that the book of Revelation is to be attributed to this *presbyter John*, not to the Apostle.³⁰

For, Eusebius accepted from Dionysius of Alexandria (+ ca. 264) that there were two monuments or tombs at Ephesus under the name of John which were held in very high honor; and so from that and from an internal examination of the writings Dionysius said that there was *one* John who was an Apostle and who wrote the Gospel of John and First Letter of John, but *another* John who was a disciple of the Lord and wrote Revelation.³¹

St. Jerome also refers to the two tombs of John at Ephesus, and to the other presbyter John he attributes 2 and 3 John,³² but not Revelation, which he attributes to John the Apostle.³³

The first one to defend the idea that “presbyter John” was someone different from the Apostle John was Keim (1867),³⁴ then Harnack³⁵; and among more recent authors, Lagrange, Jacquier, Grandmaison, Huby, Lusseau-Collomb.³⁶

29. For if we suppose that the disciples of this kind during the time of the Lord were about 20 years old (for the disciples of the Lord were not mere boys or adolescents), then at the end of the first century that elder would have been about 90 years old, truly a *senior* (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), and he would not have lived much longer in the 2nd century.

E. Gutwenger concluded that Papias belonged to the time before 110, and was living at the time of Clement of Rome; but that he wrote between the years 90 to 100, before the composition of Revelation, because he did not know this book as is certain from the silence of Eusebius about this matter. Therefore John the Presbyter cannot be anyone else but John the Apostle (*Papias: Eine chronologische Studie: ZkathTh 69 [1947] 385-416*).

30. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39,5: MG 20,297; Kch 47.

31. In Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 7,25: MG 20,697.701-704.

32. *De viris illustribus* c.17: ML 23,670.

33. *De viris illustribus* c.9: ML 23,655.

34. *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (Zürich 1867); see Rosadini, n.209-278.

35. *Die Chronologie...* v.1 p. 656-680; see Rosadini, *ibid*.

36. See the review of the authors for both opinions in J. Leal, *El valor histórico de los evangelios*² p.109.

271. But the majority of Catholic authors say that presbyter John is John the Apostle. And rightly so:

1) From an examination of the testimony of Papias it appears that *the Apostles themselves were the first ones to be called presbyter*³⁷; but Aristion, even though he is called a disciple of the Lord (and therefore in the matter of age he was a *senior*), still he is not called a *presbyter*. But John is called a *presbyter*.

2) But if the name of John is duplicated, the reason seems to be in the difference of times concerning the statements that were sought: first, what Aristion and presbyter John, who are assumed to be still living when Papias was investigating, *said* (in times past), then *what they are saying* (at the present time).

3) That presbyter (ὁ πρεσβύτερος, with the article) is a very definite and known person; this name corresponds above all to the designation at the beginning of 2 and 3 John likewise to the definite (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), *of the letters of John the Apostle*, as is commonly held³⁸; surely this seems to indicate that this is the proper name of the Apostle John in his old age. And so it is proper to him in a special way, because of the disciples of the Lord then living (Aristion and John), one “presbyter” was still living. But he is placed after Aristion, because both in age and in life he surpassed him in his old age.

4) St. Irenaeus, well versed in affairs in Asia, mentions only one John and he is the Evangelist.

5) The opinion of Dionysius about the second John, the author of the letters 2 and 3 John, today has rightly been abandoned by Catholics. And hence also the opinion of Eusebius has less weight; he said that the second John wrote the book of Revelation and that he is the presbyter John. And it helps to note that it was important to Eusebius to weaken the authority of Papias because of his admitted millenary fables.³⁹

272. On the titles of the Gospels. The titles of the Gospels *according to Matthew, according to Mark...*, although not placed there at the beginning or by the authors themselves (for it was not the custom to write down the names of the authors⁴⁰), nevertheless are very ancient: so much so that they are found in the first half of the

37. Gaechter however seems to suppose that the *seniors* were not apostles.

38. See v.gr. Gaechter, n.307.

39. On this matter see J. Chapman, O.S.B., *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford 1911). And on the meaning of the present tense of λέγουσιν, see J.F. Bligh, S.J., *The Prologue of Papias: Theological Studies* 13 (1952) 234-240.

40. St. Chrysostom, *Homil. I in Rom* (MG 60,395) says that many books did not contain the name of the author because they were written *for those who were present*.

2nd century.⁴¹

Although per se these titles can signify the Gospel *according to the preaching of Matthew...*, still that is not convincing; because then regarding Mark and Luke it would have to be said, *according to Peter and according to Paul*, whose preaching Mark and Luke represent (see n.278ff., 289ff.). The meaning therefore has to do *with the author* of each Gospel; in order to signify this, the way of speaking was familiar (see v.gr. 2 Macc. 2:13: ἐν ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνηματισμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Νεεμίαν...).

273. Summary of the sayings. From the written reports, therefore, it is certain that in the first centuries there was *an explicit and universal and constant tradition from the first century* about Matthew the Apostle as the author of the first gospel. *And not all the testimonies of the churches can be reduced to the one testimony of Papias (and of the Apostle John)*; but what we said about Pantaenus (and therefore about Clement, about Origen) clearly show another source.

This tradition has *very learned witnesses* (like Jerome, Tertullian, Eusebius, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus); likewise there are *witnesses who associated with the Apostles or with their disciples* (like Papias and Irenaeus) or also John the Apostle himself.

And we have pursued *the origin of the testimony all the way back to the first century*. And it helps to point out regarding the writings of the profane classics, about whose genuineness no one doubts, that they cannot produce such an abundance of witness, *and so immediate*, with regard to the origin of the manuscripts.

274. Secondly, the internal arguments confirm that the Apostle Matthew is the author of the first gospel. For

a) *the author of the first gospel knows very well Jewish things*, plus the institutions and customs of the Jews; and, since he is writing for Jews who know the same things, it is easy to understand why he does not offer any explanations of them.

Thus v.gr. it is obvious that he knew the Palestinian geography: Rama (2:18), the wilderness of Judea (3:1), Corozain, Bethsaida (11:21), Capernaum (8:5; 11:23); *rulers of the people*: Herod (2:3ff.), Archelaus (2:22), Herod the tetrarch (14:1), Caia-phas (26:57), Pilate (27:2ff.); *the Judean way of speaking*: *raca*, fool, liable to the council, liable to the hell of fire (5:22); to swear by heaven, by the earth, by Jerusalem, by your head... (5:34-36); Bar-Jona (16:17), to bind-to loose (16:19; 18:18), to swear by the altar (23:18); *the custom of the Judeans*: not to enter into the cities of the

41. Thus also Harnack, *Die Chronologie...* 1,682; see Rosadini, n.116 p.134.

Samaritans (10:5); about Pharisees and Herodians (22:15f.) and Sadducees (22:23-34); the Pharisees make their phylacteries broad (23:5), are hypocrites (23:13ff.); he knows the wedding customs (25:1-13), to put money in the treasury (27:6): *all of these things correspond accurately to the history of that time.*

b) *The author speaks excellently about tax and monetary matters: the shekel found in the mouth of the fish (17:24.27); “to give taxes to Caesar” (22:17), “money for the tax” (22:19).*

c) *The style of composition shows that the author is a Semitic man: thus v.gr. in the parallelism of members in a sentence (16:25) and in other points of style.⁴² Likewise the skilful literary composition manifests a man well versed in literature.⁴³*

d) *The author knows the O.T. and cites it more often than the other evangelists: seventy times (Luke: 19; Mark: 18; John 12 times); and he does it with a formula of absolute authority as scripture admitted by his readers. Likewise he is familiar with the religion of the Jews. And the intention of the author is to demonstrate that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah foretold by the prophets to the people of Israel.⁴⁴*

e) *The author reports about the call of Matthew that he was a publican (9:9ff.); also later he calls him a publican (10:3); this agrees with a spirit of humility, if the author really is Matthew.*

f) *The author is writing in the first century, certainly before the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70, as the following considerations will show.*

275. On the time of composition. a) *Citations of the gospel.* The Gospel of Matt. is cited for his sayings (Matt. 3:4.11) by St. Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho* in the year ca. 155 (R 139); by St. Polycarp (Matt. 7:1f.; 5:3.10) in his *Letter to the Philippians* in the year ca. 107 (R 71); in the *Letter to Barnabas* (Matt. 9:13) written ca. 96-98, and also (Matt. 20:16; 22:14) is cited under the formula *as it has been written* (R 30); by St. Clement of Rome (Matt. 26:24) in his *First Letter to the Corinthians*,

42. See on this matter Gaechter, n. 70.

43. This artistic skill appears also in the seven sections (note the *sacred* number) into which the whole gospel is divided: first part: 1:1—4:16 (preamble); second part: 4:17—9:34 (doctrine in the *sermon* on the mount and its confirmation by miracles); third part: 9:35—11:1 (where especially, but not uniquely, the choice of the Apostles takes place and the *sermon* to the Apostles); fourth part: 11:2—16:12 (especially his rejection by the people and the *sermon* on the parables of the kingdom); fifth part: 16:13—20:34 (mainly the proposal of founding the Church and the *sermon* to the disciples); sixth part: 21:1—25:46 (last controversy with the Pharisees and the *sermon* to them); seventh part: 26:1—28:20 (passion and resurrection of Jesus).—Hence it is apparent that no precise chronological order in all things is observed by the author, but an artistic order either because of the similarity of ideas and events or some association of ideas. Gaechter treats the literary composition and the language in Matt., n.68-71.

44. On the scope of Matt., see DB 4,891f.

also written ca. 96-98 (R 24)⁴⁵; in the *Didache* or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which was composed between 90 and 100 (Matt. 22:37-39; 7:12; 5:44ff.; 28:19; 6:5; 6:9ff.; 7:6; 21:9; 24:24; 10:22; 24:10.13.30) (R 1, 4-7, 10).

Quotations of this kind, which are not unique and could be increased, and also *allusions* to Matt.,⁴⁶ support the view that the gospel already existed before the year 90; and this agrees with the explicit testimony of the “presbyter” John as found in Papias (above n. 268f).

276. b) Other indications of an early composition. In Matt. 24:1-51, in the eschatological sermon, things that pertain to the destruction of Jerusalem are mingled together with the second coming of the Lord; surely these things would not be so mingled together, if the attack on and the occupation of the city had already taken place when they were written down. Therefore, certainly the Gospel of Matthew was written before the year 70.⁴⁷

Moreover, in Matthew there are no indications which allow one to suppose that the Jewish State was in a period of convulsion or was disrupted in its relations with Rome.

But many things are scarcely mentioned which, given the dispersion of the Jews after the war of Vespasian and Titus and also keeping in mind the departure of the Apostles to the nations, would have been if Matt. was written after 70. Such, for example, as Matt. 10:5: *Go nowhere among the Gentiles...*; 15:24: *I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*; although it is true that a universal kingdom is proposed clearly in Matt. (21:23-46: on the vocation of the Gentiles; 28:19: and preaching to all nations...) and it is true that Matt. supposes that the gospel has been proclaimed to the Gentiles.

c) Now if we admit the historical worth of Acts 15:1-29 (*on the council of Jerusalem*), and by comparing this passage with Gal. 2:9 (where there is no mention of St. Matthew as being among the Apostles who were in Jerusalem): then Matthew, in the years ca. 48-49, seems not to have been in Palestine. *Therefore it seems that his gospel was written before his departure from Palestine, that is, before the year 48.*

45. Also in his Second Letter (2,4) under the formula *another scripture says*, he quoted Matt. 9:13: *I came not to call the righteous, but sinners*; but this is also found in Mark 2:17 and Luke 5:32. See F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* I (Tübingen 1901) 186f.

46. See Rosadini, n.110-111 p. 126-128.

47. See the Response of the Biblical Commission (D 3563).

277. Objections. The author cannot be Matthew, who is supposed to have written before the year 70. For:

1. Matt. leans towards the universalism of the kingdom and the admission of the Gentiles. Therefore it has its origin at the end of the first century.

I deny the consequence. That can be said only from prejudicial opinions.

2. Matt. 22:7 (*he burned their city*) and Matt. 24 (in the eschatological sermon) allude to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Therefore the gospel was written after the year 70.

Response. The objection proceeds in an aprioristic way by supposing the impossibility of prophecy. *And the matter would not be proposed so vaguely* (as in Matt. 22:7) *or confusedly* (as in Matt. 24), if it had been written really after the event.

3. St. Irenaeus⁴⁸ says that Matt. was written *while Peter and Paul were evangelizing in Rome and establishing the Church*. Therefore Matt. was written after the year 60, and not before by Matthew, as is supposed.

Response. Those words are vague; and they do not compel us to take them so strictly (see above n.265). Moreover, regarding Matt., he was in error with regard to this matter (see D 3563 and below n. 281).

4. All the testimonies given go back to Papias.

I deny that. See n. 273. Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria have *other sources*. Likewise, Irenaeus and Origen do not merely repeat reports, but offer new material.

5. And Papias does not speak about the Gospel of Matthew, but *about the sermons of the Lord* (τά λόγια).

I deny that from what was said in the proof in n. 268 (see also D 3564).

6. Papias, according to Eusebius, was “a man of very mediocre talent.”⁴⁹ Therefore he was not a witness endowed with knowledge and authority.

Response. Eusebius was hostile to Papias because of his opinion concerning crass millenarism and for explaining the words of the Apostles in a very materialistic way; but Eusebius believed Papias in the testimony he gave about the authorship of Matthew. Moreover, Papias diligently researched the matter in this case, as is certain from his words (n.266, 269); also, *no great talent is required* so that someone can rightly establish and accept the fact that a definite man is the author of a book.

7. Papias alludes to the gospel of the Hebrews.

Response. Such a gospel did not yet exist. It is not licit to suppose either that Papias, a diligent researcher or John the Apostle erred in this matter.

8. Papias erroneously says that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. For a) it is written in good Greek; b) indeed, it contains paranomasias and plays on words (Greek Matt. 24:30; 6:16...); c) it cites the O.T. from the LXX and not from the TM; d) it interprets some words: *Haceldama, that is, the field of blood* (27:8); *Golgotha, which means the place of the skull* (27:33).

Response. 1) *Papias is not the only one who says that it was written in Hebrew, but also others, as we have seen.*

48. *Adversus haeres.* 3,1,2: R 208. See the text above in n. 265/

49. *Hist. eccles.* 3,39: MG 20,300.

2) Regarding the added reasons: To a): This means that the Aramaic gospel had a good translator; but even admitting that a good translation was made, there is still the internal Semitic style of writing, which we mentioned above in n.274. To b): paranomasias and plays on words not rarely are found also in the Latin version; and it happens not rarely in the versions that preserve the form of the original: v.gr., “he will put those wretches to a miserable death (*malos male perdet*” (21:41), “when he comes... will find” (*venerit... invenerit*” (24:46), “in praying do not heap up empty phrases” (*nolite multum loqui... in multiloquio...*” (6:7). To c): Not all the citations of the O.T in Matt. are from the LXX, but some are from the TM. And even if all the citations were from the LXX, that would prove that the translator took them from that version. To d): These rare explanations could be attributed to the translator, who gave the interpretation of the words.⁵⁰

50. See Gaechter, n. 80, p. 66.

Thesis 17. The author of the second gospel is Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter.

E. Manganot, *Marc (Evangile de Saint)*: DB 4,719-744; M.J. Lagrange, O.P., *Evangile selon S.Marc*⁵ (Paris 1929) Introduction; J. Huby, S.J., *L'Evangile selon Marc*¹⁹ (Paris 1929) p.VII-XX; Gaechter, n.90-109; Rosadini, n.133-150; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in evangelium sec. Marcum*² (1907) Prolegomena; L. Méchineau, *I Vangelii de S.Marco e di S.Luca e la questione sinotica secondo le risposte della Commissione Biblica* (Rome 1913).

278. The adversaries against this thesis are the ones mentioned below in our presentation of the *doctrine of the Church*.

The doctrine of the Church concerning the Gospel of Mark [and also Luke] is contained *in the responses of the Biblical Commission* given on June 26, 1912; and according to the first response *the clear voice of tradition, wonderfully consistent from the beginnings of the Church and supported by numerous arguments... and also by intrinsic reasons taken from the text of the sacred books themselves, compel us to affirm with certainty that Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, and Luke, a physician, the assistant and companion of Paul, are really the authors of the Gospels that are respectively attributed to them* (EB 395 [408]; D 3568).

Moreover, after Matthew, as the first of all, wrote his Gospel in his native language, *Mark wrote second in order* (D 3572); and it is not licit to defer the date of composition up to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem (D 3573); nor can the opinion reasonably be called into question that holds that Mark wrote according to the preaching of Peter (D 3575).

The theological note according to which the thesis must be held is certain from what has been said, and it is surely *with an internal religious assent*.

279. It is proved firstly by extrinsic arguments: from the eloquent testimonies of the holy Fathers and the ecclesiastical writers.

In the 4th century, St. Jerome, after consulting the ancient tradition writes: “Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, according to what he had heard Peter preaching, *having been asked by the brothers in Rome, wrote a brief Gospel*. When Peter heard about this he approved it, and by his own authority he handed it on to the churches to be read, just as Clement wrote in his sixth book ‘Υποτυπώσεων and also Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis.”¹

1. *De viris illustribus* 8: ML 23,653f. A.

St. John Chrysostom, speaking about Peter's denial of the Lord, refers to what is found in Mark:

"But Mark says, after he [Peter] had denied him once, that the cock crowed; after his third denial, then the cock crowed a second time, more accurately recounting the weakness of the disciple, who was almost dead from fear: *and Mark learned this from his master, since he was a disciple of Peter*. This is even more remarkable, because not only did he not conceal the fall of his master, but that he narrated it even more clearly than the others, because he was his disciple."²

Similarly St. Epiphanius: "Therefore immediately after Matthew, *Mark who had been a companion of St. Peter in Rome, was given the task of writing a gospel*. When he had completed it, he was sent to Egypt by blessed Peter. He was one of the 72 disciples who were sent forth because of that sermon which the Lord had proclaimed: Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you are not worthy of me, as those know who read the gospel [John 6:54]. But having reviewed the work of Peter and being filled with the Holy Spirit, he accepted the task of writing a gospel."³

And at the beginning of the 4th century, Eusebius of Caesarea wrote in his *Ecclesiastical History*: "But such a great light of truth leaped forth in their minds, of those who had heard Peter, that they thought little of hearing him only once, nor were they content to accept the doctrine of the heavenly word from his living voice without having it written down; but *they eagerly pleaded with Mark, Peter's assistant, whose gospel exists among us today, that he would leave with them a written account of the doctrine which they had accepted after hearing it. And they did not desist until they had convinced the man and were in possession of the gospel which is said to be according to Mark...*"⁴

But since above we treated the authorship of Matthew, we have already given some direct testimonies, which apply also to the authorship of Mark:

280. *Among the authors of the 3rd and 2nd centuries, Tertullian said: "... of apostolic men Luke and Mark renew it [faith]."*⁵

And a little later: "... The same authority of the apostolic churches will afford evidence to the other Gospels also, which we possess equally through their means, and according to their usage—I mean the Gospels of John and Matthew—*while that which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was*. For even

2. *In Mt homil.* 85: MG 58,758.

3. *Adversus haereses* 2,51: MG 41,897-900.

4. *Hist. eccles.* 2,15,1: R 652. Eusebius continues in this place: "When Peter learned about this through a revelation of the Holy Spirit, delighted by the ardent zeal of the men, he is said to have approved the book with his own authority, so that from then on it would be read in the churches." Gaechter, n.103, supposes that these words are due to a certain tendency, that is, of invoking revelations, etc. Eusebius reports the words of Clement of Alexandria (in his sixth *Hypotyposeon*; see MG 9,745 D), which indeed on their face value do not agree with what we added later, n. 280, from the same Clement. See also from Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 2,16: MG 20,173.

5. *Adv. Marcionem* 4,2: R 339.

Luke's form of the Gospel men usually ascribe to Paul.⁶

Similarly, Origen says that *Mark also sang with a priestly trumpet*⁷; and, according to Eusebius, he had affirmed: "*But the second [Gospel is that according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter had explained it to him....]*"⁸

Clement of Alexandria explains the occasion of the writing in this way: "... The Gospel according to Mark was composed in the following circumstances. – Peter having preached the word publicly at Rome, and by the Spirit proclaimed the Gospel, those who were present, who were numerous, entreated Mark, inasmuch as he had attended him from an early period, and remembered what had been said, *to write down what had been spoken*. On his composing the Gospel, he handed it to those who had made the request to him; which coming to Peter's knowledge, he neither hindered nor encouraged..."⁹ Therefore, according to this testimony, Peter was still living, at least when Mark began to write.

In the *Monarchian Prologues*,¹⁰ which, although they seem to have been composed in the 3rd to 4th centuries, contain elements of a much later time, says this about Mark: "Mark, the evangelist of God and of Peter, in baptism a son and in divine speech a disciple, carrying out his priesthood in Israel according to the flesh, a levite who had converted to faith in Christ, *wrote his Gospel in Italy*, while showing in it that he had a debt both to his race and to Christ..."¹¹

281. St. Irenaeus said (above n. 265): "After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter..."¹²

And alluding to Mark, because of his beginning and final words, he says: "Wherefore also Mark, *the interpreter and assistant of Peter*, wrote at the beginning of his Gospel thus: The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God... But at the end of the gospel *Mark says*: So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven..."¹³

282. Finally, from Papias there is testimony about Mark, from the very words of John the Apostle, which Papias records (above n. 267): "*Mark, the interpreter of Peter, carefully wrote down everything he had committed to memory*, not however in the order in which they were either said or done

6. *Adv. Marcionem* 4,5: R 341.

7. *Homiliae in Jesu Nave* 7,1: R 538.

8. *Hist. eccles.* 6,25: R 503.

9. From Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6,14: R 439.

10. So called because they contain the errors of the Monarchianists.

11. P. Corsen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien*: TU 15, p. 9.

12. *Adversus haereses* 3,1,2: R 208.

13. *Adversus haereses* 3,10,6: MG 7,878f. See *ibid.*, 3,11,7: R 214.

by the Lord. For he himself had never heard the Lord or followed him. But, *as I said*, he was associated with Peter afterwards and for the help of the hearers, not in order to conceal the history of the Lord's words, he preached the Gospel..." (R 95).

As I said: Probably these are the words of John; others, however, attribute them to Papias.

Not in the order: Probably, not in an orderly way, but as the occasion of Peter's preaching presented itself. This defect of order is *in some things*, but not in all. This preoccupation with order is expressed well, if these words come from the Apostle John, the author of the fourth Gospel, who was very solicitous about order. Therefore, this testimony is not so much an attempt to show that Mark wrote the Gospel, which is assumed, as it is to defend and authenticate him, in spite of a certain lack of order.

The writing of Mark is understood to be nothing other than his Gospel: for, that is how Eusebius understood it, and it cannot be understood as some other work of Mark.

283. A summary of the statements. Therefore from the abundance of the preceding testimonies we openly conclude that *Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter*,¹⁴ *really is the author of the Gospel attributed to him*.¹⁵ Thus Mark was actually written according to the preaching of Peter (D 3575).

284. Secondly, what we presented above in the intrinsic proof is confirmed by **internal arguments**. For

a) *The frequent Semitisms*, especially the way of speaking by the coordination of members (v.gr., 1:21-29; 4:1-9), repetitions (ἰδοῦ, behold; καί, and),¹⁶ and the keeping of Aramaic words, which will be treated under d): show that *a Semitic man is speaking there, and truly what is had there is the preaching of Peter*.

b) *The vivid and concrete manner of narrating* (in contrast with Matt.) indicates that the narrator is an eye witness; he is indeed of simple talent, from the vulgarity sometimes of the words (v.gr., on the cure of the paralytic 2:1-12; likewise on the storm at sea and its calming 4:35-41; on the multiplication of the loaves 6:30-44...).

c) *The narration has a special relation to Peter*: sometimes only Mark *mentions Peter by name among the disciples* (in parallel texts the other

14. See also 1 Pet. 5:13: "The church, which is at Babylon, sends you greetings, *as so does my son Mark*."

15. P. Gaechter, S.J., wrote about the function of the interpreter at that time, *Die Dolmetscher der Apostel*: ZkathTh 60 (1936) 161-187.

16. See Gaechter, n.91.

evangelists do not name him); shameful things are said about him (“He rebuked Peter” 8:33); Peter’s denials of the Lord stress his presumption and the circumstances of the fact (14:29-31, 54-72). *But his noble deeds are omitted*: the miraculous catch of fish in Peter’s boat (Luke 5:4-9), Peter walking on the water to the Lord (Matt. 14:28), the promise of the primacy (Matt. 16:17-19), the coin found in the mouth of the fish (Matt. 17:24-27). All of these things, on the hypothesis that Mark is reporting the preaching of Peter, and surely in a spirit of humility, can be well understood; but they are not so rightly and properly understood in the gratuitous supposition of some rationalists that Mark wanted to humiliate Peter; for, why does he name him especially among the disciples, since he also deals with some indifferent things?

d) *Mark was written for the Gentiles and indeed for those outside of Palestine.*

For, he explains Aramaic words: “Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder” (3:17); “Talitha cumi, which means, ‘Little girl, I say to you, arise’” (5:41); “Corban, that is, given to God” (7:11); “Ephphatha, that is, be opened” (7:34); “Abba, Father” (14:36); “to the place called Golgotha, which means the place of the skull” (15:22); “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which means, my God, my God...” (15:34). See also 3:22; 9:43; 10:46.

He also explains the customs of the Jews, like the ablutions (7:2-4); but he omits some things from the Law of Moses (Matt. 5:17-26); and he does not say that the Lord had a special mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 10:5; 15:24)

e) *Sometimes Mark explains the Greek words for the Latins*: “she put in two copper coins (λεπτά δύο), which make a penny (ὁ ἐστὶν κοδράντης)” (12:42); “they led him away inside the palace, that is, the praetorium (Greek: ἐσω τῆς αὐλῆς ὁ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον) (15:16). But this corresponds well with what is known from other sources, namely, *that Mark was writing for those familiar with the Latin language*, for Romans.

Latinisms are more frequent in Mark than they are in the other Gospels: v.gr., λεγιών, legion (5:9); σπεκουλάτωρ, soldier of the guard (6:27); κήνσος, taxes (12:14)...¹⁷

f) *The author is writing in the first century, before the year 70*, as the following considerations show.

285. On the time of composition. a) The Gospel of Mark is found not only in all the major codices (α. B, D...), but it was also entirely in the

17. There is more about this about the style of Mark in Gaechter, n.91-94.

Diatessaron of Tatian (ca. 170), since it is found in all the ancient Latin, Syrian and Coptic versions....

Likewise, citations from it are found in St. Justin, who in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 155) alludes to Mark 3:16f. and he says it is *written in the commentaries of Peter*.¹⁸ Also, in addition to other cases, Mark is probably quoted by St. Ignatius the Martyr in his *Letter to the Ephesians*¹⁹; and probably by St. Clement of Rome twice in his *First Letter*, and five times in his (so called) *Second Letter to the Corinthians*,²⁰ between the years 96-100, when they were written. Similarly probably in the *Didache*, between the years 90-100.²¹

Therefore we can say that the Gospel of Mark was already known and venerated at the end of the first century; although, because of the brevity and scarcity of the words of the Lord, it is not cited as often as Matt. and Luke.

286. b) Mark 13, in the eschatological sermon, mingles together some things from both comings of the Lord, namely, the destruction of the city and the final Parousia; he would not have done this, if the city had already been destroyed. Therefore it is certain that Mark was written before the year 70 (D 3573).

287. c) If we use extrinsic arguments, the time of composition of Mark can be determined more accurately. For, tradition holds (from what was stated above) that the Gospel of Mark was written before Luke; but it is certain that Luke was written before Acts; but Acts was written before the year 63. Therefore Mark was composed some years before the year 63.

On the other hand, if it is established that Mark accompanied Peter and listened to him often, especially when he was in Rome: that could not be before the year 52, because Mark, before the Council of Jerusalem, was a companion with Paul and Barnabas (Acts 12:25; 13:13), and after the Council of Jerusalem (ca. 49-50) accompanied Barnabas to Cyprus (Acts 15:39).

Therefore the conclusion is that the writing of Mark took place more or less between the years 53-58.

18. *Dialogue with Trypho* c.106: MG 6,723 A. See also R 139.

19. *Ad Ephesios* c.16: Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1,226.

20. See Funk, 1,645f.

21. *Didache* c.1 n.2: R 1.

288. Objections.²² 1. There is opposition between the testimony of Eusebius concerning Mark already written (“When Peter learned about this through a revelation of the Holy Spirit, delighted by the ardent zeal of the men, he is said to have approved the book with his own authority, so that from then on it would be read in the churches” (R 652; above n. 279, in note 4), and the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (“which coming to Peter’s knowledge, he neither hindered nor encouraged”) (R 439; above n. 280).

Response. The opposition is not in the author, but in the accidental elements, if any are present.

2. All the testimonies depend on Papias.

Response. 1) Even if they did depend on Papias alone, the testimony of Papias is not *false*.

2) And neither Irenaeus nor Clement of Alexandria seems to depend on him, since they offer new material.

3) The testimony of Papias, that Mark was the *interpreter of Peter*, is not in coherence with the gift of tongues given to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost.

Response. The gift of tongues was given on Pentecost to proclaim the mighty works of God (Acts 2:11), “and they began to speak in other tongues, *as the Spirit gave them utterance*” (Acts 2:4). And there is no evidence that this was a permanent gift.

4) It is surprising that Peter preached in Aramaic and needed someone else to translate for him at the same time into Greek.

Response. There is nothing surprising about this, especially if you take into account the customs of the time. And it is not necessary that *on every occasion* Mark *always* interpreted every sermon of Peter.

22. See Rosadini, n.142f.

Thesis 18. The author of the third Gospel is Luke, a physician, the assistant and companion of Paul.

E. Mangelot, *Luc (Evangile de Saint)*: DB 4,383-402; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in evangelium sec. Lucam*² (Paris 1905) Prolegomena; Gaechter, n.110-145; Rosadini, n.151-171; L. Méchineau, *I Vangeli di S.Marco e di Luca...* (Rome 1913).

289. The adversaries against this thesis are the ones against whom the following *doctrine of the Church* is directed (see also n. 278).

The doctrine of the Church on the Gospel of Luke is contained in the *Responses of the Biblical Commission* given on June 26, 1912 (D 3568, 3570-3576). According to the first response, from which the wording of the thesis is taken, this thesis must be affirmed with certainty. (See above, where the Gospel of Matthew was treated, n. 278; and read the words in EB 395 [408]).

Luke was the third one to write his Gospel (D 3572), and it is not correct to defer his composition up to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem (D 3573); also, Luke wrote his Gospel according to the preaching of Paul (D 3575).

The theological note is certain from the first of these documents: that it is to be held *with internal religious assent*.

290. First proof: by external arguments. *In the 4th century.* St. Jerome, after summarizing the tradition of his predecessors, clearly writes: “Luke, a physician from Antioch, as his writings indicate, was not ignorant of the Greek language, a follower of St. Paul and companion on all his travels, wrote his Gospel, about which the same Paul said: *With him we are sending the brother who is famous among all the churches* [2 Cor. 8:18]; and to the Colossians: *Luke the beloved physician greets you* [Col. 4:14]; and to Timothy: *Luke alone is with me* [2 Tim. 4:11].¹

Likewise St. Epiphanius: “...the Holy Spirit motivated and inspired the blessed Luke by his own hidden stimuli to lead the minds of blind men out of the deep pit, and to put down in writing what had been omitted by others, lest anyone straying away from the truth should think that the generation of Christ was proposed by him like an imaginary fable.”²

But Eusebius of Caesarea summarizes the tradition in this way:

1. *De viris illustribus* 7: ML 23,649 B.
2. *Adversus haereses* 51,7: MG 41,899f.

“But Luke, a native of Antioch, a physician by profession, who both lived very closely with Paul for a long time, and was closely associated with the other Apostles, now instructed in the art of healing the souls of men, which he learned from the teaching of the Apostles, *has left us two books that are divinely inspired. One of them is the Gospel*, which indeed is known to have been written in such a way that it is accepted by the ministers themselves of the divine word and by those who had seen Christ from the beginning; also it is widely known that all have followed it for a long time. *The other book is called the Acts of the Apostles*, which he handed on not because he heard things from others, but he wrote down what he saw with his own eyes. Furthermore, they say that this Gospel usually was meant by Paul, as often as he mentioned his own Gospel when he says: According to my Gospel....”³

291. *But in the 3rd century* from the different churches we have: Origen, who makes mention (ca. 249-251) *of the priestly trumpet with which Luke plays*⁴; Tertullian says (in the year 207-208) *of apostolic men Luke and Mark renew it [faith]*.⁵ And a little later Tertullian has this to say:

“I say therefore that in them (and not simply such of them as were founded by Apostles, but in all those which are united with them in the fellowship of the mystery [of the Gospel of Christ]) that Gospel of Luke which we are defending with all our might has stood its ground from its very publication; whereas Marcion’s Gospel is not known to most people... *Luke’s form of the Gospel men usually ascribe to Paul....*”⁶

The Monarchian Prologue to Luke recalls the same tradition in these words:

“Luke, a Syrian from Antioch, a physician and a disciple of the Apostles, afterwards followed Paul to his confession, serving God without fault. For, having neither a wife nor children, he died at the age of 73 in Bithynia full of the Holy Spirit. *When Gospels had already been written by Matthew in Judea, and by Mark in Italy, at the prompting of the Holy Spirit he wrote his Gospel in Achaia*, and he states at the beginning that others had already written about these things....”⁷

292. *In the 2nd century* towards the end, if we search out the beginnings of the tradition, we find a new document, named for its discoverer⁸ as the so-called *Muratorian Fragment*. In verses 73-78 of this document mention is made of the *Shepherd Hermas* (a.140-155), which work is said *to have*

3. *Hist. eccles.* 3,4: MG 20,219f.

4. *In Iesu Nave* homil.7,1: R 538. And according to Eusebius Origen also says this: “The third is according to Luke, a Gospel which is commended by Paul, and composed for Gentile converts...” (*Hist. eccles.* 6,25: R 503).

5. *Adversus Marcionem* 4,2: R 339.

6. *Adversus Marcionem* 4,5: R 341.

7. P. Corssen, *Monarhianische Prologe...*: TU 14, p. 7f.

8. *L. Muratori*; the text is edited in *Antiquitates Italicae* III (Milan 1740) 851ff.

been written recently during our time in the city of Rome by Hermas, while Pius [I] was presiding over the Church in the city of Rome; he was pope during the years 140-155; therefore it is necessary to place the writing of this fragment towards the end of the 2nd century.

Therefore in this fragment the following is found about Luke right at the beginning.

“The third book of the Gospel, that according to Luke, was compiled in his own name on Paul’s authority by Luke the physician, when after Christ’s ascension Paul had taken him to be with him⁹ like a legal expert.¹⁰ Yet *he* did not see the Lord in the flesh; and he too, as he was able to ascertain events, begins his story from the birth of John.”¹¹

Finally, we come to the first explicit testimony about the authorship of Luke, recorded by St. Irenaeus (ca. 140-202) who, after mentioning Matt. and Mark, says this: “*Luke, also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him.*”¹²

And in other places he speaks about the same Luke as the author of the Gospel.¹³

However, the Gospel of Luke, although Irenaeus was the first to mention him as the author, was known and quoted much earlier; when we are dealing with the time of its composition, we will point this out in n. 295, 304-305.

293. Second proof: The thesis is confirmed by internal argument.

a) *The author of the third gospel does not seem to be a Jew, but a Gentile Christian:* for, his language, although it is κοινή and is not classical Greek, still shows a large vocabulary (about 370 proper words), and it agrees very well with the character and artistry of the Greek language; thus, v.gr., he manifests this in the use of the particles μέν... δε, άν in the optative mood (v.gr., Luke 1:38), and also in the prologue 1:1-4. This agrees very well with the extrinsic arguments which refer to him as an author from Antioch.

b) *Certain words and medical observations are found, among the evangelists, only in Luke.*

See Luke 4:23: Physician, heal yourself; 4:38: Now Simon’s mother-in-law was ill with a high fever; 8:43: A woman who had spent all her living upon physicians and could not be healed by any one; 14:2: a man who had dropsy; 21:34: with drunkenness... These texts show well the *culture of the author* and agree well with the extrinsic argu-

9. Westcott-Hort give this reading.

10. Other have: *expert in justice* (Cornely), *expert in letters* (Rouët de Journal).

11. The whole fragment can be found in R 268; and in EB 1, with the form restored by recent authors.

12. *Adversus haereses* 3,1,2: R 208.

13. *Adversus haereses* 1,27,2: R 196; 3,11,7: R 214; 3,15,1: R 217.

ments about the medical knowledge of the author, but by themselves alone they do not prove that the author was a physician.

294. c) *The affinity with St. Paul in ideas confirms that the author was his companion.*

Thus in the way of narrating the institution of the Eucharist (Luke 22:19f.; 1 Cor. 11:24f.), in which Matt. and Mark differ in the similar form; in the affirmation of the end of the Law of Moses (Luke 16:16); in the frequent mention of the universalism of the messianic kingdom (Luke 2:30-32; 3:6; 3:29; 24:46f.); and also that salvation is available for sinners, as some examples found only in Luke demonstrate (7:36-50: on the woman sinner in the house of Simon; 10:25-37: on the good Samaritan; 15:8-32: on the lost silver coin and the prodigal son; 18:9-14: on the publican and the Pharisee; 19:1-10: on Zacchaeus; 23:40-43: on the dying good thief).

Moreover Luke, as *intended for Gentile Christians*, omits certain things that Matt. has regarding the Law and giving the first place to the Jews (v.gr., Matt. 5:17ff. in the sermon on the mount; 10:6: "But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; 15:21-29: on the Canaanite woman).

d) Also, all of this is confirmed from the fact that *the author of the third Gospel, based on the internal examination, is the same man as the author of the book of the Acts of the Apostles*, who was Luke, as we shall soon see.

e) *For the early time of the composition of Luke*, see what we will soon say about this matter, and also later, in the following thesis, it will be treated more at length in n.304f.

295. Citations of the third Gospel. *The very ancient composition of the third Gospel and also its equally ancient acceptance in the Church is certain from the citations, which were made from it by ancient authors.*

This Gospel was not only included in *Tatian's Diatessaron* (about the year 170), but concerning his teacher St. Justin (ca. 100-167) in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (ca. 155) mentions the Gospel of Luke, since only this gospel contains the pericope about the sweat of blood: "For in the memoirs which I say were drawn up by his Apostles *and those who followed them*, it is reported that his sweat fell down like drops of blood..."¹⁴ Likewise in his *Apology*, written about the same time as the Dialogue, St. Justin refers to the words of Luke 22:19 on the institution of the Eucharist: "For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread and when He had given thanks, said, 'This do in remembrance of me, this is my body....'¹⁵

14. *Dialog. cum Trypho* 103: R 143.

15. *Apologia* 1,66: R 128.

Among other probable citations of Luke, there is that of Polycarp in his *Letter to the Philippians* written in 107, which refers to the words of Luke 6:20.36-38¹⁶; although they could also be from Matt.

Luke 6:44 is probably cited by St. Ignatius of Antioch.¹⁷ In the so-called second letter to the Corinthians (written probably at Corinth before the year 150) a saying of the Lord "in the gospel" is cited: "If you have not been faithful in small things, who will entrust you with big things? For I say to you: He who is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much" (Luke 10:10-12).¹⁸ *But in the first letter to the Corinthians* St. Clement of Rome has a probable citation of Luke 17:2.¹⁹ Also, probably there are some others.²⁰

In the *Didache* (90-100) Luke is probably cited four times.²¹

Therefore, from these citations it is certain that at the beginning of the 2nd century, and even at the end of the 1st century, the Gospel of Luke was known.

The heretics themselves used Luke's Gospel, or rather abused it: as Tertullian²² and St. Irenaeus²³ say about Marcion. Valentinus also was attacked by Irenaeus, in the middle of the 2nd century, as someone who had abused Luke.²⁴ Similarly Basilides, a heretic at the beginning of the 2nd century, appealed to Luke 1:35: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you...*²⁵

296. Objections.²⁶ 1. When he speaks about the authors of Matt. and Mark, Papias does not mention Luke. Therefore, when Papias was writing (probably between the years 90 and 100; see above n. 269, in note 29), Luke had not yet been written, for otherwise he would have spoken about him. Therefore the third Gospel does not have Luke as its author.

I distinguish the antecedent. Papias is silent about Luke *in the preserved fragments, conceded; in other places* in his books, *I ask for proof.* Even if he had remained silent, the argument from silence is proof only to the extent that Papias *ought to have spoken* about Luke.

2. Irenaeus said incorrectly that Luke contains the preaching of Paul; rather, he depends on Matt. and Mark. Therefore, the testimony of Irenaeus is not to be accepted.

I distinguish the antecedent. Since Irenaeus said that, therefore the substantial testimony of Irenaeus about Luke as the author must be rejected, *denied; it should be explained* in the sense that the ideas contained in Paul's preaching are found in Luke, *conceded.* See n. 294, about the affinity of the ideas between both of them (see also D

16. *Ad Philip.* 2,3: R 71.

17. *Ad Ephesios* 14: Funk 1,225.

18. 2.^a *ad Corinthios* 8: Funk 1,194.

19. 1.^a *ad Corinthios* 46,7: R 24.

20. Both in the first and the second *Letter to the Corinthians*; see Funk 1,645f.

21. See Funk 1,641: R 1.

22. *Adversus Marc.* 4,5: R 341.

23. *Adversus haereses* 1,27,2: R 195; 3,11,7: R 214.

24. *Adversus haereses* 3,14: MG 7,916.

25. See Origen, *Philosophoumena* 7,26: MG 16,3315. See *ibid.*, 6,35: MG 16,3247.

26. See Rosadini, n.159.

3575). Moreover, Paul also can be among those *who from the beginning were ministers of the word* (Luke 1:2).

3. Luke reflects the Judeo-Christian influence *of the teaching of the Ebionites*, according to whom the rich are excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Thus Luke proposes a curse and parables of the Lord concerning the rich in favor of the poor (see. Luke 6:20ff.; 12:13-21; 16:11; 16:19-31; parable of the rich feaster and Lazarus; 18:22-25: on the rich young man, "How hard it is for those who have riches to enter the kingdom of God").

Response. This same teaching *is found substantially in the other gospels*. But even in Luke the Lord is not said to have excluded the rich; indeed, "What is impossible with men is possible with God" (Luke 18:27). Luke in showing favor to the poor expresses the universalism of salvation and is in harmony with Paul (see 1 Cor. 1:26-31).

Thesis 19. The evangelist Luke is the author of the book of the Acts of the Apostles.

E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1926) Introduction, especially c. 1-10; J. Corluy, *Actes des Apôtres*: DB 1,152-159; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum* (Paris 1899) Prolegomena; Gaechter, n.127-145.

297. Since the very frequent mention of the book of the Acts of the Apostles occurs throughout the treatise on Apologetics, it has seemed to us opportune, and in fact necessary—as we have said—to demonstrate its genuineness and historicity, just as we have done for the gospels.

298. **Definition of terms.** The book of the *Acts of the Apostles* or Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων indicates the book containing *the things admirably done by the Apostles*; its title in the *Muratorian Fragment* is assumed to be known already: “Acts of All the Apostles.”¹ Hence the book was designated with this name already in the 2nd century.

Of the two forms of Acts one is “eastern,” which several manuscripts have; but the other is called “western,” responding to the variations of some codices. The “canonical” form is the *eastern* one.

299. **Adversaries.** Among the adversaries should be mentioned those who, making a distinction between the different parts of the book of Acts, say that there is not one author, Luke, but *different authors*; and they claim to prove this both from the alleged diversity of language and style and from the abrupt use of narration in the third person and the introduction of the first person plural (see D 3582f.).

300. **The doctrine of the Church** concerning Acts is contained in the *responses of the Biblical Commission* given on June 12, 1913 (D 3581-3586); according to the first response, “In view especially of the tradition of the universal Church going back to the earliest ecclesiastical writers, considering the internal reasons furnished by the book of *Acts* considered in itself and its relation to the third Gospel, and particularly the mutual affinity and connection of the two prologues, *it must be held as certain... that the volume has the evangelist Luke for its author*” (D 3581).

From another response of the same Commission, the book of Acts *must be attributed to one sole author, and the opinion that Luke is not the sole author of the book lacks any foundation* (D 3582); surely the unity of composition and its authenticity are confirmed precisely by the introduction

1. Verse 34: R 268; EB 3.

of the first person plural (*Wir-stücke, we sections*) (D 3583).

Theological note. From what has been said it is certain that the thesis must be held *with internal religious assent*.

301. First proof: from extrinsic testimonies. *In the 4th century* St. Jerome, after his attribution of the third Gospel to Luke, the physician from Antioch, has this to say about Acts:

*He [Luke] also published another famous volume which is called the Acts of the Apostles; its narration goes up to the two-year stay of Paul in Rome, that is, to the fourth year of Nero. Thus we understand that the book was composed in the same city.*²

Likewise Eusebius of Caesarea concerning the two divinely inspired books, which he attributed to Luke from Antioch, a physician, who also lived for a long time associated with Paul, said the following: “The second book is called the Acts of the Apostles, which he wrote down not just according to what he had heard, but what he had seen with his own eyes.”³

In the 3rd century Tertullian, when referring to different sections of the Acts of the Apostles, says about its author: “Then since *in the same commentary of Luke* it is demonstrated in the third hour of prayer, in which those moved by the Holy Spirit are thought to be drunk [Acts 2:15]; and in the sixth hour when Peter went up on the housetop to pray [Acts 10:9]; and at the ninth hour they went up to the temple to pray [Acts 3:1]...” evidently he is alluding to the book of Acts.⁴

But Origen, while mentioning the playing of the priestly trumpets, says this about Luke: “... *and when Luke is describing the deeds of the Apostles*”⁵; and the same Origen also reports: “And Judas the Galilean, *according to the testimony of Luke in the Acts of the Apostles*, wanted to be considered as someone important, and before him Theudas [Acts 5:36f.]...”⁶

Clement of Alexandria alludes to the words of Paul to the men of Athens about the unknown God “*how Luke also in the Acts of the Apostles mentions that Paul spoke [to them].*”⁷

In the 2nd century the Muratorian Fragment speaks very openly about

2. *De viris illustribus* 7: ML 23,650f.

3. *Hist. eccles.* 3,4: MG 20,219f. See also *Hist. eccles.* 3,25: “Therefore first of all [among the books of the N.T.] the most important are the four Gospels, which are then followed by the Acts of the Apostles” (MG 20,267f.).

4. *De ieiuniis* 10: ML 2,1017 B.

5. *In Iesu Nave* homil.7,1: R 538.

6. *Contra Celsum* (about the year 248) 6,11: MG 11,1308 A.

7. *Stromata* (ca. 208 to 211) 5,12: MG 9,124 A.

the Acts of the Apostles: "... *The Acts, however, of all the Apostles are written in one book. Luke, 'to the most excellent Theophilus,'* includes events because they were done in his own presence, as he also plainly shows by leaving out the passion of Peter, and also the departure of Paul from the City on his journey to Spain."⁸

Finally, St. Irenaeus, after he had spoken about several things that are in the Acts, says:

"Thus it is harmonious and like the same announcement both of Paul and the testifying of Luke about the Apostles. – But since this Luke was always with Paul and was his associate in preaching the Gospel, he himself makes it manifest... [now he recounts several things from Acts which make it clear that Luke was a companion of St. Paul]. *Since Luke was present at all of these events, he carefully wrote them down, so that he cannot be accused either of lying or exaggerating, because all of these things really happened, and he wrote before all those who now teach something different....*"⁹

302. Second proof from internal arguments and from a comparison with the Gospel of Luke. The third Gospel and the book of Acts have the same author. For:

a) *The book of Acts, as is stated in the prologue to the excellent Theophilus,* supposes a previous account, or a book written by the same author, "about all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day when he was taken up, after he had given commandments through the Holy Spirit to the Apostles whom he had chosen" (Acts 1:1f.). But that best of all and only among known books corresponds to the Gospel of Luke.

b) *There is also an excellent following or connection between the last fact narrated in the third Gospel (Luke 24:50-53: on the Ascension) and the first fact mentioned in Acts (1:4-12: also about the Ascension).*

c) *The author of the book of Acts was a companion of St. Paul in his journeys;* this is certain from the way of speaking in the first person plural, when he says, v.gr., *we sought to go on (16:10-17); they were waiting for us at Troas, but we sailed away (20:5-15); likewise 21:1-18; 27:1—28:16... (Wir-stücke).*

But Paul non rarely in his letters mentions his companion Luke: "Luke the beloved physician greets you" (Col. 4:14); he as a Gentile-Christian is contrasted with the Christians of the circumcision (ibid., v. 11); likewise Luke alone is with me (2 Tim. 4:11); Epaphrus sends greetings to you... and Luke, my fellow workers (Philem. 23-24); and

8. Verses 34-39: EB 3: R 268.

9. *Adversus haereses* 3,14,1: MG 7,914. See *Adversus haereses* 3,12,9: MG 7,902f, and *Adv. haereses* 3,15,1: R 217.

probably this: *With him [Titus] we are sending the brother who is famous among all the churches for his preaching of the gospel; and not only that, but he has been appointed by the churches to travel with us* (2 Cor. 8:18f.).

d) *There is not lacking an indication of the author as a physician* (Acts 28:18); although this is only an indication, and in no way a definite proof.

e) *The way of speaking in Luke and Acts is often identical, in those things that are proper to the Gospel of Luke: thus Luke 15:13 and Acts 1:5; Luke 1:20 and Acts 1:2 ("until the day")*.

f) *The author of Acts and Luke was a man of the early Church*, because from an examination of these books it is apparent that the author must have written before the year 66, as will now be demonstrated.

303. On the time of the composition of Acts and Luke. 1) *Regarding the Acts of the Apostles.* a) St. Luke speaks in Acts 28:30f. about the two years of captivity of St. Paul in Rome, and also *about his activity*, since he could speak *openly and unhindered*. This refers to the year 61, when that imprisonment of Paul began.¹⁰ *Therefore Luke wrote Acts after the year 62, or at least he finished it after that year.*

b) But since Luke narrates nothing about the condemnation and martyrdom of Paul, who had appealed to Caesar (Acts 25:11), and surely by a narration of his glorious martyrdom he could have advanced the Christian faith: this is a sign that *the martyrdom of Paul had not yet taken place, when Luke wrote Acts*. Therefore Acts was written before the year 67.

c) Furthermore, *there are no indications in Acts about any public disturbance among the Jews* and in the temple worship in Jerusalem; but there were such disturbances from the year 66 until the year 70.

d) Likewise, since Luke says nothing about the release of Paul, and it is certain that Paul was released in the year 63¹¹; this is a sign that *Acts was completed in the year 63 "toward the end of the first Roman captivity of the apostle Paul"* (see D 3584).

For, it is gratuitously asserted (Th. Zahn) that Luke "wrote another volume that has been lost or intended to write one and that the date of the composition of the book of Acts can therefore be assigned to a time far later than this captivity" (D 3584): as if after the "first book" (Acts 1:1) of the gospel, a second one about the Acts was to follow, and then a third one in which he would narrate the martyrdom of Paul. But if Luke had thought in this way, which is gratuitously imagined, he would have written a conclusion

10. See Gaechter, n. 231.

11. Thus he could have visited Spain (see Clement of Rome, *First Letter to the Corinthians* 5,7 [Funk 1,106]; *Muratorian Fragment* v.38 [R 268] and spent time at Ephesus [1 Tim. 1:3] and in Crete [Tit.1:5].

at the end of Acts about the martyrdom of Paul, according to his way of connecting the end of one book with the beginning of another, as he did with the Ascension of Jesus at the end of the third gospel and at the beginning of Acts.

304. 2) Regarding the time of the composition of Luke. a) *The Gospel of Luke was written before Acts*; since the author of both calls the gospel his *first book* (Acts 1:1). Therefore, if the book of Acts was written about the year 63, the gospel must have been written before that year (see D 3573).

b) But since tradition holds that Luke is the third gospel, written after Matt. and Mark, but Mark was written between the years ca. 53-58 (above n. 287), the conclusion is that Luke was written between the years 58 to 62 (see D 3572).

305. You will say: In Luke there are narrations written after the fact, such as the besieging of Jerusalem: Luke 19:43 (*your enemies will cast up a bank around you and surround you...*); likewise Luke 21:20-24 (*but when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies... They will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led captive among all nations...*). Therefore this gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, after the year 70.

Response. 1) This is said a priori, and not in a scientific way. It also presupposes the prejudice about the impossibility of prophecy.

2) The form and style of these prophecies are Semitic, as in Matt. and Mark; and therefore they suppose a more ancient source, not a narration by Luke after the fact.

3) The prophecy refers to what at that time usually happened in the besieging of a city; and if Luke were narrating after the fact, he would not have said *they will not leave one stone upon another in you* [Jerusalem] (Luke 19:44); because in the actual destruction that is not exactly what happened, but it is said as a hyperbole (see n.512-520).

306. Objections. 1. The differences that are noted between the diverse parts of Acts show a diversity of authors. Thus there is the difference that exists between Acts ch. 1-12 and Acts ch. 13-28. For

a) the former deal primarily with St. Peter and the latter with St. Paul;

b) there things are narrated succinctly and rather abruptly, in an unconnected way, while in the second half they are narrated at length and in a continuous manner;

c) there the author speaks mainly in the third person, but in the second part in the third person plural;

d) there a more prolix mention of times and places is not found, while the opposite is true for the second part;

e) the language of ch. 1-12 is more like the Greek language of the LXX;

f) there some terms are used that were already forgotten when he wrote: v.gr., God glorified his servant τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Jesus (3:13); there were gathered together against τὸν ἅγιον παῖδα σου (4:27); or *that his Christ should suffer* παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ (3:18).

Response. All of these things are not opposed to the unity of authorship, if you pay attention to this: Luke was a companion of St. Paul, and therefore he was an eyewitness and participated in the things he narrated in the second part; hence he often speaks in it in the third person plural, and he could tell the story more at length and continuously, and he could speak more accurately and in detail about the times and places; and these are doubtless mainly the deeds of Paul, not of Peter. *Therefore from these facts the response is clear to the difficulties under a) to d).*

In order to write the first chapter Luke had to consult the Judeo-Christian sources, both oral and written, for chapters 1-5, and Hellenistic sources (that is, from non Palestinian Jews, but educated in a Hellenistic culture) for chapters 6-12. Hence it is not surprising, if for these first chapters of the first part the Semitic sources are apparent, and also if the language reflects the LXX; likewise if the narration is not fully continuous, but at times is broken and is proposed in a schematic way. For, if the author used written sources, what else could he have done? – Actually, this proves the accurate critical sense of the author, who did not attempt to modify his sources (*retocar, remanier, bearbeiten*), but strove as best he could to preserve their genuineness.

However, the differences in the composition are in no way so great that they point to different authors (see D 3582f.).

2. The attribution of the third gospel and Acts, which the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers made to Luke, rather than being something accepted by tradition, is an interpretation based on the study of the Gospel and Acts, and this study does offer some foundation for that.

Response. *That is said gratuitously*, because there is no certain foundation in Luke and Acts so that those writers and Fathers would say that Luke was from Antioch, and also a physician. And if a companion of St. Paul was to be so designated, there was no reason to select precisely Luke, who is mentioned by Paul only in passing. See n. 302, c.

Thesis 20. The Apostle John, and no one else, must be acknowledged as the author of the fourth Gospel.

M.J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon S.Jean*³ (Paris 1927) Introduction c.1; A. Durand, S.J., *Evangile selon S.Jean*²³ (Paris 1938) Introduction; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in evangelium sec. Ioannem*² (Paris 1906) Prolegomena; M. Lepin, *L'origine du quatrième évangile* (Paris 1907); Rosadini, n.204-228; Gaechter, n.165-212; Simón-Dorado, *Novum Testamentum* I m.98ff.

307. Adversaries.¹ *In the middle of the 2nd century the ἄλογοι, heretics who denied the Word; since they were ashamed openly to contradict St. John, who clearly speaks about the Word in the fourth Gospel, they denied that those texts were written by John and attributed them to Cerinthus.*²

In the year 1792 Evanson thought that the author of the fourth Gospel was a neo-Platonic philosopher in the second century³; and a little later, in 1796, Eckermann wanted to attribute much of John not to the Apostle, but to others.⁴

In the year 1820 S. Bretschneider, although he did retract his opinion later, said that the author of the fourth Gospel seemed to be someone other than the Apostle John, whom the synoptics show.⁵

Frederic Strauss (1835) and Bruno Bauer (1840)⁶ in no way think that the Apostle John is the author of the fourth Gospel.

Christian Bauer (1844) said that the fourth Gospel appeared between the years ca. 160-170 in order to reconcile the tendencies of *Gnosticism* and *Montanism* by means of the doctrines on the incarnate Word and the Holy Spirit.

Keim⁷ and afterwards A. von Harnack⁸ wanted to attribute the fourth Gospel not to the Apostle John, but to the other *presbyter John*.

Others denying the genuineness of the author and the historicity are I.H. Holtzmann (1892), Thomas, Jülicher, Io. Réville....

A. Loisy⁹ and H. von Soden¹⁰ think that this gospel was written by a Hellenistic Jew immersed in Alexandrian philosophy. Likewise P. Gartner¹¹ and W. Bacon¹² seem to belong to the same tendency.

1. There is a brief overview of them in Rosadini, n.208-211, p.276-281.

2. St. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 2,51,3: MG 41,892.

3. *The Dissonance of Four Generally Received Evangelists* (London 1792).

4. *Theolog. Beiträge* 5 (Altona 1796).

5. *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolae Ioannis apostoli indole et origine* (Leipzig 1820).

6. *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Joannes* (Berlin 1840).

7. *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* (Zürich 1867).

8. *Die Chronologie...* 1,656ff.

9. *Le quatrième évangile* (Paris 1904; 2nd ed. 1922).

10. *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin 1905).

11. *The Ephesian Gospel* (New York 1915).

12. *The Older John* (New York 1916).

Among those *who reject as John's only part of the fourth Gospel*, the ones who can be named are H. Weisse, K. Weizsaecher, A. Sabatier, H. Wendt, Soltan, Briggs....¹³

308. The doctrine of the Church on the fourth Gospel is found in the year 1907 in the responses of the Biblical Commission on May 29 (D 3398-3400). And indeed the genuineness of the author *on the basis of the constant, universal, and solemn tradition of the Church coming down from the second century..., prescinding from theological proof, is demonstrated by strong historical proof* (D 3398); and *the internal reasons, which are taken from the text of the fourth Gospel, considered separately, from the testimony of the author and the manifest relation of the Gospel itself with the First Epistle of the apostle John, confirm that tradition*; the difficulties that are taken from a comparison of this Gospel with the other three can be reasonably solved (D 3399).

Theological note. The thesis is to be held *at least with internal religious assent*, based on the responses of the Biblical Commission. We say *at least*, because if the internal reasons, taken from an examination of the Gospel itself, not only confirm the thesis but also definitely prove it: then the thesis must be said to be contained either in the word of God itself or to be deduced from it; and therefore at a minimum it will be theologically certain.

309. It is proved firstly by extrinsic arguments, according to which the constant, universal and solemn tradition of the Church makes it certain.

In the 4th century St. Jerome admitted the Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel:

“The apostle John, whom Jesus loved very much, the son of Zebedee, brother of the apostle James, whom Herod beheaded after the passion of the Lord, *wrote his gospel as the last of all, having been asked to do it by the bishops of Asia*; it was directed against Cerinthus and other heretics and especially then against the surging teaching of the Ebionites, who said that Christ did not exist before Mary. Hence he was compelled to proclaim his divine nativity...”¹⁴

Elsewhere St. Jerome tells how the book was composed: “And Ecclesiastical History narrates, since he was compelled by the brothers to write, that he responded that he would do it, if by proclaiming a common fast all would pray to God; when that was completed, having received a revelation, he broke forth with the introduction that came

13. See Rosadini, n. 210.

14. *De viris illustribus* 9: ML 23,653f.

to him from heaven: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God...*¹⁵

And St. Augustine *solemnly* repeated the pristine tradition in his “*In Ioannis evangelium*” (ca. 416-417):

“In the four Gospels, or rather in the four books of the one Gospel, St. John the Apostle, not undeservedly in respect of his spiritual understanding compared to the eagle, has elevated his preaching higher and far more sublimely than the other three; and in this elevating of it he would have our hearts likewise lifted up. For the other three evangelists walked with the Lord on earth as with a man; concerning his divinity they have said but little; but this evangelist, as if he disdained to walk on earth, just as in the very opening of his discourse he thundered on us and soared... to reach Him through whom all things are made, saying: ‘In the beginning was the Word.’”¹⁶

And St. Epiphanius affirms the same thing, pointing out the special characteristics of the evangelists: “*Finally, John is the fourth*, putting the finishing touches on the sublime condition and nature of Christ, and so he is the interpreter of his eternal divinity.”¹⁷

But Eusebius of Caesarea recounts the universality of the tradition: “... *the writings of the same apostle [John], which we think are ascribed to him by the consensus of all. And first of all his gospel, which is well known by all the churches throughout the world, without any doubt has been accepted. But that rightly and with good reason it has been allotted by the elders the fourth place after the other three gospels, can be made clear in this way... Nevertheless, of all the disciples of the Lord only Matthew and John have left us their written memoirs of what happened...*”¹⁸

310. *In the 3rd century* the following was said by Tertullian: “Of the apostles, *John and Matthew first instill faith into us...*”¹⁹; and again: “The same authority of the apostolic churches will afford evidence to *the other Gospels also, which we possess equally through their means, and according to their usage –I mean the Gospels of John and Matthew...*”²⁰

And Origen did not fail to mention that John played his *priestly trumpet*²¹; and he extols the gospel of the same evangelist with not less

15. *Prolog. commentariorum in evangelium Mt.*: ML 26,19.

16. *In Ioannis evangelium* tr.36,1: R 1825.

17. *Adversus haereses* 2,69,23: MG 42,239f. See also *ibid.*, 2,51,19: MG 41,924.

18. *Hist. eccles.* 3,24: MG 20,263-266.

19. *Adversus Marcionem* 4,2: R 339.

20. *Adversus Marcionem* 4,5: R 341. And in *Adversus Praxeam* c.23 he said: “Concerning how these things were said, the evangelist and also close disciple John knew more than Praxeas, and therefore he knew the meaning of this: ‘Now before the feast of the Passover... (John 13:1)’”: ML 2,209.

21. *In Iesu Nave* homil.7,1: R 538.

solemnity and beauty than the others, saying:

“But I think, although there are four gospels as the elements of the faith of the Church, from which elements it is certain that this whole world has been reconciled to God by Christ..., that the first-fruits of the gospels is *the gospel given to us by John*... [Luke] reserved the greater and more perfect sermons of Jesus to the one who reclined on his breast. For none of them manifested his divinity so clearly as *John did*... Therefore, we may dare to say that the first-fruits of all the Scriptures are the gospels; *but that the first-fruits of the gospels is the gospel handed down to us by John*; no one can perceive its true meaning, except the one who reclined on the breast of Jesus, or received Mary from Jesus, who also was his mother...”²²

Clement of Alexandria agrees with Origen: “But John,²³ the last of all, when he saw in the gospels of the others that the things pertaining to the body of Christ were handed down, inspired by the divine Spirit *wrote a spiritual gospel at the request of his close associates*.”²⁴

311. *In the 2nd century* St. Irenaeus, having mentioned the other gospels, says: “Afterwards *also John*, a disciple of the Lord, who also reclined on his breast,²⁵ *did himself publish a gospel*, while he was living at Ephesus in Asia.”²⁶

And in another place: “*John a disciple of the Lord*, announcing this faith, *wished by the publication of his gospel* to refute the error, which had been sown among men by Cerinthus...”²⁷

What St. Jerome and others have handed down, we find also in the *Muratorian Fragment*, written almost at the same time as Irenaeus, as the fundamental and substantial truth of the fragment: that John, *a disciple and hearer and eyewitness of the Lord*, wrote the following:

“The fourth Gospel was written by *John, one of the disciples*. When exhorted by his fellow-disciples and bishops, he said, ‘Fast with me this day for three days; and what may be revealed to any of us, let us relate it to one another.’ The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John was to write all things in his own

22. *Praefatio Commentariorum in evangelium Ioannis* n.6: MG 14,29-32. See also Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6,25: MG 20,583.

23. And he means the *Apostle*, the only apostle whom Clement of Alexandria knew; and also according to the interpretation of Eusebius; see *Hist. eccles.* 3,23: MG 20,257f.

24. *Hypotyposes*, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6,14: R 439.

25. Therefore it cannot be anyone else but the Apostle.

26. *Adversus haereses* 3,1,1: R 208. See *ibid.*, 3,11,7: R 214. And regarding the origin of the tradition from Papias, see *Fragmentum 2, ex epist. ad Florinum* in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,20: R 264.

27. *Adversus haereses* 3,11,1: MG 7,880 AB.

name, and they were all to certify.²⁸ And therefore, though various ideas are taught in the several books of the Gospels, yet it makes no difference to the faith of believers, since by one sovereign Spirit all things are declared in all of them concerning the Nativity, the Passion, the Resurrection, the conversation with his disciples and his two comings, the first in lowliness and contempt, which has come to pass, the second glorious with royal power, which is to come. What marvel therefore if John so firmly sets forth each statement in his Epistles too, saying of himself, ‘What we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears and our hands have handled, these things we have written to you’? For so he declares himself not an eye-witness and a hearer only, but a writer of all the marvels of the Lord in order....²⁹

But if John is called “one of the disciples,” and Andrew is “one of the Apostles,” that does not deny that John was an Apostle, but it says that John was *among the disciples*, and really that particular disciple, as he was called, whom Jesus loved.

312. In the *Monarchian Prologue* to the fourth gospel (ca. 170) there are several things about its author, among which is this: “*He [the author of the fourth gospel] is the evangelist John, one of the disciples of God, who as a virgin was chosen by God, whom God called. In the gospel there is a twofold testimony of his virginity, because he is both said to have been loved by God more than others and going to his cross God entrusted his mother to him, so that a virgin might take care of a virgin. Finally, manifesting in the gospel that he was incorruptible and beginning with the work of the Word, he alone testifies that the Word was made flesh and that the light was not overcome by darkness....*”³⁰

313. Finally, St. Papias speaks about the same origin of the fourth gospel from John, the author of Revelation, whose disciple he was; that is, he was referring to the fourth gospel of the Apostle John. This testimony of Papias is read, indirectly, in a codex from the 10th century, which is now kept in Matriti:

“...the Apostle John, whom the Lord loved very much, was the last of all to write a gospel... Therefore this gospel, written after the book of Revelation, was made known and given to the churches in Asia by John while he was still living in this body, *just as Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, a disciple and dear friend of John, reported in his exoteric works, i.e., in his last five books*; he it was who wrote down this gospel while John was

28. This circumstance perhaps is taken from the apocryphal work, *Actis Ioannis*. Thus Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen 1880-90) 1,784.

29. Verses 9-34: EB 2; R 268.

30. P. Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien*: TU 15, p.6.

dictating it....”³¹

314. A summary of the comments. Therefore *a universal and solemn tradition* affirming that the fourth gospel has the Apostle John as its author is certain from what has been said above. And from these testimonies it is clear that what was said by *Irenaeus and the Muratorian Fragment*, composed about the same time, and the other statement of *Clement of Alexandria*, are independent of one another.

Also there is another testimony that seems to be independent, namely, that *from the heretic Ptolomaeus*, who attributes to the *Apostle* (John) some words from the fourth gospel (John 1:3).³²

315. Second proof from internal argument. a) *The author of the fourth gospel is the disciple whom Jesus loved... who also reclined on his breast at the last supper* (John 21:20); for, *this is the disciple who is bearing witness to these things, and who has written these things* (21:24).³³ And also³⁴ *he who saw it and has borne witness* (19:35) is *the disciple whom Jesus loved, standing near the cross* (19:26).

Now who is this disciple whom Jesus loved and reclined on his breast? It must be an *apostle*, because at the Supper of the Lord there were twelve apostles (Matt. 26:20; Mark 14:17; Luke 22:14), and no mention is made of other disciples.

However, among the favored apostles (Peter, James, John) Peter cannot be meant, because he who in John is called “the one whom Jesus loved and who reclined on his breast” is someone different from Peter in the narration of the Supper (John 13:23-25) and elsewhere.³⁵ And it cannot be James, since he died under Herod Agrippa I in the year 43 (Acts 12:2), and the fourth gospel had not yet been written. Therefore it remains that it was John.³⁶

31. Jo. Wordsworth-H.I. White, *Novum Testamentum D.N. Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi* (Oxford 1889-1895) 490.

32. “...with these words [John 1:3] *the Apostle* in no way refutes the wisdom of very deceitful men...”: in St. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 1,33,3f.: MG 41,557f.

33. These words, like the following *and we know that his testimony is true*, which are by John speaking in the plural of majesty, which is not unusual for him (1 John 1:14; 2:1-12; 3 John 12), but who also later speaks in the singular (21:25: I suppose): these words are not a quasi attestation of some church, *but they pertain absolutely to the gospel itself*. For a) they are found in all codices and versions; b) he would finish his gospel in an unsuitable way with the word, *If it is my will that he remain... what is that to you?*; c) the language and style are substantially the same also in the rest of the gospel; d) these words close not only ch. 21, but the whole gospel: for in this way the final hyperbole is better understood....

34. If someone still does not want to admit the preceding testimony from ch. 21, there is more proof in the previous note.

35. See John 20:2; 21:7 where he is again someone other than Peter.

36. It is certain that he was not killed with James, as some say lightly; for, if he had been, the author of Acts would have mentioned it. But John was living at the time of the Council of Jerusalem in the year 49-50 (see Gal. 2:9 and the tradition).

And this is confirmed by the fact that the author of the fourth gospel never names John with his own proper name, but always under the formula “the one whom Jesus loved.”³⁷

316. b) The author of this book, even prescinding from the testimonies given above, *must necessarily be an eyewitness of the many things he narrates, and at the same time in a special way be loved by the Lord.* For, the things narrated in the fourth gospel are narrated with such minuteness and accuracy in detail (then especially when “the disciple whom Jesus loved” is mentioned), that they necessarily point to a knowing eyewitness.

Thus in the narration of 1:35-40 concerning the conversation with Jesus: *Rabbi, where are you staying?*; note also the accurate chronology: *the next day... about the tenth hour*, in a matter that does not contribute anything to an explanation of his teaching.

Likewise in determining the time of the wedding at Cana: *on the third day (2:1)*, and in what he says about Jesus being *weary from his journey, that he sat down beside the well. It was about the sixth hour... and the disciples marveled that he was talking with a woman (4:6.27).*

Similarly in the cure of the man born blind (9:1-4); in the resurrection of Lazarus: *Jesus wept... there will be an odor*, etc. (11:4-45); in the washing of feet before the institution of the Eucharist (13:1-15, 22-30); in the understanding of Jesus: *whom do you seek?... they drew back and fell to the ground... (18:3-11)*; and at the cross *standing near... He who saw it has borne witness... (19:26-35).*

Thus also in ch. 20:2-10, Peter and the other disciple, the one whom Jesus loved, ran to the tomb *together, but the other disciple outran Peter...* After the resurrection in the catch of fish at the Sea of Tiberias *they were not able to haul it in, for the quantity of fish... the net was full of large fish, a hundred and fifty-three of them. And although there were so many, the net was not torn... (21:2-13).*

These details, which manifest a knowing eyewitness, remind us of what the author says at the beginning: and *we have seen* the glory of the incarnate Word (1:14); and this is fully in harmony with the beginning of First Letter of John, which is also attributed to the same author: “*That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands,*

37. Unless you should say that the name is so indicated, since the word “John” means “he whom Yahweh favors.”

concerning the word of life... we proclaim also to you” (1 John 1:1-3).

317. c) *The author of the gospel was a Jew.* First of all, because he often *cites the O.T. from the Hebrew text*, not from the version of the Septuagint, LXX (1:23; 6:45; 12:15.40; 13:18; 19:37); and he also *often alludes to the O.T.* (thus when dealing with the betrayal of Judas, 17:12; on the obstinacy of the Jews in not believing, 12:37f.; on the dividing of Jesus’ garments, 19:24; on the thirst of Jesus, 19:28; on the piercing of his side, 19:34f.).

Then because the author *knows very well the public festivities of the Jews*; and so he sets his chronology and accordingly places facts in their proper time: Passover (2:13 etc.); and the last big day of the festivity (7:37) with the ceremonies of the sprinkling of water to which he alludes (7:37f.); likewise it was the feast of the Dedication and winter (10:22-23); the day of Preparation (19:14.31.42).

He also knows the customs of the Jews: the expectation of the Messiah (1:19-51), which we also know from Flavius Josephus was present, and indeed of a Messiah who would remain forever (12:34); about ritual ablutions (2:6); that Jews do not have dealings with Samaritans (4:9); to hope for salvation from Judea, not from Galilee (7:41.52); to glory in Abraham, in Moses (8:33; 9:28)...

318. d) *The author was a Palestinian Jew, not a Hellenistic one.*

Often he locates Palestinian places very accurately: Bethany [Bethabra] beyond the Jordan (1:28); at Aenon near Salim, because there was much water there (3:23); Sychar, near the field that Jacob gave to his son Joseph (4:5). *Actually, sometimes he measures the distances:* when they rowed [on the Sea of Galilee] about twenty-five or thirty stadia (6:19); Bethany, about fifteen stadia from Jerusalem (11:18).

The author knows how to interpret Aramaic words: Messiah, which means Christ (1:41; see 4:25); Cephas, which means Peter (1:42); Thomas called the Twin (11:16; 20:24; 21:2); Rabboni, which means Teacher (20:16); *and he uses Aramaic words:* Amen, amen... (1:51; 3:5...); Bethzatha (5:2).

The style of the author does not abound in Greek words (there is less variety in him than in Mark); phrases are constructed in the simplest way, or they are juxtaposed (asyndeton) without conjunctions, or merely coordinated (parataxis) with the repetition of the particle καί (v.gr., in the prologue 1:1-18) like the “vav” of the Hebrews, and with a certain monotony either of words or sentences, especially in the long sermons.³⁸

e) *The author of the fourth gospel is an old man*, as the following

38. For more on this, see Gaechter, n.167-175; Lagrange, *Evangile selon S.Jean*, Introduction, c.2.

considerations will show.

319. On the time of composition or on the genuineness of the time.

1) *The fourth gospel is cited already at the beginning of the 2nd century.* Thus not only did Theophilus of Antioch in the year ca. 180 quote the words of the prologue (John 1:1)³⁹; and St. Justin in the year about 150 or 155 refer to the words from John 3:33⁴⁰ and in the year 155 from John 1:20.23,⁴¹ not to mention others that seem to be from John; but also St. Polycarp, a little after 107, seems to allude to John 6:44: *And I will raise him up at the last day*⁴²; and St. Ignatius of Antioch makes an allusion to John 3:8: the Spirit knows where it comes from and where it is going.⁴³ Also in the *Letter to Barnabas* (about 90-100) some words seem to allude to John 3:14.⁴⁴

The same hold also for *heretics* (in the first half of the 2nd century), like the *Gnostics*, Ptolomaeus a disciple of Valentine, Heracleon, Theodotus, Celsus, Basilides Valentine.⁴⁵

Therefore the conclusion is that John was composed at the end of the first century, so that it could thus be spread abroad and quoted....

320. 2) And this also should be added: in the year 1935 a *papyrus belonging to the beginning of the 2nd century was published*, that is, at the time of Hadrian (117-138) or even Trajan (98-117), in which there is a fragment of the Gospel of John (John 18:31-33, 37-38). The papyrus, written in Egypt, was part of a book; hence we know that John was commonly known at that time also in Egypt, and not just in Asia Minor.⁴⁶ This requires that the fourth gospel was written shortly before that: thus we really find ourselves at least as the end of the first century as the time of the composition of John.

3) *On the other hand* regarding the Gospel of John: a) from tradition it is certain that it was written after the other three gospels⁴⁷; and b) it was

39. *Ad Autolyicum* 2,22: R 182.

40. *Apologia* 1,61,4: MG 6,420.

41. *Dialog. cum Tryphone* 88: MG 688: R 139.

42. *Ad Philip.* 5,2: Funk 1,302.

43. *Ad Philip.* 7,1: R 58.

44. *Epist.* 12,5-7: Funk 1,76.

45. See Lagrange, Introduction, XLVif.; Rosadini, n.207.

46. For matter pertaining to this papyrus, see C.H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1935). See Gaechter, n.13.15.198B; Simón-Dorado, *Nov. Test.* I n.100,2. There is another papyrus [*Egerton*, 2] with fragment from John whose time is *before the middle of the 2nd century*.

47. *Above*, Clement of Alexandria, n.310.

published while John was living in Ephesus⁴⁸; c) but it seems that John did not come to Ephesus to live until after the martyrdom of Paul in the year 67, since before that Paul governed that Church through Timothy (1 Tim. 1:3); d) but his gospel was written against Cerinthus and his followers⁴⁹; e) Cerinthus came to Ephesus about the same time as John did, and he needed some time to spread his errors; f) but Papias, while he was researching the traditions of the elders (ca. 80-90), has nothing about the Gospel of John and at that time says nothing about it; this seems to imply that it had not yet been written. Therefore from all of this it seems to be clear that the Gospel of John was really written towards the end of the first century, that is, about the year 90; and this is confirmed by those things in John that suggest an author of mature age.⁵⁰

321. Objections.⁵¹ 1. With Keim and Harnack: the fourth gospel should not be attributed to the apostle John, *but to the presbyter John*, who is mentioned by Papias; hence the confusion and the later attribution to the apostle John.

Response. 1) We have already proved (n.271) that this presbyter John most probably is the same apostle John.

2) Papias in his quoted testimony says absolutely nothing about the author of the fourth gospel; hence there is nothing against the thesis from this testimony. Moreover, Irenaeus, Eusebius..., knowing the testimony of Papias, with one voice with the rest of tradition attribute the fourth gospel to the apostle John.

2. Irenaeus, when he was a *boy, while he was listening to Polycarp* (R 212) and therefore would not easily understand him, is the one who introduced the confusion of the presbyter John with the apostle John.

Response. 1) Again the gratuitous and probably false assumption appears, namely, that there were two Johns and not one.

2) *It is gratuitously asserted* that Irenaeus had only one source in Polycarp *and not several others*; or that he erred in receiving from Polycarp the tradition of this testimony, which was not difficult to understand.

Even if Irenaeus at that time was about 15 years old, since he was born at least by the year 140, and Polycarp suffered martyrdom in the year 155: Irenaeus could easily have committed to memory *that the apostle John wrote the fourth gospel*, especially since he appeals to the accuracy of his memory when he was young.⁵²

3. Irenaeus erred in other things, v.gr., by admitting fables about millenarism,⁵³ about the extended life of the Lord to 40 or 50 years,⁵⁴ about the death of Judas the be-

48. *Above*, Irenaeus, n.311.

49. *Above*, n.311, the testimony of St. Irenaeus; and n. 309 (St. Jerome).

50. For the development of these considerations, see Gaechter, n.200-203.

51. See Rosadini, n.220f.

52. See *Fragmentum 2 epist. ad Florinum*, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,20: R 264.

53. *Adversus haereses* 5,33,3f.: R 261.

54. *Adversus haereses* 2,22,5: MG 7,785.

trayer... Therefore he could err concerning the author of the fourth gospel.

Response. It is one thing to err in *transmitting* the name and author of a famous book, which is difficult and improbable in this case; it is something else to err in the *interpretation* of events, which is easy to do if the matter concerns such things as millenarism, or the allegories and symbols that are in Rev. 20:27; or if the gospel offers the occasion that someone should think that the Lord preached until he was 40 or 50 years old, as the Jews were saying: "You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?" (John 8:57); or if myths about the death of Judas were circulated....

4. The author of the fourth gospel seems not to be a Palestinian Jew, but rather an Alexandrian influenced by the Alexandrian and Philonian philosophy.

Response. Some words, like λόγος, ζωή, φώς... are common to John and Philo; but the philosophical concepts underlying them are completely different. The author of the fourth gospel wants to write against the errors disseminated by Cerinthus from Alexandria; therefore it is not surprising if some *words* are common with the Alexandrian philosophy, etc.

5. The Syrian martyrology places the martyrdom of the apostle John with the apostle James.

Response. But this martyrology is from the 4th-5th century, and the tradition coming from Irenaeus is without doubt much stronger.⁵⁵

Other gratuitous objections, raised by the adversaries and easy to solve, you will find in *Rosadini*.⁵⁶

55. Rosadini, n.224.

56. N.220f.224.

ARTICLE III

ON THE INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

Thesis 21. The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles have come down to us integral and incorrupt, at least substantially.

Cornely-Merk, diss.2 c.2 § 5: De N.T. graeci auctoritate; Hoepfl-Gut, Introductio, § 45: De textus graeci N.T. integritate et auctoritate; Rosadini, n.84-87; Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ l.3 c.2 n.54.

322. Definition of terms. A book is said to be *integral* if it is preserved exactly as it was composed by the author. It is usually said to be *incorrupt* inasmuch as it excludes changes and interpolations introduced by others.

If the agreement with the original text of the author is had completely in everything, even in the smallest things, then the *integrity* is said to be *total and absolute*. But if the agreement is had with some discrepancies in words and in some minor details, then the *integrity* is said to be *substantial or relative*.

323. State of the question. We are saying explicitly that the Gospels and Acts have substantial integrity or incorruption; we can also extend that to the whole New Testament, since the arguments are valid also for the other books. But we do not exclude some accidental integrity or incorruption, which is often found in the New Testament

324. Adversaries. In general, those who should be mentioned, among more recent authors, are the *modernists*, according to whom “until the time the canon was defined and constituted, the Gospels were increased by additions and corrections. Therefore there remained in them only a faint and uncertain trace of the doctrine of Christ” (D 3415).

Therefore they say that the sacred books and especially the first three Gospels “have been gradually formed by additions to a primitive brief narration—by interpolations of theological or allegorical interpretation, by transitions, by joining different passages together. This means, briefly, that in the Sacred Books we must admit a *vtial evolution*, springing from and corresponding with evolution of faith....”¹

325. In particular, those are opposed who have attacked or are attacking definite passages of the gospels as not pertaining to the primitive gospels. They are Matt. 1-2 (the childhood of Jesus); Matt. 14:33 (confession of

1. Encyclical “*Pascendi*”; EB 278 [271].

the divinity of Christ by the disciples); Matt. 16:17-19 (promise of the primacy); Matt. 28:19 (the Trinitarian formula). – Likewise Mark 16:9-20 (the conclusion of the gospel). – And Luke 1:11-52 (the infancy of Jesus); Luke 1:46 (attribution of the “Magnificat” to Mary); 22:43-44 (the bloody sweat and agony of the Lord). – In John 5:3-4 (about the angel coming and moving the water at Bethzatha); 7:53—8:11 (the adulteress); 21 (the last chapter, on conferring the primacy).²

Of these disputed passages, there can be serious doubt only about a few of them, namely, John 7:53-8:11 (on the adulteress); Luke 22:43f. (on the bloody sweat); John 5:3f. (on the angel moving the water); Mark 16:9-20. But even in these cases the authenticity is vindicated by Catholics.³

326. Doctrine of the Church. *Besides the condemnation of the modernists, which was given above (D 3415; EB 271), the Church defends the integrity of the gospels regarding the things disputed. A fortiori, therefore, she defends the others about which there is no doubt.*

Thus there are the *responses of the Biblical Commission* (1911): that the Greek text of Matt. is identical with the Aramaic Matt. (D 3565) and the opinions concerning the disputed passages of Matt. mentioned above are devoid of any solid foundation (D 3567).

Likewise there are the responses of the same Biblical Commission (1912) about admitting the authenticity of the last verses of Mark (D 3569); and concerning the narrations of Luke of the infancy of Christ and his bloody sweat (D 3570); and concerning the attribution of the canticle *Magnificat* to the Bl. Virgin Mary (D 3571).

In the Encyclical “*Spiritus Paraclitus*” Benedict XV expressly defended the integrity of the gospels:

“What can we say of men who in expounding the very Gospels so whittle away the human trust we should repose in it as to overturn divine faith in it? They refuse to allow that the things which Christ said or did have come down to us unchanged and entire through witnesses who carefully committed to writing what they themselves had seen or heard. They maintain—and particularly in their treatment of the *Fourth Gospel*—that much is due of course to the Evangelists—who, however, added much from their own imaginations; but much, too, is due to narratives compiled by the faithful at other periods, the result, of course, being that the twin streams now flowing in the same channel

2. Regarding the arguments raised by the adversaries, often gratuitous and aprioristic, see v.gr. Rosadini, where he explains the incorruption of each one of the gospels, ed. 1938, n.128-130.149, 168-170, 229-231.

3. Later and more appropriately, *when the occasion presents itself*, we will vindicate also the authenticity of those passages, which will be necessary or helpful in order to substantiate our proofs. See v.gr. n.554, note 24.

cannot be distinguished from one another” (EB 462 [475]).

Furthermore, *in its decree on the authentic version of the Vulgate* by the Council of Trent, “which has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries” (D 1506), an implicit declaration is contained of its at least substantial conformity with the original text. The same point is found in the similar decree of Vatican Council I (D 3006).

327. Theological note. *It is a doctrine of faith that there is at least substantial conformity* with the original text; this is from the definition of Trent (D 1506) and Vatican I (D 3006) concerning the authenticity of the Vulgate. Likewise the definition applies to the passages disputed at the time and to those parts of the sacred books at least that are more important, since we must receive these books “in their entirety, with all their parts, as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate editions” (D 1504; see D 3006).

328. First proof. *From the substantial agreement of the codices and from the accurate custody of “that which has been handed down.”*

A. a) The actual Gospels and Acts agree (in their substantials) with the codices of the 7th century (v.gr., Codex Amiatinus), of the 6th century (v.gr., Codex F of Fulda), of the 5th century (v.gr., A of Alexandria, C of Ephraem palimpsest), and of the 4th century (B Vatican, S Sinaiticus).

b) They also agree *with the texts quoted by the Fathers* in the 4th and 3rd centuries; actually these texts, if they were all gathered together, would almost form our gospels.

c) They also agree *with the versions* called “bohairica” (5th century), the Syrian (2nd century); with the old Italian and African (in the first half of the 2nd century, which Tertullian and St. Cyprian used).

d) These versions agree with one another. Therefore also already at the beginning of the 2nd century the manuscripts agree with one another, from which the versions in the different regions were made.

e) Moreover, the quotations made by the Fathers in the 2nd and 1st centuries, and the Diatessaron of Tatian, plus the quotations made by some heretics... agree with our gospels.

f) Therefore our Gospels and Acts agree substantially with the Gospels and Acts *as they existed at the beginning of the 2nd century*; and they presuppose manuscripts that are either original or almost contemporary with the authors; certainly these manuscripts were made not long after they were originally composed.

But in this brief period of time and in this brief transition from the

original writing there was no corruption of the gospels. For:

B. The gospels a) were preserved with the greatest reverence and b) they were very well known by the pastors and faithful; and c) other non-sacred writings were preserved integral with the greatest diligence; and d) the Christians were very much opposed to adulterated books⁴; and e) they zealously appealed to tradition, and they had a holy rule of protecting the tradition “neither adding to it nor removing anything from it.”⁵

Therefore our Gospels and Acts agree substantially with the Gospels and Acts as they were written by the Apostles and apostolic men (Luke, Mark).

329. Second proof. *From an examination of the various readings.*⁶

The proof can be made for the whole New Testament; a fortiori then it will be valid for the Gospels and Acts.

The variant readings from so many codices and lectionaries mentioned above (n.223) are thought to be about 250,000⁷; the words of the N.T are thought to be about 150,000. But still it must not be said that a corrupt text has come down to us. For:

1) The variations, for the most part, do not touch the substance and the meaning of the text, but only small accidental things: as, for example, the order of words, words that are synonyms, recognizable corrections of the scribes, or purely grammatical changes, but not changes of the genuine meaning.

2) Variations often concern the same words or phrases, so that from eight parts of the text seven parts are recorded uniformly by all and are beyond any doubt.

3) Variations that touch on the meaning are about 200, but there are

4. St. Spyridon, a bishop in Cyprus, publicly rebuked the man who had dared to change the word κράββατον to the more elegant σκίμμοδα (see what Sozomenos says in *Hist. eccles.* 1,11: MG 67,889.

Christians were good at choosing the genuine and rejecting the apocryphal. Thus *Tertullian* narrates the rejection of the *Acts of Paul*; thus *Serapion*, relying primarily on doctrinal and dogmatic reasons, wrote from Antioch to Cilicia that they should put away the gospel of Peter as not being genuine.

Apocrypha, a display of words, with exaggeration and not with apostolic simplicity, and also divergence from the original sources were all rejected; and in this rejection the Christians manifested the critical sense of the Church. The rule for accepting writings was the apostolic tradition, and that is what they followed.

5. “Do not abandon the commands of the Lord; but protect what you have accepted, neither adding to it nor detracting from it” (*Didache* 4,13: R 2). See the words of *Irenaeus* in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,22: MG 20,483f.

6. See Vaccari, *Institut. biblicae* 1^o 1.3 c.2 n.54. T. Ayuso argues in a similar way, *El gran problema de la crítica textual y los Evangelios*: Arbor 1 (1944) 165-183.

7. Others say about 150,000.

only 15 of great importance.⁸

4) But these variations are not of such a nature that they introduce a new doctrinal truth which is not found anywhere else; nor do they cancel out any other truth.

5) With critical skill in many places we can recover the genuine reading; there are very few doubtful readings; and they concern things that are not fundamental.

6) Places where some doubt remains can be said⁹ to be 1/60 of the whole text... But with critical skill it is possible to hope that even these places can be made fewer, since even from different principles editors of the N.T arrive at almost the same text.

7) Therefore no book of classical antiquity can show as much certitude of the text as the Gospels and Acts, and the whole New Testament, show beyond all doubt. "For all other books, both profane and ecclesiastical, have been handed down in a few codices which are recent, with no ancient versions (with a few exceptions), with hardly any quotes from ancient authors."¹⁰

Hence we have the original text, not only substantially incorrupt, but also with the greatest part (morally all) that is also accidentally certain.

330. Third proof. The main texts, about which there could be serious doubt as to whether they are genuine and authentic or not, were cited above (n.325: Mark 16:9-20; Luke 22:43-44; John 5:3-4; 7:53—8:11). But there is no one who does not see that these texts are not so many or of such importance that they weaken the substantial integrity of the Gospels. In fact, the real authenticity even of these passages is demonstrated.

331. Objections. 1. If we have only relative certitude, but not absolute, we cannot then argue with certitude by relying on one word.

Response. 1) In other historical profane and religious books, whose authenticity and incorruption is much less clearly proved (as for the Gospels and Acts they are demonstrated irrefutably), arguments are often made from them, even by relying on individual words, because their authenticity is supposed and *is in possession*, unless a contrary doubt *positively* is shown.

2) If some word of the N.T. really remains doubtful, even after a critical examination of the text, then certainly it is not licit to insist on that word as if it were certain.

3) Arguments that are made in Apologetics often do not rely so much on one word

8. Vaccari, *Institut. biblicae* 1^o 1.3 c.2 n.54, in a note, reviews the main following ones (besides Mark. 16:9-20; Luke 22:43f.; John 7:53—8:11): Mark 1:1 (son of God); Luke 22:19f. (the order of the action at the Last Supper); John 5:3f. (about the angel descending on the pool); Acts 16:17 (± Jesus); Rom. 5:14 (± μῆ); 1 Cor. 15:51 (about the dying and rising); 1 Tim. 3:16 (θεός, ός, ό).

9. Westcott-Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, Introduction, 2.

10. Vaccari, *loc.cit.*, n.54.

as they do on a complete idea expressed with many words; also arguments are put together from a series of texts or quotes from different parts of Holy Scripture; hence the possibility of error because someone *perhaps* relies on some doubtful words is very much lessened, and it is morally certain that it is not present.

4) If we suppose, after the proofs of the infallible magisterium of the Church (below in another treatise), the dogmatic decree *on the authenticity of the Vulgate as has been proved by its centuries-long use in the Church*, it will be possible to use the Vulgate in dogmatic Theology for matters of faith and morals, and no one rightly will be able to reject it (see regarding this authenticity, known in a dogmatic way, the treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.148-165).

2. *The history of the Vulgate shows much corruption in the codices of the sacred books. Thus St. Jerome said:* “For if faith is to be put in the Latin examples, they come down to this: there are almost as many examples as there are codices...”¹¹; and a little later he said: “If indeed this great error was present in our codices, it was because in the same matter one evangelist said more than another because the others thought less of it. Or while another expressed the same idea differently, someone who read one of the four first thought that he should change the others to agree with his version. Hence it came about that among us everything is mixed up, and in Mark more than in Luke and Matthew, and so things proper to one are found in the others.”¹²

Response. In addition to the fact that St. Jerome uses *some emphasis*, that corruption he is talking about and which we find in the history of the Vulgate (n.228), was not, at least in general, a *substantial* corruption; and it did not pertain to the Greek codices, which St. Jerome valued very highly, and which he used; “Why do we not correct the text—he said—by going back to the original Greek, those things which have been removed by bad interpreters, or badly changed by ignorant, presumptuous persons, or have been added by sleepy copyists?”¹³

3. According to Origen *Celsus the heretic accused Christians:* “Afterwards, from among the faithful, he says that there are those who, like those whom drunkenness causes to inflict injury on themselves, first of all change the context of the gospel three, four or several times, and they pervert things so they can have a way to remove what they object to.”¹⁴ Therefore Christians do not accurately preserve the sacred text.

For our response, let us hear the next words of Origen: “Indeed I did not know any others, who changed the context of the Gospel, but the followers of Marcion, of Valentine, and perhaps also of Lucan. But this is not to be imputed to our teaching: *the guilty ones are those who dare to corrupt the gospels.* For, just as in philosophy you apply yourself badly, if you accept the false opinions proposed by the Sophists, the Epicureans, the peripatetics or others: so, because some of the gospels are corrupt, and they have introduced new opinions foreign to the teaching of Jesus, it is not necessary immediately to accuse true Christianity of a crime.”¹⁵ Hence from the context it is appar-

11. Praefatio in quattuor evangeliiis, Damaso Papae: ML 29,558.

12. *Ibid.*: ML 29,560.

13. *Ibid.*: ML 29,559.

14. *Contra Celsum* 2,27: MG 20,387-390.

15. *Ibid.*

ent how that accusation of corrupting the gospels *does not pertain to true Christians, but to heretics*, whom Celsus (a pagan) does not distinguish from the true faithful.

4. St. Dionysius, a bishop, wrote to the Corinthians: "I wrote letters at the request of the brothers. But certain ministers of the devil sowed weeds in them by deleting some things from them and by adding things. That deadly sentence certainly applies to them: Woe to you! *Therefore it must not seem to be surprising, if some have dared to falsify the most sacred writings of the Lord, since they have been caught trying to do the same thing to much less important writings.*¹⁶ Therefore the gospels were not preserved with careful diligence.

Response. These words and other that could be cited¹⁷ *pertain either to heretics who distorted the writings to their own way of thinking or to the corruption of some particular text*; in no way can it be proved that the Church accepted damaged sacred writings, and in fact the exact opposite is proved completely, and the careful vigilance of the pastors is demonstrated.

16. In Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 4,23: MG 20,387-390.

17. In Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,28: MG 20,515-518.

ARTICLE IV

ON THE HISTORICITY OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

Thesis 22. The synoptic gospels rightly claim for themselves complete historical faith.

Rosadini, n.191-203; Gaechter, n.164; E. Mangelot, *Les Evangiles synoptiques* (Paris 1911).

332. First of all we are treating the historicity of the synoptics, and then that of John; this is both because of the similarity that exists between the three synoptic gospels (Matt., Mark, Luke), and because of the dissimilarity that obviously is present between the synoptics and John. There is the added problem that the Gospel of John has some special opponents.

333. State of the question. Historicity is that property of books whereby historical faith is due to them. Therefore this faith should be attributed to them, if

- 1) the writing pertains to *a strictly and properly historical* genus.

Therefore we are not dealing with poetry or mere allegories, or with legends and romantic novels, nor with merely didactic writings; but we are dealing *with history in the strictest sense* (and not with "historical novels").

However, a strictly and properly historical genus can easily be joined to a doctrinal or apologetic purpose, that is, in order to teach some doctrine or to defend some truth.

- 2) Historical credence must be given to writings, *if there is certainty a) about the knowledge and b) about the veracity of the authors.* For then human testimony is apt to generate certitude.

334. Adversaries. In addition to those we mentioned above in n.248ff. and who, in general, have doubts about the gospels, the more recent adversaries to the historicity of the Matthew, Mark and Luke will be singled out in the following doctrine of the Church.

335. Doctrine of the Church. *In general*, regarding the gospels, we have the *following condemned propositions of the modernists*: The evangelical parables were artificially arranged by the evangelists themselves and the Christians of the second and third generation (D 3413); in many narrations the evangelists recorded, no so much things that are true as things that, even though false, they judged to be more profitable for their readers (D

3414). See D 3415 about additions and corrections, with which they said the gospels had been increased.

In particular about the synoptic gospels: regarding the historicity of Matt., the Biblical Commission defended it (June 19, 1911) declaring that *from the fact that the purpose of the author is principally dogmatic and apologetic, demonstrating to the Jews that Jesus is the Messiah foretold by the prophets... it is not permitted to conclude that these are not to be accepted as true;* and it cannot be affirmed that the accounts of the deeds and words of Christ have been subjected to changes and adaptations under the influence of the prophecies of the O.T. and the more developed status of the Church (D 3566).

With regard to Mark and Luke, according to the same Commission (June 26, 1912) the opinion cannot prudently be called in to doubt which holds that *Mark wrote according to the preaching of Peter and Luke according to the preaching of Paul and that at the same time these evangelists also had at their disposal other trustworthy sources, either oral or already written* (D 3575); and *they have a just claim to the full historical credence that the Church has ever given them,* and it does not matter that the writers were not eyewitnesses, or because in both evangelists a lack of order and discrepancy in the succession of events is not infrequently found, or because they came and wrote later... (D 3576).

336. Theological note. The historicity of the gospels is not only critically most certain, but it is also *divine and Catholic faith*, since the historical character of the gospels is easily found in the written word of God, and through tradition we have received that character. But the Church proposes the historical character of the gospels as handed down and included in revelation, at least according to her ordinary magisterium and her daily praxis.

337. Proof. The synoptic gospels have a just claim to full historical credence. 1) *if they pertain to the strictly and properly historical, literary genus;* 2) *if there is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the authors.*

But they do. Therefore....

Proof of the minor. 1) *The synoptic gospels pertain to the strictly and properly historical, literary genus.*

a) In these gospels it is easy to make a distinction between what has an allegorical quality, like the parables, and *what has a poetic quality*, like the canticles (Benedictus, Magnificat, Nunc dimittis), and *the narrations about the life and deeds of the Lord.* For, the latter are presented in these gospels

in the style normally found in narrations and in accounts of historical facts. Therefore by the same token the historical worth of any book considered as such could be denied or called into doubt, so that thus complete historical skepticism would be the rule.

b) *But the manner of narration* in these gospels is of such a nature that sobriety is apparent, even in the explanation of sublime facts, and also the authors' objectivity, frankness and simplicity...; senseless myths or ridiculous exaggerations and fantasies are not found in them, as is immediately apparent to anyone reading, for example, certain legends or apocryphal gospels, which certainly pertain to the genus of popular literature that is not strictly historical. These apocryphal writings, which appeared towards the middle of the 2nd century, tend to verify the rule concerning the myths about great men that grow after their death.

c) The objective and strictly historical character of the gospels is so manifest that *the ancients fully understood them as historical accounts*, both Catholics (like Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenaeus... although inclined to find allegories), and enemies (like Celsus, Porphyry...), who then argued from the gospels, v.gr., by supposing that the narrated miracles actually took place (see n.474); indeed some of the more recent enemies of the Church do not reject the total historicity of these gospels.

338. 2) *There is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the authors.* A) *There is certainty about their knowledge.* a) For they were *immediate witnesses or having contact and familiarity with other witnesses of the first order* (Bl. Virgin Mary, the Apostles, disciples). Thus Matthew and also Peter were witnesses of the things they preached. Or the authors of the gospels received a large number of things from immediate witnesses and genuine sources, *with great effort* and the possibility of finding the truth; this was so because of their eagerness and because it had to do with something very important. Mark *carefully wrote down* what Peter preached (R 95); Luke expressly says that *he followed all things closely ἀκριβῶς* (1:3), which he received from Paul and from others, *as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word* (1:2).

b) These authors did not write *at a time very far removed from the events*, but a short time after them: Matthew about the year 45, Mark between 53-58, and Luke between 58-62. Therefore these gospels were written between the years 45 and 62.

c) The things that these authors wrote down were *simple to narrate and easy to remember*; hence they could be handed on easily. So the sayings

could be easily preserved by oral and written tradition because of their form, such as maxims and parables; this is especially the case with men of the East, where this oral tradition was very common, and was also aided by written sources.

d) The tendency of the oral tradition, to which these authors belonged, was *to preserve and to repeat what they had heard*.

e) The minor differences between these authors, not at all irreconcilable with one another, prove on the one hand that the gospels were not composed from a pre-established will of deceiving (if they had been, they would fully agree with each other); and on the other hand it shows that the evangelists observed great fidelity in their narration.

339. B) *There is certainty about the veracity of the authors.* a) Fraud was impossible *internally*. No one lies gratuitously; and the authors of the gospels could not have any motive for lying: they spurned riches, the pleasures of life, honors; they could expect absolutely no advantage from their fraud, except persecution and death with ignominy. If they had intended to obtain temporal advantages from their desire of glorifying Christ, they would have chosen various deceits and another way of portraying the image of Christ; that is, they would have described the Messiah and his kingdom and doctrine in the way the crowds and the leaders of the people were expecting them to be.

If the authors of the gospels had written down such fictions and similar falsehoods, they would have committed a very grave crime against God and religion, by using blasphemous deception and they would be very evil men. However, such crimes in them must be totally excluded, for the purity of their morality is apparent from their teaching, and what is more, from their life and from their death.

340. b) Fraud was impossible *externally*: because it could easily be known, and they could easily have been contradicted for their falsehood by other contemporary witnesses and by those still living. Consider the case of Matthew writing to his contemporary Jews shortly after the events. Thus both the enemies of the new religion and those who sincerely loved Christ could easily have refuted any false statements found in the gospel, namely, those who had seen the contrary as immediate witnesses, or had heard the contrary from eyewitnesses. Moreover, Matthew agrees in many things with Mark and Luke.

In fact, *friends or enemies would have rejected it*, if the gospels had narrated falsehoods, both because of hatred of the new religion limiting

them and their natural tendencies, and because of the love of the truth in others who had a strong religious sense. But it is certain that there was no such rejection according to the historical record of the things narrated (at most concerning the supernatural interpretation of the facts!); on the contrary, there is certainty about *recognition and veneration* which these gospels obtained from the first Christians, so much so that they are quoted in the earliest writings (Didache, Letter to Barnabas, St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp...). And even *the heretics themselves* (Cerinthus, Valentinus, Marcion...) did not consider them to be false, but in general accepted them, although they did mutilate some things because of the subjective opinion that they did not agree with their own theories.

341. c) *An internal examination* of these gospels shows the veracity of the authors. For, they write in an objective manner, not inserting their own ideas and impressions about the recorded facts; they write *frankly, without any oratorical flourish*, even when they are narrating sublime and great things (there you will not find oriental images, v.gr., in the account of the Incarnation!); and they do not write *about themselves*, in order to build themselves up; but if at times they must say something about themselves or about their companions, it is done *candidly*, not to promote themselves but to put themselves down: frankly and openly admitting their stupidity, cowardice and ambition.

What the synoptics narrate *agrees completely not only with the geography, but also with the affairs of the time which we know from profane history*; thus, v.gr., Luke 2:1f. about the universal census taken under Quirinius about the year 8 before Christ¹; on the authorities in Palestine and Judea (Matt. 2:1ff.19.22; 14:3-12; 26:57; 27:2f.; Luke 1:5; 3:1; 23:7f.)²; likewise about the factions and the political and religious and social sects (Pharisees, Sadducees, Scribes...); likewise about the customs and morals of the Jews.³ And here recall everything we said above in developing the internal arguments for the genuineness of the gospels.

These gospels briefly, but accurately and consistently describe *the character of the persons*; especially in portraying the image of Christ. In this case all harmoniously present him as a perfect human exemplar; but at the same time as an exemplar raised above the messianic ideas of the time, an admirable exemplar of perfection that is natural and attractive... so much so that the only sufficient reason for the description of this figure is

1. See M.J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Luc*² (Paris 1921) at this place, c.2.

2. See Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates* 17,1ff.; *Bellum iudaicum* 2,9ff.; Tacitus, *Annal.* 6,1ff.

3. See on this matter H. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* vol.1-4 (Munich 1922-1928).

the objective and historical reality of his person and of the things narrated about him; for false images eventually are recognized and disappear.⁴

Likewise *the very sublime doctrine*, which is found so harmoniously in the synoptics, cannot be the fruit of the thinking of unrefined fishermen, but comes from objective preaching.

342. Objections. 1. The synoptic gospels tended to foster the worship of Jesus as Lord and Messiah. Therefore they do not contain strict history.

I distinguish the antecedent. They tended to foster such worship *with strict and historical truth* of the things narrated, *conceded*; with myths and legends, *denied*. For such worship would not be fostered by errors and irrational enthusiasm by those who were ready to suffer martyrdom for this cause.

2. Love blindly transfigures everything that pertains to the person loved. Therefore also the love of the Christians for Jesus.

I distinguish the antecedent. Love of the world, *I bypass the antecedent*; a love *strong to the point of death, and under the eyes of enemies*, that is, of witnesses also who could attack the things narrated, *denied*.

3. Legends and myths often are attributed to great men after their death. Therefore also something similar happened in the gospels concerning Jesus.

I distinguish the consequent. Something similar happens *in the apocryphal gospels*, which tend to support this rule, *conceded*; "in the four gospels handed down to us," which are greater than every exception, *from what has been demonstrated, and from the efforts of Christians to conserve not fables, but what was absolutely authentic, denied*.

4. These gospels pertain to the genus of legend, and not to critical history.

Response. They do not pertain to that kind of *critical history, as it is often written today*, with a large apparatus of notes and citations, we readily concede; they do not pertain to true and *objective and strict history*, we deny based on our proofs. Luke indeed openly states that he is acting *ἀκριβῶς (diligently)*; and that the gospels do not belong to the legends of the saints, etc., is evident from the fact that legends of this kind are anonymous and do not have, like the gospels, known authors and witnesses of the facts, and writing at a certain time.

5. Historical writings should be demonstrated with all the more weight as authentic according as they narrate more serious things (miracles, supernatural events). But the gospels narrate very serious things... and the authenticity of the gospels is not demonstrated with much proof. Therefore the gospels have not been demonstrated as authentic.

I bypass the major and deny the second part of the minor. The authenticity of the gospels is demonstrated *very firmly and seriously*, in a way that is truly proportionate to the gravity of the things narrated. Moreover, it is not necessary that there be a proportion between the thing narrated and the argument whereby its existence is demonstrated, provided that the argument is sufficient and something impossible is not being narrated.

6. But the miracles narrated in the gospels are impossible. Therefore....

4. See L. Hertling, S.J., *Das literarische Porträt in den Evangelien als Echtheitskriterium*: ZkathTh 52 (1928) 40-52.

I distinguish the antecedent. And this is being said falsely and *a priori, conceded*; this is being said scientifically and truly, *denied*. Finally, this reason is *a priori* (!) and prejudicial, not at all scientific, and it is given as the reason why the gospels are rejected by the adversaries.

7. Oral transmission corrupts the narration of facts and sayings.

I distinguish the antecedent. This easily happens in a long series of transmissions, *conceded*; it always happens *necessarily*, especially *if the witnesses are immediate* or receive the data from immediate witnesses, *denied*. Matt. proceeds as an immediate witness; Mark from Peter by Mark himself; Luke by a diligent investigation into the things that they saw from the beginning or from those who were ministers of the word. Also consult the other arguments whereby such corruption is substantially excluded.

8. *It is impossible for us now to possess exactly the words of the Lord:* a) For Jesus spoke Aramaic and we have the Greek version through translators; b) it was impossible that the disciples both understood accurately and faithfully committed to memory the long sermons of Jesus.

Response to a) We are not saying that the Greek words were spoken by the Lord, but the *ideas* (!), which were translated from Aramaic, the translators of Matthew were able to record well (see D 3565); and Mark and Luke did the same thing from the preaching of Peter and Paul, or also sometimes from written documents.

To b) The sayings of Jesus *were not hard to understand*, because they were well adapted to the Semitic mentality: for they were in short sentences, rhythmic, vivid, antithetic, paradoxes, repetitions...; and they were about lofty doctrines concerning charity, concerning mercy... But if at times they were not understood by the Apostles, it is certain that they asked the Lord to explain them (see Mark4:10ff.; 7:17ff.; etc.). – And it was not difficult for Semites to commit these ideas and phrases to memory, since this was precisely the custom and way of retaining things that the disciples learned from the Rabbis. See n. 350f.

9. It was the custom of historians (like Thucidides, Tacitus, Titus Livius...) to insert rhetorical speeches into their histories, as if they were actually said by the leaders, etc.... Therefore the evangelists also adopted this custom with regard to the words of Jesus.

Response. There is such a custom *in the classical erudite history*, but from that custom falsity is not to be deduced concerning what is said; for, the authors strove to truly narrate the truth as best they could in an objective manner based on documents, etc. But in the gospels such rhetorical erudition and artistry is not apparent, but rather a simple sincerity and objective simplicity; and there is also *a marvelous harmony between the evangelists* from the desire of preserving completely the very *sentences* of the Lord, and frequently the words themselves.

343. Against the historicity of Matt. 10. Why does Matthew not say, “I saw, I was present”... but always narrates in the third person?

Response. Not infrequently the ancients wrote in an impersonal manner about things they did, or at which they were present (v.gr., Caesar in his Commentaries). Also in Matt. there is the matter of the humility of the author; or also because he as the author was already known to his readers; or because he was not present at all the events.

11. A vivid coloring of time, places, persons in Matt. is lacking that would make everything concrete; rather, he speaks in a vague way: *at that time* (11:25...), *then* (9:14...), *on the mountain* (5:1)... Hence he was not an eyewitness.

Response. If Matt. had intended to write a narrative work *that is merely entertaining*, perhaps he would have added more color (if he had the ability and talent for the, since everyone acts according to his ability); but if he intended to write a historical-apologetic or historical-dogmatic work, then that color was not really required. Thus Matt. with this monotony is imitating the art and style of the Rabbis in the area of literary composition.

12. An eyewitness does not easily err in following the chronological order in the narration of events as happens in Matt.

I distinguish the antecedent. That happens in Matt. often, *denied*; sometimes because of his doctrinal and expositive purpose, pre-established for him, and because then he did not intend primarily to present the sequence of events, *conceded*. See the Response of the Biblical Commission, D 3566).

13. Matt. has Greek words identical with Mark and many other similarities with him. Therefore he depends on Mark and is not an eyewitness.

I deny the consequence: or Mark depends on Matt., or both depend on a common source.

14. How can the conformity of the Greek version of Matt. with the original Aramaic be established? For, even Papias seems to have indicated that each one interpreted Matt. as he was able (R 95).

Response. That conformity is certain because “the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, and even the Church herself, from her beginning, have used only the Greek text of the Gospel known under the name of Matthew as canonical, not even excepting those who have explicitly testified that Matthew, the apostle, wrote in his native language” (Response of the Biblical Commission, D 3565).

344. Against the historicity of Luke. 15. Luke fails and really does not give “an orderly account” as he had promised (1:3). Therefore he does not preserve historicity.

I distinguish the antecedent. He does not give “an orderly account,” καθ'εξής, whether logical or chronological, taking the word in a broad sense, as the word itself signifies, *denied*; he does not speak in precise chronological order, *I subdistinguish:* sometimes, *conceded*; generally, *denied*.

16. Luke fails in narrating the circumstances of time, place, and regarding the important sermons of the Lord (which are in the fourth gospel), and which doubtless he would have known and written down, if he had really consulted the immediate witnesses.

Response. He would have known them and written them down, if he had spent a long time with these witnesses, *I bypass this*; he would have known them and written them down, if he had obviously interacted with them, and if it were very important to him to know and narrate the substance of these facts or sayings, *denied*.

345. Scholium. The Synoptic Question

L. Méchineau, *I vangeli di S.Marco, di S. Luca e la Questione sinottica* (Rome 1913); L. Murillo, *El problema sinoptico*: EstEcl 7 (1928) 42-59, 412-449; 8 (1929) 173-192; Gaechter, n. 146-163; Rosadini, n. 172-190; J.M. Bover, *Bernabé ¿clave de la solución del problema sinóptico?*: EstBibl 3 (1944) 55-77; Cornely-Merk, diss. 7 c.5; A.G. da Fonseca, *Quaestio synoptica*³ (Rome 1952); C.B. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew* (Cambridge 1951); A. Wikenhauser, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg 1953) § 26; L. Vaganay, *Le problème synoptique* (Paris-Tournai 1954); J. Levie, S.J., *L'évangile araméen de S.Matthieu est-il la source de l'évangile de S.Marc?*: NouvRevTh 76 (1954) 689-715, 812-843.

The synoptic gospels are Matt., Mark and Luke, which because of their similar narration really offer the same kind of synopsis (σύνοψις), or the same *overview* of the deeds and words of the Lord.¹

The problems arising from that and the proposed solutions, which touch upon the origin of the similitude and at the same time the dissimilitude, are called *the synoptic question*.

The importance of this question, both for apologetics and for exegesis, lies in the fact that from the study of this question the sources of the gospels are known, whether oral or manuscripts or sources independent of one another; and hence not only the genuineness and the historicity of the gospels are confirmed, but also all those things are confirmed which we know from tradition and from the internal examination of each gospel.

346. Doctrine of the Church. According to the Responses of the Biblical Commission, given on June 26, 1912, in solving the synoptic question the other statutes of the Commission must be observed that were previously (1911) published (see D 3561-3575), especially those concerning the authenticity and integrity of the three gospels—Matt., Mark and Luke; likewise concerning the substantial identity of the Greek gospel of Matt. with its primitive original; and also concerning the order of time in which the same gospels were written. *But it is permitted for exegetes, in order to explain the similarities and dissimilarities of the gospels between them and in view of so many varying and opposing opinions of authors, to debate freely and to appeal to hypotheses of oral or written tradition or even to the dependence of one on the one or both that precede* (D 3577).

But if some, unsupported by any testimony of tradition or by any historical evidence, readily endorse the so-called “two-source” hypothesis, which strives to explain the composition of the Greek Gospel of Matthew

1. *Synopses* of this kind are offered, v.gr., by F.X. Patritius, *Evangelium Διατεσσαράων seu Quattuor evangeliorum contextus* (Freiburg Br. 1852); A. Brâssac, *Nova evangeliorum synopsis*² (Paris 1922); A. Huck, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (Tübingen 1922); Io. Prado, *Synopsis evangelica* (Madrیتی 1943); S. Stefini, *Synopsis evangeliorum et vaticinia de Christo* (Marietti 1954); J. Leal, *Sinopsis concordada de los cuatro evangelios* (Madrid 1954).

and the Gospel of Luke mainly by their dependence on the Gospel of Mark and on the so-called collection of "Sayings of the Lord": *they are considered not to have sufficiently observed what has been laid down and therefore they cannot freely advocate it* (D 3578).

347. Attempts to solve the problem. A) *The system of mutual dependence.* a) Some explain the synoptic question by affirming a mutual dependence of the evangelists, as in antiquity St. Augustine² and Grotius³ did; and according to almost all Catholics the dependence is had in the order in which we said above that the gospels were composed: Matt., Mark, Luke.

Thus St. Augustine says: "And although the individuals [evangelists] seem to have followed their own order of narrating, still each one of them is not thought to have wanted to write as being ignorant of the one preceding him, or to have omitted as unknown what the other is found to have written; but just as each one was inspired, he added the useful cooperation of his work...."⁴

b) Some authors, defending this system, prefer this order: Matt., Luke, Mark.

c) But other more recent authors, almost all non-Catholics who defend this system, place Mark first, then Matt., and finally Luke.

But on the contrary there is this: this system, regarding b) and c), does not agree with tradition about the order in which the gospels were written (above, *passim*); nor with that which holds that Mark contains the preaching of Peter, while Luke contains the preaching of Paul.

This system is based only on a supposed internal examination. But from an internal examination something else is also apparent: because *if the evangelists depend on their predecessors, where do they get what is proper to themselves?*

348. B) The system of dependence on written documents. Some try to explain the matter by the hypothesis either of some pristine document written in Aramaic (Lessing in 1778); or of two Hebrew documents (A. Resch in 1898), although with diverse redactions in order to explain the differences between the gospels; or finally, they think that the individual synoptic gospels coalesced out of several pristine fragments and documents.

However, in this way the literary unity and style of each author, which

2. *De consensu evangelistarum* 1,2,4: ML 34,1044.

3. *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* (Halle 1879) on the title of Matt.

4. *De consensu evangelistarum* 1,2,4: ML 34,1044.

is perceived in each gospel, *is certainly not explained; and this theory does not agree with the tradition* according to which Matt., Mark and Luke each composed his own gospel.

349. C) *The hypothesis of "two-sources."* The hypothesis of the "two sources" (*Zweiquellenhypothese*) has become more well known. It claims to find two sources of the synoptics: *The first source* is a collection of the sayings of the Lord, τὰ λόγια (S = source; or Q = Quelle [German]), about which Papias speaks (above n. 268); *the second source* is the Gospel of Mark, which Papias also mentions (above n. 267). And see n. 257.

And they develop their system in this way: Since the way of narrating of Mark is more popular and primitive, his language is more plain and his style abounds in Semitisms, it is necessary—they say—that the Gospel of Mark is older than the others.

There is also this: Mark hardly has anything proper (68 verses), but almost all his material is contained in Matt. and Luke. These gospels, Matt. and Luke, also omit things in Mark that could cause scandal, for example, "he [Jesus] looked around at them *with anger*" (Mark 3:5). Moreover, Mark does not stress the divinity of Jesus very much.⁵

On the other hand, since in Matt. and Luke there are many common sermons of the Lord, which are not found in Mark, it is necessary that there be another common source, but different from Mark: therefore this other source is a "collection of the sayings of the Lord."

But on the contrary there is the following: This theory, as is evident,

a) Does not agree with the well founded tradition which establishes another order in the composition of the gospels, namely, Matt, Mark, Luke.

b) Also it does not agree with the tradition, equally well founded, that the words of Papias, τὰ λόγια, refer to the whole Gospel of Matthew.

c) And by a mere recourse to a common source for the gospels of Matt. and Luke the significant differences between Matt. and Luke are not explained, since Luke has much that is proper to himself (especially chapters 10-18), and he places some of the other common things in his own special order.

d) If Mark is the common source, then the theory does not explain why Matt. and Luke omitted those verses that are proper to Mark, and would be useful for Matt. and Luke. Hence the adversaries are forced to postulate several redactions of Mark and Q.

5. Thus in Mark the brothers of Jesus [οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ] say that he is beside himself (3:21); his fellow citizens at Nazareth are scandalized at him (6:3); he could not perform miracles among them, except he did cure a few sick people (6:5); Jesus rejects the title of good Teacher (10:18); he does not know the day of the last judgment (13:32); being on the cross he is abandoned by God (15:34).

350. D) *The system of oral tradition.* Some authors defend the so-called *system of oral tradition*,⁶ by which they explain the similarities between the synoptics *from the oral transmission of the primitive apostolic catechesis*. This consisted mainly in the narration of the life of the Lord (see Acts 1:21ff.; 2:22ff.; 10:37ff.; Luke 1:1...)⁷; and it also consisted in narrating the deeds and sayings of the Lord, *especially those in Galilee*, which as taking place before the people, but not in the presence of the leaders of the Jews and the Pharisees, were more adapted to the believers among the common people....

From this repetition the order and the words were committed to memory, and because of the psychological attraction they were fixed permanently in the mind.

But from this adaptation, whether to the Palestinian Jews or to the Roman Gentiles or to the Jewish and Gentile Christians, the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke took their origin.

However, by *mere* oral tradition there does not seem to be an explanation why the gospels agree in some minute things and differ in the *Our Father*, in the Beatitudes, in the institution of the Eucharist... which should have been transmitted with greater care; moreover, why Luke presents such beautiful and new things, which are omitted by the others. Therefore it seems that this theory must be completed by recourse to written documents, whether Aramaic or Greek, which were available to the evangelists, *or existed beforehand*; this is what Luke seems to imply, namely, that he consulted written sources.

351. Recently P. Gaechter defended this system. "For certain differences of the forms can be explained from the literary skill of the evangelists, but many things cannot be reduced to the human intellect selecting one form in preference to another. *For the synoptic Gospels contain innumerable vestiges of a certain faculty, which depends on the sound of the words, on the accent of the speaker, on number and rhythm, and which cannot be anything other than memory (sensitive or mechanical).*"⁸

The written sources surely explain the similarity of order and disposition of the material; but those sources were for the most part not immediate (for thus the dissimilitude of the forms in the gospels would not be explained, since they would have, on this supposition, the same immediate sources); but *they were mediated written sources, which*

6. See Cornely-Merk, diss.7 § 32, p.703ff.

7. See also R 264, where there is a fragment of St. Irenaeus from his *Letter to Florinus*, explaining the preaching of the Apostles.

8. *Summa introductionis in N.T.* n.153, p.122f. M. Jousse, S.J., wrote a great deal about linguistic psychology, *Etudes de psychologie linguistique. Le style rythmique et mnémotechnique chez les Verbo-moteurs*: ArchPh 2 (1924) 435-675. Against exaggerations in this matter with regard to the gospels, Félix Puzo, S.J., wrote *El ritmo oral en la exégesis evangélica*: EstBibl 6 (1947) 133-186.

were transmitted by an oral tradition.

And this is not surprising: For “there are among contemporary Brahmins, who can repeat from memory 420,000 words of the Rig-Veda poem—and the whole N.T. contains about 132,000 words—. In fact the whole India literature, which contains a mass of many volumes, handed on by memory, can be assembled by the Brahmins (Veda) and by the priests and those who play on and sing to the cithara (Purana and Sutra)...⁹

352. E) A more probable hypothesis. The following hypothesis can be admitted from among those that are more probable and in harmony with tradition:

The primitive catechesis of the Apostles Matthew and Peter are found respectively in the gospels of Matthew and Mark. This catechesis consisted mainly in a narration of the life of Jesus and the sayings of the Lord, especially what he said to the crowds in his Galilean ministry. This catechesis could have *a common written source*, mediated especially (Aramaic Matthew?¹⁰) and orally handed down.

Afterwards Luke knew this source, in addition to other written sources. *Therefore Luke, besides some written sources, received this source handed down orally*; for, it is hard to understand how Luke could have used Mark, since Mark composed his gospel far away from Luke.

This source orally handed down or this oral tradition, which originated about the year 40, could easily be preserved for some decades... so that the gospels certainly were written before the year 70.

9. P. Gaechter, *Summa introductionis* n.157, p.127, who cites for this matter M. Vinternitz, *A History of Indian Literature* I (Calcutta 1927) 34.

10. P.J.M. Bover thinks that Barnabas is the probable author of the Greek version of Matt.: *Bernabé ¿clave de la solución del problema sinóptico?*: *EstBibl* 3 (1944) 55-77.

Thesis 23. The book of the Acts of the Apostles deserves historical credence.

Cornely-Merk, diss.7 c.6 § 37-38; E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1926) Introduction ch.13; Gaechter, n.134-136.

353. The adversaries are the *exaggerating and aprioristic critics*, who reject the book because it contains miracles, or they claim to find a contradiction in it with things known and narrated elsewhere.

Some attack definite parts of Acts in a special way, like E. Norden who rejects the sermon of Paul in Athens (Acts 17:22-31) as not being genuine; others reject the letters (Acts 15:23-29; 23:25-30).

354. Doctrine of the Church. According to the teaching of the Church *it must be held for certain that Luke had in hand absolutely trustworthy sources and that he used them accurately, properly, and faithfully, so that complete historical authority may be claimed for him* (D 3585); nor are some difficulties that are commonly alleged (discourses, miracles) of such a nature as to render doubtful or at least in some way as to diminish the historical authority of the Acts (D 3586).

Theological note. It seems that what we said above about the historicity of the synoptic gospels can be applied also to this thesis, and to the book of Acts; therefore this thesis seems also to be a matter of *divine and Catholic faith* (see n. 336).

355. Proof. By admitting the historicity of the Gospel of Luke and that this same Luke, a physician, is the author of the book of Acts, the strict historicity of this book is proved without difficulty:

1) *For the book of Acts pertains to the strictly and properly historical kind of writing*, as is per se obvious to the reader;

2) *There is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the author*: not only as in Luke's Gospel, but a fortiori, since the author is an immediate witness of many of the things he narrates.

The author of Acts *knows very well geographical matters*, places, etc. which he mentions; likewise *historical persons* (v.gr., Caiaphas: 4:6; Gamaliel: 5:34ff.; Sergius Paulus: 13:7...); and their *chronology* and the circumstances of the time (although for the first part, Acts 1—12, they are not so abundant and concrete as in the second part of the book, where he reports on events at which he was present); likewise he knows *the social customs* of the region (v.gr., about the Sadducees and the Pharisees: 5:17; 23:6-9;

about Gamaliel: 5:34-36...). But in all of these things and in others he is in full accord with what we know from profane historical accounts.

Therefore "if we consider at once the frequent and easy relations that Luke undoubtedly had with the first and principal founders of the Church of Palestine as well as with Paul, apostle of the Gentiles, to whom he was an assistant in his proclamation of the gospel and companion in his journeys; (Luke's) customary industry and diligence in examining witnesses and in seeing things for himself; and finally the evident and most remarkable agreement of the Acts with the epistles of Paul himself and with the more genuine historical records" (D 3585), then there is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the author.

356. Objections.¹ 1. The book of Acts contains 18 orations or speeches as in profane historians like Thucydides or Titus Livius, as a way of enhancing the book. Therefore in these discourses the book of Acts is not a strictly historical book.

Response. Not because of this fact is there a similitude with profane books, and therefore in Acts these discourses are written down and reported in a false manner. Moreover there are those who think that the discourses in Thucydides are not fabricated by the author. Also, the longer discourses of the first part of Acts (v.gr., Peter, Stephen) are not like the Greek rhetorical works of art.

2. Acts 15:7 where Peter says: *God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe...*, does not agree with Gal. 2:8 where Paul says: *for he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles...*

Response. Paul does not deny that Peter knew about the election of the Gentiles to enter the Church, which election Peter also preached; but Paul wants to say that a special mission to the Gentiles was given to him.

3. According to Gal. 2:6 at the Council of Jerusalem nothing was imposed on the Gentiles concerning the observance of the Law of Moses; that is opposed to Acts 15:28-29.

Response. The precepts imposed at the Council do not concern the substance of the Law of Moses (circumcision, etc.), which is recognized as unnecessary; but they concern certain particulars in the order of discipline in order to promote sociability between Jewish-Christians and Gentile-Christians.

4. Acts contains miracles. Therefore it is not a strictly historical book.

Response. Such reasoning is an aprioristic prejudice and in no way proceeds in a scientific way.

1. See D 3586; Gaechter, n.136.

Thesis 24. The fourth Gospel enjoys complete historicity.

M.J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean*¹ (Paris 1927) Introduction c.2-3; M. Lepin, *L'origine du quatrième évangile* (Paris 1910); Rosadini, n.232-243; Gaechter, n.165ff.; Cornely-Merk, diss.8 c.1 § 7; Simón-Dorado, *Novum Testamentum I* n.123-130; Hoepfl-Metzinger, *Introductio in N.T.*, n.271-303.

357. Adversaries.¹ 1) Some authors deny completely the historicity of John and say that this gospel contains only the views of the author and fictions composed by him in order to promote his own theological ideas. Thus Baur (1867), Strauss (1874), Réville (1890), Jülicher (1906), H.J. Holzmann (1908), Harnack (1902), Loisy....

2) Other concede that *some small part* whether in John's narrations or in his discourses is historical; but they do not concede complete historicity.

3) Certain Catholics attributed *to the discourses of the Lord in John not a strict historical value*, but they considered them to be interpretations and amplifications of the author. Thus Calmes, Batiffol....

358. Doctrine of the Church. According to the *Responses of the Biblical Commission* published on May 29, 1907, the facts related in the fourth gospel are in no way either totally or partially invented so that they are allegories or doctrinal symbols; nor can it be said that the words of the Lord in this gospel are not properly and truly the words of the Lord himself, but theological compositions of the author (D 3400).

Likewise the Church in the decree *Lamentabili* (July 3, 1907) condemned some similar propositions opposed to the strict historical worth of this gospel: That the narrations of John are not properly history but a mystical contemplation of the Gospel (D 3416); that the fourth Gospel exaggerated miracles (D 3417); that John claims for himself the quality of witness concerning Christ. In reality, however, he is only a distinguished witness of the Christian life, or of the life of Christ in the Church at the close of the first century (D 3418).

The Encyclical "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (September 15, 1920) also deals with those who attack the historical truth of the gospels, *especially in what pertains to the fourth gospel*:

"...For what our Lord Jesus Christ said, and what He did they are of the opinion did not come down to us entire and unchanged, although they are witnesses of all those who wrote down religiously what they themselves had seen and heard; but that—*especially with reference to the fourth Gospel*—part came down from the evangelists who themselves planned and added much, and part was brought together from the account of the

1. See Rosadini, n.233.

faithful of another age. And for this reason waters flowing from two sources today are contained in one and the same channel so that they cannot be distinguished from one another" (EB 462 [475]; D 2188 [34th ed.]).

Theological note. *Divine and Catholic faith*; see what we said above about the dogmatic value of the historicity of the synoptics (n. 336).

359. Proof. The fourth Gospel enjoys complete historicity, 1) if it pertains to the strictly historical literary genus; 2) if there is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the author. But that is the case. Therefore....

Proof of the minor. 1) *It pertains to the strictly historical literary genus.*

The narrations of the fourth gospel are not narrations of parables or fantasies, or pure allegories; they are strictly historical narrations, which at times and simultaneously can also have a symbolism and very well contribute to the doctrinal purpose intended by the author.

a) First of all, *the author appeals to his own testimony as a hearer and eyewitness*, which indicates that he intends to write a strictly historical narrative. For otherwise it would be superfluous for him to invoke his own testimony, and the constant and repeated appeal would not make sense: *He who saw it has borne witness... (19:35); This is the disciple who is bearing witness to these things, and who has written these things; and we know that his testimony is true (21:24)*. Similar words are found in the prologue to 1 John, by the same author, as is well known from tradition.

b) The strictly historical character of the narrations is apparent *from the accurate determination of the time, place, and circumstances of persons...* which are associated with the things narrated or said; and everything agrees with the topography, geology, chronology... But in order to prove this it suffices to read John, v.gr., ch. 1 (after the prologue) about the baptism of John and the first call of the disciples; ch. 2, about the wedding at Cana of Galilee; ch. 4, about the Samaritan woman; ch. 6, about the multiplication of the loaves; ch. 9, about the cure of the man born blind; ch. 11, about the raising to life of Lazarus....

And consult what we said above in n. 316, and which proves that John was *an actually present eyewitness*.

c) But the passages that at times are referred to in the narrative as parables are *sufficiently recognizable as such*, as for example about the good shepherd (10:1-15), about the vine and the branches (15:1-6).

d) None of the ancients, who have testified above concerning John as the author, including the heretics, has doubted the strictly historical nature of John's Gospel.

360. 2) There is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of the author.

A) *There is certainty about his knowledge.* For he was an *immediate witness*, and also from his way of narrating one can see that he was an *actual eyewitness* of the many things he narrates (above n. 316).

And no one of his contemporaries or of those in the early period afterwards accused the author of ignorance; actually, this gospel, like the others, not much later was quoted and used.

B) *There is certainty about his veracity.* a) John *expressly professes his veracity* (19:35; 21:24) and his intention of motivating readers to believe (20:31): *that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;* hence his *religious intention* is evident.

But if the author had lied, he would have committed a great crime—of fraud in religion and of blasphemy against the honor of God.

b) An author proceeding in this way could expect nothing for himself but imprisonment and death...; hence he would be more miserable than all other men....

c) John, like the other Apostles, by his way of acting and martyrdom, *is proved to be sincere.*

d) Also consult what applies here concerning the *internal examination* of the Gospel, according to what was said about the synoptics in n. 341.

361. Objections. 1. The things narrated about Jesus in John are so *different from the account of the synoptics that*, if we grant historical worth to John, then historicity must be denied to the synoptics.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Johannine narration about Jesus differs from that of the synoptics *in its substantials, denied; in its accidentals, I subdistinguish: because of the difference in the person narrating and in the intended purpose, conceded;* so that he contradicts the synoptics, *denied.*

John wants to supply what is lacking in the synoptics; he wants to emphasize the divinity of Jesus, not in an obscure way, but so that he makes clear Jesus' eternal generation; he wants to teach and confirm more and more the Christians already educated in the faith; he wants to contradict the heretics of the time... Hence he presents both a longer version of the discourses of the Lord in Jerusalem before the Jews and the Apostles and some of the miracles performed there. And because of this the differences can be explained which, not at all irreconcilable, are sometimes proposed, as will be made clear in the following objections.

2. The Jesus of the synoptics is popular and a popular orator, having human affections; *but in John he is a theologian who avoids contact with sinners* (Loisy).

Response. Jesus is portrayed also in John as human and he mingles with the crowds. Read all the narrations of John and you will see how also in John he mingles with the people and has human affections: *And making a whip of cords, he drove them all out of the temple...* (John 2:15-18); he avoids the dangers coming from the Pharisees and leaders (4:1-4; 7:1; etc.); he proclaimed in the temple (7:28.37); he loves his friends *Martha and her sister and Lazarus* (11:5), the disciple John (passim); Jesus wept (11:35ff.).

But in the synoptics his divinity is also explained (see n. 434-443). Moreover, a certain difference in the narration between John and the synoptics is sufficiently explained by what was said above.

3. In the synoptics Jesus professes his messiahship at the end of his public life (Matt. 16:16; Mark 14:62); *but in John he does it at the beginning*, before his disciples (ch. 1) and before the Samaritan woman (ch. 4).

Response. Also in the synoptics the manifestation of his messiahship appears not only in the infancy of Jesus (Matt. 1—2; Luke 1—2), but also at the beginning of his public life, when they narrate the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus, who appeals to the fulfillment of the prophecies of Isaiah (Matt. 11:2-6 referring to Isa. 35:5f.) and in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-21 referring to Isa. 61:1f.).

4. *The miracles in John are more brilliant than the miracles in the synoptics:* the conversion of water into wine (ch. 2), the cure of the man born blind (ch. 9), the raising of Lazarus (ch. 11). Therefore John shows a tendency that is not historical, but merely one to prove the divinity of Christ.

I distinguish the antecedent. The miracles in John are narrated very accurately and, if you wish, with a singular dramatic flair, which reveals an eyewitness, *conceded*; these miracles in themselves are more potent than the miracles in the synoptics, *denied*. For absolutely the same power is required to convert water into wine as to multiply loaves, which the synoptics report just like John; the same power is needed to bring a dead person back to life (Matt. 9:23-25; Mark 5:22-43; Luke 8:41-56) and the youth who is being carried to his grave (Luke 7:11-17), as to raise a man dead for four days (John 11:39); the same power to cure a paralytic of 38 years (John 5:6) as to cure a woman crippled and bent over for 18 years (Luke 13:11ff.); and no less power is required to catch 153 large fish (John 21:11) than to fill two boats with a miraculous catch of fish so that they almost sank (Luke 5:7); etc.

5. *John abounds in symbolism:* v.gr., the Samaritans (enemies of the Jews) believe in Jesus (ch. 40); the multiplication of bread before the Eucharistic discourse (ch. 60); the cure of the man born blind (ch. 9); the Gentiles want to see Jesus (ch. 12:21); washing the feet of the disciples... so that Jesus says: *I have given you an example...* (13:1-15); Judas exits from the Upper Room... *and it was night* (13:30); Mary under the cross (19:25-27); blood and water flowed from the side of Jesus (19:34); they looked on him whom they had pierced (19:37). Therefore the Gospel of John is not strictly historical.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Gospel of John abounds in such symbolism whose foundation is completely historical, *conceded*; whose foundation is merely invented, *denied*. Certainly it pertains to the full nature of a symbol that it have a real foundation,

v.gr., the cursed fig tree.²

6. *John does not finish some of his narrations*, v.gr., in ch. 1 what happened afterwards to John the Baptist; in ch. 3 what Nicodemus did after his conversation with Jesus; in ch. 12:23 what happened to the Gentiles who wanted to see Jesus; in ch. 21 what happened to Peter and the disciple who followed the Lord... Therefore John did not intend to write something historical.

Response. It was not necessary for him to say everything, but to pay attention to those things that pertain to his intended substantial purpose, which in John is both historical and doctrinal—"that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."³

7. John does not narrate some of the greatest miracles of Jesus, like the raising of the daughter of Jairus and of the son of the widow at Naim, and the transfiguration... which would contribute very much to his purpose of extolling the divinity of Jesus. Therefore in this his non-historical tendency is apparent.

Response. This is said *gratuitously*. He did not *have to* narrate those things, just as both Matt. and Mark say nothing, and they were not obliged to say something, about the raising of the son of the widow at Naim; and John could assume that these things were known, and it is especially apparent that he wanted to narrate the ministry of Jesus in Judea rather than in Galilee.

8. The *tendency* of a narration in John is evident in the fact that the miracles reported by him do not tend to help men, but to prove the messiahship and divinity of Jesus.

Response. Also in John Jesus is presented as performing miracles to help men, and this can be seen by reviewing each of the miracles.

9. The ministry of Jesus in Judea, about which John writes, contradicts the synoptics, who only place the ministry of Jesus in Galilee for a year and *afterwards* he goes up to Jerusalem at the end of his life.

Response. The ministry of Jesus in Judea in no way contradicts the synoptics, but the latter suppose only two Passover feasts (Matt. 12:1-8 when the disciples want ears of corn and eat them; likewise Mark 6:39 when they sit down on green grass, compared with John 6:4 dealing with the multiplication of the loaves: *now the Passover was at hand*); besides the third Passover during the Passion... And in these things the chronological sequence is certainly observed by the synoptics.

Moreover, many other things in the synoptics are not easy to explain, unless Jesus' ministry in Judea is supposed (v.gr., Luke 10:38-42; Matt. 21:8; 23:37ff...).

10. Other difficulties are proposed concerning the reconciliation of John with the account of the synoptics: *on the day of the supper in Bethany* (John 12:1 compared with Matt. 26:2.6 and Mark 14:1.3); *on the day of the month of Nisan on which the paschal supper was celebrated* (John 13:1 compared with Matt. 26:17; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7);

2. On symbolism, see A. Durand, *Evangile selon S. Jean*²³ (1938) p. XLII-XLVII. In John, of the seven narrated miracles, there are four (the wedding at Cana, the cure of the centurion's son, the paralytic at the pool, walking on water) in which nothing is said about their symbolic meaning; the others are so minutely described that an undistracted mind cannot doubt about the reality of the historical fact. But there is nothing hindering, as we say, but that at the same time they take on a symbolic character.

3. On this intention of the author *to teach* while at the same time he narrates *historical events*, see v.gr. Gaechter, n.185.

likewise on the hour of the death of the Lord (John 19:14 compared with Mark 15:25).

Response. These difficulties in no way pertain to the substance of the matter; also, they are not insoluble, and in the exegesis of the texts they find a fitting solution.

11. Words put in the mouth of Jesus by the synoptics and John, when they present him as speaking, do not always agree. Therefore historical credence cannot be put in these words.

I distinguish the antecedent. These words do not agree *in substantial matters, denied*; in accidental matters, *I subdistinguish*: so that *they contradict each other, denied*: so that *they mutually complement each other, conceded*. But two people who narrate something can say that someone said the same thing, but they report the same thing in different words, and especially in indirect discourse they may omit something or recount only a part of what was said. And note that Semitic authors were not accustomed to use indirect discourse and usually speak in direct discourse by introducing others speaking directly.

12. In the discourses of Jesus in John the colorful language proper to the synoptics when they report the words of Jesus is not found. Thus in John you will not find: a) *parables both delightful and abundant* as in the synoptics, while in John there is an abundance of abstract ideas (judgment, life, charity...) rather than concrete images; b) in John there is *a rhythm of speaking*, as if he were imitating the parallelism of Hebrew poetry⁴ in imitation of the didactic books of the O.T. and of the rabbinic authors; c) *the words of the discourses of Jesus are not the same* as those in the synoptics; also in John there is *a certain repetition and monotony of ideas* (v.gr., on charity at the Last Supper) together with *solemnity in speaking*: *Thus the discourses of Jesus in John are more theological meditations of the author than they are the very words of Jesus*.

Response to a) Although in John the colorful language proper to the synoptics is not found, the differences are such that they can be explained *because of the diversity of authors and of the intended purpose, conceded*; there is a contradiction with the synoptics or the discourses are not strictly historical, *denied*. The synoptics want to extol the ministry of Jesus in Galilee among the people; but John emphasizes the ministry of Jesus in Judea among the leaders.

To b) *The rhythm of the discourses in John in an outstanding way confirms the Semitic nature of the author*. And the "Johannine" rhythm and way of speaking are not lacking in the synoptics, as is shown in Matt. 11:25-27 (Luke 10:21-22); see n. 437f.

To c) *In the discourses in John Jesus speaks with almost the same words as he does in the synoptics*; since, on the other hand, the narrations in John abound in other words, which are not found in the synoptics, and therefore they are attributed to John the author. *Therefore the discourses in John, in which the Semitic quality is apparent, are readily assumed to have been spoken by Jesus and transmitted by Christian tradition*.

Furthermore, when John speaks, as in the prologue, he expresses ideas about the divinity of Jesus with even clearer words than Jesus himself proposes and hints at with a more indirect way of speaking (v.gr., John 5:17-32), as happens in the synoptics; hence also the hearers say: *How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell*

4. In Gaechter, n.175, you find some articles quoted about this point.

us plainly (John 10:24). But this indicates that the author John has preserved the original form of the words of Jesus, rather than that he has used his own ideas in reporting them.⁵

Thus in the discourses of Jesus some words do not appear which are proper to the evangelist, such as λόγος, μονογενής, πιστεύειν εἰς τό ὄνομα, ποιῆν τήν ἀλήθειαν, or others that are read in 1 John, which are suited to express the ideas of Jesus, such as ἀντίχριστος, ἀγγελία, ἐπαγγελία, ἐρχεσθαι ἐν σαρκί, ἰλασμός.⁶

To d) But the repetition and, if you wish, sometimes a certain monotony of ideas and solemnity, which are present in John, certainly are not opposed to the strict historicity of the sentences; and, especially when John speaks, he makes a good case for the advanced age and great authority of the author, who was so accustomed to speak in that way; for it has been noted how old men love to repeat themselves and to reduce everything to a few, abstract ideas; and, while preserving the historicity of Jesus' discourses, this corresponds to the genius of John.

In this way John could propose and proclaim the ideas of the Lord, while often preserving the very same words of the Lord (see what we said to c), with the rhythm that seemed to be both for him and for his hearers more suitable.⁷

5. See Gaechter, n.192.

6. See Cornely-Merk¹⁰ (1929) diss8 c.1 § 8 n.2, p.761; Gaechter, n.192, p. 160.

7. In Gaechter, n.194, p.163f., you will find a summary of the different proposals of authors to explain this point. See also concerning the discourses of the Lord the opinion briefly proposed by Simón-Dorado, *Novum Testamentum* I n.128f.

B O O K I I I

ON PROVING THE FACT OF DIVINE REVELATION
OR
ON JESUS THE DIVINE LEGATE

362. Connection of the treatise and division of the book. After our consideration of the historical sources, from which our proofs are to be derived, now we can prove the historical fact itself of the divine revelation made by Jesus Christ. But if you look at what is most important and more general, these are the main points to be presented in this book:

1) The historical existence of Jesus of Nazareth will be demonstrated with certainty from the sources (chapter I).

2) It will be proved that Jesus bore witness to the fact that he is the divine Legate who teaches us truths from God (chapter II).

3) It will be demonstrated that this divine Legation has been proved by both primary and secondary criteria (chapter III).

Thus Jesus will appear as *the faithful witness* (Rev. 1:5) of the truths which he heard from the Father (John 15:15); thus we will be able to say to Him: *We know [scientifically] that you are a teacher come from God* (John 3:2).

C H A P T E R I

On the historical existence of Jesus the Nazarene

363. Although this question is most evident and is plainly conceded by the enemies of the Church,¹ still it is necessary to treat it, both because of the required erudition, and because of the adversaries who have recently denied it.

Thesis 25. **The historical existence of Jesus the Nazarene, which is irrefutably certain from the gospels and from the fact of the Christian religion (I), is proved also from the letters of Saint Paul (II) and from profane authors (III).**

1. Thus, among others, the following authors whom F.M. Braun, O.P., cites, *Où en est le problème de Jésus* 209f. in a note: A. Bauer, C. Clemen, A. Jülicher, E. Klostermann, H. v. Soden, J. Veiss, A. Jeremias, H. Vindisch, Th. Reinach, Ch. Guignebert, M. Goguel, A. Loisy, L. Salvatorelli. The following words of Loisy himself are reported by the same P. Braun: "Libre aux mythologues d'opposer au témoignage substantiel des premières générations chrétiennes l'hypothèse d'un mythe qui, vers le fin du règne de Tibère se serait mis tout seul et tout à coup à conquérir les esprits crédules: libre à eux d'entasser par-dessus cette première hypothèse mille autres conjectures pour écarter le sens naturel des textes qui ne la favorisent pas. Leur méthode n'est pas la nôtre" (A. Loisy, *De la méthode en histoire des religions* in *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse* 8 [1922] 37).

F.M. Braun, O.P., *Où en est le problème de Jésus* (Brussels-Paris 1932) 159-211 (*La lutte autour de l'existence de Jésus*); Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.538-574; L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus dans l'histoire et dans le mystère* (Paris 1925); I.CI. Fillion, *Les étapes du rationalisme dans ses attaques contre les Evangiles et la vie de Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1911) c.8; H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., *Jésus et l'Histoire*, Confer. De Notre-Dame de Paris (1929) confer.2-4; M. Lepin, *Le Christ Jésus* (Paris 1929) 11-135.

364. The adversaries, or evolution in the denial of the existence of Jesus. This denial took place in the last years of the 18th century and had Voltaire (1694-1778) as its precursor, for whom Jesus was an unknown and crucified Jew.

The first adversaries are to be called *mythologists*, because they wanted to explain the existence of Jesus as a *myth*.

Thus C.F. Volney (1757-1820), trained in rationalistic philosophy and pursuing a false method in the history of religions, in his book published in 1791² considers Jesus as an astral myth or as taking his origin from fables related to astronomy.

Similarly according to Ch.F. Dupuis (1742-1809), writing a little later in 1794,³ Jesus is a solar myth and the personification of the sun...; for just as the sun in its departure from the winter station under the sign of the Lamb repairs the evil introduced by the preceding cold, so the God of the Christians under the symbol of the Lamb, the savior of sinners, rises again to a new life at the approach of spring. The twelve Apostles are the twelve signs of the Zodiac; Peter, with the keys and boat, is the old Janus as the head of the twelve gods, who are the twelve months of the year..⁴ Using the same method, J.L. Pérés, writing in 1836, cleverly refutes this author by denying the existence of Napoleon.⁵

365. At the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century some proposed the existence of Jesus as a *personification made from different tendencies whether philosophical or social*.

Thus Bruno Bauer (1809-1882), wanting to explain the origin of Christianity from Roman Hellenism, in 1877 published his book on this

2. *Les ruines ou méditations sur les révolutions des empires* (Paris 1791).

3. *Origine de tous les cultes ou la religion universelle* (Paris 1794); *Abregé de l'origine de tous les cultes* (Paris 1798). Against these theories is quoted Fr. José de Jesús Muñoz, *Tratado del verdadero origen de la religión y sus principales épocas* 2 t. (Madrid 1828).

4. See Braun, *Où en est le problème de Jésus* 162f.; H. Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'étude comparée des religions*⁴ (Paris 1929) t.1 § 112, p.227.

5. *Comme quoi Napoleon n'a jamais existé*. "En usant habilement des rapprochements et des ressemblances, il établit que Napoleon est le soleil, que sa mort prétendue à Sainte-Hélène symbolise le coucher de cet astre à l'occident, que ses quatre frères sont les quatre saisons, ses douze maréchaux les douze signes du Zodiaque... Parmi les nombreuses réfutations que suscita l'*Origine de tous les cultes* celle-ci était peut-être la moins laborieuse; ce n'était pas la moins efficace" (Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'étude comparée des religions* t.1 § 112, p. 228.

matter⁶; in it he followed the critical school of Tübingen: for him Jesus is the personification of the Christian idea, which he says took its origin from the Greco-Roman element (Stoic-Platonic) and from the Jewish element (Josephus, Philo).

A. Kalthoff (1850-1906) wanted to explain history from social and economic tendencies⁷: for him Jesus is the personification of a certain social and communistic tendency, which was in the messianic-apocalyptic expectation of the Jews.

366. In the beginning of the 20th century the *mythologists* come back again because of the discoveries in Egypt. Thus in their oriental enthusiasm men experienced in their art, but carried away with too much fantasy, for a new reason found myths in the humanization of some divinity of the Jewish sect:

J.M. Robertson (born in 1856)⁸ goes back to *Joshua* and wants to explain the gospels supposing that a cult to “Jesus” was found under the symbol of a lamb among the polytheistic, Israelite cults and that this cult is one with the Egyptian divinity, Osiris-Tammuz.

For W. B. Smith⁹ the sect of the Christians is identical with the sect of the Nazareans, which venerated a certain god, Jesus.

P. Jensen (born in 1861)¹⁰ said that Jesus is the new manifestation of the Babylonian deity, Gilgamesh, uniting in himself both divine and human qualities, as also Moses and St. Paul and others from the Old and New Testaments, and that he is a personification of the sun; so the gospel comes from a certain solar legend.

A. Drews (born in 1865) in 1909 and in the following years caused quite a sensation because of his literary skill and erudition¹¹; but in a syncretistic way he put together the preceding ideas from the various schools: from the astral hypothesis and from the Israeli and pre-Christian cult, and from Parsism, agnosticism, Hellenism...; and he does not follow a scientific method. Everything in his work is a mass of conjectures and hypotheses.¹²

6. *Christus und die Caesaren. Der Ursprung des Christentums aus dem römischen Griechentum* (Berlin 1877).

7. *Das Christusproblem. Grundlinien zu einer Sozialtheologie* (Leipzig 1902); *Die Entstehung des Christentums. Neue Beiträge zum Christus-problem* (Leipzig 1904).

8. *Christianity and Mythology* (London 1900¹. 1910²).

9. *Das vorchristliche Jesus nebst weiteren Vorstudien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Urchristentums* (Jena 1906); *Ecce Deus. Die urchristliche Lehre des reingöttlichen Jesu* (Jena 1911).

10. *Das Gilgamesch-epos in der Weltliteratur...* (Strassburg 1906); *Hat Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* (Frankfurt 1910).

11. He wrote *Christusmythe* (Jena 1909-1911).

12. *Una cascada de hipótesis*. According to Couchoud the book by Drews, *Christusmythe*, in its astral mythology is nothing but a “phantasmagoria”: *Mercure de France* 221 (1929) 193; see Braun, *Où en est le problème de Jésus* 205.

According to Drews Jesus had to be *Joshua*; but he is not a historical man, but some kind of solar divinity from the tribe of Ephraim, fashioned to be like the Messiah of the Jews.

After the First World War, from the year 1921, what was said by Drews and his followers was repeated not infrequently.¹³

P.L. Couchoud, a physician and historian of religions, in his book in 1924, *Le mystère de Jésus*, in an elegant style and abandoning the previous myths and theories, rejects the liberals and eschatologists¹⁴; he says that the proofs for the existence of Jesus are insufficient and then offers his explanation; for he prefers not a mythological explanation, but a symbolical one: that Jesus is constantly becoming and has only an ideal reality in the mind of believers.¹⁵

Alfaric¹⁶ tries to explain the fact of Christianity from a conflation of Jewish messiahship with the pagan myths of the gods who save (Osiris, Attis, Mithra); but these views are strongly rejected even by rationalistic critics and radicals.¹⁷

367. Doctrine of the Church. It is not necessary to cite it now in a special way, since it is certain enough *from the Creeds and the ordinary magisterium* that the historical existence of Jesus is taught definitively by the Church, and pertains to divine and Catholic faith.

In the *Syllabus of Pius IX* the proposition is proscribed: "Jesus Christ himself is a mythical fiction" (D 2907).

368. The theological note concerning the historical existence of Jesus is *divine and Catholic faith*, as we already have said. Concerning the different parts and expressions of the thesis: it is certain from the gospels about the historical existence of Jesus, and so it is divine and Catholic faith; that it is proved also from the letters of St. Paul is at least a matter of divine faith, since it is clearly contained in these writings; but that it is proved from profane authors is critically certain.

If the historical existence itself of Jesus is examined *merely critically and historically*, by this process it is a matter that is *metaphysically certain*.

369. The proof of the first part does not need a special presentation,

13. Braun cites the principal editions, *Où en est le problème de Jésus* p. 165 in the note.

14. For this would be *evhemerism*, coming from Greek philosophy, which in the 3rd century before Christ said that the gods are men who have been raised to the divine order.

15. L. de Grandmaison, S.J., wrote against Couchoud, *Jésus dans l'histoire et dans le mystère* (Paris 1925).

16. *Le problème de Jésus* (1932).

17. In the preceding notes we have cited the books and principal editions of the authors who have written against the historical existence of Jesus; for others, even more recent, see Braun, *op.cit.*

because *the gospels themselves and the Acts*, whose historicity without any doubt has already been proved and admitted, if they contain the least thing true it is the historical existence of Jesus.

Moreover, the *existence and nature of the Christian religion is a firm and virtual argument* for this matter: for Christians were convinced that they were established by the historical man Jesus, whom they believed is the Messiah, the Christ; thus also for the first time they received this name at Antioch (Acts 11:26), and they were called the sect of the Nazarenes (Acts 24:5); thus also the ancient creeds profess the human nature of Jesus; thus also they considered him as a really immolated victim for the redemption of men; thus they maintained that his presence in the Eucharist is real....¹⁸

And we can *accurately determine the space and time, the land and the historical moment in which Jesus lived*: in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee...(Luke 3:1); and there are many other things that could be said about the time and the history of the life of Jesus. Many places visited by him in Palestine are demonstrated with certainty and without doubt; and the chronology of his life is determined within certain limits.¹⁹ Therefore his existence is not clothed with obscurity, as doubts can be raised about the existence of Homer: the matter is totally different compared with the fables about Homer, about Aeneas, about Calypso and Ulysses....

The evidence is so great from the gospels and from the fact of the Christian religion for the historical existence of Jesus that this truth, although it is established with moral certitude, is *reductively metaphysical*.

370. The proof of the second part is taken from the letters of St. Paul whose authenticity is admitted by all.²⁰ Therefore this proof must be presented because of the recent invectives by Couchoud; but at the same time *we will have very ancient historical testimonies about the historical existence of Jesus* and about the transformation of a mortal man to God shortly after his death and this by Jewish monotheists themselves (!), *a unique case in history*, in the year 55—not after a long evolution which

18. Absolutely absurdly, gratuitously and with much imagination Couchoud tries to find the beginning of the Christian religious movement *in the visions of Peter*, then in those of the *twelve*, afterwards in that of the 500 *brothers*, which is mentioned in 1 Cor. 15, and hence to make a *duplicate* of Yahweh... where the qualities of the expected Messiah are mingled together: the son of man, the servant of Yahweh, the just man persecuted by others, etc. Thus from the imagination of a poor middle-eastern fisherman the religion took its origin. See Braun, *Où en est le problème de Jésus* 205f.

19. See U. Holzmeister, S.J., *Chronologia vitae Christi*: (Rome 1933); L. Llamas, *La cronologia de Jesús* (Turin-Rome 1935).

20. Certainly Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., 1 Thess., Phil., Philem.

Strauss required for his myths (n.252).²¹

371. It will help to present this matter in such a way that we follow the chronological order of Jesus' life:

Jesus had a Hebrew mother, and he was devoted to this race of people and their religion, since he is "born of woman, born under the law..." (Gal. 4:4).

He had relatives ("brothers") (1 Cor. 9:5); and he himself descended from the ancient fathers of the Jews, since Paul says about his relatives according to the flesh, that is, about the Jews: "... to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ" (Rom. 9:3-5).

But he was a son of David (Rom. 1:3; 9:5; see 2 Tim. 2:8) and a son of Abraham, "Now the promises were made to Abraham and to his offspring... but referring to one: and to your offspring, which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16).

But he lived as a poor man, "though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich" (2 Cor. 8:9; see Phil. 2:7).

It is supposed that miracles were performed, which Paul attributes to him because of signs and wonders (Rom. 15:18f.; see 1 Cor. 1:22-25; 2 Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:5).

He established the Apostles and indeed as a college of twelve (1 Cor. 15:5; 9:5).

He instituted the Eucharist, just as Paul accepted it—as he says—from the Lord himself (1 Cor. 11:23-26);

on the night when he was betrayed (1 Cor. 11:23); put to death for our trespasses (Rom. 4:15).

He was sacrificed for us (1 Cor. 5:7; Gal. 2:20)

and crucified (1 Cor. 1:17-23; 2:2.8; 2 Cor. 13:4; Gal. 3:13; see Rome 6:5-8).

He died (Rom. 5:6f.; 6:3-10; 8:34; 14:9; 1 Cor. 15:3; 1 Thess. 4:14);

and was killed by the Jews (1 Thess. 2:15).

He was buried (1 Cor. 15:4; Rom. 6:4).

He was raised (1 Cor. 15:4f.; Rom. 1:4; 4:25; 8:34; 1 Thess. 1:10; 4:14).

He was seen by the disciples after his resurrection (1 Cor. 15:5-7).

And he was seen by Paul himself (1 Cor. 15:8; 9:1).

As is certain from what has gone before, St. Paul does not describe the life of Jesus with a continuous history, because his epistles deal with particular problems and are not intended to give systematic teaching. But

21. *The first epistle to the Thessalonians* was written in the year 50-51; the epistle to the Galatians in the year 54 and 1 to the Corinthians in 55; but the epistle to the Romans was written a little before the feast of Passover in 58. This is from P. Gaechter, *Summa introductionis in Novum Testamentum* (Innsbruck 1938) n.239, 245-255.

Therefore between the years 50 and 60, shortly after the death of Jesus, there was writing about him as being at the same time both God and man; this is a sign that he really was both God and man, for one who considers that the Israelites were so fiercely monotheistic, and that the Christians acted differently than the Mohammedans and Israelites did with their founders, Mohammed and Moses, who were not raised to the divine order. See Braun, *op.cit.*, 167-171. Couchoud concedes that these are grave objections, but from his aprioristic prejudice he is not willing to admit the divinity of Jesus; see Braun, p. 174.

they do contain an *outline and the most important events in the life of Jesus and he does that in a fixed and definite way*, not nebulously and obscurely; so that the historical and human existence of Jesus is supposed absolutely.

372. Furthermore, St. Paul mentions *examples of the virtues of Jesus* (passim), names his disciples, and *the teaching he hands on about redemption* supposes the human existence of Jesus.

But in the sermons of St. Paul, such as we have them in the Acts of the Apostles, given before Jews and Gentiles alike, he proclaims the messiahship of Jesus as something absolutely historical (Acts 12:24-41; 17:3.18.31; 19:4; 26:23).

373. Therefore there is certainty about the knowledge and veracity of Paul in proclaiming all these things, since he considers himself the most miserable of all men if he has been deceived in this (see 1 Cor. 15:19). And he was able to know these facts very well, just like any other contemporary well-known historical facts; and the facts recorded by him agree totally with the gospels, and on the other hand he could have been refuted by the then living witnesses; for Paul writes between the years 50 and 60.

374. Objections from the thinking of Couchoud. 1. In the letters of St. Paul only a certain ideal image of Jesus the Nazarene is found—formed by the internal experiences and visions of Paul (see Rom. 1:2ff.; 1 Cor. 15:3ff.; Gal. 4:4).

I deny this completely, based on the proven facts.

2. *He insists.* According to 1 Cor. 2:8 Paul preached the wisdom of God in mystery *which none of the rulers of this age understood; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.* Hence the rulers of this age did not understand the Lord, and “mythical” beings crucified him.

Response. The conclusion is completely arbitrary. For from the fact that in the preaching and in the person of Jesus there are mysteries, it does not follow that both are not historical; and from the fact that the rulers of this age did not understand *the wisdom of God*, it does not follow that they did not know the *Lord*.

3. In the letter to the Philippians 2:5-11 are found elements of idealizing the image of Jesus: the descent and death of a divine being and the ascent with glorification. Therefore the existence of Jesus is only a part of the Christian idea.

I deny the antecedent and the consequence. There is no one who does not see how gratuitous these statements are. In the cited text is found indeed the proposed *mystery* of the twofold nature in the person of Jesus Christ, *who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant... obedient unto death, even death on a cross...* But the historicity of the same Jesus Christ agrees well with this mystery, as is certain from this same passage and as we have demonstrated abundantly from the works of St. Paul.

4. In the most ancient documents of Christians, in the letters of St. Paul, Jesus is

introduced as God. Thus he is called *Lord*, a name which the LXX reserves for God; at the name of Jesus every knee should bend (Phil. 2:10-11; see Isa. 45:24 where this expression is said); everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved (Rom. 10:13; see Joel 2:32); all things were created in him, in heaven and on earth (Col. 1:15f., 19). But this is not correct for a monotheistic Jew to say that the man Jesus is God. Therefore Jesus is only the hero of an apocalypse, the object of a mystical experience, a God of mystery.

I concede the major. But it is true that in the letters of St. Paul Jesus is introduced and is held to be God. *I distinguish the minor.* It is incorrect for a Jew to introduce a man as God, if very efficacious proofs had not preceded it, *conceded*; if such efficacious proofs had preceded it, *denied*; actually this is a sign that the Jews had such efficacious signs. And so *I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

5. The writings of Paul, as they now stand, are the second edition produced after Marcion, in the century after Paul; for the first edition or the Pauline corpus was the *Apostolicon* of Marcion (about the year 140); but Marcion, as a Gnostic, denied the reality of the flesh of Christ.

Response. All of these points are stated *absolutely gratuitously and falsely*; for it is evidently most certain about, and even the enemies of the Church confirm the ancient and primeval antiquity of those letters of Paul on the basis of which we have made our arguments. See n. 370.

375. Scholium. The question can be raised *whether extracanonical Christian writings can make another effective proof* for the existence of the historical Jesus.

Without doubt the existence of Jesus the Nazarene most certainly can be deduced from these Christian sources; but, since many of these writings depend on the New Testament, in a critical way they cannot increase the force of the prior arguments from the N.T. However, some can be indicated which seem to be independent of the N.T.

Thus Hegesippus around the year 180 speaks about some relatives of Jesus (nephews of Jude, a cousin of Jesus) who lived in the time of Domitian.²² Origen says that the cave of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem was shown, and in the cave was the manger where he lay wrapped in swaddling clothes.²³ And Quadratus in his *Apologia* (ca. 124) speaks about those healed and raised by the Lord, who were still living even up to his time (R 109).

376. The proof of the third part is made by considering: A) Jewish testimonies; B) Gentile testimonies.

22. In Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 3,20; see Kch 67-69.

23. *Contra Celsum* 1,51: MG 11,756.

A) *Jewish testimonies*. 1) Flavius Josephus (ca. 37-105), from a Jewish priestly family, was present during the war of the Jews against the Romans, but he moved over to the Roman side and between the years 75-79 he wrote in Aramaic *De bello iudaico*, which was later translated into Greek. There are also some *Additions from the old Slavic version*, which are lacking in the Greek version, and were published by Berendts (in 1906) and by Grass (in 1924); in these additions some things are found about Jesus and his deeds.²⁴ Recent authors consider the Slavic version as an interpolation²⁵; but it gives strength to the historical conviction about the existence of Jesus as a historical person.

377. 2) The same *Flavius Josephus* wrote the work, *Antiquitates iudaeorum*, which he completed about the year 93 after Christ and in which two testimonies about Jesus are found:

“Also at that time there was Jesus, a wise man, if it is allowed to call him a man. For, he was the cause of marvelous works, a teacher of men, who accepted the truth with pleasure, and he drew to himself many Jews and also many Gentiles. *He was the Christ*. When this man was turned over to Pilate by the leaders of our people, he condemned him to the punishment of the cross, and those who at first had loved him, loved him no more. But having come back to life he appeared to them on the third day according to the divine prophecies, and both these and [a thousand] other wondrous things are said about him. And the race of Christians named after him continues up to the present day.”²⁶

“In the meantime Ananias the younger, whom we have already said accepted the high priesthood, being very clever and extraordinarily daring, was also a member of the sect of the Sadducees who, in their judgments, are harsh and pitiless beyond the other Jews, as we indicated previously. Therefore since Ananias was a man of this sort, he thought the time was ripe for him because Festus was no longer living, and Albinus was still travelling, so he called together a council of judges; *and the brother of Jesus who is called Christ, whose name is James*, was brought in for judgment, and with him some others. After he had made an accusation against them as violators of the law, he handed them over to be stoned to death....”²⁷

378. *This second testimony* which is about the martyrdom of James the brother of Jesus who is called the Christ, although it is dealing directly with the martyrdom of the Apostle, still is a good argument for the historical existence of Jesus.

24. See the German version of these additions in Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.567-569f.; but a compendium of the sayings, *ibid.*, n.558.

25. See Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundam.* n.144.

26. *Antiquitates* 1.18,3,3: Kch 7.

27. *Antiquitates* 1.20,9,1: Kch 9.

Concerning the prior remarkable testimony, there are three opinions about the genuineness of the text:

a) Many have their doubts about it or deny it, because the ancient ecclesiastical authors, who otherwise knew about Josephus, hold their silence about this testimony (argument from silence), besides Eusebius²⁸; or they doubt it because they are amazed that Flavius Josephus, an unbeliever, could call Jesus the Messiah.

b) Others respond—and rightly, it seems—that the ecclesiastical authors did not have to speak about this testimony; that Josephus could have mentioned the messianic dignity and other things about Jesus, without necessarily ascribing the messianic office to him, just as later he speaks about James “the brother of Jesus *who is called the Christ*.”

c) Others in a different way admit an interpolation into the testimony of Josephus, namely, by adding the words “He was the Christ.”

379. 3) Other Jewish sources are a) the *Mishna* or the collection of laws and traditional customs from the schools of the Pharisees written at the end of the 2nd century²⁹; b) also the *Talmud* or commentary on the *Mishna*—one is the *Palestinian* written in Aramaic at the beginning of the 5th century, and the other is the *Babylonian* from the 5th and 6th centuries written in the Aramaic-Babylonian language; both hand on the sayings in Hebrew of the ancient teachers.³⁰

These sources say something about Jesus and speak about his historical existence. But *the Traditions of the teachers of Amoraim* (3rd century) are not independent of the narration of the gospels, since they were produced out of a desire of calumniating the Church, and they select various things from Christian sources out of hatred. The situation is different regarding the *Traditions of the teachers of Tannaim*, which are not related to the gospels; they stem from Jamnia after the destruction of the temple in the year 70. Thus, according to the non-Catholic Jew, J. Klausner, in these rabbinic writings there are historical references, worthy of credence, about Jesus the Nazarene: “He was called Jesus the Nazarene; he performed magic (that is, he worked miracles, like many others at that time) [!], and he deceived and seduced Israel; he spurned the words of the teachers; he commented on the Scriptures the way the Pharisees did; he had five disciples; he declared that he came not to add or to remove anything from the Law; he was suspended (crucified) on the vigil of Passover, which took place on the Sabbath,

28. *Demonstr. evangel.* 3,5: MG 20,221; *Hist. eccles.* 1,11: MG 20,117.

29. On the *Mishna*, see H. Lesetre: DB 4,1127-1130.

30. On the *Talmud*, see H. Lesetre: DB 5,1977f.; but it is treated more at length in H.L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud and Mishnah*⁵ (Munich 1930).

because he was a “deceiver”; and his disciples cured the sick in his name.”³¹

With regard to the *Toledoth Ieshua* (history of Jesus), this book according to the non-Catholic Jew, J. Klausner, does not have any historical value³²; unless you want to say that it is a confirmation of the universal conviction concerning the historical existence of Jesus.

380. B) *Gentile testimonies.*

Of the Gentile testimonies about Jesus, some are *polemical* against Christians, like what Celsus and other said; others are *non-polemical*. We will not say anything about the former, since they depend on Christian sources; but now we will consider the others that are non-polemical.

1) The second Pliny the Younger, proconsul in Bithynia, about the years 111-113 consulted the emperor Trajan because of the spread of Christianity; but while he is narrating the way of acting of the Christians, he says among other things: that he required them “to curse Christ” and that they “assemble before dawn and sing a song to Christ as to a god.”³³

Concerning this clear testimony about the rapid spread of the Christian religion the question can be raised whether it is a direct affirmation of the historical existence of Jesus, which is said more fittingly, or is only the affirmation of some divinity.

2) Cornelius Tacitus, a disciple of Pliny the Elder, who was also living in Judea under Titus, in his *Annales*, written between 69-117, while writing about the burning of Rome under Nero, says that a rumor blamed it on the *chrestianos*, and that this name is explained from *Christ*: “...the originator of this name is Christ, who was put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberias....”³⁴

And this is a solemn testimony of a famous historian for the historical existence of Jesus.

3) C. Suetonius Tranquillus in the year 120, writing the *Life of Claudius* the emperor, says this about him: “[Claudius] expelled from Rome³⁵ the Jews who were continually causing a disturbance at the instigation of *Chrestus*.”³⁶ However, in his *Life of Nero* this is found: “... christians were afflicted with punishments, a race of men under a new and wicked

31. J. Klausner, *Jésus de Nazareth. Son temps. Sa vie. Sa doctrine* (Paris 1933) (the French version translated from the original Hebrew text was reviewed by the author) 53.

32. *Ibid.*, 65.

33. Kch 28-31.

34. *Annales* 15,44; Kch 34.

35. *Vita Claudii* 25,4; Kch 39.

36. That is, *Christ*, because it was pronounced in the same way: “Christian, according to the interpretation of the word, is derived from “anointing.” But since it is badly pronounced “Chrestian” by you (for among you there is no certain knowledge of the name) it is composed of sweetness and goodness” (Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 3:ML 1,331).

superstition...."³⁷

Therefore the first testimony from the *Life of Claudius* concerns a man, namely Christ, whose existence is affirmed; hence disturbances and controversies and the expulsion of the Jews took place (about this see Acts 18:2); however, this testimony seems to suppose that Christ was in Rome.

4) *Official acts referring to things done under Pilate* seem to have been preserved in Rome, as public and authentic communications. And St. Justin seems to allude to these acts, when he reports the miracles of Jesus and adds: "And you can learn what was done by him [Jesus Christ] from the collected public acts under Pontius Pilate."³⁸ And perhaps *Tertullian* refers to the same documents in his *Apologeticum*.³⁹

381. The profane testimonies about Christianity, which are not spurious, are gathered together in Kch: 8,9 (the testimony of Flavius Josephus on the death of John the Baptist and of James the Less); 39 (on the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius about 49-52); 32 (on the accusation of Pomponia Graecina, ca. 56-57); 39-40 (on the burning of the city and the persecution of Nero in the year 64); 42-45 (on the future kingdom of the Jews); 43.44.226 (on the persecution of Domitian in the years 81-96); 28-31 (the consultation of Pliny with Trajan about the Christians and the rescript of the emperor to Pliny in the years 111-113); 36-38 (the rescript of Hadrian about Christians in the years 125 and 132-134); 64 (rescript of Antoninus Pius ca. 138 to 161)...⁴⁰

382. Objections. 1. If Jesus really did exist and was such an outstanding historical figure, the silence about him in the profane documents of the first century is not explained.

Response. Nothing can be deduced from this silence, because such contemporary historians, during the time of Jesus, did not exist; even the emperor Caesar Augustus did not have a contemporary biographer; and from that time there is no existing history of the provinces of the empire, and specifically of Syria and Palestine.

Flavius Josephus in his writings wanted to please the Romans, and so he is silent about many things in Palestine, especially by omitting many things concerning messianic movements and growing Christianity.

Furthermore, silence about Jesus is not absolute in the profane documents of this century, as we have shown above.

2. But the figure of a wonder worker, such as Jesus is said to have been, should have been reported to the emperors.

Response. It should have been made known to those who lived in Palestine or to those who had easy communication with it, *conceded*; it should have been made known

37. *Vita Neronis* 16,2: Kch 40.

38. St. Justin, *Apolog.* 1,48: MG 6,400. Similarly he refers to the death of Jesus: *Apolog.* 1,35: MG 6,384.

39. *Apolog.* 21: ML 1,450.

40. On the ancient profane sources, see I.B. Aufhauser, *Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse* (Bonn 1925); also L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* I c.1; *Le Christ* (Bloud and Gay) 115-124.

everywhere on earth, *denied*. The difficulty seems to suppose that at that time there was in existence the contemporary facility of reporting the news almost as soon as it happens. But even now many extraordinary things are not reported, since an aspect of the reporting is the concern and psychological disposition with respect to the person or place from which the news comes. What took place among the Jews did not have much interest for the Romans and the Gentiles. In fact, even the Jews living in the diaspora seem not to have had any knowledge about Jesus before they were touched by the preaching of the Apostles (see Acts 2:5-12; 13:13-41; 28:17-28).

Moreover, the religious movement of primitive Christianity did not have the importance among the Romans that it was going to have later among us. For, every new tendency generally does not arouse much attention of its contemporaries until it presents a danger to the existing institutions. Therefore, first it is *unknown*, then *it is opposed by the common crowd*, and finally *it is attacked as it were scientifically* by the intellectuals and philosophers. Thus Celsus and Porphyry did that against Christianity.⁴¹

3. Why are such errors possible concerning the existence of Jesus in a matter that is so evident?

Response. Besides *the disposition of the will*, which brings it about that things clearer than light are thought to be obscure, working here is a *very exaggerated, hypercritical* tendency—one that has become extreme; and among some *the logical consequence from false principles* is at work, because the gospels were considered to be non-historical; hence the result is that from a false principle anything follows, that is, the negation itself of something most evident and by reduction metaphysically certain.

41. On the pagan resistance to Christianity, see P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne. Etude sur la polémique antichrétienne du I^{er} au VI^e siècle* (Paris 1934).

CHAPTER II

On the testimony that Jesus gave about Himself

383. In order to undertake our proposition of proving the fact of divine revelation made by Jesus who is called the Christ, first of all it is necessary for us to show *that Jesus said that he is the Legate of God in the sense of an authentic religious teacher who reveals truths*. But the affirmation of this divine legation can be found not explicitly in the words of Jesus, but *implied in other statements by him (about his messiahship and divinity)*, which it will not be necessary to examine.

ARTICLE I

ON THE MESSIANIC AFFIRMATION OF JESUS

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* tr.2 c.1 q.1, especially n.618-667; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 c.1 § 2f.; M. Lepin, *Le Christ Jésus*, deuxième partie, c.1f.; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Jésus Messie*, Conférences de Notre-Dame de Paris (1930) confér.3.

Thesis 26. Jesus of Nazareth testified that he is the Messiah.

384. **The concept of the Messiah** is surely of great importance, since from it is derived the name which the centuries attribute to Jesus *Christ*; from it also the name of our *Christian* religion has its origin.

Messiah is the Greek form of the Aramaic word משיחא (meshiha'), from the Hebrew משיח (mashiáh), in Greek ó χριστός (*o Christós*), and in Latin *unctus* (anointed).

In the O.T the *kings* were anointed and called the anointed, or the christs of God. Thus the Lord says to Samuel: "Anoint him [Saul] to be prince over my people" (1 Sam. 9:16); so Samuel took a vial of oil and poured it on his head (1 Sam. 10:1). And Saul is called by David *the Lord's anointed* (2 Sam. 1:14); and David himself bewails his being killed "as if he were not anointed with oil" (2 Sam. 1:21...).

The *prophets* were also anointed. Thus it is said to Elijah: "Elisha... you shall anoint to be prophet in your place" (1 Kings 19:16).

Finally, the *priests* were anointed, as is certain from the words addressed to Moses: "And you shall take the anointing oil, and pour it on his head [Aaron] and anoint him" (Exod. 29:7); and Moses said to Aaron and his sons: "the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you" (Lev. 10:7; see 21:10)....

This name *Christ*—which we will consider later when we are treating the messianic prophecies—is applied to the coming Prince and Liberator, who will bring salvation, in three places: in the canticle of Hannah, the

mother of Samuel, who extolled the Lord who was about to exalt *the power of his anointed* (1 Sam. 2:10); likewise in the psalm of David foreseeing that the kings of the earth would set themselves against the Lord *and against his anointed* (Ps. 2:2); finally by the prophet Daniel, when he designated the time *for the coming of an anointed one, a prince* (Dan. 9:25). And already in the last centuries before Christ this name became as it were the proper name of this future king.

This naming of him, *as if he were the anointed by antonomasia*, was attributed to him because of the prophecies which were made about him—which in its proper place will be explained at greater length¹—and it conferred on him a threefold dignity: *king* (v.gr., Ps. 2:6-8), *prophet* (Deut. 18:15f.), *priest* (Ps. 110:4).

385. *Other names by which the Messiah is designated in the O.T. were: Emmanuel* (Isa. 7:14), *servant of Yahweh* (Isa. 42:1f.), *seed of David* (Jer. 23:5), *son of man* (Dan. 7:13f.).²

386. *The properties of the messianic kingdom from the O.T.* Since the Messiah was a future king, his qualities or prerogatives appear by considering the properties with which in the O.T. the messianic kingdom or reign or power of the Messiah are described. Therefore the kingdom of the Messiah was proclaimed to be:

Eternal (2 Sam. 7:13-16 [see Ps. 89:29f.37f.]; Ps. 72:5-7; Isa. 9:7; Dan. 7:14.27...).

Universal (Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; 49:10; Num. 24:17-23; Ps. 2:8f.; 22:28f.; 72:8-11; Isa. 2:2-4; 66:19ff.; Mic. 4:1-3; Dan. 7:14-27; Mal. 1:11...).

External and visible (Isa. 2:2f.; 11:10; Mic. 4:1f; Mal. 1:11...).

New, with a new sacrifice and worship (Mal. 1:11f.), with a new priesthood (Isa. 66:20f.), with a new law (Jer. 31:31-33).

Doctrinal, that is, announcing doctrine (Deut. 18:18; Isa. 2:3; Ps. 2:6; 22:23...).

Spiritual and graciously conferring good things (Isa. 11:1-9; Jer. 31:34; 50:20...).

387. **The adversaries**³ first of all are *certain older rationalists* who denied the authority of the sources, like F. Strauss, Bruno Bauer, G.

1. See n. 582ff., where we treat the messianic prophecies, presenting arguments for the divine legation of Jesus and confirming it.

But for the development of the messianic idea see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.587-617; *Le Christ* (Bloud and Gay, Paris 1932) 92-112.: *Le Messie annoncé dans l'Ancien Testament*; Ed. Kalt, article, *Messias*: *Biblisches Real-Lexikon* 2,157-183 for the evolution of this idea in the O.T.; and by the same author, *ibid.*, 1,893-898 for the messiahship of Jesus; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Jésus Messie* confer.4. All of these deal with messiahship in general; see also what we say later about the individual prophecies.

2. For the messianic expectation, which was current in the time of Jesus, see J. Bonsirven, *Le judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ* (1935) 1,341-476 (there is a condensed version of this book: Paris 1950); M.J. Lagrange, *Le judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1931); Kch 35 (from Tacitus), 42 (from Suetonius); Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundam.* n. 148.

3. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.628.631.

Volkmar.⁴

Likewise a few recent authors, who say that Jesus did not present himself as the Messiah, that his disciples later introduced this idea of the messiahship of Jesus, when they had convinced themselves that he had risen from the dead and would come again. Thus W. Wrede,⁵ who, while denying the public manifestation of Jesus as the Messiah, has an indissoluble doubt about whether Jesus considered himself to be the Messiah; K. Wellhausen, A. Merx *and some others* also adopted this position.

R. Bultmann also professes a similar skepticism that one cannot be certain about the messianic consciousness of Jesus.⁶

A.v. Gall contends that Jesus refused the messianic dignity, but not the titles "Son of man" and "Son of God."⁷

Among the condemned propositions of the *Modernists* there is this one: Jesus was not speaking in order to teach that he was the Messiah, nor were his miracles aiming to prove this (D 3428).

388. Doctrine of the Church. It is most certain that the doctrine of the thesis is proposed by the ordinary magisterium of the Church and that it is often preached, and indeed as revealed. Moreover, the proposition of the Modernists has been condemned (D 3428), as we said above.

Theological note. The thesis is a matter of *divine and Catholic faith*.

389. Proof 1). *From the fact that the Apostles continually attribute to Jesus this dignity and this name. They do this in their gospels:* for the purpose of Matt. is to show that Jesus is the Messiah foretold by the prophets, which he says often by introducing the destiny of Jesus "to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet..." (passim); but John wrote that they may believe "that Jesus is the Christ" (John 20:31). The Apostles also do this *in their preaching* (Acts. 2:36; 3:18; 4:10...). But the sufficient reason for doing this cannot be in such witnesses so truthful, to the point of death, who associated with Jesus so often, unless the fact itself is true: that Jesus considered himself to be and said that he was the Messiah. Therefore, Jesus really considered himself to be and said that he is the Messiah.

4. We have mentioned them before, n.252ff.

5. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen 1901); see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.628.

6. *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (Giessen 1925) 33ff.; *Jesus* (Berlin 1926) 12; see Dieckmann, *De revelatione*, p.462, note 3.

7. βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, c.10; see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.631 and p.462, note 6.

390. 2). *Jesus, expressly and publicly asked if he was the Messiah, affirmed it.* Thus, when asked by the disciples of John the Baptist whether he was (the Messiah) who was going to come, he appeals completely to the things that were expected of the Messiah, namely, to the miracles performed (Luke 7:18-23; Matt. 11:1-6; compared with Isa. 35:4-6; 61:1). He gave the same answer when interrogated by Caiaphas, the high priest (Matt. 26:63-64).

391. 3). *Jesus gives himself and accepts messianic titles: A) Different titles accepted by Jesus or that he gave to himself by which the Messiah at that time was designated. Messiah or Christ:* Jesus openly admits this, when he is speaking with the Samaritan woman (John 4:25-27: *I who speak to you am he*). And previously, at the beginning of his public life, Andrew when speaking to Simon so named him: *We have found the Messiah* (John 1:41). He expressly accepts and praises the confession of Peter, made in the name of all the Apostles, *You are the Christ, the Son of the living God* (Matt. 16:16f.; see Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20). He appropriates this name to himself: *You have one master, the Christ* (Matt. 23:10), and he praises a merciful act done to the Apostles in his name *because you bear the name of Christ* (Mark 9:41); but if anyone says to them: *Behold, here is the Christ*, they should not believe them because they are false prophets (Matt. 24:23f.). And this is eternal life—to know God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent (John 17:3). Finally, he proclaims his messiahship solemnly before the Sanhedrin (Matt. 26:63f.; Mark 14:16f.); and he is presented after the resurrection as claiming this dignity for himself, when he was speaking with the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:26) and with the other disciples (Luke 24:46).

392. By Nathaniel he is called the *King of Israel* (John 1:49); he is proclaimed by the people on Palm Sunday (John 12:13; see Matt. 21:1f.; Mark 11:10; Luke 19:38), by the thief on the cross (Luke 23:42); and he himself accepts this title, although at times he flees from the crowd of people wanting to make him a king after the multiplication of the loaves (John 6:15). He speaks about *his kingdom* (Matt. 13:41 when explaining the parable of the weeds; in Matt. 5:34-40 when he speaks to those who will be on his right); and he admits that he is a king when he is quizzed by Pilate the governor (Matt. 27:11f.; John 18:33-37; see Matt. 27:27-29; Mark 15:16-18; Luke 23:2f. on the taunts of the soldiers because of this title; and similarly the imprecations of the crowd and the priests near the cross, because he said he was the king of Israel: Matt. 27:42; Mark 15:32;

Luke 23:37; and this is confirmed by the inscription on the cross: Matt. 27:37; Mark 15:26; Luke 23:38; John 19:19-21).

393. Son of David. This was also a title of the Messiah, since he was a descendant of David (see n.595f.610; and Matt. 12:23; 22:42...). Thus the blind men address him in this way (Matt. 9:27; 20:30-34) and the Canaanite woman (Matt. 15:22); finally the Apostles and the people when he is entering into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:9.15f.).

He who is to come (ὁ ἐρχόμενος, with the article, a name signifying a definite person who is expected) when he is interrogated by the disciples of John the Baptist (Matt. 11:3-5).

A prophet (ὁ προφήτης, again with the article, a name signifying a definite prophet about whom Moses wrote, Deut. 18:15-18; see John 5:46). The crowds give him this name after the multiplication of the loaves (John 6:14), and also on the last day of the festivity those who are arguing with him (John 7:40); Jesus accepts this designation when he says that Moses wrote about him (John 5:46).

Elijah was his precursor (Matt. 17:10-13).

394. B). The title of Son of man.⁸ Jesus gives himself the title “Son of man.” But the title “Son of man” is a messianic title. Therefore Jesus gives himself the messianic title.

The major is certain from the reading of the gospels, from which it is evident that Jesus gave himself this name right from the beginning of his public life; and that this name is used only for Jesus and for no one else; and that it occurs only in the mouth of Jesus (with the exception of Luke 24:7; John 12:34 but which are relating the words of Jesus).

Matt. 8:20; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8.32.40; 13:37.41; 16:13.27f.; 17:9.12.22; [18:11]⁹; 19:28; 20:18.28; 24:27.30 [*on the coming of the Son of man on the clouds of heaven with great power and majesty*]; 37.39-44; 25:31 [*on the coming of the Son of man in majesty for the judgment*]; 26:2.24-45.64 [to Caiaphas he announces that *the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power will come on the clouds of heaven*].

Mark 2:10.28; 8:31.38; 9:9.12.31; 10:33-45; 13:26; 14:21.41.62.

Luke 5:24; 6:5-22; 7:34; 9:22.26.44 [56].58; 11:30; 12:8.10.40; 17:22.24.26.30; 18:31; 19:10; 21:27.36; 22:22.48.69; 24:7.

John 1:51; 3:13-14; 5:27 [the Father gave the Son *authority to execute judgment*,

8. F. Tillmann, *Der Menschensohn. Jesusebstzeugnis für seine messianische Würde* (Freiburg 1907); J. Linder, S.J., *Commentarius in librum Daniel* (Paris 1939) at this place; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.640-653.662. See however Ct.M. Henze, C.SS.R., *Quis sit genuinus sensus locutionis* “ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου”: DivThom (Pi) 24 (1947) 69-80.

9. This text [18:11] and afterwards [Luke 9:56] can be said to be critically doubtful.

because he is the Son of man¹⁰]; 6:27.53.62; 8:28; 12:23 [the hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified; v.23-33: “And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself” (he said this to show by what death he would die)]. 34 [the crowd is surprised at this, since the Christ remains forever, that it is necessary for the Son of man to be lifted up]; 13:31.¹¹

395. The minor: *The messianic meaning of this title.*¹² a) This title in the mouth of Jesus has a special, singular and definite meaning, since a definite and new form is used: ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *that* (definite) son of man; to this form, in accordance with the Aramaic language which Jesus used, corresponds the Aramaic *bar-‘enasha’*,¹³ since in order to designate definite men ‘enasha’ was used.¹⁴ Therefore with this name Jesus wants to signify something special and something singular.

b) With this name, especially in the texts mentioned above (Matt. 24:30; 26:64; John 5:27...), there is an obvious allusion to the messianic prophecy of Dan. 7:13-14.

396. *Explanation of Dan. 7:13f.*¹⁵ After the prophet sees the power opposed to God destroyed (v. 11f.: until the beast was slain, and the dominion was taken away from the rest of the beasts), correspondingly he sees afterwards the establishment of the kingdom of God by the Son of man (v. 13f.).

v.13: *I saw in the night visions* [the prophet Daniel is speaking], *and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.* v.14: *And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed.*

By the name *Son of man* (LXX: ὡς υἱός ἀνθρώπου; Aramaic, TM: כְּבַר אִנְשָׁא, *kebar ‘enash*) signifies in this place an *individual person*, who comes and is presented before the “Ancient of Days”; he, as the supreme Ruler, gives him a kingdom and honor. The name *son of man* connotes in Ezek. 2:1; 4:1; 5:1 and passim (v.gr., Dan. 8:17) the fragility of human nature.

If it is said *like* a son of man, it refers to what visibly appears, as before (v. 4: like a

10. But this is given in the Greek *without the article*; see Objections 5.

11. For other texts in the N.T., see Acts 7:26; Rev. 1:13; 14:14.

12. There are other opinions of those who say that by this name is indicated only *the true human nature* of Jesus; or, by prescind from the messianic meaning of the word, it expresses in a special way his human nature considered as *miserable*, or as *looked at in an ideal manner*.

Under this name *the Fathers understood* the true human nature affirmed by Jesus himself; and *the exegetes of the Middle Ages* considered the humility of this human nature. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.644.

13. Not *bar‘enash*, an undetermined form, which is a poetical expression in order to express the Hebrew word, *ben-adam*.

14. See G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig 1898) 1,195; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.643; Zorell, *Lexikon graecum N.T.* at the word υἱός, 2,3.

15. See J. Linder, *Commentarius in librum Daniel* 309-312.

lion; v. 6 like a bear), and corresponds to the Aramaic form *ke bar*.

Because to this man is given *an eternal and universal kingdom*, as is said in v. 14, it follows that *he is speaking here about the Messiah*; because only to the Messiah, besides Yahweh, are all peoples given as an inheritance and the Messiah has eternal and universal dominion, according to the sayings of the preceding prophets (see n.597f.606f., etc.; and Gen. 49:10; Ps. 2:8; 45:5ff.; 72; Isa 11:10; 49:6; 53:11; Jer.23:5; 30:21; Ezek. 34:23; Mic. 5:4ff.).

To come on the clouds of heaven is an expression whereby God in Holy Scripture is said to appear: thus God descends on Mt. Zion, thus he manifests his presence in the tabernacle, thus he manifested himself in the temple, and thus in the Psalms he is described as Judge and Lord (Ps. 18:10; 97:2; 104:3f....). Therefore this is attributed to the divinity. This is confirmed from the fact that Caiaphas (Matt. 26:64), hearing the response of Jesus found in this place, understood his messiahship and divinity, because he also condemned him for blasphemy.

But if the kingdom is said to be given then to the Messiah, it does not follow that previously he was not a king, but he was the king of a fighting kingdom, not yet of *a kingdom where he rules peacefully after having conquered his adversaries*; for someone is said to rule completely, when all things are fully subject to him *rightfully and actually*.

397. c) This messianic meaning, to which Jesus alludes, was also recognized at the time of Christ. This is certain, not only because Caiaphas fully understood the response of Jesus (Matt. 26:64-66; Mark 14:62f.), but also the crowd understands *the Son of man* as being the same as *the Christ who remains forever* (John 12:34).

398. Scholium. Therefore his name *Son of man* not only has a messianic meaning, but it also indicates the divinity of the Messiah, because it includes pre-existence and his heavenly origin (for he comes on the clouds of heaven; and see John 3:13: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven*).

Thus this name avoids on the one hand earthly images that are mundane and political concerning the Messiah; and on the other hand it indicates his twofold nature—*human*, fragile, lovable, and at the same time *divine* and powerful. And these can be *the reasons why Jesus chose that name for himself*.

399. Objections. 1. Jesus at times *seems not to have accepted messianic dignity and honors*. But he flees alone into the mountains, when the crowds recognize that he is the prophet who is to come into the world, and when they want to make him a king (John 6:14f.); similarly, after performing miracles in Capernaum he went off to a deserted place, when the crowds were still seeking him (Mark 1:35-38). Likewise he forbids his miracles to be made public, since by them he would easily be acknowledged to be the

Messiah (Mark 1:43f.; 5:43; 7:36; Matt. 9:30).

Response. In these affairs Jesus does not deny his messiahship and the witness that he had given to it, but certainly *some caution* is indicated in his way of proceeding, that is, to avoid stirring up political movements among the people, and that he might not seem to approve the earthly ideas they had about the Messiah. So he proceeded *gradually* until the meaning of the Messiah was made known that he wanted to give to it; and at the same time to avoid the envy of his adversaries. But if there was no fear of such dangers, then he sometimes urged that a miracle be announced (Mark 5:19) and acknowledged (Luke 17:18).

2. Jesus *also did not allow the demons to say* that he is the Christ (Mark 1:25-34; 3:12).

Response. If he did not stop them, he could easily arouse suspicion that he was associated with them; and de facto calumnies were circulated that he expelled demons with the help of Beelzebul (see Mark 3:22-30). Moreover, it could seem improper for the Messiah to be announced by demons.

3. Jesus *also commanded his disciples* "to tell no one that he is the Christ" (Matt. 16:20; Mark 8:30; Luke 9:21).

Response. This prohibition is not definitive, but *until the Son of man has risen from the dead*, since he was speaking about the vision of the transfiguration (Matt. 17:9). And this prohibition was made when his messiahship had been amply proposed to the people and had been rejected; but the Lord did not want to stir up further the hatred of the Jewish leaders nor did he want to provoke the useless and extemporaneous shouting of the people.¹⁶

4. The name *Son of man* can seem to be surprising, because it does not occur frequently in the other books of the N.T. except in the gospels.

Response. The gospels are fully historical sources, and this appears much more in this name used by Jesus, which occurs in them so frequently. But if the other books of the N.T. do not use it, that could be because the Gentiles were not familiar with the prophecy of Daniel to which it alludes; also, because by the name *Son of God* it was easier to communicate the divine sonship of the Messiah, which had to be proposed to the Gentiles. Moreover, that name, rather than the Greek form, reflected the nature and character of the Aramaic language.

5. In John 5:27 *Son of man* is found in the Greek text without the article determining one individual.

Response. That is true, but from the complex of all the texts and from the matter being treated in John 5:27 it is sufficiently certain that the concern is with a very definite person; thus the *judgment* that is given to him is not because he is simply a *man* (said generically or poetically), but because he is this definite man, namely, the Messiah.

6. Other objections can also be introduced, by which it is shown that Jesus did not perform miracles in order to be recognized as the Messiah (see below n.499, where the relative truth of Jesus' miracles is treated).

16. J.M. Bover, S.J., *El evangelio de S. Mateo* (Barcelona 1946) 332.

Thesis 27. Jesus of Nazareth already from the beginning of His public life knew and said that He is the Messiah.

400. This thesis is proposed because of some modern adversaries who, not denying that Jesus said he is the Messiah, thus concede it only with regard to the end of his life, when he more or less lost his mind. Hence our task here is to vindicate the full messianic consciousness of Jesus right from the beginning of his public life.

401. The adversaries in general advocate a slow beginning and a purely natural evolution in the consciousness which Jesus had about his messiahship and in the manifestations he gave about himself.

This is the view of former rationalists (E. Renan and others) and also of recent ones (A. Harnack, J. Weiss, H.H. Wendt, A. Jülicher, P.W. Schmiedel, W. Bousset, O. Holtmann...).¹ And this is how in general they view the matter:

“The beginning and quasi foundation of the messianic consciousness of Jesus was a certain religious sense in which Jesus experienced God as father, and himself as his son, but in a very special way. Then in his baptism it seemed to him that he heard a voice from heaven and under the influence of John and his messianic preaching he acquired a definite conviction that he was the Messiah. Some doubts about this follow (“temptations”), but afterwards he overcomes them with serious consideration and reflection, and certain security remains concerning his messianic office. The nature of this office was recognized gradually in the consciousness of Jesus; it changed and became definite by a psychological evolution that was subject to various external influences. In the beginning of his public life, when the people were applauding him, he nourished the hope that he would be able to lead his listeners to accept his religious and pure ideas about the Messiah and his kingdom; but as time went by gradually he saw more clearly that the opposition of his adversaries was increasing, that the people were following the leaders of the Pharisees, that he was being abandoned, that grave dangers and death itself threatened him. This is the reason why he proclaimed universalistic ideas and a universal mission; why he spoke about his passion and his future death; why he withdrew himself from the people. The agony in the Garden of Olives indicates, they say, the supreme depression of the soul of Jesus which he experienced under the influence of this conviction...”²

Among the propositions of the *modernists* there is the following: “Christ did not always possess the consciousness of his messianic dignity” (D 3435).

1. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.629.

2. Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.629, p.420. On a doubtful opinion, see D.A. Froevig, *Das Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu und der Geist* (Gütersloh 1924); see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.629, p. 429.

402. Doctrine of the Church. The Church proposes, and indeed *as something revealed and as what is contained in Holy Scripture*, the fully developed consciousness of Jesus concerning his office; and “consequently, when he came into the world, he said, ‘Sacrifices and offering thou hast not desired’... Then I said, ‘Lo, I have come to do thy will, O God,’ as it is written of me in the roll of the book” (Heb. 10:5-7). Likewise there is the twelve year old boy remaining in the temple, and all the manifestations and messianic affirmations of Jesus, which the Church celebrates pertaining to the beginning of his public life. See also John 1, in his prologue to the Gospel, and the proofs which we will quote from the sacred writings.

Also the *proposition of the modernists*, which we cited above, was condemned (D 3435).

403. Please note, according to the teaching of the theologians, that Christ had a threefold species of knowledge in his human intelligence: one was his *knowledge of vision*, whereby he had the beatific and intuitive vision of God, by reason of which he knew everything pertaining to himself, and this knowledge was in him from the beginning and was due to him. The second was *infused knowledge*, which he also had from the beginning of his existence, and by reason of which he knew also everything that pertained to his royal and messianic office that was to be carried out in the full sense in a correct and worthy manner. The third was *experimental knowledge*, which increased in him and developed as in other human beings.

We do not admit an increase and evolution in messianic consciousness itself of Jesus; but we do admit an evolution *in the manifestations* of his messiahship, which Jesus accomplished *externally and publicly*.

And it could not happen that Jesus by his human and experimental knowledge, or by his purely natural external experience, or by the success of his preaching, or by the natural exhortations of John the Baptist would be led to the idea of the Messiah or to take up this office. For the messianic vocation and office were *supernatural*.

404. Proof of the first part: *Jesus from the beginning knew, that is, he had the consciousness that he was the Messiah.* a) *Before the public life.* The twelve year old Jesus calls himself the *Son of God*, because he had to be in his Father’s house (Luke 2:49); this indeed readily implies a messianic meaning, and in fact a natural sonship of God, compared with Ps.2:7 (where it is said of the Messiah by God, “You are my Son...”) and with other texts of the N.T. where Jesus said that he is the Son of God in the natural sense (see n.434ff.).

b) *In the period of preparation for his public life* many things were done from which it is apparent that Jesus already was aware of his messianic dignity.

Thus the Baptist, knowing that the Messiah was going to be baptized “in the Holy Spirit and with fire” (Matt. 3:1), made a protest to Jesus about baptizing him. “I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?” (v.14). Jesus *does not reject this testimony, but very aware of his own dignity says*: “Let it be so now; for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness” (v. 15).

In his baptism *Jesus himself* sees the Spirit of God descending like a dove, *and he himself* heard the voice by which he was called the *Son of God* (Matt. 3:16f.; Mark 1:10f.; Luke 3:22); hence he was very much aware of his dignity.

In the temptations in the wilderness twice he is called by the devil the Son of God and he is urged to perform wondrous works which were expected of the Messiah (Matt. 4:1-12; Luke 4:1-13). But Jesus *does not rebuke the devil because of this title given to him*, and his victory really confirms that he is aware of his own dignity.

The testimony of the Baptist by which Jesus is plainly called the Lamb of God, the Son of God (John 1:29-35), and by which the first disciples are drawn to Jesus,³ *without doubt was not unknown to Jesus; he did not reject it*, but immediately and explicitly he confirmed the disciples in their faith, as we shall see immediately.

Therefore Jesus already from the beginning of his public life had consciousness of his messianic dignity.

405. Proof of the second part: *Jesus from the beginning of his public life said that he is the Messiah.* a) Thus, according to chapter 1 of St. John's Gospel, after speaking with Jesus Andrew knows that he has found the Messiah (1:41), then Philip (v. 45) and Nathaniel (v. 49) know the same thing; and Jesus confirms them and, as a summary of everything, *he manifests himself expressly as the Son of man* (v. 51).

In the conversation with Nicodemus (John 3:13-18) the same manifestation is made openly.

Similarly, *in the conversation with the Samaritan woman* (John 4:25f.) and afterwards *with the disciples* (4:34) *and in the presence of the Samaritans*, who proclaim him the Savior of the world (4:42).

But at the beginning of the second year there is a solemn manifestation (John 5:17-47).

b) *From the synoptics*, in his preaching throughout Galilee, Jesus appears having awareness of his mission, and therefore that he is evangelizing the

3. The testimony of John the Baptist surely has great importance: not only because of the authority of the precursor, which so many people acknowledged; nor only because it was given at the beginning; but also because it had an enduring influence on the thinking of the Jews. See Matt. 21:24-27; Acts 18:24-28; 19:1-5.

kingdom of God, *because he was sent for this purpose* (Luke 4:43; Mark 1:38).

406. Scholium. Jesus wanted to be acknowledged as the Messiah in the sense of the prophets of the O.T.

At the time of Jesus of Nazareth there were many interpretations concerning the Messiah and his kingdom.⁴

In the captive situation of the Israelite people, which existed in the time of Jesus, at the same time there was *a hope of liberation and the expectation of being liberated by the Messiah*, who is going to come soon, as is clear also from the gospels in the questions of the Magi (Matt. 2:1-12), in the preaching of John the Baptist (Matt. 3:1-17; Mark 1:1-11; Luke 3:1-23; John 1:19-34), in the views of the common people (v.gr., John 1:41.49) and of the Samaritans (John 4:25).

But not all had formed for themselves the same idea and an image with the same characteristics.

407. 1) According to *a popular and earthly explanation* the Messiah was going to bring material prosperity with an abundance of temporal goods with no danger and work; but he was to come with great earthly pomp and he was going to establish a political kingdom that would last forever.

Thus we find in the gospels that the crowds after the multiplication of the loaves want to make Jesus king (John 6:15); so they do not understand the exaltation of the Son of man (John 12:34); thus the temptations of Jesus (Matt. 4:1-11) are in accord with the ideas of the crowd. And even the disciples of Jesus were not able to abandon these ideas except with difficulty (see Matt. 14:22; 16:22; Luke 24:21).

Jesus rejected this explanation of the messianic kingdom, since against this exaggerated expectation of temporal goods (earthly and political prosperity) *he preached a religious kingdom "which is not of this world"* (John 18:36), *namely, a kingdom primarily spiritual and internal, although it is also external and visible*. See the thesis on this in the treatise *On the Church*.

408. 2) According to *the rabbinic explanation*, which the Rabbis and the leaders of the people especially promoted, the Messiah was going to come with a glorious appearance: therefore they demanded a sign (Matt. 12:38; 16:1) which could be observed (see Luke 17:20); the Messiah also

4. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.619-625, 654-659.

would have to observe the “law,” which would be of such perfection that anything better could not be given to men by God (Matt. 12:1-16; 15:1-4; 23:1-36). Furthermore, he must liberate the people from external enemies (see Matt. 22:15-22) by establishing a national kingdom that would rule over other peoples.

However Jesus a) contrary to the rabbinic idea about the absolute perfection of the *Law (Thora)* and about the worth of the traditions of the Rabbis, proposed the preaching of a *gracious kingdom*, communicating divine gifts, the salvation of Yahweh, redemption from sin by the blood and life of the Redeemer (Matt. 18:14; 20:28; Luke 19:10); not because the cooperation is not required, but in such a way that the works alone of the Law, that is, natural works, are not capable of causing salvation (see John 15:4-6). So Jesus not only rejected the rabbinic traditions as human (Matt. 15:1-20; 23:1-36), but also said that the Law itself was going to be abrogated (regarding the judicial and ceremonial precepts) by his own death and *the constitution of a new and eternal covenant* (Matt. 21:43; 26:28; John 4:21).

b) In contrast to the contempt of the “Gentiles” who are ignorant of the Law, Jesus preached a kingdom that was to be offered firstly to the Jews (see Matt. 21:43...), and then to be extended to all the nations, that is, a *universal kingdom*. See the thesis on this in the treatise *On the Church*.

409. 3) There was also an *eschatological or apocalyptic explanation* about the messianic kingdom; it was actually the explanation of those who, despairing of the possibility of establishing a messianic kingdom in this world, thought about its establishment at the end of the world and for the soon to come last judgment. And in the apocalyptic literature of that time the foundation is given for this explanation.

However, Jesus preached indeed an *eschatological and apocalyptic messianic kingdom* with his glorious coming (see Matt. 25:31ff.; 24:29-31); but it is *not merely eschatological, but existing right now in this world* (Matt. 11:12; 12:28; 13:1ff.; see Mark 16:15). See the thesis on this in the treatise *On the Church*.

410. Finally, there was another *explanation of the justified*, which is introduced in the gospels, and which being shaped by the reading of the O.T., *can be said to be prophetic*.

Thus they were expecting a Messiah who would bring primarily spiritual salvation—a religious and suffering Messiah—and would establish a universal kingdom. This is apparent especially in the first two chapters of Luke (1:15-17.68.75.77.79; 2:14.30-32.38), and in the preaching of repentance of John

the Baptist (Matt. 3:2-12...), who showed the Messiah as the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (John 1:29). The Samaritans were also expecting a teacher and Savior of the world (John 4:25-42).

411. *Jesus wanted the Messiah to be understood in this prophetic sense.* Now this is clear from the fact that Jesus *had rejected the other explanations which preceded the one immediately above.* Moreover:

a) Jesus, when he speaks about his office, *appeals to the predictions of the prophets which are in the O.T.:* and he does that *explicitly* when he says that Isa. 61:1f. was written about him and fulfilled by him, which he had read in the synagogue (Luke 4:16-21), and when he says that Moses wrote about him (John 5:46; or *equivalently* when, after being asked about his messiahship (Matt. 11:2-6), he mentions the signs that Isaiah had prophesied (35:5f.; 61:1); or *universally* when he urges the Jews to search the Scriptures, because they bear witness to him (John 5:39).

412. b) *Jesus, in the messianic texts that pertain to him, often appeals to the O.T.* Thus in Matt. 21:41-43 (on the stone rejected by the builders: Isa. 28:16); Matt. 22:41-46 (on David calling the Messiah his Lord: Ps. 110:1); Matt. 26:31 (it is written: I will strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be scattered: Zech. 13:7); Matt. 26:64 (on the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven: Dan. 7:13); Luke 22:37 (this Scripture must be fulfilled: And he was reckoned with transgressors: Isa. 53:12).

413. c) *Jesus also in other messianic matters, which concern others, appeals to the O.T.* Thus in Matt. 11:10 (on the angel who will prepare the way for him, see Exod. 23:20); Matt. 13:14f. (on the obstinacy of the Jews, see Isa. 6:9f.); Matt. 15:7-9 (on the merely external worship of the Jews, see Isa. 28:13); Matt. 21:16 (out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, see Ps. 8:2); Matt. 24:15 (on the abomination of desolation in the holy place, see Dan. 9:27); John 7:37-39 (out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water, see Isa. 44:3; 55:1; 58:11...); John 13:18 (he who ate my bread, see Ps. 41:9); John 15:25 (they hated me without cause, see Ps. 35:19; 69:4).

414. *Therefore Jesus accepts everything that was foretold by the prophets about the Messiah, and he does it in its total integrity.* And he also understands him as a *suffering Messiah*, which is especially opposed to the human and earthly understanding; and as *the servant of Yahweh* (Matt. 20:28; Luke 17:25; John 10:11-21; 13:1-5), *who was going to bring a primarily religious salvation* (Matt. 26:28).

ARTICLE II

ON THE AFFIRMATION OF THE TEACHING LEGATION OF JESUS

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.709-721; Tromp, *De revelatione* 1.2 prop.3.

415. As a result, especially from what is certain from the preceding considerations, the question must be raised whether Jesus thought that he was the Legate of God and a Teacher with the right to demand assent to his teachings. And so the idea of a legate, from which this treatise gets its name, must be explained.

Thesis 28. Jesus testified that he is the divine Legate, the religious Teacher.

416. Definition of terms. A *legate* is said to be someone who *is sent* by another person who has authority, in order to take his place as his minister.

A *divine legate* is he who is sent by God. It is in the *proper sense*, if he has an express mandate from God speaking to him; thus Moses, the prophets, John the Baptist, the Apostles of the N.T., are considered as legates of God in the proper sense. In the *improper sense*, or broad sense, a man endowed with outstanding gifts can be considered a legate, like St. Boniface, St. Francis Xavier...; he is someone who promotes the cause of God with special effort and efficacy, but does not have an express mission *immediately from God speaking to him*, although he can have an internal *vocation for that mission through the influence of grace*.

A *mission* pertains to the formal notion of a legate. Indeed every legate is sent, *but not everyone sent is a legate*.

Mission among the divine persons is broader than legation. For mission implies the procession of a divine person from his principle with a relation to a temporal terminus. Thus the Word, proceeding from the Father, with a relation to a temporal terminus because of the Incarnation, is said to be sent by the Father; and the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father and from the Son, with a relation of manifesting his grace in time, is said to be sent by the Father and the Son, but he is not said to be their legate, because for this he does not have an express mandate from them.

However, the legation of Jesus belongs to him according to his human nature. Therefore we want to treat his teaching legation before we consider his divine sonship.

417. State of the question. A legation of mission can be conceived as *priestly, doctrinal, royal*, depending on the nature of the task given to the legate: priestly, doctrinal, jurisdictional. This threefold legation was proper

to Jesus, since it was included in his messianic office.

But here the legation of Jesus is understood as doctrinal, in the sense of the old prophets, who spoke in the name of God, and who announced a religious Teacher who would speak in the name of God.

418. The Adversaries, besides those who deny the messianic consciousness of Jesus and who therefore do not admit a consciousness of this strict legation from God, now to be considered are *those rationalists who say that Jesus was a legate of God in the improper sense*, inasmuch as through his more vivid religious experiences he promoted the cause of God in his own very special way.

Thus A. Harnack wrote: "Jesus Christ did not bring any new teaching, but he only gave expression to a holy life with God and before God in his person, and in virtue of this life, he handed himself over for service of his brothers, in order to gain them for the kingdom of God, that is, in order to lead them from egoism, from the service of Mammon and earthly cares to God, and from the lack of mutual love to union in charity; and so he prepared them for the eternal kingdom of God and for eternal life."¹

The modernists contend that Jesus did not teach a determined body of doctrine applicable to all times and all men, but, rather, inaugurated a religious movement adapted to and that should be adapted to different times and places (D 3459).

419. The doctrine of the Church in her ordinary magisterium continually refers to these titles of Legate of God and religious Teacher, which Jesus has and as witnessed to by Jesus himself.

Theological note. The thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*, since it is clearly contained in the written word of God and it is proposed by the Church as such.

420. Proof. 1) *As a consequence of his own messianic dignity.* Jesus testified that he is the Messiah. But a doctrinal function to be exercised in the name of God is understood to be included in this messianic office. Therefore Jesus testified that he is a religious Teacher and Legate of God.

1. "Jesus Christus hat keine neue Lehre gebracht, sondern er hat ein heiliges Leben mit Gott und vor Gott in seiner Person vorgestellt, und er hat sich in Kraft dieses Lebens in den Dienst seiner Brüder begeben, um sie für das Reich Gottes zu werben, d.h., sie aus der Eigensucht, dem Mammondienst und der irdischen Sorge zu Gott, aus der Lieblosigkeit zu einer Verbindung in der Liebe zu führen und sie für ein ewiges Reich und ein ewiges Leben zu bereiten" (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*¹ [Tübingen 1909-1910]t.1 *Die Voraussetzungen der Dogmengeschichte* § 3 n.2, p.48).

The major is certain from the preceding article.

Proof of the minor: The Messiah is understood as a prophet of God and a religious teacher. *For he was announced as a prophet* (by Moses in Deut. 18:18; see n.591-593); and *he was expected to be a prophet*: thus Nicodemus, having considered the signs performed by Jesus, acknowledges him as a Teacher who comes from God (John 3:2); the Samaritan woman was expecting a Messiah who would announce doctrines (John 4:24f.); the crowds easily connected the idea of the Messiah with the coming of a great prophet: thus, after the multiplication of the loaves, they said that Jesus is the prophet who is to come into the world (John 6:14); similarly on another occasion on the last great day of the feast (John 7:40-53); see also Luke 7:16.

The Messiah was also *announced in the O.T. as a teacher of the nations* and an orator who would preach the commands of Yahweh: thus in Ps. 2:6 he is introduced announcing the decree of Yahweh (see n.598); in Ps. 22:22 it is said that he will declare the name of the Lord to his brothers, and in the midst of the congregation he will praise the Lord (see n.601); in Isa. 2:3 the doctrinal character of the messianic kingdom is proclaimed for the last days, since the Lord *will teach us his ways... because out of Zion shall go for the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem* (see n.611).

421. 2) *Jesus a) explicitly and implicitly shows himself as Master and religious Teacher, b) and indeed as sent from the Father.*

a) *Jesus shows himself as a religious teacher.* For, *he calls himself a Teacher* after washing the feet of his disciples (John 3:13), and when he forbids his disciples to be called masters, because they have one master, the Christ (Matt. 23:10).² The same idea is found in the discourses to the disciples (Matt. 10:24), and to the disciples and crowds (Matt. 23:1-10).

He also accepts the name of teacher—from Nicodemus (John 3:2), from the disciples (John 13:13), from others (Matt. 8:19; 17:24; 19:16; John 11:28; 20:16), from the Pharisees (Matt. 9:11; 12:38; 22:16-24.36); *and he also accepts the name of prophet* (v.gr., John 4:19.44; Luke 7:39; 24:19).

Moreover Jesus dedicates himself to religious teaching and preaching whose object is the “kingdom of God,” and he instructs his disciples in this doctrine and sends them out to preach. Jesus also calls himself *the light of*

2. “Neither be called masters (Greek καθηγηταί): because you have one Master (καθηγητής), the Christ (Matt. 23:10). Καθηγητής means the same things as *master, teacher* (Zorell, *Lexikon graecum N.T.* at this word); if some difference can exist between the words διδάσκαλος and καθηγητής, perhaps it is this: that the second word signifies the head of a school, such as they were conducted at that time under the Rabbis and scribes (Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.719, p.511).

the world (John 8:12), and *the way, the truth and the life* (John 14:6), and *the one speaking the words of the Father* (John 14:10).

422. *Jesus also proposed dogmas, and he did it in an authoritative way, since we explicitly deny what Harnack and the modernists say, namely, that no new doctrine was advanced by Jesus, and that there is no fixed, doctrinal substance in his preaching, besides a religious sentiment in the sense of sonship towards the Father.*³

Thus Jesus taught the mystery of the Holy Trinity (Matt. 28:19; see n.438); the procession of the Word from the Father, and of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son (John 8:42; 15:26...); his own divinity (Matt. 11:27; see n.437f.); redemption (Matt. 20:28); universal judgment (Matt. 25:31-46); the existence of hell (Mark 9:43-49) and of angels (Matt. 18:10). Also he taught the existence of rites (the sacraments) which confer grace (John 2:3-11; Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16; Matt. 26:26-28; John 6:55-59).

423. b) *Jesus shows himself as sent by the Father for his teaching office.*

Thus Jesus expressly says that he had been *sent* to preach (Luke 4:43; therefore he had been sent; see Mark 1:38; Matt. 15:24); this recurs in the parable of the vinedressers (Matt. 21:37; Mark 12:6; Luke 20:13) under the form of a general mission, not being restricted just to doctrinal matters. But while speaking to his disciples, he speaks about the one *who sent him*, hence he also sends others *as prophets* (Matt. 10:40f.).

In John's Gospel talk about the *mission of the Son from the Father* recurs frequently (John 3:16-19), so that Jesus says: *My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me* (7:16). For, Jesus himself speaks to the world what he heard from the one who sent me (8:26-29). In another place he declared the same thing most clearly: *For I have not spoken on my own authority; the Father who sent me has himself given me commandment what to say and what to speak* (12:49f.; see 14:10; 15:15).

Thus Jesus hands over to his disciples his own mission, full and messianic, and therefore also to teach (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15f.; John 20:21; 17:18.20f.25).

Therefore Jesus shows in many ways that he *was sent* by the Father *for a teaching, religious mission*.

3. "In dem Gefühl: Gott der Vater, die Vorsehung, die Kindschaft, der unendliche Wert der Menschenseele, spricht sich das ganze Evangelium aus" (A. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* 91; see Lercher, *Theolog. fundament.* n.158).

Thesis 29. Jesus willed that all men accept his teaching as morally obligatory and under the danger of losing salvation.

424. From the preceding material it is certain that Jesus said that he is a religious Teacher, but the obligation of all men to listen to him and to follow him does not therefore follow from that, unless other proofs are added to it, whether it is what we plan to establish in this thesis, or later when treating his divinity. Therefore from this thesis we want to make clearer the nature of the authoritative and universal mission which Jesus claims for himself.

425. **The adversaries** in general are the *religious indifferentists*, inasmuch as they deny that Jesus wanted a determined teaching and religion to be accepted by all. On indifferentism see above n. 26ff., 36ff.

Rationalistic critics, like A. Harnack, contended that Jesus did not propose universalism in his preaching and teaching, but that this universalism was introduced through the evolution of a later time. A. Harnack does indeed concede that the religious ideas of Jesus were capable of being applied to all men, and that during the time of primeval Christianity there was a projection of this later teaching back to the time of Christ; thus Harnack gratuitously claims that the words of Christ that favor and teach the universalism of his teaching are not authentic.¹

The modernists also speak about a religious movement started by Jesus, but not in such a way that Jesus taught a body of doctrine applicable to all time and to all men; but actually "it was far from the mind of Christ to found a Church as a society that would continue on earth for a long course of centuries" (D 3452).

426. **The doctrine of the Church** on this universal and obligatory preaching of Christ is certain *from the necessity of belonging to the Church in order to obtain salvation*; see the thesis on this in the treatise *On the Church*. For, the Church founds this necessity on the mandate given by Christ of preaching the gospel which is universal and obligatory for all.

Furthermore, the *Council of Trent* solemnly defined that Christ Jesus was given to men by God *as a lawgiver whom they are to obey* (D 1571); and in the Encyclical "*Quas primas*" *on the universal kingship of Christ over all nations and peoples his absolute power is vindicated*, hence his power and will to teach all men religious truths clearly follows from that (see D 3676-3679).

Also, the errors of *indifferentism* have been condemned (see n.26ff.,

1. A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*⁴ (Leipzig 1924) t.1 l.1 c.4.

36ff.), and of *Modernism* (D 3452-3459; see D 3493), which were treated above.

In the Encyclical “*Mit brennender Sorge*,” where the pope speaks about genuine faith in Christ, the necessity coming from the will of Christ of listening to him is explained.²

Theological note. The thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*, because, besides the fact that it is clearly contained in Scripture, it is taught as the word of Christ by the Church in her ordinary and universal magisterium.

427. Proof. Jesus in the complete power given to him *gives a command to his disciples to go out and preach in the whole world* and to make disciples of all nations (Matt. 28:18); he commands that the gospel is to be preached by them to every creature (Mark 16:15), and indeed *under the danger of losing salvation* (Mark 16:16), *for he who does not believe will be condemned*.³

From other words of Jesus his will of universal preaching, which is to be done by the disciples, is also certain. Because it is necessary—he says—“that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem” (Luke 24:47); and the disciples must be his witnesses “to the end of the earth” (Acts 1:8). And he pre-announces that the gospel will be preached in the whole world (Matt. 26:13), as a testimony to all nations (Matt. 24:14). For, the Apostles are *the light of the world* (Matt 15:14). And *Jesus preached a universal kingdom of heaven* (see the thesis on this matter in the treatise *On the Church*).

There are also *other warnings that Jesus gave universally* for those who do not believe his words. For, “he who believes in him—as he probably said about himself⁴—is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God” (John 3:18). And “whoever is ashamed of me and of my words... of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” (Mark 8:38).

2. “Es darf also niemand sagen: Ich bin gottgläubig, das ist mir Religion genug. Das Heilands Wort hat für Ausflüchte dieser Art keinen Platz. *Ver den Sohn leugnet, hat auch nicht den Vater; wer den Sohn bekennt, hat auch den Vater*” (1 John 2:23)“: AAS 29 (1937) 150 (p.173 in Italian).

3. On the authenticity of Mark 16:15f., see n.554, note 24.

4. See I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Ioannem*² (Paris 1906) at this place; he attributes these words to Jesus himself. On the other hand, M.J. Lagrange, O.P., *Evangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris 1925) 86, attributes the words in verse 16 to the evangelist.

ARTICLE III

ON THE AFFIRMATION MADE BY JESUS OF HIS OWN DIVINITY

428. After examining the testimony of Jesus about his messiahship, there is also another testimony that we must examine, namely, his testimony about his natural divine sonship, which introduces Jesus to us as the Son of God. Thus the proofs, which later were made in favor of his messiahship and divine legation, will also be shown to be proofs in favor of his divinity; and therefore his teaching will be apparent as immediately divine revelation.

Although in fundamental Theology a) it suffices to demonstrate the messianic character of Jesus and a demonstration of his divine consciousness is not required; and b) although the joining together of the divine nature with human nature in the unity of a divine person is a mystery in the strict sense, which must be left for the speculation of dogmatic theologians: nevertheless, for someone studying the gospels in a historical way—which apologists do—there are not fewer testimonies in number and clarity of Jesus affirming his divine dignity than there are of his affirming his messianic dignity.

Hence, so that the apologetic proof of diverse testimonies which Jesus gave about himself may be later more organized and complete, and so that many apologetic truths may be made very clear and given full consideration, it seems necessary for us to establish the following *apologetic* thesis, while we refer the dogmatic consideration and the investigation of the mystery to other theological treatises.¹

Thesis 30. Jesus affirmed that he is the Son of God in the natural and proper sense.

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.668-708; Wilmers, *De religione revelata* prop.90, p.410-425; Lercher, *Instit. Theolog.* t.3 (updated by the professors of the Canisanum Faculty) n.12-24; Ottiger, *Theolog. fundam.* part 1 s.2 c.3 a.2 § 43 p.707-715; L. Koesters, S.J., *Unser Christusglaube* (Freiburg Br. 1939) 128-137; Van Laak, *Repetitorium Theolog. fundam.* tr.3 prop.4, p.105-117; Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* t.2 l.2 c.4 a.2; *Lumière et Vie*, n. IX (April 1953); especially P. Benoit, O.P., *La divinité de Jésus dans les Evangiles synoptiques*: *ibid.*, p.43-74.

429. Definition of terms. *Son of God in the natural and proper sense, or—as some say—“in a metaphysical sense,”* is opposed to the *ethical sense*, inasmuch as he would be said to be the Son of God in a moral sense, that is, either by a pure *adoption* (which happens when an extraneous

1. Among the authors who proceed in this way, besides those of fundamental Theology cited above in the Bibliography after the statement of the thesis, are the following: J. Brunsmann, *Lehrbuch der Apologetik* 1,306f. (Das Selbstzeugnis Christi); H. Felder, *Apologetica* I s.2 c.2; J.M. Ponce de León, *Jesús, Legado divino* (Buenos Aires 1935) c.8 a.2; A. Cotter, *Theologia fundamentalis*², theses 14-16; and others.

person is granted the rights of natural children), or if someone reproduces the way of another of conducting himself by reason of a *certain similitude* and affections and characteristics.²

Son in the natural sense is one who by generation takes his origin from a living being in a similitude of nature; he truly has the same nature as the father. In the case which the thesis is considering, the nature would not be numerically different and specifically the same, as happens in human generations, but it would be numerically the same, because the divine nature must be unique.

430. Adversaries. 1) All who deny the divinity of Jesus (like the *Arians, Socinians and rationalists*); or also his messianic consciousness (see n.387-401).

2) Those who understand the consciousness of Jesus about his divine sonship *in a moral sense*, like D.A. Froevig³ and A. Schlatter.⁴

3) Those who say that the Church at a later time interpolated the words which give expression to a consciousness of divinity in Jesus.

Thus W. Bousset,⁵ in his investigation of the name *Kyrios*, wants to find stages in the evolution concerning the divinity of Jesus. First of all the "Son of man," having abandoned hope of a political kingdom because of Jesus' death, is expected by the Jews because of the current apocalyptic ideas to come in glory, and he is held to be "exalted"; and he is considered to be living because of the paschal "visions" of Peter and of others. But "the Servant of God" dying as a sacrifice (Isa. 53) could not be for the Jews "the Son of God"; for this would be a contradiction.

But under Hellenistic influence the name of the emperor, *Kyrios* (from Syria and Egypt) is attributed to Jesus, and so to him is given the name which the LXX in the O.T. attributes to Yahweh, *Adonai*: thus Jesus becomes an object of worship.

From St. Paul Jesus is identified with the "spirit" (so there are the formulas "to be in Christ," and the mystical "body of Christ"); and from St. Paul Jesus is the Son of God, but subject to him. Thus the Pauline mysticism is made by the primitive Church into the mysticism of God, and the dogma of the divinity of Jesus is accepted, which John now expresses in the prologue of his gospel when he speaks about the incarnate Word.

Others from the liberal school inquiring into the forms of tradition (*Form Criticism*) agree in admitting these interpolations, like R. Bultmann

2. *In a moral sense* in the O.T. the angels are called "the sons of God" (Job 1:6; 2:1) and the *people of Israel* (Exod. 4:22) or even individual Israelites (Wis. 2:13ff.; Sir. 4:10).

3. *Das Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu und der Geist* (Gütersloh 1924); see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.629, p.429.

4. *Die Geschichte des Christus* (Stuttgart 1920); see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n. 533, p.356.

5. See Dieckmann, *De Revelatione* n.512.676f. where his theory is explained from his book, *Kyrios Christos* (*Geschichte des Christentums von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (Göttingen 1913; 1921³)).

and M. Dibelius.⁶

431. *The modernists* say that the divinity of Jesus Christ is not proved from the gospels (D 3427); likewise, when Jesus was exercising his ministry, not only did he not teach his divinity, but he did not even intend to prove his messiahship (D 3428). Hence it is not surprising if the modernists assert that the historical Christ is far inferior to the Christ who is the object of faith (D3429). See D. 3430-3432.

432. Doctrine of the Church. The divinity of Jesus Christ is contained very clearly in the doctrine of the Church, both in the creeds (D 11, 30, 41, 44ff., 76) and in the *Councils*: in Nicaea (D 125-126), in Constantinople I (D 150), in Ephesus (D 250-251, 252ff.), in Chalcedon ((D 301-303), in Constantinople II (D 421ff.), in Constantinople III (D 554-555).

Likewise it is found in the creed of the Council of Toledo XI in the year 675 (D 533-538); and against the Unitarians or Socinians in 1555 (D 1880).

This dogma is confessed by the Church because Jesus of Nazareth bore witness to it; hence *the faith of the Church is reduced ultimately and especially to this affirmation of Jesus about himself*: that he is the Son of God, the second Person of the divine Trinity, that is, the Son of God in the natural sense, not in the merely moral sense.

Recently there are some documents that attack *the errors of the modernists* on this matter which deny the divine consciousness of Jesus (D 3427-3431, 3494ff.).

433. Theological note. Doubtless it is contained in Holy Scripture (and in Tradition), and therefore in divine revelation, that Jesus had such awareness of his divinity and manifested with words his natural divine sonship; we will see this is so in the arguments presented. Nor is there any doubt that this truth, whether explicitly in the condemnations especially of the modernists or in the ordinary magisterium and by the sacred Liturgy is proposed by the Church as being contained in Scripture and in revelation. Therefore the thesis is a matter of *divine and Catholic faith*.

434. Proof 1) from the synoptics, so that we may see also that the first gospels show this conviction of Jesus about his divinity.

6. R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Berlin 1921); *Jesus (Die Unsterblichen 1)* (Berlin 1926); M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen 1919); *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion in Christentum* (Göttingen 1925). See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.678.

A) *Jesus claims for himself divine attributes.* a) *Jesus sets himself above the leaders of Israel* (“something greater than Solomon is here”: Matt. 12:42; “something greater than Jonah is here”: Matt. 12:41); *likewise he sets himself above the temple and the Law of Yahweh* (“something greater than the temple is here”: Matt. 12:6; “for the Son of man is lord of the Sabbath”: Matt. 12:8).

b) Thus Jesus performs miracles *to vindicate for himself unlimited and absolute power, which also at that time was attributed to God alone.* Thus by an act of his will alone he cures a leper (Matt. 8:3); and at a distance the servant of the centurion (Matt. 8:7); and he also knows that he is going to raise the dead daughter of Jairus (Mark 5:23ff.); and quietly he calms the storm with a word (Mark 4:39); and as Lord he drives out demons and he does it from the beginning of his public life (Mark 1:25)....

He communicates these powers absolutely to his disciples (Matt. 10:8); and the disciples in his name make use of them (Mark 6:13; Luke 10:17-19); and even others drive out demons in the name of Jesus (Luke 9:49f.).

435. B) *Jesus equivalently attributes to himself divine dignity equal to the Father.* a) *He attributes to himself legislative power equal to the Father.* Therefore he completes and perfects the divine law (Matt. 5:22.28.34.39-44), which was given by Yahweh to the ancients, that is, to Moses and the Fathers of Israel (Matt. 5:21.27.31.33.38-43); he revokes (Matt. 5:32) the divine indult of a bill of divorce (Deut. 24:1); he changes the law about the right of retaliation: “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” (Matt. 5:38.42; Lev. 24:19-20). But he does these things regarding to divine law on his own authority, not just vicariously: “But I say to you...”; for it has to do with someone who is also “lord of the Sabbath” (Matt. 12:8; see John 7:23).

b) Jesus also *claims for himself absolute judgment of the moral life,* which is proper to God alone, and it was so understood in Israel (see Matt. 9:3); and he is not exercising a power that is merely delegated or vicarious: thus he says to the cured paralytic that he has power to forgive sins (Matt. 9:6); and he forgives the sins of the sinful woman (Luke 7:48-50); he also communicates this power to his disciples (John 20:23 and probably in Matt. 16:19; 18:18).

Also Jesus himself will exercise *judgment over all men* at the end of the world, so that he will send out *his angels* (Matt. 13:41...); thus those damned by him will have as their punishment *to depart from him* (Matt. 7:23; see Matt. 24:29-31; 25:31-46; 26:64).

c) *Jesus constituted himself as the center of all hearts and the object of*

the religious life.

Jesus claims for himself *love above all things*, that is, before father and mother and children (Matt. 10:37); *life itself* must be given up because of him (Matt. 10:39; 16:25); we must follow him by denying ourselves completely, even if we have to carry our cross daily (Matt. 10:38; 16:24; Luke 9:23); if someone is reviled because of him, he will be blessed (Matt. 5:11); and *faith in him* must be kept absolutely under pain of damnation (Matt. 10:33).

436. C) The preceding arguments are strengthened and confirmed from the clear statements whereby *Jesus professes that he is the Son of God in the natural sense.*

a) Jesus does not deny that other men are sons of God, and therefore he affirms that God is *their* father (Matt. 13:43) or he says: *your* Father (Matt. 6:4.6.18), when speaking about other men, or *your* (in the plural) Father (Luke 12:30.32). But his way of speaking about *his* Father is opposed to the above way of speaking: *My Father* (Luke 2:49; Matt. 7:21; 10:32f.; 11:27; 12:50; 15:13; 16:17; 18:10.35; 20:23; 25:34; 26:29.53; Luke 10:22; 22:29; 24:49). Certainly there is in this way of speaking about the Father in relation to himself and in relation to other men *no parity or reckoning together*, which happens when many are included under the same reason, but there is here a difference in the sense which is clearly signified in John 20:17: "I am ascending to *my* Father and *your* Father, to *my* God and *your* God."

b) There are also some other well-expressed texts:

437. Matt. 11:25-30 with Luke 10:21-22.⁷

After the mission of the seventy disciples and their return Jesus, exulting in the Holy Spirit (Luke 10:1-21), confesses to the Father, because he has revealed to the little ones something great, mysterious and hidden from the wise men of this world (Matt. 11:25; Luke 10:21). And he adds (Matt. 11:27): *All things have been delivered*

7. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.691-696; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*³ (Paris 1922) 1,511-523; M.J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu*² (Paris 1923) 226-231; A. Durand, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Verbum Salutis 1)¹⁷ (Paris 1929) 212-216; P. Dausch, *Die drei alteren Evangelien* (Bonn 1932) 186-189; J.M. Bover, *El Evangelio de S.Mateo* (Barcelona 1946) 255-257.

(παρεδόθη)⁸ *to me by my Father. And no one knows (ἐπιγινώσκει)⁹ the Son* (Luke 10:22: no one knows who the Son is) *except the Father; and no one knows the Father* (Luke: and who the Father is) *except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.* Later Jesus exhorts men to come to him and to take up his light yoke (as legislator) and to become his disciples (v.28-30).

The total genuineness of this text is certain, since it has been accepted universally and there has been no debate about it in Christian tradition; likewise it is in full agreement with other texts in Matt. (16:16ff.; 28:16ff.), and it is not a statement that is so singular and foreign to the books of the N.T. that it would not merit historical credence. St. Paul has similar statements.

This text has been called *Johannine* because of its similarity with some other texts in the Gospel of John (see John 3:35; 6:46; 10:15; 13:3; 17:2-7).

438. The argument from this text is made in three steps:

a) According to this text *the knowledge of the Son* (who the Son is, that is, who Jesus is) *is such that it is reserved and exclusively proper to the Father.* But it cannot be said to be about a merely moral sonship. *Therefore it has to do with a natural sonship* of such a nature that it cannot be understood and penetrated by any creature nor can it be known before revelation.

b) And no one knows the Father (who the Father is) except the Son. Therefore, *if the Son knows him exclusively, and only he understands and penetrates who the Father is,* it is not a merely abstract knowledge of God, such as men have, nor a merely intuitive knowledge of God, which according to the teaching of revelation rational creatures can have of him; it has to do with a knowledge not possessed by a merely created and finite intellect, but it is *reserved to the infinite intellect, which the Son possesses.* And he will be able to reveal it to others: that in God there is the divine person of the Father.¹⁰

c) According to this text there is also a *coordination of the Son with the Father,* because from the parallelism of the members the Son is like the Father by reason of his cognitive power and by reason of the object known.

8. The reading of others, an easier one, παραδέδοται, in the perfect: *I have as handed over*, even though it is more suited for making our argument, still should not prevail over critical norms (above n.243). See also Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.691, p.486; he cites H. Schumacher, *Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Matt. 11:27* (Freiburg 1912).

9. The reading *in the aorist*, ἐγνώ, which Harnack says is to be preferred in place of the present, as if it had been introduced against the abuse of the heretics, according to the weight and number of witnesses should not be admitted; and if it were admitted, it would not have such historical meaning of past things (*at one time I knew*) that it would exclude the permanence of such knowledge. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.691, p.486. Here on this matter he cites L. Koplér, *Die Joanneische Stelle bei den Synoptikern und die Gottessohnschaft Jesu Christi: ThPraktQschr* 66 (1913): 67 (1914).

10. This explanation of the meaning seems to be better and more immediate than the case would be if one were to speak about the beatific vision had of the Father by the Son.

Therefore just as the Father is understood to be God, so also is the Son.

Hence these words become clearer: *All things have been delivered to me by my Father*, that is, by generation *also the divine nature*; and just as this has been revealed to babes by the Father (v.25-26), so also the Son will be able to reveal similar things about the Father (v.27).

This is confirmed by a parallelism with Matt. 28:18-20 where Jesus, approaching the disciples, likewise says: “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me” [Everything has been handed over to me by my Father]; and he orders them to make disciples (μαθητεύσατε) [learn from me]; and he reckons himself with the divine person of the Father, so that all men are to be baptized and consecrated in the name (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) or in the majesty and dignity of the one God, namely, of the Father *and of the Son* and of the Holy Spirit.

439. Matt. 16:13-20.¹¹

Jesus, when he was outside of Palestine, in the area of Caesarea Philippi, questions his disciples, at the time free from the fear pressure of the Pharisees; and he does this with the intention that they manifest their thinking and openly confess what they think about him and his work.

V.13: *Who do men say that the Son of man is?* (Mark 8:27: Who do men say that I am?; Luke 9:18: Who do the people say that I am?). Therefore Jesus first asks what the others, namely the crowds, believe him to be. The naming of him as the *Son of Man*, as we said above in n.394, in the N.T. is a proper name of Jesus, which is predicated not as a common name, but it applies to Jesus alone, and it is used only by Jesus; by others it is used only by quoting the words of Jesus or the words of the O.T. – This name already contains the messiahship of its subject, because of what we said above in n.395f., as an allusion to Dan. 7:13f.

V.14: in this verse the disciples respond by citing the opinions of the people. Some say he is John the Baptist (resuscitated, see Matt. 14:2), but others say he is Elijah who is supposed to come again (see Matt. 17:10), or Jeremiah come back from the dead, or one of the prophets sent to help the people (see 2 Macc. 15:14; 2:1-21; Esdras 2:18).

V.15: Jesus wants to contrast the opinion of the disciples with the opinion of the people: *But who do you say that I am?* Therefore he is asking not only about his messianic dignity, which *he supposed as already known by the disciples and which was fully contained in the name of the “Son of man,”* and the disciples had already been convinced about this title, as one must suppose; but Jesus is asking them especially *about his internal nature.*

V.16: In response Simon Peter said: *You are the Christ* (ὁ χριστος, the Messiah), the

11. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n. 697-699; Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Evangelium sec. Matthaem*³ 2,48-72; Lagrange, *Evangile selon S. Matthieu*² 318-329; A. Durand, *Evangile selon S. Matthieu*¹⁷ 304-314; P. Dausch, *Die drei älteren Evangelien* 238-243; Bover, *El Evangelio de S. Mateo* 328-332.

Son of the living God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος).

V.17: Jesus accepts this appellation: *Blessed are you Simon, Bar-Jonah* [the son of Jonah, just as I am the Son of God]: for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven. Therefore to Peter, as to an infant in the spirit, the revelation is given about what had said before in Matt. 11:25 about the internal nature of Jesus.

V.18-20: Jesus follows up by speaking with Peter with his own proper and absolute authority: “*And I tell you...*; and on this rock I will build my church...” He speaks in this way *about his work* after the profession of his internal nature, in a way parallel to Matt. 11:25-30 after the manifestation of his divinity when he talked *about his yoke and his burden*; and the same idea is found in Matt. 28:18-20 (“All authority has been given to me... baptizing them in the name... of the Son... teaching them to observe [make disciples]...”).

There is no doubt *about the genuineness* of the pericope Matt. 16:13-20 nor about the verses that have been especially attacked concerning the primacy of Peter (v.17-19), as will be explained more at length in the treatise *On the Church*.¹²

440. Argument. Jesus accepts and praises the response of Peter about himself. But in this response the natural divine sonship of Jesus is affirmed.

I prove the minor: a) *Jesus is not asking only about his messianic dignity*, which was already known to the disciples and had been accepted by them.

b) Jesus praises the response of Peter and attributes it not to natural knowledge (flesh and blood have not revealed this to you¹³); but *he attributes it to a special revelation from the Father*. But in order to know the messiahship alone of Jesus or for his sonship in the moral sense there was no need for a special revelation. Therefore *Jesus is praising the knowledge about his natural sonship*, which was had through a revelation from his Father.

c) *This agrees with the revelation about the natural divine sonship of Jesus, which is made by the Father to babes, according to Matt. 11:25-27*; now that babe in the spirit is Peter. Therefore also he is now dealing with the revelation of his natural sonship.

d) *This is confirmed* by the following absolute way of speaking of Jesus and from his own authority concerning the promise of the primacy (and *I tell you...*) and concerning *his church*, and by prophesying as from himself (not like the old prophets: Thus says the Lord...). It is also confirmed by the solemn form in Peter’s words: *the Son of the living God*, which is fully determinate with the article: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

12. See Rosadini, *Institutiones introductoriae in libros N.T.*⁵ n.129; Dieckmann, *De ecclesia* 1 n.344-361. The first author treats the matter briefly, the second more at length.

13. See 1 Cor. 15:50.

441. Matt. 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19.

Jesus also proposed to the leaders of the priests and the elders of the people *the parable about the wicked tenants*, to whom, after they had killed his servants, the Lord sent his son, saying: "They will respect my son" (Matt. 21:37); in this parable the allusion is clear to the prophets of the O.T. in the servants, and to himself in the son. But the prophets of the O.T. were sons in the moral sense; *therefore now the son is more fittingly understood in the natural sense.*

Matt. 22:41-46; Mark 12:35-37; Luke 20:41-44.

And Jesus asked the Pharisees how David in the Spirit called his son (the Messiah) *Lord*, thus alluding to Ps. 110:1; there Yahweh (also Lord) calls the Messiah Priest and Lord: "Sit at my right hand..." in which the divine dignity is expressed.

442. Matt. 26:62-66; Mark 14:60-64; Luke 22:66-71.

On a most solemn occasion, at the end of his public life and in the fact of death, before the Sanhedrin gathered together in solemn assembly, and having been asked by the High Priest when using his supreme authority, Jesus openly professes his divinity.

Matt. 26:63: *And the high priest said to him: I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God* (Mark. 14:61: *Are you the Christ, the, the Son of the Blessed?*). Luke speaking about another meeting of the Sanhedrin held in the morning distinguished two forms of the interrogation; v.67: *If you are the Christ, tell us; v.70: Are you the Son of God, then?*

To these questions during the night Jesus in the fullest sense says that he is the Son of God: Matt. 26:64: *Jesus said to him: You have said so. But I tell you, hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.*

And in the morning in Luke 22:70 Jesus says: *I am.*

All of them considered this as blasphemy and so they condemned him to death.

443. Argument. Jesus before the Sanhedrin says that he is the Son of God, not in the moral sense or only that he is the Messiah, but in the proper and natural sense. For

a) *the denomination Son of God* in Holy Scripture, if it is used for angels and men, *never occurs in the singular form*; unless it is used in an indefinite way or for a gathering of many (v.gr., Israel, the son of God), so that then

evidently the use of the word is tropological.¹⁴ Hence *the interrogation made by the high priest has only the meaning of a natural sonship.*

b) Jesus, affirming this denomination, *at the same time affirms that he will come in such a way that he is seated at the right hand of God*, and in this way his divine dignity is understood; see Ps. 110:1 where Yahweh says to David's Lord (but he is the son of David): Sit at my right hand....¹⁵

c) *This affirmation is heard as blasphemy and with great horror* (for the high priest rends his garments), and all said: "He deserves death." Indeed such an affirmation would not be blasphemy, if Jesus had claimed for himself only a moral sonship or the messianic dignity.¹⁶

d) In the jeers of those who blasphemed Christ on the cross, this is said: *If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross* (Matt. 27:40), "for he said: I am *the Son of God*" (Matt. 27:43). Surely it seems that this would not be said, if the concern were only for a moral sonship or the messiahship.

444. Proof 2). *In the Gospel of John* there are many places where Jesus either openly says he is the Son of God, or he attributes such things to himself that his natural divine sonship is readily understood.

Among the texts, the most effective ones to consider are the following: Jesus calls himself the Son of God: John 5:17.25; 8:35ff.; 11:4.27; 20:17. – He affirms his own pre-existence: 3:13; 6:32; 8:58; 17:5; for "he came forth" from the Father: 6:33.38.46; 7:16.28ff.; 8:18.23.42; 11:42; 16:27; 17:8; "he has seen" the Father: 3:11; 6:46; 8:38. – He affirms his equality with God; and also in acting: 5:17ff.30; 8:18; 14:10; in knowing: 10:15 (see Matt. 11:25ff.); in being: 5:18; 10:30.33.36; 12:44ff.; 14:7.10.20; 16:15; 17:10.21. – He accepts the testimony of others: 11:27; 20:28.¹⁷

Now that this denomination of *Son of God* must be understood in the proper and natural sense is certain from the fact that

1) *John himself understands the matter in this way.* Thus in his gospel he clearly teaches this divine sonship, so that his whole gospel tends toward it, as he says at the end, "that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, *the Son of God*, and that believing you may have life in his name" (20:31); and he says in the prologue solemnly that he is treating the natural sonship,

14. Only *Solomon* is said to be a son of God, in 2 Sam. 7:14; 1 Chron. 17:13. But at the same time it is said about his descendants, his successors in the kingdom, and especially about the Christ; St. Paul applies 2 Sam. 7:14 to Christ (see Heb. 1:5, and below n.595 at verse 14). Hence son of God is said of Solomon *as a type of the Messiah*.

15. See n.610. Also please note that "coming on the clouds of heaven" is a divine attribute; see above n.396.

16. The mere affirmation of his own messiahship, which was supposed to be made by the Messiah, was not considered as blasphemy. See H. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash* 1,1017.

17. Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.705. See *ibid.* the distribution of these places as arranged by H.J. Cladder.

since the Word which was in the beginning, was—he says—with God, and the Word was God (1:1); and he says that the Word made flesh has the glory as of the only Son from the Father (1:14), i.e., truly the glory that belongs to the only Son of the Father.

2) When Jesus calls himself the *Son of God* (v.gr., 5:17: “My Father is working still, and I am working...”), *the Jews understood this to be about his natural sonship*: “This is why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath, but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God” v.18). *Jesus does not correct this, but confirms it* by affirming his unity of activity (and so of nature) with the Father (v.19); he also affirms the judgment given to himself and the community of honor with the Father, “that all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father” (v.22f.).

3) The same point is affirmed in John 10:30: *I and the Father are one*. For the Jews answered Jesus, when he complained that they are about to stone him: “We stone you for no good work but for blasphemy; because you, being a man, *make yourself God*” (v.33).

445. Proof 3). *The testimonies of the Apostles* concerning the divinity of Jesus confirm that Jesus had this conviction and awareness of his divinity; so they had to refer to the testimony of Jesus about himself as the fountain or source.

Among the many testimonies of the Apostles, implicit or explicit, in the Acts the words of St. Peter stand out, when he applies to Jesus Ps. 110:1 *about the Messiah being David's Lord* (Acts 2:34 compared with Matt. 22:43-45); likewise by calling Jesus *the Author of life* (3:15).

And in St. Paul, besides the name of *Lord* given to Jesus, with which name Yahweh (Adonai) is designated in the LXX, the best known texts are the following:

Phil. 2:5-7 dealing with Christ Jesus “who, *though he was in the form of God* [he had the nature of God], did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant [the nature of man]....”

Tit. 2:13 in which he is treating the expectation of a blessed hope and *the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ*.

Rom. 9:5 where Christ is said to be from the race of Israel according to the flesh *who is God over all, blessed forever*.

Heb. 1:1ff.: here God is said to have spoken to us *in the Son*, whom the Apostle contrasts with the prophets (who were sons of God in the moral sense) and he is introduced as superior to the angels.

446. Objections. 1. Jesus says that he expels demons “in the Spirit of God” (Matt. 12:28) or “by the finger of God” (Luke 11:20). Therefore he is not acting on his own divine power.

I distinguish the antecedent. Jesus says that this divine power by which he acts (in

the Spirit, by the finger of God) is not his own, *denied*; he says and it is certain that it is his own, *conceded*.

2. Jesus refers his miracles to God, and wants the honor to be given to Him: thus after the fig tree withered (have faith in God: Mark 11:22); and in the case of the demoniac in the territory of the Gerasenes (Mark 5:19) and in that of the leper returning to give thanks (Luke 17:18). Therefore he does not want the miracles to be attributed to himself.

I concede the antecedent and distinguish the consequent. He does not want the miracles to be attributed to himself *as a mere man, conceded*; but as to God, *denied*.

3. Jesus sometimes in performing a miracle manifests his dependence on the Father; v.gr., in raising up Lazarus: *Father I thank thee that thou hast heard me* (John 11:41). Therefore he is not professing that he is God.

I concede the antecedent and deny the consequent. Clearly in John the divinity of Jesus is introduced and the manifestation itself of the divine consciousness of Jesus: *I and the Father are one* (John 10:30), and *whatever he does, that the Son does likewise* (John 5:19). Hence if at times the dependence of Jesus is expressed, then the concern is with Jesus considered according to his human nature.

4. An objection is raised from the dependence of Matt. 11:25ff. on Sirach 51:1f.: *I will give thanks to thee, O Lord and King, and will praise thee as God my Savior...* (Loisy).

Response. There is no dependence and no real similitude; for, in Sirach the text concerns *salvation by God*, but here he is speaking about the *revelation* of the knowledge of God.¹⁸

5. The answer of Peter concerning the *Son of the living God* is found only in Matt.; but Mark 8:29 has: *You are the Christ*; and Luke 9:20: *And Peter answered: The Christ of God*.

Response. The silence of Mark and Luke does not indicate the *falsity* of Matt., just as Mark and Luke omit the pericope about the primacy. But the genuineness of Matt. is absolutely certain. The narrations of Mark and Luke are abbreviated.

6. From the beginning Jesus does not say clearly that he is the Son of God.

Response. If the manifestation of his messianic dignity had to be made with caution from what was said in n.399,1, it is much more the case with the manifestation of his consciousness of his divinity; this manifestation was apt to stir up amazement and persecution, since it could not easily be understood by the Jews who professed a strict monotheism. *But a very fitting pedagogy recommended that*, lest someone should say to the Jews educated in such monotheism: *I also am God*; but they were to be taught gradually, until they should come to a full knowledge of the mystery of the Trinity of persons in one nature.

7. "In all the evangelical texts the name "Son of God" is equivalent only to that of "Messiah." It does not in the least way signify that Christ is the true and natural Son of God' (D 3430).

I deny this on the basis of what we have proved.

8. *The objector insists:* During the time of Christ the Jews used the names Messiah

18. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.693.

and Son of God interchangeably.

I deny that. For the crowds and the people never speak about the Son of God, when they are speaking about the Messiah; but they say: King of Israel, Christ, Messiah, Son of David; in fact they distinguished between the accusation about being Messiah and about being a king: *saying that he himself is Christ a king* (Luke 23:2) which was the first accusation against him made to Pilate (John 18:33; Matt. 27:11; Mark 15:2), and the other accusation: “by the law he ought to die, *because he has made himself the Son of God*” (John 19:7). For they considered this last accusation as blasphemy and they understood it to be about his natural sonship: *This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because... he called God his Father, making himself equal to God* (John 5:18).

9. The name “Son of God” in O.T. literature is attributed to many others, who certainly are not God (v.gr., *about Israel* Exod. 4:22: *Thus says the Lord: Israel is my first-born son*; or *about Solomon* 2 Sam. 7:14: *I will be his father, and he shall be my son*). Therefore this name ought not to be understood about natural sonship.

I distinguish the consequent. This name ought not to be understood about natural sonship, if there are not cogent reasons for it, *conceded*; if there are reasons of this kind, which prove with given arguments the affirmation of Jesus, *denied*.

Both angels and men in Scripture are called sons of God *in an indefinite way*, without someone being definitely named (v.gr., Sir. 4:11); or *tropologically*, when the talk is about Israel in its assigned place (Exod. 4:22) in which the concern is with the whole assembly of the people; also *tropologically* and *quasi typically*, when the concern is with Solomon (see above, note 14 and n. 595 at v.14). – But where Jesus Christ is said to be the Son of God, the text says *in a definite way* ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, with the article; and these are cogent reasons for the metaphysical and natural meaning of this name.

CHAPTER III

On the proof of the testimony that Jesus gave about Himself

ARTICLE I

ON CONSIDERING THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF JESUS

447. After explaining the testimony by which Jesus of Nazareth affirmed his Messiahship, doctrinal Legation and Divinity, now it is necessary to prove the truth of such testimony. Thus it will become clear that Jesus of Nazareth really was a religious Teacher sent by the Father, a divine Legate, and also the Son of God in the proper and natural sense, with the right of requiring assent to the truths that he revealed.

However, miracles constitute the primary criterion of public revelation, as we said in the first book; therefore it is necessary first of all to provide proof by demonstrating that the miracles were performed in confirmation of this divine legation and revelation.

But concerning certain circumstances in order to evaluate a miracle itself, it is often necessary to consider the person of the wonder worker.¹ Therefore we will begin now by considering the human nature and talent and character of Jesus, by which later the consideration of his miracles will become easier. But the argument for the truth of his testimony will be apparent in this consideration of the nature and human character of Jesus of Nazareth.²

Thesis 31. Jesus in giving his testimony was not a deceiver (I), nor was he deceived (II); in fact his holiness is a confirming moral miracle (III).

Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.725-745, 784-794; L. De Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 I.4 c.2 (*La personne de Jésus*); L. Koesters, *Unser Christusglaube* 151-156; Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* N.164-170; H. Felder, *Jesus Christus* 2 (Paderborn 1924) c.1-3.

448. By considering the psychology and personal character of Jesus we want to show that his testimony about uncommon things and things of great importance *cannot be erroneous*, namely, about his Messiahship, teaching Legation and Divinity.

This testimony would be erroneous a) either *because Jesus wanted to deceive us*; or

1. See above n. 173.
2. This argument will have two parts—one from the logical necessity for the truth of his testimony, after having seen the veracity and wisdom of Jesus; but the other will be from the miracle that is found in his holiness.

b) *because he himself was deceived*. The first alternative would be contrary to his veracity and holiness, and would make him a *monster of wickedness*; the second would be contrary to his wisdom and healthy psychic constitution, which would have fallen into error in matters of great moment, and would make him a *monster of insanity*.

The first two parts of the thesis are arranged in order to exclude these two hypotheses; and in this way the argument becomes convincing in favor of Jesus' testimony. But the argument considered in this way, from the psychological nature of the human characteristics of a person, remains a human argument. But the third part of the thesis shows the miraculous character, which is present in the moral quality of Jesus; and in this way it introduces *a new argument, a divine argument*, in favor of his testimony.

449. Adversaries. 1) *That Jesus was a deceiver* is held by the defenders of the theory of fraud, which already in the time of Christ acquired its first followers.

Thus the *Jews* attributed the miracles of Jesus to a pact with the devil (Matt. 9:34; 12:24).

Later *Jews* in the *Talmud* attributed them to the magic arts which he learned in Egypt.³

Similarly in the middle ages there is a collection of pristine calumnies in *Toledoth Ieshua* (history of Jesus)⁴; from it recently *E. Haeckel* got his calumnies.⁵

H.S. Reimarus (1694-1768) presented his theory of fraud in his work "on the purpose of Jesus and his disciples."⁶

But the rationalists themselves have already abandoned this theory which presents Jesus as an avowed deceiver.

450. 2) Others hold that *Jesus was deceived* on another level and with a different theory.⁷

a) Some (*the psychiatric school*) say that Jesus was paranoid and delirious and epileptic, and that this is apparent from his way of acting: elation of mind, with fixed ideas of fear and horror, his inconstancy, and sexual abnormality; *so that his words and deeds must be examined by psychiatry and according to the norms of pathology*.

Thus *E. Rasnussen* (a Dane) thinks that Jesus was an epileptic.⁸

W. Hirsch maintains that Jesus was paranoid.⁹

3. See *J. Klausner, Jésus de Nazareth* 53; above n.379.

4. The Jewish author *J. Klausner* acknowledges it, *Jésus de Nazareth* 64.

5. See *Dieckmann, De revelatione* n.525.579.

6. *Vom Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger*; see above n.250; *Dieckmann, De revelatione* n.507.

7. See *Dieckmann, De revelatione* n.729-732.

8. The German title: *Jesus. Eine vergleichende psychopathologische Studie* (Leipzig 1905).

9. The German title: *Religion und Zivilisation vom Standpunkt des Psychiaters* (Munich) 87-164.

Binet-Sanglé considers him to be a religious paranoid.¹⁰

Dr. de Loosten (pseudonym G. Lomer) says that Jesus because of his morbid self-esteem became insane in the presence of the Sanhedrin.¹¹

451. b) Others do not affirm insanity, but abnormality (*psychopathological school*) and error in the internal experience of Jesus: they say that Jesus was disturbed by hallucinations from an uncontrolled fantasy and great excitement of his nerves, with a fanatical disposition to stir up public disturbances.¹²

Thus O. Holtzmann said that Jesus was an ecstatic who acted as the instrument of a foreign spirit (of what kind?).¹³

For J. Baumann Jesus labored under hallucinations.¹⁴

Likewise Joh. Weiss,¹⁵ Rudolf Otto¹⁶ and others hold that he was a fanatic.

452. c) *Liberal critics and modernists* (like B. Weiss, A. Harnach, H. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer) hold the following in this matter¹⁷: Jesus did not want to deceive, nor was he deceived because of ill health; for, *a careful distinction must be made between the historical Jesus and the idealized Jesus* whom we have in the gospels; the errors must be attributed to this idealized Jesus, but in the historical Jesus only one error is found: that he believed he was going to come back soon (parousia). But you will rightly observe that this error in a fundamental matter, related to his own mission, is so serious, so that it cannot be attributed to a sane man. Therefore these critics fall into the preceding categories of those who deny the perfect psychological health of Jesus.

453. Doctrine of the Church. Pius IX, while reviewing the many motives in favor of the Christian religion in his Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*" (1846), speaks about this faith... *of its divine author and consummator Christ Jesus... confirmed... by his life, death and wisdom* (D 2779).

454. Theological note. Without doubt it is a matter of *divine and Catholic faith* that Jesus was not a deceiver (part 1), since from divine

10. *La folie de Jésus* 1-3 (1910-1912).

11. *Jesus Christus vom Standpunkt des Psychiaters* (Bamberg 1905).

12. *Schwärmerei* or you may say a tendency to have morbid dreams and fantastic thoughts.

13. *War Jesus Ekstatiker?* (Tübingen-Leipzig 1903).

14. *Die Gemütsart Jesu ...* (Leipzig 1908).

15. *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (Göttingen 1900); see Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.165.

16. *Leben Jesu nach hist.-kritischer Auffassung*⁵; see Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* N.165.

17. See Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.166.

revelation and from the teaching of the Church it is sufficiently certain that no deceit was found in him (1 Pet. 2:22) nor could it be found. Likewise it is certain that Jesus was not deceived (part 2), because this also is contained in divine revelation and in the teaching of the Church, namely, the supreme wisdom of the Son of God. And these two propositions are proposed by the Church as revealed.

The proof from an examination of the character of Jesus (in parts 1 and 2) and from an examination of his holiness (part 3) for his legation and his testimony is surely found in the words just quoted from Pius IX; but since in this document it is not sufficiently stated whether by *this argument alone* that legation and that testimony is proved, or *in a comprehensive way with other arguments* which are mentioned in the same place *from the resurrection, miracles, prophecies...* of Jesus (D 2779), we cannot draw from this document a certain theological note for this thesis, inasmuch as we want to show the apologetic worth of this argument from the personal character of Jesus.

But surely this argument is *critically and apologetically valid*.

455. Proof of the first part: *Jesus was not a deceiver. For, fraud was not possible* a) *either internally*, b) *or externally*.

a) *Not internally*, because since man acts because of motives and the values of things, *there were no motives in Jesus* for such fraud: he did not seek temporal goods, but he spurned them; he contemned worldly honors and any temporal advantages, and he did not wish to adapt himself to the messianic ideas of the common crowd (see n.399,1) which would have been followed by the applause and shouts of approval of the people. The affirmation of his messiahship and divinity brought upon him hatred and accusations of blasphemy.

If Jesus had committed such a fraud, *he would surely be very evil and a master of wickedness*, since that would be a crime against religion, a principal moral virtue: in a matter so grave and fundamental, claiming for himself a divine legation for all men and a natural divine sonship; and thus he would be leading men into the worst of errors. Indeed in this man who acted with a holiness not in any way mediocre, as all who knew him admit, but with an outstanding holiness (as is stated explicitly in part 3), and who sought so openly and sincerely to do the will of God, and with such unflinching charity sought the well-being of men, this blasphemous mentality and this crime must be absolutely excluded.

b) *But also externally* fraud seems to be impossible *from the public character of the life of Jesus*: for, he taught the people publicly, even manifesting everything to his disciples (which is proved both by his character and by his later sincere martyrdom). Even his enemies, zealously

trying to catch him in his speech (Matt. 22:15ff), could not find the basis for an accusation of fraud.

456. Proof of the second part: *Jesus was not deceived.* For, there is certainty about A) *his extraordinary character*, B) *together with the equilibrium in his wisdom and intelligence,—together with his healthy psychic constitution.*

It would not be sufficient to prove the extraordinary talent of someone, in order from that to conclude that he was not deceived, since there are men of great talent, who are at the same time abnormal and unbalanced in their wisdom; unless there is added—which also will have to be proved here—an equilibrium of mind and a healthy psychic constitution. For this rules out that someone would be deceived in his testimony *about such a grave matter.*

457. A) *The extraordinary character of Jesus, which at the same time is well-balanced,* will be apparent by considering the principal forms of intelligence that are found in men: whether it is *an intelligence which is said to be abstract* or philosophical, and which implies great facility in considering abstract matters clearly and profoundly (this is characteristic of a philosopher, a theologian, a mathematician...); or it is *an intelligence which is said to be verbal*, which supposes the ability to speak eloquently and to move others (orators, lawyers...); or it is *an intelligence which can be called social*, which is the skill to understand and to lead men (presidents, governors...); or it is *an intelligence which is said to be spatial* or mechanical and signifies the ability to grasp things in space and in their shape and often also to handle mechanical things; or finally it is *an artistic intelligence* with the ability to capture the beautiful in artistic creations.¹⁸

458. a) With regard to abstract intelligence, *nothing contradictory or contrary to reason* can be found in the truths which Jesus taught; not even in the following centuries among those who studied his teaching with great intensity, nor in the mysteries themselves. In fact, the truths show *such great logical connection* with each other that the scholastic theologians, dedicated to the study of them, could fashion a harmonious and beautiful system (see n.653-666).

The truths which Jesus taught about temporal and mundane things, about man, about God, *surpass all the philosophy of the Gentiles*, so that, having set aside the solicitude for transitory things, men in a community of fraternity should raise their eyes to the Father who is in heaven. And these truths *bring to completion the old Covenant*; thus the merciful God,

18. The somewhat vague and manifold concept of “intelligence” is usually understood in different ways. The preceding forms of intelligence respond to different inclinations which, especially for the so-called professional orientation, are usually considered in functions of this kind.

the Father running to embrace the neck of lost son replaces the just and terrifying God of the Old Testament... But in those truths and in his other deeds *a wonderful unity* shines forth in referring all things to God as Father (see Matt. 22:36-40). These things are all the more amazing, since Jesus did not attend the schools of the Rabbis (see John 7:15; Mark 6:2).

But there are also *extraordinary axioms* in which the excellent summaries and mysteries of his teaching are expressed briefly and at the same time lucidly and profoundly; and thus they make clear his extraordinary genius: Matt. 11:25-30¹⁹; 16:17-19; 28:18-20; John in chapters 13-17. With this is joined his *certitude and peace of mind* in speaking (see Matt. 24:35), so that he never corrects a previous statement.

This extraordinary genius appears as *subtle, polemical in controversies* with the Pharisees and Sadducees who tried to trick him in his speech (see Matt. 22:15-46²⁰).

459. b) With regard to verbal intelligence, *a simple and clear way of speaking* corresponds with this extraordinary talent and philosophical intelligence in a truly outstanding way, by adapting very profound truths to the understanding of the people, by using truly beautiful parables. “There is the praise of all in the whole world for the parables of the Lord. The customs of men and their taste are changed, but the parables and similitudes of the Lord are never far from the heart and the mouth of men. Under this respect also the saying of the Lord is true (Mark 13:31): My words will not pass away.”²¹

In his form of speaking there was *a sum total of opposites*—grace and gravity, profundity and clarity, great simplicity and “power”; for he was teaching them as one having authority... (Matt. 7:29).

460. c) But the movements which his way of speaking provoked were not disrupting, like those of an insane or paranoid person, but they were *movements of admiration and gentleness*; so much so that, when he was twelve years old, all were amazed who heard him because of his prudence and answers (Luke 2:47); and all in the synagogue at Nazareth wondered as the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth (Luke 4:22; see

19. This conclusion of chapter 11 in Matt. has been called “the pearl of the words of Jesus”; see A. Durand, *Evangelie selon S. Matthieu* (Verbum Salutis, I) at this place.

20. On this point, note well how Jesus could *distinguish* in a hostile debate: *Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's* (v.21); also how he denies the supposition: *For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven* (v.30);

21. Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.167 a). See also J.M Bover, *La palabra de Jesucristo desde el punto de vista literario*: EstEcl 16 (1942) 375-397; and by the same author concerning the concept of parables and the way to interpret them, *Las parábolas del Evangelio*: EstBibl 3 (1944) 229-257.

Mark 6:2); and the officers in Jerusalem who were supposed to arrest him said: "No man ever spoken like this man" (Luke 7:46).

Therefore there was in him an intelligence at the same time both "verbal" and "social." This is also evident from his wonderful way of dealing with men; he also knew how to attract crowds, but not by abusing their feelings or by conniving with their vices... (see Mark 8:33 where he rebukes Peter).

Truly he understood men, and also those who believed when they saw the signs he performed, when he was in Jerusalem for the Passover on the feast day: "Jesus did not trust himself to them, because he knew all men and needed no one to bear witness of man; for he himself knew what was in man" (John 2:24f.).

461. d) *Another form of intelligence, mechanical or spatial,* naturally cannot be so evident from reading the gospels, and it does not seem to be so necessary for complete intellectual stability. But from the manual labor that the Lord did for a long time (see Mark 6:3), and from the comparisons made by him in the gospels, and which suppose a visual imagination, it is evident that not even this form of intelligence was lacking in Jesus.

462. e) As a consequence of these forms of intelligence just mentioned, and from the qualities of imagination and sentiment (see n.461.464) which were in Jesus, it also seems possible to conclude to his *artistic intelligence* or his ability to perceive beauty and its realization through beautiful forms; however, this form of intelligence, especially in the production of beautiful things, does not seem to be necessary for complete mental stability.

Therefore this aptitude supposes several faculties, which certainly existed in Jesus: an *intellect* whose function it is to apprehend or capture the splendor of order or beauty; *sentiment* so that beautiful ideas and forms are grasped accurately and delicately, profoundly and at the same time intensely; *imagination* so that ideas and their splendor may be expressed in sensible forms, generally visual ones (except in the musical arts).

Indeed concerning Jesus of Nazareth we do not know about any physical creations or beautiful pictures; but we have certain knowledge about his discourses and his words. But from these we can also deduce his artistic qualities: they certainly demonstrate the highest intelligence that is both subtle and accurate, as we saw above in n.458; his manner and beauty in speaking (v.gr., look at the lilies of the field... etc.), and his visual images frequently taken from the world of nature, presuppose his visual imagination (see n. 461); likewise the gospels show that the observation of nature and affection for nature in him were very strong; his heart and social sentiment were shown above in n. 464, so that one can easily perceive his moral beauty.

But certainly imagination and sentiment are evident in him in such a way that they never seem to function independently of his intellect, but are constituted completely

under the power of his will; the result is that no danger of deception arises from those faculties of imagination and sentiment; and it is clear that this danger really is present in not a few cultivators of beauty because of an excessive influence of imagination and sentiment.

463. B) *The equilibrium of mind and the healthy psychic constitution in Jesus.* The things that we have just mentioned above surely show in Jesus a great and extraordinary genius, and great wisdom; they also show different forms of intelligence that are well balanced. Hence both his teaching and his way of life *do not have any strange exaggerations.*

A severe contempt for material things... is really very far removed from his teaching. A serene mind, the charm of daily life, urbane sociability, goodness of heart and pleasures of the body can be easily reconciled with his teaching, as Jesus himself showed by his own example (John 2:1ff.; Luke 5:29ff.; 7:36ff.; 10:2ff.; Mark 6:31; 7:15ff.; 10:13ff.; Matt. 11:19; 18:2).²²

Also *there is his holy way of acting*: with supreme charity towards God, both affective and effective, which are constant throughout his whole life; with universal charity towards others—effective, gentle and affable; *his way of acting is perfect* with a charity (the queen of virtues) to which all the other virtues are related: religion (John 2:14ff.), justice and prudence (Matt. 22:21), abstinence (Matt. 4:4), gentleness and humility (Matt. 11:29; 26:50; Luke 22:61; John 13:4ff.), magnanimity (Luke 12:30; John 14:31), mercy (Matt. 9:36; 11:28), forbearance (Matt. 23:37), veracity (Matt. 22:16); there is *his strong and constant way of acting* in the midst of difficulties, by joining together opposite virtues (like mercy towards sinners and zeal for the glory of God) *without deceit and violence*: all of these virtues show that such a man enjoys *a very healthy system of nerves*, which is immediately subject to the command of reason; and therefore such a man can in no way be said to be insane; rather, he is not even disposed in the least way to the morbid affections of hallucination and fanaticism. Therefore the healthy psychic constitution of Jesus is absolutely certain.²³

Therefore, *according to this extraordinary genius and great wisdom of Jesus (A), and according to his equilibrium of mind and life and his healthy psychic constitution (B)*, what Jesus said about himself must be absolutely true: that is, *that Jesus was not deceived in affirming his legation and divinity.*

22. Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.167 a) (ed. 1927, p.179).

23. See Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.168.

464. Scholium. *On the character of Jesus* or on the permanent and predominant note in his personal make up.

With regard to his intellectual life we have already pointed out his mental equilibrium and his extraordinary and harmonious functioning in the various manifestations of his talent and intelligence.

In his moral life certainly love for his Father was dominant throughout his whole life; and this virtue which already by its nature is apt to govern the other virtues and which inspires companionship of the other virtues, really in Jesus was associated with the complex of the other virtues—with the exclusion of penance—; hence in this matter equilibrium and true harmony were not lacking in Jesus.

But this harmony and equilibrium in the sum total of truly outstanding qualities were included not only in his cognitive faculties and in his will, but they were also contained in his *faculties of feeling* and in his heart, since the gospels bear witness to his heart and his feelings: thus, v.gr., about his tears (because of the death of Lazarus and the suffering of his sisters: John 11:35; on the evils to befall the city and its ruin: Luke 19:41); also about his noble and tender friendship (John 13:33; 15:15; 11:33-36).

It is to be added also that *his physical constitution was excellent*, if we put trust in the image contained in the Shroud of Turin, with which his dead body was covered,²⁴ and if we consider other things mentioned in the gospels, like his daily journeys on foot, the strong voice with which he was able to cry out....

Hence really, if some characteristic qualities are to be pointed out in him, it seems that *great harmony and equilibrium in a complex of extraordinary qualities* must be admitted.

Therefore he was a certain character, just as he was of a certain nation, of a certain mother and complexion—but without any imperfection and endowed with an extraordinary level of perfection. Therefore in order to know his intellectual and moral nature it is necessary to proceed in *a negative and deductive way*: in this way a harmonious complex of opposites and a supreme exemplar of perfection will be had.

But let us approach the mystery of Jesus, the mysterious nature of his person, so that the description of the image of Jesus may become as Fra Angelico is said to have painted his images: on bended knees—so that we might contemplate his glory as the only Son of the Father, full of grace and truth.²⁵

24. On the history and authenticity of this Holy Shroud, see recently M. de Iriarte, S.J., *Sobre el llamado "Santo lienzo de Turin"*: RazFe 131 (1945) 517-541; there also is a select bibliography. Also by the same author, *Un gran enigma científico: La imagen de Cristo en el llamado "Santo lienzo de Turin"*: Arbor 10 (1948) 201-224; W. Bulst, S.J., *Das Grabtuch von Turin* (Frankfurt 1955).

On the bodily figure of Jesus of Nazareth, see v.gr. F. Prat, *Jésus Christ*¹ 1,529-532; and A. Michel, *Jésus Christ*: DTC 8,1153,1154.1272.—*On the image of Christ in art*, see G. Maillat, *Le Christ dans l'art* in the encyclopedia *Le Christ* (Bloud and Gay) 879-975; Ch. Broussole, *Le Crucifix*, *ibid.*, 976-1048; G. de Jerphanion, *L'image de Jésus-Christ dans l'art chrétien*: NouvRevTh 65 (1938) 257-283.

25. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.786. Concerning this spiritual and moral image of Jesus, besides the authors mentioned above in the initial bibliography who treat this thesis, see also K. Adam, *Jesus Christus*. Also there are many "lives" or biographies of Jesus, which are mentioned in the Appendix, n. 769ff. J. Castiello, S.J. (*A Humane Psychology of Education*, p.3 c.2) considers Jesus also as the ideal exemplar of "personality," both in his intuitive, analytical, synthetic and creative intelligence, and in his heroic figure which is at the same time human and benign.

465. Proof of the third part. *The holiness of Jesus is a moral miracle confirming his testimony.* The holiness of Jesus, not only heroic, but truly extraordinary is shown:

- 1) *negatively* by proving the absence of sin in him; and
- 2) *positively* by trying to describe his holiness.²⁶

466. 1) *It is certain that Jesus was free of all sin:* a) *from the testimony of Jesus himself*, and his testimony is certainly valid because no one dared to challenge it, and because he did not fear the danger of a rebuttal. Thus he makes the famous claim: *Which of you convicts me of sin?* (John 8:46), and he says that the devil does not have anything against him (John 14:30) and that the sign of his veracity is in the fact that he is not seeking his own glory (John 7:18). About other men he says openly, *since you are evil* (Matt. 7:11); but about himself that he is to be handed over in sacrifice as a victim of satisfaction for sin (Matt. 26:28.45; 20:28), and he proclaims that this sacrifice has been accepted by the Father (John 10:17).

467. b) The innocence of Jesus is also certain *from the testimony of his contemporaries*, who were convinced that all men are infected with an inclination of sin (Gen. 8:21; 1 Kings 8:46; Ps. 51:7; Rom. 3:9ss.). Thus *friends*, like John the Baptist who calls him “the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29 [compared with John 3:27]); thus his *disciples*, continuous companions, who say that there is no sin in him (1 John 3:5) and that he did no sin and that no guile was found on his lips (1 Pet. 2:21-25); *St. Paul* refers to this same tradition about him “who knew no sin” (2 Cor. 5:21), was tempted in every respect without sin (Heb. 4:15) and who was a truly holy high priest, blameless, separated from sinners (Heb. 7:26-28). And even his *enemies*, eagerly trying to trap him, could find nothing but futile accusations, which show their bad will and their attempt to put a bad interpretation on innocent things: that he blasphemes (Matt. 9:3), that he casts out demons by the prince of demons (Matt. 9:34), that he is a glutton and friend of sinners (Matt. 11:19), that his disciples transgress the tradition of the elders (Matt. 15:2)... His innocence appears very clearly in the process of the passion, since nothing else could be found except that he said he was the Son of God (John 19:7); the other accusations (that he made himself a king, that he was a rebel...) came to nothing: Pilate, his wife, Judas, the thief... all proclaim the innocence of Jesus (John 18:38; 19:4; Matt. 27:19:3f.; Luke 23:41).

26. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.788-794.

468. 2) *Positively his exceptional holiness in acting is certain by considering the end which he pursued in his actions, since the moral uprightness of actions depends on the circumstances, especially their purpose. But here the purpose was God and his good pleasure to be accomplished out of filial love; and indeed with the greatest intensity, as his food (John 4:34; see Luke 2:49) and by overcoming great difficulties, namely, through sacrifices, even in agony (Luke 22:42ff.) and in death (John 19:30; Luke 23:46). And it should be noted with what great love, both intensive and extensive, he dedicated himself to all men; likewise how all the other virtues are joined together with this love, the queen of virtues, and which were evident in his character to an exceptional degree: prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance... with the one exception of penance, since where there is no sin there cannot be penance.*

469. But if this holiness is considered now not in an absolute way, but relatively, it is *truly incomparable*. For *the life of other philosophers and founders* was not religious in the strict sense, since they did not have in their systems a concept of the true God as fundamental (Buddha,²⁷ Confucius²⁸...) or it was not morally holy (Mohammed...). But the *saints*, who live in the Christian religion and surpass the common virtue of men to a heroic degree, receive from Jesus himself light and inspiration and are *his imitators*, but they are never equal to their exemplar.

470. Therefore the holiness of Jesus stands out as truly remarkable, so much so also that you would find it difficult to say that *the image of such an ideal man* was created by men; and much more would you say that *his reality* completely surpasses the common attainment of virtue in men, and that he is *a moral and psychological miracle, indicating an extraordinary intervention of God*.

For it is truly difficult to establish a criterion by which we could measure

27. Buddha, which means "illuminated," lived in the 5th or 6th century before Christ. In his philosophical system (for the popular system and its praxis is nothing other than an absurd idolatry) there is *atheism*, because he does not acknowledge the first cause or at least he does not think about it, nor does he concern himself, as in Brahmanism, with metaphysical investigations. He has a moral system that is quite good, but it cannot be compared with the Christian: Christian abnegation is an active virtue directed to the moral perfection of man and his happiness; Buddhist abnegation tends to the destruction of activity; benevolence toward the neighbor, which Buddhism recommends, is not like Christian charity because of God, which Christianity has as a fundamental doctrine; Buddhist asceticism tends towards the destruction of "desire," in order to escape suffering and to obtain "nirvana." On Buddhism and Buddha, see L. de la Vallée Poussin in *Christus* (J. Huby) c.8; G. Schulemann and J. Lippl, *Budda, Buddhismus*: LTK 2,612-620; H. Heras, S.J., *La naturaleza del budismo*: RevFilos 10 (1951) 119-164.
28. *Kong-fu-tse* (6th century before Christ) has a *moral system* without systematic metaphysical speculations about God. Concerning him, see L. Wieger, in *Christus* (J. Huby) c.5; or by the same author the article *Chine*: DAFC 1,513-516, 527-530.

what the human will can accomplish left to its own resources; certainly it can do much in religious matters (fanaticism, apathy, endurance of suffering) and in secular affairs for industrial and scientific work. But there are some acts of virtue that are naturally impossible, especially in a series of acts that is—*constant and intense of a holy life striving for the right end* (not to obtain temporal goods, but to renounce these goods and to perfectly fulfill the will of God)—and to do that *in difficult circumstances and with supreme sacrifices*. For this certainly an extraordinary intervention of God is required—and then there is a *moral miracle*.

Now if God by his intervention designates such a man, whose very word and deed has this one purpose that he manifest himself as the legate and Son of God, God with his seal of a miracle confirms the truth of this testimony.

Therefore the holiness of Jesus is a moral miracle confirming his testimony.

471. Objections. *Against the first part.* 1. Jesus did not always speak the truth. Thus in John 7:8-11: *I am not going up to this feast... But after his brethren had gone up to the feast, then he also went up, not publicly but in private.*

Response. 1) Even if falsity were present in a particular case, it would not logically follow that he did not speak the truth in giving serious testimony. But in no way is falsity present, nor inconstancy in what he said.

2) The meaning of Jesus' negation is this: I am not going up "that is, *with you or with a festive group nor in the way in which you want me to go*, that is, to manifest myself to the world so that with pomp and celebrity I may enter into the city,"²⁹ truly because my time has not yet fully come (John 7:8); but later he does go up *not publicly, but as it were in private* (v.10).³⁰

2. When Jesus heard about the illness of Lazarus he said: *This illness is not unto death* (John 11:4), but Lazarus did die shortly after that (v.17).

Response. Jesus said that the illness of Lazarus was not unto death, *but it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it* (v.4). Therefore, as is deduced from the whole fact, the illness was not unto a *permanent* death, but the sick man was to be brought back to life by his resurrection.

472. *Against the second part, in response to the critics.*³¹ 3. Jesus was easily deceived and he did not have a healthy psychic constitution. For, there are present in him *fixed ideas*, v.gr., concerning the possibility of speaking with God, from whom he believed he would receive something; also concerning the possibility of an extraordinary intervention of God in the world (a miracle), and the possibility of predicting the future.

29. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Ioannem*² (Paris 1906) 262.

30. See I. Knabenbauer, *ibid.*, 261f.; M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean*² (Paris 1925) 200f.

31. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.737-745/

Response. Such fixed ideas are only the *common ideas* held by Jesus' contemporaries about revelation, miracles and prophecy. Therefore they were not something abnormal. But how undeservedly such ideas are thought to be absurd is certain from the facts; but the way in which the adversaries proceed in this matter is obviously aprioristic and non-scientific.

4. Jesus also had several *hallucinations*:

a) *in his baptism* he thought he saw *the Spirit of God descending like a dove and coming upon him*, and also that he heard a voice from heaven saying: *This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased* (Matt. 3:16f.; see Mark 1:10f.; Luke 3:21f.);

b) he also believed that *he was tempted by the devil* in a quite amazing manner (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12f.; Luke 4:1-13);

c) and he believed that *he was transfigured on the mountain* (Matt. 17:1-9; Mark 9:1-8; Luke 9:28-36); that he saw "Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18); and *in his agony* he thought he was comforted by an angel (Luke 22:43).

Response. All of these events are easily and very well explained by a *supernatural intervention*, which should not be rejected a priori as the adversaries do. And this solution does not improperly presuppose the thesis and the mental health of Jesus, since after proving the thesis this is completely the way things are. Moreover please note: a) in the baptism others also saw the same things, at least John the Baptist (John 1:32); b) that the temptations could well have been told to the disciples by Jesus himself, so that they would become "programmatically" and that because of them false ideas about the coming Messiah would be rejected; c) that the transfiguration, in the hypothesis of the adversaries, must be interpreted as a collective hallucination, even though the disciples were present as witnesses; but to see Satan fall from heaven, while the disciples cast him out from men, is not repugnant in someone who is shown to be the enemy of Satan and the legate of God; finally that hallucination is excluded in the agony, because the fear and shuddering remained, and so it is easy to understand why Jesus through the comforting of an angel with a strengthened soul could withstand the agony and the bloody sweat.

Other objections, that Jesus was deceived in thinking that the end of the world was near, will be solved in the treatise *On the Church*.

Against the second and third parts. 5. The *affections* of Jesus are also objected to, which the adversaries call *inordinate and morbid*: the ejection of the merchants from the temple (John 2:14-17; Matt. 21:12f.; Mark 11:15-17; Luke 19:45f.), cursing the barren fig tree (Matt. 21:18-22; Mark 11:12-4.20-26); and at the same time they say there was a defect in Jesus regarding his family affection and piety towards his relatives (Luke 2:41-50; Matt. 8:21f. [Luke 9:59f.]; 12:46-50 [Mark 3:31-35; Luke 8:19-21]); there is also a defect in his understanding of sex (Matt. 19:12).

Response. All of these points are easily and rightly explained, if one pays attention respectively to the consequences: surely to *zeal for the Lord's house* that consumed Jesus (John 2:17) in driving out the merchants from the house of prayer; to the *symbolic importance* which was found in the barren fig tree, which was a type of the rejected synagogue, and at the same time so that the efficacy of prayer might be taught; but by

invoking *the rights of God and of his divine legate* over and above family affairs nothing inordinate can be found in the words of Jesus; the statement of Jesus is verified in recommending voluntary continence and virginity for the sake of the kingdom of heaven: *He who is able to receive this, let him receive it* (Matt. 19:12).

6. There were actions in Jesus which seem to diverge from moral goodness, such as to send the demons into pigs who would perish by throwing themselves into the lake (Matt. 8:30-34; Mark 5:11-17; Luke 8:33f.) with loss to their owners; similarly to present himself as a model of virtue (Matt. 11:29) and to boast about his own innocence (John 8:46).

Response. With regard to the first point, if Jesus in his way of acting is shown *and proved to be the supreme Lord* of all things, he could do that for a good purpose, namely that by this action the filthiness of the unclean spirits might be demonstrated, from whose domination men were to be liberated by Christ. And also, since among the Israelites those animals were a forbidden food, their destruction would be well understood, if in fact by those animals some law was being violated.—But if Jesus presents himself as a model of gentleness and humility, he does it in order to move his hearers to become his disciples, because he is not a hard or proud Master, but a meek and humble one.—But there was no boasting in the words of Jesus, as is abundantly clear from other texts; but he appeals to his own innocence so that his enemies, at least by their silence, would admit that no sin was found in him.

7. The testimony of Jesus' contemporaries is itself an objection; they said that *he casts out demons by the prince of demons* (Matt. 9:34; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15; see Matt. 12:24) and *he has a demon* or utters things like a mad man (John 7:20; 8:48.52; 10:20).

Response. If his enemies say these things, that proves only their bad will and envy. But Jesus very well rebuts them and shows why he does not cast out demons by the prince of demons, because *if Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself: how then will his kingdom stand?*" (Matt. 12:26f.). But the words of Jesus, which the crowds or the "Jews" do not understand, encourage them to say that Jesus is insane or speaks under the influence of a demon. But such assertions of Jesus really are found to have *a legitimate and sane meaning*; note also that not all agree in the same opinion, because *others said: These are not the sayings of one who has a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?* (John 10:21).

8. Jesus' own relatives—the adversaries say—thought he was insane, because they say: *He is beside himself* (Mark 3:21).

Response. There is another interpretation recommended for this place³²; namely, according to Mark 3:20: *Then they went home* [Jesus and his disciples] *and the crowd came together again, so that they could not even eat. And when* [they could not even eat] *they heard about this* [οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, perhaps the Galileans who were nearby, or some disciples] *they went out to seize him; for they said: he is beside himself* [ἐξέστη, that is, he works with such zeal that he seems to the crowd to act

32. See M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*⁵ (Paris 1929) 69f.; I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Marcum*² (Paris 1907) 105-108.

imprudently³³; or *he is beside himself because of his zeal* and enthusiasm (see Mark 2:12; 5:42; 6:51 in the Greek text where the word ἐξίστημι appears). Therefore his strength is almost worn out, because he is not eating, and they want to force him to eat³⁴]. Finally, *his mother and his brethren came* (v.31), which indicates that these persons, real relatives, are not the same “they” as before in verse 21; but that the brethren of Jesus do not consider him to be insane is certain from John 7:3f.

33. See Zorell, *Lexicon graecum N.T.* at the word ἐξ-ίστημι.

34. See 2 Kings 4:8 where you will find something similar: When Elisha went to Shunem, there was a wealthy woman there *who urged him to eat some food.*

ARTICLE II

ON THE WORKS DONE BY JESUS

473. When a wonder worker is already known, we can more readily evaluate his works, that is, examine his miracles, which should be considered as the primary criterion of a revelation. Also Jesus himself appealed to his miracles as confirmation of his testimony and his mission. Therefore he said: "If you do not believe me, believe the works" (John 10:38); and "these very works which I am doing, bear witness that the Father has sent me" John 5:36). See also Matt. 11:4f. [Luke 7:22]; John 5:31-36; 14:10-13.

But among the miracles that bear witness to Jesus' testimony, there are miracles *in Jesus*, miracles done *by Jesus*, and finally miracles done *for Jesus*. In the preceding article the miracle in Jesus was examined; now the miracles *done by Jesus* are to be examined.

Thesis 32. Jesus excellently proved his divine testimony by many physical miracles.

S.Th. III, q. 43f.; Suarez, *De mysteriis vitae Christi* comments on the preceding questions and d.31 (Opera 19,466-498); Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.796-841; L. Fonck, *Die Wunder der Herrn im Evangelium* 1² (Innsbruck 1907); E. Ugarte de Ercilla, *Las milagros del Evangelio*² (Madrid 1917); L.Cl. Fillion, *Les miracles de N.S. Jésus-Christ* 2 t. (Paris 1909-1910); H. Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conf. de Notre-Dame* (1931) 3; A. Due, *El poder de Dios y la ciencia* (Granada 1942) conf.9.

474. Adversaries. Many false explanations for Jesus' miracles can be cited, which is an evident sign of their inefficacy.

The Pharisees attributed them to demons: Matt. 9:34; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15; Matt. 12:24. Similarly *later Jews* and the *Talmudists* wanted to explain them as works of magic (see n.379.440.483c).

Celsus (2nd century, writing probably about 178), a pagan rationalist, and others, attributed the miracles to trickery and the black arts. Thus Origen, in his book *Contra Celsum*, introduces him as speaking and conceding that Jesus worked wonders, but like "those things that magicians do, promising always greater and greater things, and they do things after being trained in the Egyptian arts...."¹

Porphyry, a pagan neo-Platonist (232-ca.303), tried to explain all the work of Jesus in a rationalistic way.²

475. Those also should be mentioned who, just as they have a false idea about the person of Jesus and the gospels, so they explain the miracles in

1. *Contra Celsum* 1,68: R 517.

2. See St. Jerome, *Liber hebraicarum quaestionum in Genesim* I v.10: LM 23,988; L. Vaganay, *Porphyre*: DTC 12,2570-2575; L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,135-138.

accordance with their bad theories.

Thus H.S. Reimarus (1694-1768) proposed a *theory of fraud*: after the hopeless death of Jesus, he said that the disciples invented his resurrection and miracles so that they could lead a pleasant life.³ Today this theory is rejected.

E. Gottlob Paulus (1761-1851) invented the *naturalistic theory*: the miracles, narrated indeed with oriental exaggeration, can be explained naturally; thus the multiplication of loaves is only an example of a certain hospitality given by Christ, which was imitated by others.⁴

D.F. Strauss (1808-1874) cultivated the *mythical theory*; not being content with the preceding explanations, he says that the miracles are a work of imagination, which attributes them to some historical person.⁵

476. More recent authors profess a certain *eclecticism* and *criticism* concerning this matter. So they explain the miracles a) either as exaggerated natural events (v.gr., O. Holtzmann⁶); or as allegories and symbols; c) or myths because of an idealized image of Jesus; d) or as psychic-therapeutic influxes of suggestion.

Thus E. Renan attributes the gospel miracles to the popular opinion formed either during the life of Jesus or after his death; or he considers only the cures in which Jesus was actively involved: in these he says that the cure can be explained sufficiently as a result of suggestion.⁷

477. A. Harnack has the following principles for judging the gospel reports concerning miracles:

- 1) A miracle at that time was a daily occurrence because of ignorance of the laws of nature;
- 2) Miracles were attributed to eminent persons not long after their death;
- 3) "We hold very firmly" [but also very falsely, and a priori, as a preju-

3. Thus in the fragment edited by G.E. Lessing, *Von Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger*; see above, n.250.449; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.510.

4. *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Heidelberg 1828)); see on this Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.510.

5. *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*; see above n.252.

6. *Das Leben Jesu* (Tübingen 1901); see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.508.

7. *Vie de Jésus*¹³ ch.16 (*Miracles*): "...La médecine scientifique, fondée depuis cinq siècles par la Grèce était, à l'époque de Jésus, à peu près inconnue aux juifs de Palestine. Dans un tel état de connaissances, la présence d'un homme supérieur, traitant le malade avec douceur, et lui donnant par quelques signes sensibles l'assurance de son rétablissement, est souvent un remède décisif [!]. Qui oserait dire que dans beaucoup de cas, et en dehors des lésions tout à fait caractérisées, le contact d'une personne exquise ne vaut pas les ressources de la pharmacie? Le plaisir de la voir guérir. Elle donne ce qu'elle peut, un sourire, une espérance, et cela n'est pas vain..." (*ibid.* 270f.).

- dice] that a miracle as an exception to the laws of nature is impossible;
- 4) We do not yet understand the powers of nature [but we know how far they do not go].

[These last two principles pertain to *the metaphysical order* and contain two prejudices already rejected previously; see n.167f.173].

Thus Harnack distinguishes the gospel miracles into five classes:

- a) Wonderful natural facts, exaggerated by tradition;
- b) narrations of parables and discourses badly understood, or the projection of an internal experience to the outside;
- c) narrations coming from a tendency to find fulfillment of the prophecies of the O.T.;
- d) cures produced by the extraordinary spiritual power of Jesus (suggestions);
- e) things inexplicable.

Therefore things that seem to be able to be explained by the psychological powers of suggestion are to be retained; the other things are to be rejected as legendary (!).⁸

478. *The modernists* deny the historicity of the miracles narrated in the gospels: they say that the evangelists wrote not what is historical but what is edifying (D 34140; that the fourth gospel exaggerated miracles (D 3417). Moreover, the miracles of Jesus did not aim to prove that he is the Messiah (D 3428),

For R. Otto Jesus had great power of curing (for he thinks that only the cures can be admitted in a critical sense to be among the miracles); but many men have such powers like a bud... just as the prophets of the O.T. had the power of divination.⁹

479. Doctrine of the Church. The *historical* and *philosophical* truth of the miracles of Christ is clearly affirmed in Vatican Council I (D 3009), where it is said that *especially Christ our Lord himself performed many manifest miracles*; and for the relative truth of the same miracles note the word “therefore,” that is, for this reason he performed that we might have external proofs of his revelation (D 3009). Furthermore, the same Council (D 3033) says that *the divine origin of the Christian religion can be known with certainty from miracles*; the obvious meaning here doubtless concerns the miracles performed by Jesus, which were treated especially in the corresponding chapter (D 3009).

Moreover, for the relative truth of these miracles, or in order to prove

8. *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Akademische Ausgabe (Leipzig 1902) 16ff.; see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.799.

9. *Leben und Wirken Jesu nach historisch-kritischer Auffassung* (Göttingen 102); and *Aufsätze das Numinose betreffend* (Gotha 1923): *Mitfolgende Zeichen* 154-158. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.800.840.

this thesis, see also D 3537-3542 (Oath against Modernism), D 2779.

For the historical truth see also D 2907 (Syllabus), D 2753 (Bautain); and for the philosophical truth D 260.

480. Theological note. From the written word of God and from tradition it is certain that Jesus Christ worked many physical miracles to prove his own testimony (see n.495); and it is certain that this point is taught by the Church, at least by the ordinary magisterium, as something revealed (see also D 3009, 3033). Therefore the thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*.

481. Proof. Jesus proved his divine testimony by many physical miracles, if there is certainty about their historical, philosophical and relative truth. But there is certainty about this.

1) The historical truth is certain. But to prove this: A) *first of all an overview of the miracles of Christ is to be considered*, whether narrated about individuals or about groups; then in order to show their strict historicity B) *that all of these pertain to the substantial parts of the gospels is to be demonstrated*; and C) *the same point is certain from the testimony of other historical sources*; and D) *from an internal critique of the narrations themselves*; and E) *from the influence and work of Jesus*. All of this adds up to an abundance of proof.

A) *An overview of the miracles of Jesus is considered.*

a) *The miracles narrated in individual cases:*

These are the miracles narrated about individuals, taken in the order in which they are found successively in Matt., Mark, Luke and John.

b) There are also *other miracles narrated in common*, that is, *summed up all together* in a multitude:

Matt. 4:23; 8:16; 9:35; 11:45; 12:15; 14:1f.; 14:35f.; 15:30; 19:2; 21:14;

Mark 1:32-34.39; 3:10; 6:54-56; 7:37;

Luke 4:40f.; 5:15.17; 6:17-19; 7:21f.; 9:11;

John 2:23; 6:2; 7:31; 12:37.

c) Others, even the *adversaries of Jesus, acknowledge the multitude of miracles worked by him*: John 3:2 (*Nicodemus*: No one can do these signs...); Mark 6:14; Luke 9:7 (*Herod*: Powers are at work in him, i.e., as if he were John the Baptist...); John 11:47 (*Pharisees and Chief Priests*: This man works many signs); John 12:10f. (Because of Lazarus many were

	Matt.	Mark	Luke	John	
1	8:2-4	1:40-45	5:12-14	—	cure of a leper
2	8:5-13	—	7:1-10	—	servant of centurion cured
3	8:14-15	1:29-31	4:38-39	—	A Simon's mother-in-law healed
4	8:23-27	4:35-40	8:22-25	—	storm calmed
5	8:28-34	5:1-20	8:26-39	—	Gerasene demoniac freed
6	9:2-7	2:1-12	5:18-26	—	paralytic healed at Capernaum
7	9:18-26	5:21-43	8:40-56	—	daughter of Jairus raised
8	9:20-22	5:24-34	8:43-48	—	woman with hemorrhage healed
9	9:27-31	—	—	—	two blind men healed
10	9:32-34	—	11:14-15	—	mute with demon cured
11	12:9-13	3:1-5	6:6-10	—	man with withered hand cured on Sabbath
12	12:22-30	—	(11:14-14)	—	blind and mute demonic freed
13	14:15-21	6:33-44	9:11-17	6:16-21	first multiplication of loaves
14	14:23-33	6:45-52	—	—	walking on water
15	15:21-28	7:24-30	—	—	daughter of Canaanite healed
16	15:32-38	8:1-9	—	—	second multiplication of loaves
17	17:14-17	9:13-26	9:38-43	—	lunatic cured
18	17:23-26	—	—	—	drachma from mouth of fish
19	20:29-34	10:46-52	18:35-43	—	two blind men healed in Jericho
20	21:12-13	11:15-18	19:45-46	(2:14-17)	cleansing of the temple
21	21:18-22	11:12-26	—	—	withered fig tree
22	—	1:23-28	4:33-37	—	demoniac freed in Capernaum
23	—	7:31-37	—	—	deaf mute healed
24	—	8:22-26	—	—	blind man at Bethsaida healed
25	—	—	4:28-30	—	Jesus flees the ambush at Nazareth
26	—	—	5:1-11	—	miraculous catch of fish
27	—	—	7:11-17	—	resuscitation of widow's son at Naim
28	—	—	13:10-17	—	bent over woman healed
29	—	—	14:1-6	—	healing of man with dropsy
30	—	—	17:12-19	—	ten lepers healed
31	—	—	22:49-51	—	ear of Malchus restored
32	—	—	—	2:1-11	change of water into wine
33	—	—	—	4:46-54	son of official healed
34	—	—	—	5:1-15	healing of paralytic for 38 years ¹⁰
35	—	—	—	9:1-8	man blind from birth healed
36	—	—	—	11:1-45	resuscitation of Lazarus
37	—	—	—	18:4-6	enemies in garden fall to the ground
38	—	—	—	21:1-13	second miraculous catch of fish

10. What can also be considered, and by some are considered, v.gr. by Dieckmann, as miracles of Jesus are his escapes in John's Gospel from the attempts to arrest him on the part of his enemies: John 7:30; 8:20; 10:39.

leaving the Jews...); Matt. 27:42; Mark 15:31; Luke 23:35 (*The Priests: He saved others...*).

d) *Jesus himself appeals to the many miracles worked by him*: Matt. 11:5; Luke 7:22 (Go and tell John...); Luke 13:32 (Go and tell that fox [Herod]: Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures...)...; see n.495.

482. B) *All of these pertain to the substantial of the gospels, whose historicity has already been proved above (see theses 22 and 24). Therefore it is necessary to heap together miracles in such quantity so that not even this escape is valid: that for one or the other miracle there was a later interpolation; but it is also necessary to demonstrate that the miracles narrated in the gospels are something substantial to them. This is proved*

a) *from the large number of verses cited above*; if you remove them, then the gospels (Mark and Luke) become fragments and their meaning will be obscured.

b) *Also many other things would have to be removed, which are intimately connected with narrations of the miracles; especially in Matt. and John which manifest greater unity and artistry in their composition.*

Thus, v.gr., in Matt. the miracles are connected intimately with the previous preaching (ch. 5-7), as a confirmation of it. The sayings of Jesus (Matt. 11:4-6 [Luke 7:22f.] and the following discourse about John the Baptist; likewise Matt. 11:20-24 [Luke 10:13-15] about the reproach of the cities) cannot be understood in a coherent way without the miracles. Similarly, the same point holds regarding the questions about healings on the Sabbath (Matt. 12:9-14), about the power with which he casts out demons (Matt. 12:23-37) and about the sign demanded by the Jews (12:38-42)....

In John it is the same with the conversation with Nicodemus (ch. 3) and on the occasion of the signs worked by Jesus (ch. 2); the discourse on the Eucharist (ch. 6) on the occasion of the multiplication of the loaves and walking on the water (v.25f.); the healing of the man born blind is supposed in the whole narration of chapter 10 (see v. 21); the resurrection of Lazarus was the occasion of the hatred for him and his death (11:46f.); also his entrance into Jerusalem (ch. 12) is related to the resurrection of Lazarus....

483. *The historicity of these miracles is certain also from the testimony of other historical sources.*

a) *From other canonical sources*: Thus *St. Peter* in his sermons in Acts 2:22; 3:12; 10:37f.; and in 2 Pet. 1:16.¹¹ *St. Paul*, indirectly of course, since he acknowledges Jesus as the Messiah, and appeals to his own miracles as a sign of his apostolate (2 Cor. 12:12;

11. On the authenticity of Acts, above in n.297ff.353ff; on the authenticity of 2 Pet., below in the treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.32, note 18.

Rom. 15:18f. See Heb. 2:4.¹²

b) *From later Christian authors.* Thus St. Quadratus, writing about the year 124, said that some of those cured and raised by Jesus were still living at his time.¹³ St. Melito Sardensis (before 194) said that the Lord *made his divinity known to us through miracles for three years after his baptism.*¹⁴ St. Irenaeus (140-202) recalls how St. Polycarp would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord... and the things he had heard from them respecting the Lord, *both with regard to his miracles and his teaching*¹⁵; Arnobius (ca. 305) asked whether “you can specify and point out to me any one of all those magicians who have ever existed in past ages, that did *anything similar, in the thousandth degree, to Christ,*¹⁶ and he defends the historicity of these miracles.¹⁷ Similarly other Fathers, and add those soon to be cited who quote adversaries conceding that Jesus worked miracles; all of these would not have admitted miracles unless there was certainty about their historicity: thus St. Ephraem,¹⁸ St. Gregory of Nyssa,¹⁹ St. Epiphanius,²⁰ St. Augustine²¹....

c) *From unbelievers and adversaries of Christianity.* Thus Flavius Josephus calls Jesus *the performer of marvelous works*²²; thus *later Jews*²³ and *Talmudists*²⁴ admit the fact of miracles, although they try to explain them as works of magic. Similarly the Gentiles, like those whom St. Justin mentions who concede that Christ worked miracles by tricks of magic²⁵; and expressly *Celsus*, cited by Origen as admitting Jesus’ miracles, but like the ones “which those do who have been trained in the Egyptian arts...,”²⁶ or attributing similar things to Aesculapius²⁷; also Hierocles thinking that similar things could be attributed to Apollonius of Tyana.²⁸

484. D) *There is an internal criterion for the historicity of Jesus’ miracles:*

a) *from the coherence* of those things that are narrated, both about the life of those men and about the institutions and their ethnic character²⁹; b) they are narrated *in an objective and sincere way*, so that things mentioned give

12. On the authenticity of 2 Cor. and Rom. see what we say above in n.370.

13. *Apologia*, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 4,3: R 109.

14. *Fragmen.* 7: R 189.

15. *Fragmen.* 2: R 264.

16. *Adversus nationes* 1,43: R 618.

17. *Adversus nationes* 1,54: R 619.

18. *Hymni dispersi* 15,1: R 716.

19. *Oratio catechetica* 11f.: R 1031f.

20. *Adversus haereses* 51,30: R 1094.

21. *Sermones* 128,4,5: R 1506; *De civitate Dei* 22,8,1: R 1784; *In Ioannem* 24,1: R 1819.

22. *Antiquitates iudaeorum* 18,3,3: Kch 7.

23. See Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1,28,38: MG 11,713-733; St. Justin, *Dialog. cum Tryphone* 17 and 108: MG 6,512.725; Eusebius Caesariensis, *Demonst. Evangel.* 3,6: MG 22,224ff.; Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos* 9: ML 2,664.

24. See J. Klausner, *Jésus de Nazareth* 53; see above, n.379.449.474.

25. *Apolog.* 1,30: R 122.

26. *Contra Celsum* 1,68: R 517.

27. *Contra Celsum* 3,24: MG 11,948. See *ibid.*, 3,27: R 524.

28. See Eusebius Caesariensis, *Contra Hieroclem*: MG 22,796-868.

29. See above, n.337-341.359.

the impression of complete historicity³⁰; c) *and the worth of the miracles is not exaggerated*, because miracles are not a convincing argument of virtue (Matt. 7:21-23), and one must not rejoice in them, but rather that their names are written in heaven (Luke 10:20), and others will do greater works in the future (John 14:12).

From this internal criterion there is also a huge difference between the evangelical miracles of Jesus and the miracles that are spoken about by the *apocryphal*³¹ and pagan writings (see Scholium n.486ff.).

485. E) *The influence and work of Jesus, plus the religious movement that followed his death, cannot be understood without miracles*; that is, the attraction of the people to him (which cannot be explained by his eloquence alone) and the attachment of friends (Apostles and disciples) in the midst of grave contradictions and the suffering of torments: this attachment is not shown to be sufficiently founded without the historical truth of the miracles of Christ, especially if you consider the power and strength and hated of their enemies...³²

486. Scholium 1. *On the false miracles that are reported and on the miracles of the false religions.*³³ Apollonius of Tyana³⁴ was a Pythagorean philosopher who lived during the time of Nero, 3-97 after Christ, as is believed. His life, desired and requested by empress Julia Donna, wife of the emperor Severus in the 3rd century, was written by *Philostratus* about the year 220. In this life he wanted to portray the image of the ideal philosopher, from a syncretistic collection of many things; so that this life of an ancient philosopher or magician, whom neither Tacitus nor Suetonius mention, might be captured in a romantic tale: so he appears as traveling about and performing miracles... not however in a definite way, like the miracles in the gospels, but in a rather vague way; and there is no mention of Christianity.

However, this *Life* lacks historicity; this is certain from the legendary elements it contains, and because it was written a long time after the life of the hero, and also because it abounds in errors both historical and geographical.

30. As an example examine, if you wish, any of the narrations of John (v.gr., ch. 9 *on the cure of the man born blind*) or the miracles that are described so dramatically and vividly in Mark (v.gr., *on the casting out of demons*).

31. Thus v.gr. from the apocryphal *Pseudo-Matthew* ch.26-29, the childish things it has about the games of the child Jesus and the astonishing (!) and incoherent things it contains. See *Los evangelios apócrifos* (ed.E. González-Blanco, Madrid) t.I,386-389.

32. For more on this see Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.811. See St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22,5: ML 41,757; and below, n.570.

33. In general these are treated by, v.gr., Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.819f.; Fonck, *Los milagros del Señor en el Evangelio* p.47-52; J. de Bonniot, S.J., *Les miracles et ses contrefaçons*⁴ (Paris 1888, 5th ed. 1895); Marín Noguera, *Lecciones de Apologética* n.184; add also the authors we will cite immediately, for particular cases.

34. See Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,133f.219-222 (note A₂); and the article, *Apollonius v. Tyana* in LTK 1,549f.

This *Life*, which was probably written with a harmless sentiment against Christianity, was first used by the pagan *Hierocles* (+ after the year 308) in order to attack the miracles of the Christians. *Eusebius* wrote against him.³⁵

487. The same lack of historicity must be affirmed regarding the narration of cures that are attributed to *Apollinus*, *Isidis*, *Aesculapius* by invoking them.³⁶ Many cures are attributed especially to Aesculapius, and miracles are reported to have taken place at Epidaurus, a Grecian city. Here there was a temple in a healthy and pleasant place; and after fasts, prayers and vigils, *incubations* took place, in which through dreams the god revealed what would have to be done or for the person to be cured... In a few tablets that have been preserved, the priests, not the eye witnesses, narrate in a uniform style some cures which are said to have taken place in the past: some are ridiculous, others obscene, others harmless... Hence historicity is lacking in them completely, and they cannot be compared with the narrations in the gospels; but some of these cures can readily be attributed to the suggestion of the place, of dreams....

488. Certain miracles are attributed to *some kings* (Hadrian, Vespasian).³⁷ Especially to Vespasian as Tacitus and Suetonius report. Two "miracles" are reported about Vespasian, in which in the judgment of the doctors there was no impossibility of being cured, and in the friends of the emperor a sense of adulation is described, but in the emperor great hesitation...; all of these things are completely different from the narrations in the gospels:

"Through those months in which, Vespasian being in Alexandria, the summer winds were blowing and the sea was certain [that is, from the 15-27 May until September 14, when navigation was certain, not uncertain] he waited, so that the favor of heaven and a certain favoritism of the god was shown to Vespasian. From the people of Alexandria a certain individual, known for the blindness of his eyes, threw himself at his feet, entreating earnestly with a groan for a cure of his blindness; he had been warned by the god Serapidis, whom the people given to superstitions worshiped before others: and he begged the Prince that he would deign to anoint his eyes with the spittle from his mouth. Another sick man, urged on by the same god, prayed that his hand might be tread upon by the foot of Caesar. At first Vespasian laughed and turned him down; but when they insisted, at one time fearing the fame of vanity, at another time by their pleas and words of adulation he became hopeful: finally, he ordered them to be evaluated by the doctors as to whether such blindness and weakness could be overcome by human effort. The doctors gave various opinions: that to this one the power of sight would return, if the obstacles were removed; that the other one with weak limbs could be healed if salutary force were used; perhaps that would happen if it pleased the gods and it were possible

35. *Animadversiones in Philostrati de Apollonio Tyanensi commentarius, ob institutam cum illo Hierocle Christi comparationem, adornatae*: MG 22,796-868.

36. See H. Leclercq, *Incubation*: DACL 7,511-517; Herzog, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus* (Leipzig 1931).

37. See below, Tacitus and Suetonius; also Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.819; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,474-479 (note I₂).

for the Prince with divine assistance; finally, that the glory of the remedy on the part of Caesar would do away with the jeers among the miserable. Therefore Vespasian, thinking that all was open to his fortune, and that anything further was incredible, with a smiling face, while the surrounding multitude was watching, ordered that it should take place. Immediately the one recovered the use of his hand and the other began to see. Both of those who were present now also recall the event, after there was no room for lying.”³⁸ That is what Tacitus wrote.

Suetonius narrates the same facts in a similar way. “Authority and a certain majesty were lacking to the new Prince: this also happened. A certain blind man from the people, and another one with an injured leg, approached him while sitting before the tribunal, and they asked for a work of curing, demonstrated by Serapidis during the night: that he would restore his eyes, if he spit upon them; that he would cure his leg, if he would deign to touch it with his foot. Since there was hardly any belief that the matter would in any way be successful, therefore he would not even dare to attempt it; finally at the urging of his friends, openly before the crowd he attempted both cures, and the result was not lacking. At the same time at Tegeae in Arcadia, at the urging of the prophets, a vase containing an ancient work was uncovered in a sacred place and in it was found an image like that of Vespasian.”³⁹

In these narrations the tendency to glorify the hero is very apparent, whether by the authors writing the history or by the flattering companions; the matter is very obscure in Vespasian and his unawareness of his power of performing wonders; the infirmity is very uncertain on the part of those assumed to be ill, and in the judgment of the doctors it is not incurable... Therefore these stories should be thought to pertain either to a fable or to superstition.

489. What Spartianus says about Hadrian is of much less importance and it has no historical merit: that is, that Hadrian restored her sight to a blind woman; also that a certain Pannonius, born blind, touched Hadrian suffering from a fever; when he did that, the fever left Hadrian and the blind man could see... “although Marius Maximus—as Spartianus adds—says that these things were done through simulation.”⁴⁰

Some of the things said should be treated totally as fables, v.gr., about *Pirro, king of Epirus*, who, as soon as he applied his foot to those affected with spleen, saw that they were cured⁴¹; likewise about the kings of the Franks.⁴²

Because of a defect in their historicity, the miracles reported as performed by

38. C. Cornelius Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.4,81.

39. C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *Vespasianus* 7.

40. *Hist. Augusti (Adrianus 23)*; see Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,477; Tacitus, *Opera in usum Delphini* v.6 (London 1821) 3145.

41. See Tacitus, *Opera in usum Delphini* v.6 (London 1821) 3154.

42. “The kings of the Franks, with saliva applied only by the thumb in the form of an X, cure tumors” (*Lupanus*) see *ibid.*, 3155; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,478f.

Buddha,⁴³ and also by *Mohammed*⁴⁴ should be rejected. These reports cannot in the least way be compared with the gospels, and in a special way they are seen to be adorned with fantasy and oriental imagination.

490. With regard to certain things that are at times asserted about *ascetics* in India (*fakirs*) or particularly about Sadhu Sundar Singh,⁴⁵ do not readily believe what is said; but in these matter historical proof is certainly demanded, such as we gave for the miracles narrated in the gospels. The same thing holds if some miracles should be reported as taking place in the heretical or schismatic sects. For, that would not be repugnant, because, as St. Thomas says, “wicked men who teach a false doctrine never work true miracles in confirmation of their teaching, although sometimes they may do so in praise of Christ’s name which they invoke, and by the power of the sacraments which they administer.”⁴⁶

491. 2) There is certainty about the philosophical truth of the miracles of Christ, if it is established that they really were miracles or that they fulfilled the philosophical definition of a miracle (a sensible work—surpassing the powers of nature—worked by God). See n. 160-163.170.

We can distribute the physical miracles of Jesus according to the following overview:

1) *Miracles concerning inorganic things* (v.gr., calming a storm) or *irrational animals* (v.gr., a catch of fish).

2) *Resurrections of the dead.*

3) *cures* $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{of organic diseases (v.gr., blindness from birth)} \\ \text{of functional diseases} \end{array} \right. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{by casting out evil spirits} \\ \text{by not casing out evil spirits} \end{array} \right.$

492. Indeed in all of these cases it is certain: A) *that they were sensible works* both visible to all and apt to be proved;

43. See Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* I⁴ p.90f. n.132; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,447f. (note B₂).

44. See Fonck, *Los milagros del Señor* 51; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,448f.

45. See L. de Grandmaison, *Le Sadhu Sundar Singh et le problème de la sainteté hors de l’Eglise catholique*: RechScRel 12 (1922) 1-29 [it concerns a certain Hindu ascetic, born in 1889 and converted to Christianity, who was said to have performed miracles. His miracles, if there were any, tended to draw men away from superstition; but the reported miracles were either false or for the most part legendary]. See also O. Pfister, *Die Legende Sundar Singhs* (Leipzig 1926); L. de Grandmaison, *Bulletin de Littérature religieuse*: RechScRel 26 (1926) 83-85; A. Waeth, S.J., *Das Leben Sundar Singhs in historisch-kritischer Beleuchtung*: Stimm 111 (1926) 118-136; for a bibliography see Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 473f.

46. II-II, q. 178, a. 2 ad 3.

B) *that the course of nature is surpassed in them*, whether by reason of the substance of the thing done, or by reason of the subject in which it was done, or by reason of the way in which it was done.

A difficulty can be raised *regarding the functional diseases*, whether they can be explained by a mere natural suggestion, or whether in their cure the powers of nature were surpassed. It is necessary to say that these cures were performed by Jesus in a way that is beyond the order of nature. For, a natural therapy through suggestion is valid only in less serious sicknesses; it progresses slowly and the result is uncertain⁴⁷; but the cures of Jesus took place *immediately, with great freedom, always with a certain result, not just within set limits*.—Also in his way of acting it is apparent that these cures are produced by the same power by which he performed other healings and other greater prodigies; i.e., all of them were in the same way beyond the normal course of nature.

It is not correct to say that these miracles of Jesus, so openly done, can be explained by some hidden natural powers or by some occult knowledge, unless in this amazing knowledge or power you wish to understand it as an intellectual miracle.—Also in this way it would not be explained how this power could be communicated to the Apostles (Matt. 10:8; Mark 6:13; Luke 10:17-19; see Luke 9:49f.), and after many miracles were performed by them how this so wondrous power could remain secret; and how *only in Palestine, during the time of Jesus*, this power appeared and was known.

493. C) *They were worked by God*, that is, there is also certainty about the theological truth of Jesus' miracles.

a) And first of all they were worked by God *in a powerful way*.

Thus doubtless this took place in those wondrous events (*major, absolute* miracles) which could be done physically *only by God*, or morally, by positively willing that a creature should receive those miracles. Such are, regarding the substance of the thing done, *resurrections of the dead*; and, regarding the way in which they were done, in every case to operate in such a way that by a mere act of the will they are accomplished, without requiring a presupposed subject, so that an *unlimited power* over the laws of nature is shown. Jesus did such things: by his will alone, without the

47. Contemporary psychiatry has a choice in dealing with the sick, for it does not accept all as able to be cured; among the sick it deals only with nervous diseases, not with organic; and it takes a long time.—But cures by *coueism*, by E. Coué (1857-1926), strive to use the powers of imagination and auto-suggestion in order to stimulate the vital processes of healing; but the great limitations of this process are per se evident. On *coueism*, see v.gr. I. Froebes, S.J., *Tratado de psicología empirica y experimental*. Spanish version³, t.2 (Madrid 1944) 694-696.

preparation of a material subject or the application of natural powers; both while being present and also at a great distance v.gr., the cure of the centurion's servant); on all kinds of beings—inorganic (calming a storm) or living (the withered fig tree); on irrational entities or on men or on spirits; on infirmities of any kind; concerning all types of laws, whether natural in the strict sense, i.e., physical, or biological...; and all of these are done with absolute freedom and certainty of the outcome, and with the permanence of the effects (see v.gr. Matt. 8:6f.; Mark 4:39; John 5:8f.; 11:43f.).

But certain wonders, which absolutely can be conceived as being done by a supermundane cause that is not precisely divine, as v.gr. a catch of fish, casting out of demons...; in the gospel events were also done by God, just like the preceding miracles. For, Jesus presented them as true miracles (v.gr., the casting out of demons; Matt. 12:28: “it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons...”) and they must be attributed to the same miraculous power with which Jesus worked the other miracles (see Matt. 11:5 where expressly other minor prodigies are associated with the resurrections).

Likewise, that the prodigies of Christ were worked by God is certain also *from a consideration of the person of the wonder-worker and from his way of operating.*

For, the wonder-worker *was a very holy and wise man* (see thesis 31); he was also a man *publicly approved by God* at his baptism (Matt. 3:16f.), at his transfiguration (Matt. 17:1-5), by the voice from heaven (John 12:27f.), and by the earthquake after his crucifixion (Matt. 27:51-54).

His manner of acting was absolutely holy, upright, serious—not trivial, or strange or ridiculous; he emitted a sense of reverence towards God and men; God was invoked to give testimony to this and in him there was nothing superstitious or singular.

494. b) They were also done by God *for a purpose*. This is shown by the end intended by Jesus and the effects that followed.

Regarding the end intended by Jesus, his works were directed to preaching and establishing the kingdom of God on earth, and driving out the prince of this world (John 12:31). His enmities with the evil spirit already from the beginning of his public life are manifest in his overcoming the temptations (Luke 4:1-13); battles with them follow: in the Spirit of God he drives them out; and if Satan drives out Satan, he is divided against himself, and so his kingdom will not stand (see Matt. 12:24-30; Mark 1:25-32; 3:11; 5:1-16; 7:25-30; 9:16-29; Luke 11:14-26; see Matt. 9:32-34). Jesus communicated to the Apostles this power of casting out demons (Matt. 10:8; Mark 3:15; 6:7); and they de facto exercised it (Mark 6:13;

Luke 10:17-19); just as also the followers of Jesus exercised it and will exercise it (Mark 16:17). Therefore, from the purpose of Christ's miracles *the intervention of an evil supermundane spirit is excluded*. But if this casting out of spirits is done by man, it must be attributed to a divine power given to the man, since an inferior creature cannot naturally have power over a higher creature.

Also the effects which followed from Jesus' miracles, certainly morally good and salutary, prove that those miracles were worked by God.

Therefore, in Jesus' miracles all the elements of the definition of a miracle are fulfilled, so there is certainty about their philosophical truth.

495. 3) There is certainty about the relative truth of the same miracles, if it is established that those miracles are ordered by God to seal and prove the testimony of Jesus. But there is certainty about this.

For, A) *Jesus explicitly appealed* to those miracles as a sign of his mission. Thus *in general* concerning all of his miracles, he speaks *about the works which he does, which bear witness to him* (John 5:36; 10:25.37.38; 14:10-12; 15:24; Matt. 11:20f.).—*In particular* about some of the miracles: in the cure of the paralytic (Matt. 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24); in the cure of the leper, whom he commands to show himself to the priest, for thus he will be certain about the performed miracle (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14); likewise to the disciples of the Baptist who asked him if he was the Messiah (Matt. 11:2-6; Luke 7:19-22); in the cure of the man born blind that the works of God might be manifested in him (John 9:3); in the resuscitation of Lazarus (John 11:42).

Jesus appealed to his miracles in favor of his testimony *at least equivalently or implicitly*. For, he said that he is the Messiah; but from the Old Testament it was well known that miraculous works are to be taken as a messianic sign (see Isa. 35:4-6 with Matt. 11:4-6).

B) Moreover, in the circumstances in which the miracles took place *there was no reason to suspect that they were ordained by God to some other hidden ends* or that they were merely permitted; for, it would be opposed to the divine wisdom and goodness for a man to be endowed with *such* miraculous power, which he used in order to call upon God to bear witness to falsehood: for in this case error could not be avoided (see n.170,3,c; 173,3).

496. Scholium 2. *On the end of Jesus' miracles.*⁴⁸ *The principal end* of Jesus' miracles, that is, the proof of his testimony and the manifestation of his messiahship, is not

48. See Fonck, *Los milagros del Señor* n.50-59.

opposed to their also obtaining other ends. The ends of this kind are: a) a manifestation of the goodness and treasures of the heart of Jesus (see Acts 10:38; Tit. 3:4; 2:11), who went about doing good in a kindly and human way; b) a manifestation of the absolute dominion of Christ over creatures, as the Redeemer, to whom all things are to be subject (see Rom. 8:20-22; 1 Cor. 15:24f.); c) to show in a symbolic way the other Christian mysteries, as for example, the Eucharist by the multiplication of the loaves, the spiritual blindness which Christ cures for some, but not for others, by the cure of the man born blind (see John 9:39),⁴⁹ although at times some of the Fathers seem to put too much stress on some of the symbols.

Thus in Christ's miracles, *inasmuch as they are signs*, several aspects must be considered: for, they are signs of divine revelation and an apologetic criterion for us; they are a sign of the goodness of the Heart of Jesus; they are a sign of the Redemption of Christ; they can also be a sign of other mysteries of the faith.

497. Objections.⁵⁰ *Against the historical truth.* During the time of Jesus there was too much credulity, and miracles were attributed passim to illustrious men.

Response. In general this can be said regarding the wondrous facts of that time which have been reported: *Certain* facts seem to be *preternatural*, but not worked by God; rather, they are *diabolical deceptions*, and therefore Jesus warns us to beware of false prophets (Matt. 24:24).—Other facts, especially cures, rightly often can be attributed to *suggestion*.—Finally, others from the way they are narrated, or because of their doubtful or suspected origin, *exclude historical truth*, or a certain judgment as to what extent they contain anything historical. But in the narrations of the gospels the situation is completely different, and there is a huge disparity with the so-called miracles of antiquity (Apollonius of Tyana, Vespasian, Aesclepius, Buddha, Mohammed...). See the

49. Thus St. Augustine has this to say: "Let us interrogate the miracles themselves to see what they say to us about Christ: for if they are understood, they contain his way of speaking. For, because Christ is the Word of God, also what is done by the Word is a word to us. Therefore this miracle [the multiplication of the loaves in John 6], as we have heard how great it is, let us also ask how profound it is: let us not be delighted only by its external appearance, but let us also examine its profundity. For what we admire externally has something deep within itself..." (*Tract. 24 in Io* n.2: ML 35,1593). And again the same St. Augustine: "...For our Lord Jesus Christ wanted what he did in a bodily way to be understood in a spiritual way. For he did not just work the miracles for the sake of the miracles: but that what he did should be wondrous to those who saw them and true to those who understood them. It is just like someone who sees letters beautifully written in a codex, and does not know how to read, praises the handwriting of the scribe and admires the beauty of the letters; but he does not know what the letters mean; he praises what he sees, but he does not understand it; but another person both praises the artistry and understands the content... It is the same with those who saw the miracles of Christ and did not understand what they mean, and what they suggest to those who in some way understand them, they admire them only because they were made; but others are amazed at the making and understand what it means. In the school of Christ we want to be like that..." (*Sermo* 98,3: ML 38,592; see also *Sermo* 88,1-3: ML 38,539f.). Also see Lactantius: "For whatever things he [Christ] suffered were not useless, but they had a great nature and significance, just like the divine works that he did: their force and power had great value at the time, but they also announced something in the future" (*Divin. Instit.* 1.4,26: CSEL 19,377-380). Similarly Eusebius Caesariensis, *Demonstr. evangel.* : MG 22,705 A.

50. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.816-818, for difficulties against the historical truth.

Scholium n.486ff.

2. Concerning some miracles narrated in the gospels, difficulties are proposed against their historical truth, because of *the discrepancy in the way of narrating them in the different gospels*.

Thus *in the resuscitation of the daughter of Jairus*: According to Matt. 9:18 she was already dead, when the ruler of the synagogue asks for the life of his daughter; but according to Mark 5:23 she was at the point of death, and soon on the way to the house (v.35) the death of the daughter is announced to the father; the same thing is present in Luke 8:42.49.

Response. Discrepancies of this kind, which are really *accidental*, are not opposed to the substantial truth of the facts, which is sufficient for the thesis. But such discrepancies admirably confirm the historical truth of the gospels and prove that there was no pre-arranged agreement among the evangelists to deceive; for if there had been, they would have written differently. But also such discrepancies are only apparent. In the present case, they come from a different way of narrating; *for Mark narrates it extensively, but Matt. wishes to give the substance of the fact, recounting by a certain anticipation* the words which later the messengers announce to the ruler of the Synagogue on his way home (Mark 5:35).

3. According to Matt. 20:29-34 two blind men are cured as the Lord and his disciples are leaving Jericho; according to Mark 10:46-52 as he is leaving Jericho one man, Bartimaeus, is healed; according to Luke 18:35-43 also one blind man is healed, but *as he approached Jericho*.

Response. According to Matt. and Mark *there is no contradiction*, because Mark does not deny what Matt. says, but he mentions and names only one blind man, perhaps because he had some special knowledge about him. Regarding the narration of Luke, the matter is not lacking a probable solution: either that the blind man sought a cure at his entrance into the city and obtained it as Jesus left; or that the blind man mentioned by Luke is someone different from the two to whom Matt. and Mark refer; or (more difficult) because the word "approach," ἐγγίξεν, is used with an indefinite meaning: near Jericho.

4. Another difficulty is proposed *from the tendency*, which they think they detect in John's narration of the raising of Lazarus (John 11:1-57). For it would be something like a didactic poem: this raising—which the synoptics fail to mention—would be a quasi supreme level after the resuscitation of the daughter of Jairus (who had just died), and the young son of the widow of Naim (who was being carried to the tomb): and Lazarus (who had remained four days in the sepulcher); and the narration would have a symbolic character in order to show that Jesus is the life. And they also say that there are psychological difficulties in the Johannine narration, namely, that Jesus prays in a demonstrative way but does not cure the sorrow of the sisters.

Response. In order to weaken the historicity of the Johannine narration it would have to be shown that the synoptics ought to have reported the raising of Lazarus; this is something that will not be proved: perhaps they did not report it because it was already in the primitive oral tradition and was something widely known.—The gradation

in resuscitations is gratuitously assumed, especially since John narrates only the one of Lazarus.—And although it has symbolism, it is also a completely historical fact, and the contrary is undeservedly presupposed. For the difficulties that are proposed are entirely futile and gratuitous.

498. Against the philosophical truth. 5. The miracles which are said to have been performed by Christ *cannot today, after so many centuries, be examined scientifically* in order to know whether they really surpass the normal course of nature.

I deny that absolutely. For the evangelical events are, for the most part, very simple and easy to relate; the sudden cure of a leper, a sudden raising of a dead person...; so that as to their substance they have certainly come down to us, and the huge progress of the natural sciences cannot explain even the smallest part of the miracles of Christ.

6. Many illnesses, v.gr., *the cures of demoniacs, today can be explained by the healing of nervous or psychic sicknesses* (epilepsy, hysteria...), so that Jesus either would have shared the common opinion, or adapted himself to the common ideas, which attributed these possessions to diabolic possession.

Response. Although a merely historical description of these possessions, as it exists now, perhaps would not be sufficiently complete and adequate so that a certain judgment of such a true possession by the devil could be made; but there is no doubt about the true possessions and about the true preternatural cures in the cases which the evangelists narrate as worked by Jesus. Surely that *is certain from the words of Jesus, whose legation and divinity are already proved from his other miracles*; and it would be unworthy to suppose in him, full of wisdom and truth, that he would confirm and propagate the base ideas of the crowd by his way of acting. *And from the evangelical history itself the reality of possession is also certain*: since the facts related require an intelligent cause, contrary to God, and supermundane in their powers (Mark 1:24.26; 5:7.12ff.); and being freed from the devil sometimes took place *at a distance* (Mark 7:24-30 about the daughter of the Canaanite woman), and the cures *were complete and sudden* (see Luke 4:35).—On the other hand, in the cures of similar psychic illnesses: for these sick people do not manifest the knowledge that the demoniacs show; nor in their cure do those phenomena occur (to be convulsed: Mark 1:26; 9:26; to be thrown down in the midst: Luke 4:35; to be sent into pigs: Mark 5:12ff.) which are observed in the gospel narrations; nor are they cured completely by one, sudden suggestion, but it must be repeated with a difficult exit.⁵¹

Jesus therefore, by liberating from demons, shows himself as the Lord also of higher, supermundane beings; and at the same time as the liberator from the disease of possession by the devil which, as even today can be found not rarely in pagan regions, diminishes upon his arrival.

7. Other healings of diseases confirm that Jesus acted through suggestion or by psychotherapeutic pressure. Thus Jesus used a *command* in healing (see Luke 4:35), and

51. Demoniacs and their cure are treated extensively by Iohannes Smit, *De daemoniis in historia evangelica*. Dissertatio evangelico-apologetica (Rome 19130; F.M. Chaterinet, *Les démoniaques dans l'Évangile*, in *Satan*: EtCarm (1948) 315-327: he explains the facts and problems which demoniacs give rise to, and also the answers to them; in general the matter is treated throughout the whole volume.

certain *manipulations* (see John 9:6), and he desired *faith or trust in himself*.

Response. The miracles of Jesus cannot be explained in this way. For, first of all, natural psychotherapy is *restricted* to healing miracles, but it does not extend to miracles in *inanimate nature*, or to *resuscitations of the dead*, or also to cures of those absent.—Then psychotherapy cannot affect directly and suddenly the cure of *organic diseases*; for it operates through the influence of the nerves by the help of fantasy and imagination.—Then in functional diseases, that is, in the diseases in which there is an impediment in a healthy organ regarding its function, which is to be removed with the help of psychic influence, then surely suggestion or psychotherapy is properly applied: but a cure is *often uncertain and unstable*; and often it requires a *lengthy* repetition of the suggestion; and *a complete healing is not obtained*, except rarely and in the easier cases.—Jesus, however, not only worked healing miracles, but also organic ones; nor can his way of healing be reduced to just psychotherapy: for he worked by the command of his will alone, on all kinds of infirmities, with a result that was always certain and complete.

But if Jesus is said to have demanded *faith*, a) that cannot be said about all of his miracles (v.gr., about those on inanimate nature, in the cure of Malchus and of those absent); b) but sometimes he demands faith, *not from the sick person, but from others* (v.gr., Matt. 15:28: in the Canaanite mother; Mark 5:36: in the father of the girl to be raised; Mark 9:22: in the father of the possessed boy; Luke 7:9: in the centurion); c) sometimes he demands faith *after the cure* (as in the man born blind: John 9:35); d) but at times the faith demanded is not just confidence, but a conviction, legitimate and for other reasons owed, that he can do such things as the Legate of God; for he does not demand that in order psychologically to predispose the sick person for a cure, but because of the religious purpose which he desires. Therefore in Nazareth he was not able to perform many miracles: Mark 6:5f.

8. The miracles of Jesus *can be explained by occult natural powers*. Certain ones, like walking on water, can be likened to the levitations which are said to take place in occultism; others must be said to be explained by the mysterious powers of the soul (telepathy, “clear vision”...).

Response. Several miracles of Jesus are clear exceptions of the *certain* laws of nature, like those miracles which Jesus performed according to their substance and the way they were done.—The differences from those that are narrated to have taken place in spiritualistic sessions are immense: Jesus in no wise was a *medium* who operates in a “trance”; and his miracles are not restricted to only *a few kinds* (telekinesis, teleplastia, loud shouting, striking things...; see n.182, note 15); no *fraud* or errors have ever been detected in them, as in the case of many “mediums,” who appeared to be doing something amazing, and were convicted of fraud. And the *way of acting* of Jesus does not manifest any frivolity or flight from the light, or inconsistency which are often found in spiritualistic seances: where all of these things (whether by natural powers or by explicit fraud, or sometimes through supermundane interventions) certainly cannot be attributed to God, both because of the way in which they are done and because of the person doing them, and because of *the end* for which they are done; that is, such “souls” manifest

themselves as hostile to religion.

But the supposition of occult natural powers is not valid, since from the way of acting of Jesus it is certain that he is dealing with exceptions to some physical laws, which were to be applied in a unique way.—But if Jesus had knowledge of these occult power and used them freely, this would be an intellectual miracle for that time; however, if he did not know them, and nevertheless operated according to them, then he would be a man who is fully incomprehensible: and this is absolutely excluded by his way of acting.

499. Against the relative truth. 1) Jesus does not consider miracles as *divine signs*. For he says that false prophets will also do such things (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22), and that not all those who prophesy, cast out demons and do mighty works will be saved (Matt. 7:22f.).

Response. But Jesus himself, while he commands us to beware of false prophets and gives a way of discerning them, at least implicitly says that true miracles are divine signs (Matt.24:25f.); God can permit preternatural prodigies, which must not necessarily be acknowledged as divine.—On the other hand, even the ability to perform true miracles “in the name of Christ,” although it is a charismatic gift, is not connected necessarily with the gift of perseverance.⁵²

10. Jesus *did not want to be acknowledged as the Messiah from his miracles* (Mark 1:44; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26; Matt. 9:30; 2:16; John 6:15). Therefore he did not adduce them as a sign of his legation.

Response. We have already said (n.399,1) why Jesus at times declines popular and noisy recognition of his dignity as the messianic king, that is, lest he seem to approve the false ideas of the people concerning the Messiah; and in order to proceed *gradually*, until the meaning would be made clear that he wanted to be recognized regarding the Messiah; and to avoid uprisings of the people....

11. But Jesus *reprimands faith given because of miracles* (John 4:48: to the official; John 20:29: to Thomas the Apostle), and *he reprimands the Pharisees who were looking for miracles* (Matt. 12:39).

Response. He does that *sometimes*, namely, if already because of other miracles they should believe (see John 4:45); and he reprimands the Pharisees *because of their bad disposition*, as if they should select a sign at their own good pleasure.

12. Jesus *demand faith before miracles* (Mark 9:22): “If you can! All things are possible to him who believes”). Therefore a miracle cannot be the criterion for embracing this faith.

I distinguish the antecedent. Jesus demands faith *in his legation* as a prior requirement for a miracle, *denied*; sometimes to a doubting man he proposes the value of faith and trust, *conceded*.

13. From John 12:37, in spite of the many miracles, the Jews did not believe in Jesus. Therefore the miracles were not suited to prove Jesus’ testimony.

I distinguish the consequent. They were not suitable per se and according to the intention of Jesus, *denied*; accidentally and because of the bad disposition of the Jews, *I*

52. See S.Th. II-II, q. 178, a. 2.

subdistinguish: they were not suitable for any Jews, *denied* (for many of the authorities believed in him: John 12:42); they were not suitable for many Jews who de facto in their own injustice resisted the truth of God (see Rom. 1:18), *conceded*.

14. But Jesus appealed not so much to miracles that moved people intellectually, but to the action of God in the soul and to internal experience (John 6:44; 7:17; 10:26; see 8:42). Therefore miracles by themselves alone do not prove his testimony.

I distinguish the antecedent. Jesus appeals to a complete subjection to the divine will, *as to a moral disposition of the mind* in order to embrace faith, and he appeals to the internal action of grace for this same disposition and *in order to embrace faith actually*, *conceded*; he appeals to these as if the arguments from miracles intellectually do not have the force of themselves to persuade the intellect, *denied*.

Thesis 33. Jesus proved his divine testimony by many fulfilled prophecies.

J. Müller, *De vera religione* th.41, p.452-499; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 1.5 c.2 (*Jésus Prophete*); Wilmers, *De religione revelata* prop.82; F. Schmid, *Christus als Prophet nach den Evangelien dargestellt* (Brixen 1892); Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* 1,749-757; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* 1,718-731; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.7; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conférences d'Notre-Dame* (1931) V-VI; Hettinger, *Lehrbuch der Apologetik* 326-329.

500. Just as miracles constitute the primary criterion of revelation, so also prophecies; they are a type of psychic miracles. Therefore, after the physical miracles of Jesus, it seems to be necessary to deal with the prophecies uttered by him and which are proved to be true by their realization. But they are treated separately from the miracles, because prophecies of themselves have the ability to prove the testimony of Jesus: thus it will become more apparent how many kinds of apologetic arguments there are.

Jesus, however, while he was in this world, “performed miracles, and he predicts certain things that will take place a long time afterwards, and through those that took place then, he produced faith in those who heard him about the things that were to take place afterward; the miracles done at that time made credible those predicted for the future: and by this twofold demonstration he generates faith in those who belong to the kingdom.¹

501. Adversaries. *The more inflexible rationalists* consider the prophecies of Jesus as falsifications or interpolations after the event. Thus Strauss, Gottlob Paulus, W. Wrede, R. Bultmann and others who say that they are the creations of the later Christian community, in order to extol more easily the glory of Jesus.²

More moderate rationalists, and today there are several, do not deny that there is some historicity in the prophecies of Jesus; but they reduce them to presentiments or natural previsions, as vague or fortuitous or genial divinations.³

Modernists think especially that the supposed prophecies of Christ originated from the Pauline idea about the expiatory death of Christ, and therefore it had to be said in the gospels that Jesus foresaw these events... (D 3438). Modernists also hold that Jesus erred about his Parousia that was to take place soon. (See the thesis in the treatise *On the Church*).

1. St. Chrysostom, *Quod Christus sit Deus* 11: MG 48,829.
2. Strauss, *Leben Jesu* 2,341.371 (see Hettinger, 328); Gottlob Paulus, *Exeg. Handbuch* 2,417 (see Wilmers, 352); W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*² (Göttingen 1913) 92.85f. (see Grandmaison, 2,260). R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen 1921) p.93: “However, I do not dwell on the predictions of suffering and resurrection, which for a long time have been recognized as secondary additions of the community” (see Grandmaison, 2,260).
3. V.gr. also Gottlob Paulus, *Exeg. Handbuch* 3,340 (see Wilmers, 354); Pfeiderer, *Religionsphilosophie* 2 (Berlin 1884) 194f. (see Ottiger p.752); etc.

502. Doctrine of the Church. *In Vatican Council I* it is taught clearly that Christ the Lord uttered many prophecies, and indeed as an exterior proof of divine revelation, which he brought (D 3009). However, in the corresponding canon (D 3034) there is no mention of prophecies, because it was thought that this had already been provided for, and because the physical miracles are the ones especially attacked by the adversaries, and because prophecies are also miracles (of the infinite divine knowledge, just as they are of the divine omnipotence). This is the argument of the secretary, Most Reverend Conrad Martin.⁴

The teaching in the *Oath against Modernism* is similar to that of Vatican I (D 3537-3542).

Pius IX, while reviewing the different motives of credibility in his Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*," mentions the prophecies of Jesus, which seems primarily to concern the prophecies by Jesus and accomplished through Jesus, not those about Jesus, because of being numbered with others: *by the death, resurrection... of Jesus* (D 2779).

In the *Syllabus* (D 2907)), it is rejected that prophecies... are inventions of poets.

503. Theological note. Besides the document of Vatican I (D 3009), where our thesis is proposed with proof from miracles, it is sufficiently clear that it is contained in the written and handed down word of God that Jesus made many prophecies in confirmation of his mission and of his testimony about himself (see below, where we will treat the relative truth of prophecies, n.530). Furthermore, the Church proposes this as known from Holy Scripture, that is, from divine revelation. Therefore the thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*.

504. Proof. Jesus demonstrated his divine testimony with many prophecies, *if there is certainty about their historical, philosophical and relative truth*. But there is certainty about that.

1) There is certainty about the historical truth. But in order to prove this (as before in n. 481ff.): A) *an overview is presented of the prophecies of Jesus and at the same time their fulfillment*; and B) *it is shown that this complex pertains to the substance of the gospels*.

A) An overview of Jesus prophecies is exhibited, and at the same time their completion.

4. CL 7,187, at emendation 107.

a) Prophecies concerning Himself or about His passion and death

From the synoptics

	Matt.	Mark	Luke	
1	9:15	2:19-20	5:34-35	bridegroom taken away from them after the confession of Peter the Son of man will suffer at their hands to the gathering in Galilee the Son of man must suffer going up to Jerusalem the cup that I am about to drink the Son of man came to give His life on the wicked tenants after two days He will be delivered up she did it to prepare Me for burial one of you will betray me I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine
2	16:21-23	8:31-33	9:21-22	
3	17:9-12	9:8-11	—	
4	17:22-23	9:30-32	9:44	
5	—	—	17:25	
6	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34	
7	20:22	10:38	—	
8	20:28	10:45	—	
9	21:33-45	12:1-12	20:9-19	
10	26:2	—	—	
11	26:12	14:8	[Jn 12:7]	
12	26:21	14:18	[Jn 13:21-30]	
13	26:29	14:25	22:18	

From John

2:19	destroy this temple
3:14	so must the Son of man must be lifted up
8:28	when you have lifted up the Son of man
10:15-18	I lay down my life for my sheep
12:24	unless a grain of wheat...
12:32	when I am lifted up
12:35	the light is with you for a little while longer

In such an abundance of prophecies consider, v.gr., *n.6* (*Matt. 20:17-19*), where in a few words you will find many things accurately determined; and likewise for other circumstances *n.10-13* (*Matt. 26:2.12.21.29*).

Concerning the fulfillment there is clear certainty: namely about the mocking of the Gentiles: *Matt. 27:28-31*; *Luke 23:11*.

505. b) Prophecies concerning his disciples. *About Judas* the traitor: *John 6:65-71*; *Matt. 26:21-25* (*Mark 14:18-21*; *Luke 22:21-23*; *John 13:21-30*).

About Peter: Simon is called Cephas (*John 1:42*); his vocation as fisher of men (*Luke 5:10*); his primacy (*Matt. 16:18f.*); his triple denial (*Matt. 26:30-35*; *Mark 14:27-31*; *Luke 22:31-34*; *John 13:38*); his martyrdom (*John 21:18f.*).

About Magdalene: her good deed is to be preached everywhere (*Matt. 26:13*; *Mark 14:9*).

About the sons of Zebedee: they will drink the chalice of the Lord (*Matt. 20:23*; *Mark 10:39*).

Concerning the fulfillment of all these prophecies it is easy to reach certainty. Regarding the martyrdom of James, the fact is stated in *Acts 12:2*. Regarding the sufferings of John see *Acts 5:40f.*; *Rev. 1:9*; at the Latin gate, Tertullian⁵; on John's non-violent death see *John 21:18-23*.

About the flight of the disciples during the Lord's passion: *Matt. 26:31*; *Mark 14:27*.

Concerning the fulfillment see *Matt. 26:36*; *Mark 14:50* (the disciples forsook him and fled).

About the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples: *John 14:16f.26*; *Luke 24:49*; *Acts 1:8*.

Concerning the fulfillment see *Acts 2:1f.*

About the persecutions of the disciples: *Matt. 10:17-23*; *Mark 13:9-13*; *Luke 10:3*; *12:11f.*; *21:12-19*.

Concerning the fulfillment see *Acts* chapters 4-8.16.22ff.; see also thesis 40 on the martyrs, Suetonius and other historians.⁶

5. *De praescriptione haer.* 36,3; Kch 194. There also is testimony about the martyrdom of Peter.

6. C. Tacitus, *Annales* 15,44,4-9 (on the persecution of Nero): Kch 34; Suetonius, *Vita Claudii* 25; *Vita Neronis* 16; Kch 99f.; Plinius Minor *ad Traianum epist.*: Kch 28.31.

About the miracles performed by the disciples: Mark 16:17.

Concerning the fulfillment see: Mark 16:20; Acts 2:43; 3:6-10; 6:8; 9:32-42; 14:8-11; 16:16-19; 19:11f.; Rom. 15:19; 1 Cor. 12:10; 2 Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:5. In addition there is the whole history.

About the conversion of the nations and the universal preaching of the gospel: Matt. 8:11 (Luke 13:29: *many will come from East and West...*); Matt. 21:43 (*the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it*); Matt. 24:14 (Mark 13:10: *the gospel must first be preached to all nations...*); Matt. 26:13 (Mark 14:9: *what Magdalene has done will be preached in the whole world*); Luke 24:46f. (*forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations...*); Acts 1:8 (*you shall be my witnesses... to the end of the earth*). See John 3:16 (*so that everyone who believes in me...*); 17:20 (*I pray... for those who will believe in me through their word...*).

Concerning the fulfillment see Mark 16:20; Acts throughout; thesis 38 on the spread of Christianity.

Thus the existence of the Church will be had throughout the world, and the Lord bestows on her his help and assistance: Matt. 16:18f.; 28:20.

However there will be in her internal and heretical contradictions: Matt. 13:37-49 (for there will be weeds and evil persons); Matt. 7:15.22 (there will be false prophets).

Concerning the fulfillment, it is certain from the very manifest history of the Church; and see thesis 39 on the preservation of the Church in the midst of obstacles.

506. c) Prophecies about the destruction of the city and the temple. This prophecy is recounted by the three synoptics, but not by John, because, when he wrote, the matter had already taken place. In the synoptics some things are mingled with it that pertain to the second coming of the Lord. But those things that seem to be referred to the first coming of the Lord in power through the destruction of the City can be put in order in the following way:

Signs will precede the calamity (some of them, although they can be seen as more general and proper *also* of future times, nevertheless seem to indicate *more* the time *before the destruction* of the city of Jerusalem): *False Christs will come and lead many astray* (Matt. 24:4f.; Mark 13:5f.; Luke 21:8); *and you will hear of wars and rumors of wars* (Matt. 24:6-8; Mark 13:7f.; Luke 21:9f.); *there will be great earthquakes, and in*

various places famines and pestilences; and there will be terrors and great signs from heaven (Luke 21:11; Matt. 24:7; Mark 13:8). *But before all this they will lay hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, and you will be brought before kings and governors...*(Luke 21:12; Matt. 24:9.17.18f.; Mark 13:9).

The siege of the city will precede the destruction: *But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near* (Luke 21:20).

But this siege will be of such a nature that there will be time “*so that those who are in Judea may flee to the mountains, and those who are in the city can depart...* (Luke 21:21f.; Matt. 24:16f.; Mark 13:14-16); *For then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be* (Matt. 24:19-21; Mark 13:17-19; Luke 21:22f.).

All of these things will happen, *when you see the desolating sacrilege spoken of by the prophet Daniel [Dan. 9:7], standing in the holy place* (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14).—*For the days shall come upon you, when your enemies will cast up a bank about you and surround you, and hem you in on every side, and dash you to the ground, you and your children within you, and they will not leave one stone upon another in you* (Luke 19:43f.; see Matt. 24:2). *They will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led captive among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled* (Luke 21:24; see Matt. 23:38; Luke 13:35: *Behold, your house is forsaken*).

507. On the fulfillment of this prophecy, which is *not just a common and topical description* of the way in which ancient cities were besieged (see Isa. 29:1-4), as is apparent to anyone considering all the definite circumstances that are predicted, there is certainty from the historians, and it may help to know the following:

And first of all about the *false Christs*, who actually appeared, the Acts give a report in 5:36; 21:38; but especially Flavius Josephus, who speaks about a certain magician, named Theudas, who “*persuaded a large multitude of the people to take their possessions with them and to follow him to the river Jordan, because he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and give them an easy passage over it. And many were deceived by his words...*”⁷ Likewise about another man who “*came out of Egypt about this time to Jerusalem. He said that he was a prophet and told the multitude of the common people to go with him to the Mount of Olives... and he said he would show them from there how, at his command, the walls of Jerusa-*

7. *Antiquitates iudaeorum* 20,5,1: Flavii Josephi Opera (ed. F. Didot, Paris 1865) 1,777.

lem would fall down, and he promised he would secure for them an entrance into the city through the walls....”⁸ And when Titus was besieging the city, while the temple was burning, “a great mixed multitude of the people perished—about six thousand... a false prophet was the occasion of the death of these people. He had made a public proclamation in the city that day that God commanded them to go up to the temple and that there they would receive miraculous signs of their deliverance.... There were many prophets like this provided by the tyrants for the people who said that they should wait for deliverance from God; this was to keep them from leaving and so that they might rise above fear and care by such hopes... So these deceivers persuaded the miserable people and by their lies they convinced the people that they had been sent by God; they did not pay attention to the signs that were so evident and clearly foretold their future desolation....”⁹

508. *With regard to the wars and revolts within the Roman empire, it is sufficient to have read the historians who write about that time; or also Tacitus may be heard who comments on the books of the historians: “The story which I am addressing is full of disasters, grimly marked with battles, rent by treason and savage even in peacetime. Four emperors perished violently [Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius]. There were three civil wars, more foreign campaigns, and often conflicts which combined both elements. Success in the East [Asia Minor, Armenia...] was balanced by failure in the West. The Balkans were in turmoil; the Gallic provinces were wavering, and Britain was conquered but immediately abandoned. The Sarmatian and Suebian people rose up against us; the Dacian distinguished himself in desperate battles won and lost; and thanks to a charlatan claiming to be Nero, even Parthia was on the verge of declaring war. Italy also fell victim to new disasters, or ones which had not happened for many centuries....”*¹⁰ But during the time of Vespasian the war against the Jews took place.

509. *With regard to the earthquakes and famines and pestilences that preceded, if you take the matter literally and not as a mere general apocalyptic description, it can be confirmed by the historians: for they speak about two famines which happened at the time of Claudius. The first was in the years 42-44 after Christ.¹¹ About the second one in the year 51 after Christ (11th year of Claudius) Tacitus has this to say: “That year many prodigies took place... houses destroyed by the frequent earthquakes; and, while there was great fear, with the trepidations of the crowd, every sick person was crushed. Since there was a lack of fruits, the famine arising from it was interpreted as an ominous sign....”*¹² Suetonius speaks “about the charity of the yearly produce” and about “a public famine” which happened during the time of Nero.¹³ And Tacitus again describes the miserable situation at that time: “The year of the covenants was marked by many

8. *Antiquitates iudaeorum* 20,8,6: Opera 2,292.

9. *Bellum iud.* 6,5,2f.: Opera 2,292.

10. *Hist.* 1.1,2.

11. See Suetonius, *Vita Claudii* 18; Eusebius Caesariensis, *Hist. Eccles.* 2,8: MG 20,156; Flavius Josephus, *Antiq. iud.* 20,5,2: Opera 1,777.

12. *Annales* 12,43.

13. *Vita Neronis* 45.

crimes, storms and sicknesses. Campania was devastated by violent wind storms, which destroyed villas, vineyards and fruit trees. And it caused violence in the areas around the city, so that a pestilence caused the death of many people because of bad weather that was unprecedented. But there were homes with dead bodies and many funerals; no sex and no age escaped the danger; slaves along with free citizens were quickly killed amidst the laments of spouses and children; while the latter sit, while they lament, often the bodies are burned up with the same funeral pile. The ruin of the Equestrian Order and the Senators, although common, was less lamentable, since with their common mortality they preceded the cruelty of the Emperor...¹⁴ Concerning the time of the siege of the city of Jerusalem, Flavius Josephus mentions the large number of those who from the whole region came together for the feast of unleavened bread and suddenly they were surrounded by the army “so that at first because of the lack of space a plague afflicted them and then very quickly a famine...¹⁵

510. Tacitus, speaking about the Jewish war, has this to say about the *disturbances and signs in the heavens*: “Various prodigies had occurred, but a nation steeped in superstition and hostile to real religious practices considered it unlawful to atone for them by offering victims or solemn vows. Seen in the sky were clashing battle lines and shining arms, and a sudden flash of lightning from the clouds lit up the temple. The doors of the shrine suddenly opened and a superhuman voice was heard to declare that the gods were leaving and at the same time came the rushing tumult of their departure...¹⁶ And Flavius Josephus similarly treating the same war says: “... there was a star resembling a sword which stood over the city, and a comet that continued for a whole year. So before the revolt of the Jews and before the commotions that preceded the war, when the people were come in great crowds for the feast of unleavened bread, on the eighth day of the month Xanthicus, and at the ninth hour of the night, so great a light shone around the altar and the temple that it appeared to be bright daylight; this lasted for a half hour. This light seemed to be a good sign to those without skill, but it was so interpreted by the holy scribes as to portend those events that followed immediately upon it... A few days after that feast, on the twenty-first day of the month of Artemis, a certain prodigious and unbelievable phenomenon appeared. I assume the report of it would seem to be a fable, were it not related by those who saw it, and were not the events that followed it of so a considerable a nature as to deserve such signals. For, before the sunset, chariots and troops of soldiers in their armor were seen running about among the clouds and surrounding the cities. But at the feast which we call Pentecost, as the priests were going by night into the inner part of the temple, as their custom was, to perform their sacred ministries, they said that, in the first place, they felt a quaking and heard a great noise, and then they heard the sound like that of a great multitude saying: Let us get out of here.¹⁷

511. The Acts of the Apostles and the secular histories written by Flavius Josephus,

14. *Annales* 16,13; see *Annales* 14,27.

15. *Bellum iud.* 6,9,3; *Opera* 2,301.

16. *Hist.* 5,13; see *Annales* 15,47.

17. *Bellum iud.* 6,5,3; *Opera* 2,292f.

Tacitus and Suetonius bear witness unanimously *to the persecution of the disciples in synagogues and before kings and governors*.¹⁸

There is no doubt that at that time *wickedness was really multiplied, and that the charity of many had grown cold* (Matt. 24:12), as is clearly shown by the corruption reigning in the Roman and Greek world (see n.674); likewise during the time of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem there is no doubt that *the gospel of the kingdom of God was preached throughout the whole world* (Matt. 24:14), certainly in the world known at that time; as Paul praises the faith of the Romans, which is proclaimed—he said—in *the whole world* (Rom. 1:8), or also the gospel “which has been preached to every creature under heaven” (Col. 1:23).¹⁹

512. *Jerusalem was besieged two times*, according to history: once in the year 66 after Christ, when Cestius Gallus wanted to put down a rebellion of the Jews against the Romans; but contrary to expectations, after having captured part of the city, he withdrew his army.²⁰ The second siege started in the year 68 when Vespasian besieged the city, but when he became emperor his son Titus took over. These are the words of Luke regarding both sieges: “your enemies will cast up a bank about you and surround you, and hem you in on every side [twice]” (Luke 19:43). Certainly the Christians, after the first siege, remembering the word of the Lord, fled to the mountains of Perea, to the city of Pella.²¹ And the temple, which was occupied by the Zealots together with slaughter and abominations, was also defiled.²²

513. *But about the tribulations of those days* among those who remained in Jerusalem there is abundant testimony by the historian of the Jewish war (books 5-6): During the second siege, in a short space of time, in four days the space between the Romans and the wall was leveled.²³ And according to the computation of Flavius Josephus, “of persons that were pure and holy [to eat the sacrifice] upon the allowance of no more than ten that feast together it amounts to two million seven hundred thousand...

18. See Acts ch. 4-25; Flavius Josephus, *Antiq.* 20,9: Opera 1,786; Kch 9; Tacitus, *Annal.* 15,44,4-9: Kch 34; Suetonius, *Vita Claudii* 25; *Vita Neronis* 16:kch 39f.

19. See also Tacitus, *Annal.* 15,44: Kch 34.

20. *Bellum iud.* 2,19: Opera 2,131-135.

21. “... then all the faithful of the Church in Jerusalem, because of the prophecy, which had been made known by God through certain very holy men, before the beginning of the war, fled and took up residence in a city across the Jordan called Pella; now all those who had believed in Christ, having left Jerusalem, transferred their homes to Pella: thus also the royal city, which is the head of the whole nation, and all of Judea having been abandoned by holy men, then finally the divine punishment afflicted them because of so many crimes committed both against Christ and against his Apostles, and utterly destroyed that whole race of impious men” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 3,5: MG 20,221-224). And St. Epiphanius says this: “... after the departure from Jerusalem... when all the disciples were living in Pella, having been pre-warned by Christ to abandon the city of Jerusalem and to flee because its being besieged was imminent...” (*Adversus haereses, Nazaraeorum* 9 or 29: MG 7,401-404).

22. *Bellum iud.* 4,3,4: Opera 2,191ff.

23. *Bellum iud.* 5,3,5: Opera 2,237.

[2,700,000].²⁴ And “the famine increased and devoured the people by whole houses and families; the upper rooms were full of women and children that were dying from famine; and the streets of the city were full of the dead bodies of the aged. The children also and the young men wandered about the marketplaces like shadows, all swelled with the famine, and fell down dead wherever their misery seized them. As for burying them, those that were sick themselves were not able to do it; and those that were strong and well were deterred from doing it because of the great number of dead bodies, and by the uncertainty there was how soon they should die themselves....”²⁵

514. “Now of those who perished by famine in the city, the number was prodigious, and the miseries they underwent were unspeakable. For, if so much as the shadow of any kind of food did anywhere appear, a war was commenced, and the closest friends fell to fighting with one another about it, snatching from each other the most miserable supports of life. Nor would men believe that those who were dying had no food; but the robbers would search them when they were dying, lest anyone should have concealed food in his bosom and be pretending to die... But why do I describe the shameless impudence that the famine brought on men in their eating inanimate things? For, I am going to relate a matter of fact, the like of which no history relates, either among the Greeks or barbarians. It is horrible to speak of it, and incredible when heard. And I would have willingly omitted this calamity of ours, that I might not seem to deliver what is so portentous to posterity, but I have many witnesses to it in my own age....”²⁶ Here he speaks *about the woman who ate her own son because of the famine*, and “then she roasted him and ate half of him, and kept the other half in a hidden place, until it was discovered and she offered it to others for food....”²⁷

The temple of the Jews was destroyed by fire and by the assaults of the Romans, even contrary to the will of Titus²⁸; false prophets from among the people were the occasion for an even greater ruin.²⁹

515. But after the city had been captured “since his soldiers were already quite tired from killing men, and yet there appeared to be a vast multitude still remaining alive, Caesar gave orders that they should kill none but those that were in arms and should take the rest alive. But, together with those they had orders to kill, they slew the aged and the infirm... the number of those that perished during the whole siege was eleven hundred thousand [1,100,000]. The greater part of these were of the same nation, but not belonging to the city itself. For, they came up from the whole country to the feast of unleavened bread and were shut up by an army; this first occasioned so much need among them that there came a pestilential destruction upon them and then shortly thereafter a

24. *Bellum iud.* 6,9,3: Opera 2,301.

25. *Bellum iud.* 5,12,3: Opera 2,265.

26. *Bellum iud.* 6,3,3: Opera 2,285f.

27. *Bellum iud.* 6,3,4: Opera 2,286f.

28. *Bellum iud.* 6,4,5: Opera 2,288-291.

29. *Bellum iud.* 6,5,4: Opera 2,292f.

famine....”³⁰ Actually *the distress was so great that a greater one can hardly be imagined*. And rightly Flavius Josephus says: “...our city Jerusalem had arrived at a higher degree of felicity than any other city under the Roman government, and yet at last fell into the sorest of calamities again. Accordingly, it seems to me that the misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to those of the Jews, are not so considerable as they were.”³¹

516. And they indeed *for the most part fell by the edge of the sword*. But with regard to the others, those Jews “but for those that were in their flourishing age, and might be useful to them, they drove them together into the temple, and shut them up within the walls of the court of women. Over them Caesar set one of his freed men, as also Fronto, one of his own friends, who was to determine the fate of everyone according to his merits. So this Fronto slew all those that had been seditious and robbers; but of the young men he chose the tallest and most handsome and kept them for the triumph. Concerning the rest of the multitude that were over seventeen years of age, he put them into chains and sent them to the Egyptian mines. Titus also sent a great number into the provinces that they might be destroyed in their theaters by the sword and by wild beasts. Those that were under seventeen years of age were sold as slaves. However, during the days while they were being selected by Fronto, eleven thousand died because of a lack of food... And the number of those captured during the whole war was ninety-seven thousand.”³² *So the prisoners were sent to all the nations...* But in the games held in Caesarea, from among the Jews “the number of those that were now slain in fighting with beasts, and were burned, and fought with one another, exceeded two thousand five hundred.” The same thing took place at Berytus.³³

517. With the devastation of war, with the killing and bloodshed, and also with the insignia of the gods of the Gentiles, which the Roman soldiers brought in, *he proceeded to defile the temple with these abominations*,³⁴ which before the capture of the city the Zealots and Idumaeans, who occupied it, had already defiled and filled with abominations by their internal battles with each other in the city.³⁵

518. *And the city was destroyed*, so that in its obvious sense this will be fulfilled: “and there will not be left here one stone upon another that will not be thrown down.” For “the army had not more people to kill or to plunder... Caesar gave orders that they should now demolish the entire city and temple, but should leave as many of the towers standing as were of the greatest eminence; that is, Phasaelus, and Hippicus, and Mariamne, and as much of the wall as enclosed the city on the west side. This wall was spared, in order to make available a camp for those who were to be in garrison; the towers were also spared,

30. *Bellum iud.* 6,9,2f.: Opera 2,301.

31. *Bellum iud.* Preface 4: Opera 2,5.

32. *Bellum iud.* 6,9,2f.: Opera 2,301.

33. *Bellum iud.* 7,3,1: Opera 2,307.

34. *Bellum iud.* 6,4,5: Opera 2,287ff.

35. *Bellum iud.* 4,3,4: Opera 2,191ff.

in order to demonstrate to posterity what kind of a city it was, and how well fortified, which the Roman valor had subdued. *But for the rest of the wall, it was so thoroughly made even with the ground by those who dug it up to the foundation, that there was nothing left to make those who came to see it believe that it had ever been inhabited.* This was the end which happened to Jerusalem because of the madness of those who were for innovations—a city of great magnificence, and of great fame among all mankind.”³⁶

519. In a very full and more perfect sense the prophecy about the destruction of the temple was fulfilled in the time of Julian (in the year 363), who wanted to restore the pristine temple of the Jews. Concerning this matter it will help to listen to the Gentile, Ammianus Marcellinus, companion and close friend of the emperor, who offers this testimony: “He was thinking about restoring at great expense the formerly magnificent temple in Jerusalem which, after many civil wars and after the siege by Vespasian and then Titus, was completely destroyed. And he turned this task over to Alypius of Antioch, who formerly had cared for Britain as prefect. When therefore Alypius was eagerly pursuing this and the governor of the province was helping him, dreadful balls of fire near the foundations broke forth with frequent assaults and made the place unapproachable to the workmen who got burned, and in this way, constantly being driven back by the fire, he stopped doing what he had started.”³⁷ And other authors also bear witness to these events.³⁸

520. Thus *Jerusalem will be conquered by the Gentiles*, until the times of the nations are fulfilled (Luke 21-24). That happened almost twenty centuries ago and the city has not been returned to the Jews. And this refers in the first place to what happened to the Jews at the time of Hadrian. For, the emperor wanted to build a new temple to Jupiter on the ruins of the temple in Jerusalem and build a new city in place of the old one which would be called Aelia Capitolina. So the Jews were moved to rebellion and under the leadership of Bar-Cochba (*son of a star*), who often said that he was the Messiah, the Jews passionately resisted the Romans, until the sedition was put down by the shedding of much blood and the death of many Jews to the number of about 580,000.³⁹ The rest were sold into slavery and were dispersed; they were also forbidden to enter the city, except once a year, on the day of the destruction of the city. On that day by paying a fee they could enter the city in order to lament publicly the calamity that had befallen the people and the city.⁴⁰ The destruction took place in the year 134-135 after Christ.

Thus you see that the people dispersed throughout the world, sent into exile, “be-

36. *Bellum iud.* 7,1,1: Opera 2,304.

37. *Hist.* 23,1; see Müller, *De vera religione* 483.

38. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. in Iulianum* 12,4: MG 35,668f.; St. Chrysostom, *Quod Christus sit Deus* 16: MG 48,835; *Hom. 76 in Matt.*: MG 58,695f.; St. Ambrose, *Epist.* 40 (to Theodotius) 12: ML 16,1105; Socrates, *Hist. eccles.* 3,20: MG 67, 428-432; Sozomenus, *Hist. eccles.* 5,22: MG 67,1281-1285. On the death of Julian in Persia, Theodoretus, *Hist. eccles.* 3,30: MG 82,1117-1120.

The destruction of the temple is also treated by Basmagius, reporting the words of the chronologist Rabbi Gedaliab (*Hist. Iud.* L.6 c.18f.); see Müller, 483.iHistFHhHkkkkkkk

39. See Müller, *De vera religione* 480f.

40. See St. Jerome, *In Sophoniam* 1,15.

cause the children of Israel shall dwell many days without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without ephod or teraphim. Afterward the children of Israel shall return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and they shall come in fear to the Lord and to his goodness in the latter days⁴¹: *until the times of the nations are fulfilled*, that is, or until the times are fulfilled in which the Gentiles shall rule, or—according to others and more truly—until the times are fulfilled so that the Gentiles will know the gospel and enter into the kingdom of God. This also agrees with the word of St. Paul, “because a hardening has come upon part of Israel, *until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved*” (Rom. 11:25f.).⁴²

521. d) *There are also other prophecies* uttered by Jesus, which at the same time are connected *with his knowledge of hidden things*: like untying the ass and bringing it to him (Matt. 21:1-6; Mark 11:1-6; Luke 19:29-34); and about the upper room that was to be prepared for the Passover (Matt. 26:17-19; Mark 14:12-16; Luke 22:7-13)....

522. B) In the preceding overview of Jesus’ prophecies it is easy to recognize how great the number of places is in the gospels, and also how many verses there are which explain the prophecies; the result is that these narrations in the gospels are *something absolutely substantial*. Now add to these the parallel passages, and the other places that are intrinsically connected with these because of the flowing narrative, then anyone can see that we are not dealing with interpolations or falsifications, but with things fully reported in a historical way and pertaining to the substantials of the gospels. But if you were to reject the prophecies because of their supernaturalness; also if you reject the miracles narrated in the gospels because of the same supernaturalness; if you remove from the gospels the places connected with both of the above; if you also reject other texts where miracles are reported that were not done by Jesus (v.gr., Luke 1-2)... what, I ask, still remains of the gospels... whose historicity we have proved is absolutely certain?—Therefore, *there is complete certainty about the historical truth of the prophecies pronounced by Jesus; at the same time also—as we have seen—about the truth of their fulfillment*.

523. 2) **There is certainty about the philosophical truth** of these prophecies of Jesus, since in them everything is fulfilled which is required in a true and strict prophecy.

41. Hosea 3:4f. Not a few serious authors explain verses 4 and 5 as being not about the Babylonian exile and the messianic renewal, but about the condition of the Jews during the messianic time and about their conversion to Christ at the end of the world: I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. in prophetas minores, pars prior* (Paris 1886) 52.

42. On the role of the Jewish people now, see what we say in the corollary in n. 535-539.

For, as is clear, they are concerned with a) *future free events*; b) which are predicted *not with ambiguous words*, but at least on the whole *in a sufficiently determined manner*; so that a *probable conjecture or chance is excluded*.

524. Thus it is clearly apparent, since the matter *is predicted with many small and concrete details*, as in the prophecies of the passion: the Son of Man *will be handed over*—not just to others in general, but *to the chief priests and to the scribes*; – and they will condemn him not to exile or something similar, but *to death*; – but in such a way that they themselves will not carry out the sentence with a stoning by the people or by doing it themselves, – but *they will turn him over to the Gentiles*; – not only to inflict capital punishment, – but *to mock—and to scourge—and they will spit on him—and crucify and kill him*, – *and on the third day he will rise again*. Likewise, the good will of the people and his triumphal entry into the city (Matt. 21:8f.) are opposed to a natural foreseeing of his passion and death, so that the chief priests feared *lest there be a tumult among the people* (Matt. 26:5); and the Roman governor, who was required by the law to pass sentence, was hostile to Jesus, as was confirmed by later events.

525. Similarly regarding the prophecies concerning the disciples, a probable conjecture is excluded: Thus about Judas, *as the traitor* and about *the definite time* of his betrayal. Likewise concerning the triple denial of Peter, *while he professed the contrary with such great ardor*; and in fact it is predicted: *for that very night* – before the cock will crow twice – he will deny him *three times*. – However, concerning Mary Magdalene, basic prudence prevented Jesus from speaking too earnestly about the fame of the woman throughout the whole world (*amen I say to you...*); also he did not speak out of mere conjecture about the coming of the Holy Spirit (a free decree of God), nor about the miracles to be performed by the Apostles....

526. *The conversion of the Gentiles and the universal preaching of the gospel* (which is contained in several prophecies) *and the permanence of the Church in difficult circumstances*—all of these things were not to be expected from the efforts of the twelve disciples and the others, who were held back by ignorance and fear; in fact we will see (theses 38-38) that a moral miracle takes place in these disciples, hence conjecture or chance is excluded absolutely.

527. *The destruction of the city and the ruin of the temple*, in the way in which we have already described them, certainly were not expected for that famous city and for that famous temple. Also the political skill of

the Romans was opposed to this, since they wanted to preserve the things pertaining to the vanquished; and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple carried out by the raging soldiers was completely contrary to the will of Titus.⁴³

528. Since that is the case, *there is sufficient certainty about the philosophical truth of the many prophecies of Jesus*; and all the other predictions must be attributed to the same prophetic power, and not to some kind of natural foresight or chance or probable conjecture.

529. *The theological truth of the prophecies*, since it concerns future free events, is always present, as we have said (n.181,2); for these events are always known by reason of Jesus' divine knowledge.

530. 3) **There is also certainty about the relative truth** of Jesus' prophecies: a) *if Jesus ordained them as confirmation of his testimony*; and b) *if this connection is clearly approved by God*.

a) *In general* Jesus ordained his prophecies, like all of his works and physical miracles, at least implicitly and equivalently, as a confirmation and proof of his divine mission.

In particular, Jesus appeals to the fulfillment of some of his prophecies, *so that when it does take place you may believe* (John 14:29). – Thus he also said (John 13:19): *I tell you this now, before it takes place, that when it does take place you may believe that I am he*, that is, because I am the Christ and the Son of God (see John 8:24 where he speaks about his *divine* mission, and uses the expression *because I am he*). – Likewise John 16:4: *.. that when their hour comes [persecutions] you may remember that I told you of them*. – And about the future false prophets (Matt. 24:23-25): *Lo, I have told you beforehand...*

531. b) *The connection between these prophecies and his legation and divinity*, for which they are intended to give witness, evidently is approved by God. For, there is no reason to raise suspicions about the falsity or wickedness of the prophesying or that God merely permits it: because this is excluded because of the holiness of the person and because of his way of acting; and because of the good and holy end which he intends, and because of the good and very holy results that followed... Hence in these circumstances it would certainly be opposed to the providence, wisdom and goodness of God to honor him with the fulfillment of false prophecies.

43. See Flavius Josephus, *Bellum iud.* 6,4,5: Opera 2,288-291.

Therefore there is certainty about the relative truth of the prophecies of Jesus, and so Jesus proved his divine testimony by his many fulfilled prophecies.

532. Scholium 1. *On the prophecies not yet fulfilled.* The preceding proof was made from the prophecies already fulfilled, and which can be proved. But there are also others, whose fulfillment is awaited, like those about the final coming of the Son of man; or the present expectation that those relating to the permanence of the Church will be fulfilled. But the words of St. Augustine pertain to this point:

“Therefore all these things, as we read were predicted so long before, we know now as facts; and just as the first Christians, because they did not yet see that those things had taken place, were moved by the miracles to believe; so also we, because all those things have thus come to pass, just as we read about those things in books, which were written a long time before they were fulfilled, where all those future things were said, and now they are seen to be present and our faith is increased, *so also the things that remain, while standing and persevering in the Lord, we believe without any doubt that they will come about....*”⁴⁴

533. Scholium 2. *Other intellectual miracles.* Prophecies about free events show the divine knowledge of Jesus. To these can be added other manifestations of his admirable knowledge, whether *discerning hidden things and reading hearts*, which occur continually in Jesus’ public life.

Thus it happened with regard to *Nathaniel* (John 1:48-51); also concerning the *Samaritan woman* (John 4:18.29.39); also concerning the thoughts of the scribes *before the cure of the paralytic* (Matt. 9:4; Mark 2:8; Luke 5:21f.); thus also in the *casting out of demons* (Matt. 12:25); also the thoughts of the disciples *about the leaven of the Pharisees* (Matt. 16:7f.); also *about the coin in the mouth of the fish* (Matt. 17:27); also about the thoughts of the Pharisees *concerning a cure on the Sabbath* (Luke 6:8); *the thoughts of Simon* despising the woman who washed Jesus’ feet with her tears (Luke 7:39ff); the thoughts of the *Pharisee before the meal* (Luke 11:38); and *Jesus knew what was in man* (John 2:24f.).

Jesus, therefore, with great composure and certitude, and also with great simplicity and ease, speaks about hidden things and about future events, about all these things as if they were present, so that rightly you may say: *Before him no creature is hidden, but all are open and laid bare to the eyes of him with whom we have to do* (Heb. 4:13).

44. *De catech. rudib.* 24 (45); ed. Christopher, 102.104: ML 40,541f.

534. Objections. 1. Jesus foretold three denials of Peter. But Peter denied him five times. Therefore the prophecy was not fulfilled exactly.

I distinguish the major. Jesus foretold three denials as *three moral acts* or three occasions, *conceded*; as three physical acts, positively excluding others, *denied*.

2. The predictions of Jesus are not univocal, for he says according to John 13:38: *The cock will not crow, till you have denied me three times* (see Matt. 26:34; Luke 22:34); and according to Mark 14:30: *before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times*.

Response. It is commonly known that a cock crows in the middle of the night and at dawn, but the crowing of the cock, simply put, is not finished until the second time; thus it is understood how *the crowing of the cock* (*alekterophonía*) is a technical term for the third watch of the night, that is from the hour of 12 to 3, and put simply it indicates the end of this watch, “indeed since cocks in those parts of the East usually crow at about the third hour”; and this is the second crowing, if it is compared with the first crowing which more or less coincides with midnight.⁴⁵

3. Jesus erred in prophesying his return that was to take place soon (Matt. 4:17; 10:23; 16:28; 24:24ff.).

Response. Jesus indeed predicted an eschatological kingdom; but it is *not merely eschatological*, that is, it will have a course on earth; the final and definitive foretold coming was not to be immediate. On the difficulties that can be raised against this, see the treatise *On the Church*.

4. Jesus identified his future parousia with the proximate destruction of the city.

I distinguish the antecedent. His glorious manifestation which would precede the destruction of Jerusalem, *conceded*; his final coming, *denied*. These two comings are joined together, since, because of the similarity of events, *with a prophetic perspective* they could be seen as one event, although they were to take place at different times or on different levels.

5. The prediction of the destruction of the city is a description interpolated after the event.⁴⁶

Response. a) If that were so, the synoptics would not have mingled together the things referring to the destruction of the city with the things that must be referred to the final coming of the Lord. b) But also the veracity and historicity of the synoptics, and likewise that these gospels were written before the year 70—these facts are completely in possession (see n.275f.285-287.304f.332ff.). c) According to the testimony of Eusebius and St. Epiphanius the Christians, before Jerusalem was besieged the second time, fled to Perea because they remembered the words of the Lord (Matt. 24:16).⁴⁷

6. Jesus, not having obtained success in his preaching, could foresee his death.

I distinguish the antecedent. With all the details and circumstances which he prophesied, *denied*; otherwise, *I bypass*. From the beginning Jesus knew about his future death by being raised up on a cross (John 3:14), but *his hour had not yet come*.

45. See Van Laak, *Repetitorium Theolog. fundam.* (1921) 163.

46. Thus Strauss, *Leben Jesu* 2,341.371; see Hettinger, 328.

47. See above, n.512, note 21.

7. Jesus could surmise, from the personalities of Judas and Peter, the betrayal of the former and the denial of the latter.

Response. Naturally and *with certitude* such great perversity and the time of Judas's betrayal could not be conjectured, since he acted in such a way that the others did not suspect him (see Matt. 26:22); but Peter, although he was inconstant with his sanguine temperament, still was an ardent disciple and he acted with fervor, so his denials could not be foreseen naturally in such a definite way.

8. Jesus could know his own death and its circumstances from the prophets of the O.T.

Response. a) Therefore *his divine supernatural legation is already admitted*, which the O.T. records. b) Those prophecies *did not have the circumstances added by Jesus*, and they were not made clear except by Jesus.

9. Jesus was convinced that he could not be acknowledged as the Messiah as long as the temple existed, and therefore he was convinced that God would remove this impediment through the destruction of the temple.⁴⁸

Response. All this is imagined gratuitously; and by a natural pre-vision Jesus could not predict the destruction of the temple, since God could well bring it about that the Messiah would be acknowledge while the temple was still standing; nor could he naturally predict the destruction in the circumstances in which it was foretold.

10. Jesus could foresee the desolation and destruction of the temple from the words of Dan. 9:26.

Response. The prophecy of Daniel did not have all the details that the prophecy of Jesus had.

535. Corollary. On the fate of the Jewish people as an apologetic argument.⁴⁹ From the fulfilled prophecy of Jesus it is certain that the Jews, after the destruction of the city, *were taken as captives to all the nations*, and that *Jerusalem was conquered by the Gentiles*. What happened almost twenty centuries ago is certain from history for anyone who considers the miserable condition which the Jewish people has had as a people:

For, the people *were driven from their homeland and dispersed*; and, since they were not absorbed by other peoples, still they did not establish their own country.

And this people does not have a legitimate priesthood, which would be such from the tribe of Levi and from the family of Aaron, because the different tribes after the destruction of the city and the dispersion were mixed together in a confused manner. They have Rabbis but not priests.

And they do not have a sacrifice, because the temple where the sacrifices had to be offered was completely destroyed. Hence the Mosaic worship and

48. Thus Gottlob Paulus, *Exeg. Handbuch* 3,340; see Wilmers, *De religione revelata* 354.

49. See Müller, *De vera religione* 490-495; St. Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos orationes* VIII: MG 48,843-942; St. Jerome, *Epist.* 129 (Ad Dardanum, de terra promissionis): ML 22,1099-1107.

the observance of that Law in a big way became impossible for the Jews.

And they were also found to be *without the temporal happiness*, which they had formerly in their own homeland, and which God promised to them while they observed the divine precepts and or did penance, if they had committed any crime. But now often, and you may say always and continually in different places *they are subject to persecutions*.

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) said about the Jews: “Now ever since they were driven from their homeland they remain exiles, contemned; no prophet comes to them; there is no indication of a future return; their teachers as it were inspired by a spirit of vertigo have invented disgraceful fables and ridiculous teachings with which the Talmudic books abound....”⁵⁰

536. But if anyone considers the fate of peoples as being governed by divine providence, he will easily perceive this terrible misery of a people that is so singular, so great that it far exceeds the suffering of the Babylonian captivity, a punishment that was inflicted also for the greatest crime; and certainly no other such crime is found except the killing of the Messiah, the Son of God: *so that the people ordained by God to produce the Messiah, when the Messiah was rejected by it, it in turn is rejected by God.*

Therefore from these events also *it is confirmed* that the Messiah has already come, and that there is no other Messiah except Jesus of Nazareth, rejected by them—the cornerstone; and *he who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces; but when it falls on any one, it will crush him* (Matt. 24:44).

537. And as St. Augustine says: “... the Jews have been dispersed throughout all nations, witnesses of their own iniquity and of our truth. They have the books, which prophesied the Christ, and we have Christ. And if sometime perhaps a pagan should have doubts, when we have told him the prophecies about the Christ, he is amazed at their evidence and in his surprise should think that they were written by us, we can prove the point from the books of the Jews because this was predicted much earlier....”⁵¹

538. And again St. Augustine says: “But when they read, they are not surprised that they who have the books do not understand those things because of the darkness of their enmities. For it was predicted before by the same Prophets that they would not understand it; and this, like the others, had to be fulfilled, and that the proper punishment should be given to them by the hidden and just judgment of God. Certainly he

50. *De veritate religionis christianae* 1.5 c.16; see Müller, *De vera religione* 491.

51. *In Ps 58* serm. 1,22: ML 36,705.

whom they crucified, and to whom they gave gall and vinegar, although hanging on the cross, because of those whom he was about to bring out of the darkness into the light, said to the Father: *Forgive them, for they know not what they are doing* (Luke 23:34); however, because of others whom he was going to abandon for more hidden reasons, he had predicted much earlier; “*They gave me poison for food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. Let their own table before them become a snare; let their sacrificial feasts be a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, so that they cannot see; and make their loins tremble continually* (Ps. 69:21-23)... and they were not killed, but they were dispersed, so that, although they would not have the faith by which one is saved, still they might by memory retain that by which we are assisted, namely, our supporters with their Books, our enemies in their hearts, witnesses in their scrolls.”⁵²

539. Meanwhile, the word of the Lord always remains real: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! Behold, your house is forsaken and desolate. For I tell you, *you will not see me again, until you say: Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord* (Matt. 23:37-39).

They are Israelites, *and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever* (Rom. 9:4f.). We can hope for many of them that God quickly “*will remove the veil from their hearts,*”⁵³ and that *they will be grafted into his olive tree* (Rom. 11:24), and that they will produce abundant fruit for salvation, until all Israel is saved; *for the gifts and call of God are irrevocable* (Rom. 11:29).⁵⁴

52. *De fide rerum quae non videntur* 6,9: ML 40,178f.

53. See the liturgy for Good Friday. See also 2 Cor. 3:14-16, where St. Paul says that *a veil covers their hearts; and to this day whenever Moses is read a veil lies over their minds*.

54. Recently the State of Israel was established; but everything is not definite on all sides, nor is there a historical or chronological perspective of sufficient time in order to be able to judge the situation and to make some comments. See what we said above (n.506-520), especially n.520, on the prophecies of the Lord concerning the destruction of the city, and the dispersion of the people and the conquest of the city by the Gentiles, and also about its future conversion, which we just now spoke about, from the evangelical teaching of St. Paul. The following also wrote about this matter: J. Enciso, *La maldición del pueblo judío: Ecclesia* 8 (1948) 121f.151f.261.; and with a slight criticism, A. Colunga, O.P., *El reino de Israel en los planes divinos: Ceinc-Tom* 76 (1949) 353-366. Others who wrote about this are: J.M Bover, S.J., *La reprobación de Israel en Rom 9-11: EstEcl* 25 (1951) 63-82; J.M. González Ruiz, *La restauración de Israel en los profetas: EstBibl* 11 (1952) 157-187.

Thesis 34. Jesus, after his predicted resurrection (I), by truly dying (II) and resurrecting (III), confirmed his divine testimony with an excellent proof.

S.Th. III, q. 53-56; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.841-887; Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 c.4 p.369-446; Müller, *De vera religione* th.40; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conf. de N. Dame* (1930) V.VI; E. Mangelot, *La Résurrection de Jésus*⁴ (Paris 1910); Koesters, *Unser Christusglaube* 170-181; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.6; H. Felder, *Jesus Christ* 2, part 2, c.3.

540. Connection. Since the resurrection of Jesus participates in the nature both of a physical miracle and of a fulfilled prophecy, it seems more fitting to deal with it after we have already treated in a general way the miracles and prophecies of Jesus.

Moreover, the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth is *the crown and the recapitulation* of all the signs given by him; therefore it seems that it should be treated at the end of the miracles worked by Jesus

541. The importance of the thesis. Therefore you may say that we approach the principal thesis of Christianity *lest our faith be in vain, if Christ has not been raised* (1 Cor. 15:14); and certainly we now come to the kernel and heart of the treatise. For the resurrection of Jesus was his *greatest miracle*: not only because it has to do with a first class miracle—to raise someone from the dead; but also, which is still more extraordinary, to raise himself, that is, to resurrect by his own power; although regarding this point, that Christ raised himself by his own power, it is not necessary to prove this in order to establish the truth of the miracle and the confirmation of the testimony of Jesus.

Therefore it is not surprising if *Jesus* appeals to this miracle in a special way; nor is it surprising if the *Apostles* in a special way, or *contemporary adversaries* of the Catholic religion either invoke the resurrection of Jesus or attack it.¹

542. State of the question. In order that the force of fulfilled prophecy may appear which is contained in the resurrection of Jesus, and to proceed chronologically, in the first place the prediction of the resurrection made by him must be explained; then the fact of his death must be established; so that finally certainty is gained about his true and real resurrection. Hence the thesis *must be divided into three parts.*

1. The Apostles rather often appeal to the resurrection of Jesus: see Acts 1:21f.; 2:24-32; 3:15; 4:10.33; 5:30; 10:40f.; 13:30-37; 17:3.31; 26:23; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:1f.; 1 Pet. 1:21; Rev. 1:5....

S. Tromp has gathered together statements of the Fathers about the resurrection of Jesus: *De revelatione*⁶ 273 (1.2 prop.6, prenotes, n.4). See also R in the index n. 27.

Concerning the opinion of recent historical critics, here is what M. Goguel has to say: "La critique historique... constate que c'est sur la base de la foi à la résurrection que c'est contraint l'édifice du christianisme" (*Actes du Congrès international d'Histoire des Religions* [1923] [Paris 1925] 2,225; see Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,369 [1.4 c.4 § 1]. — On the more recent history concerning this apologetic argument, P. de Haes, *La résurrection de Jésus dans l'apologétique des cinquante dernières années* (Rome 1953).

If the historical truth concerning these three points is established, the divine testimony of Jesus will easily be made certain. For, *the philosophical and theological truth of this wondrous event will be apparent without any difficulty*, since it clearly surpasses the powers of nature, and only God could be its author (for the restoration of a dead person to life is effected without any doubt by the supreme Author of life); moreover this is also certain from what has already been said concerning the person of the wonder worker, Jesus, and his way of acting, concerning his intended end and concerning the effects of his action which followed. *But the relative truth* will be established by quoting the words of Jesus whereby, when he predicted some event, he then appealed to it as proof of his mission. And this will be pointed out expressly in a more suitable way *in the first part, where we will explain his predictions*.

543. Adversaries. There are many theories proposed in the attempt to find a natural answer to the fact of the resurrection, succeeding each other like the waves of the sea with a marvelous instability and singular mobility; all of this, since truth is immutable, is a very clear sign of the inefficacy of these theories.

1) Among the ancients, the *theory of fraud* was at first proposed by the *Pharisees*, who wanted to attribute the hiding of Jesus' body to the disciples who, they said, came to the tomb at night (Matt. 28:11-15).

The same claim was made *by other later Jews*²; and Celsus, who also wants to associate this lie with some illusions.³

In the 18th century Reimarus revived the same theory: that the disciples stole the body from the sepulcher, and that the apparitions⁴ were only their inventions.

Other more recent authors prefer to say that the body was removed by the Jews (Réville, Le Roy)⁵; or by Joseph of Arimathaea who, recognizing the shame brought on his own family by the burial of a crucified man, secretly buried the body someplace else (O. Holtzmann).⁶

544. 2) The theory of apparent death was proposed especially by Gottlob Paulus, which agrees with the naturalistic explanations we treated before (n.251.475). The death of Jesus was only apparent. Everything in a wonderful way produced the cure of the wounded Jesus: that is, the thrust of the lance with the spilling of blood was a medicinal alleviation, the anointing for his burial was a strengthening for his half-dead body,

2. See St. Justin, *Dialog. cum Tryphone* 17 and 108: MG 6,512f.725-728.

3. See Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2,55: MG 11,884f.

4. *Vom Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger* ed. G.E. Lessing (Brunswick 1778); see above n.250.449.475.

5. A. Réville, *Jésus de Nazareth* (Paris 1907) 1,461ff.; see Grandmaison, 2,410; Dieckmann, n.845.

6. *Leben Jesu* (Tübingen-Leipzig 1901) 392f.; see Dieckmann, n.845.

the earthquake made it possible for him to leave the sepulcher, and finally Jesus put on the clothes of a gardener and was found by the pious women and they cared for him.⁷ Strauss himself humorously ridicules this amazing explanation.⁸

Recently F. Spitta embraced this theory; he does not admit the resurrection of Jesus and wants only to admit a *miraculous cure of Jesus* by God, willingly and gratuitously by accepting the sources or rejecting them.⁹

Others who agree with the theory of an apparent death are Herder, Venturini, De Regla, K. Otto, Streffe.¹⁰

545. The following can be called *historical-critical theories* (n.3-6), because they use historical criticism; but they are based on the principles of naturalism and subjectivism:

3) *The mythical theory* proposed by D.F. Strauss (see n.252.475): the resurrection is a myth under the influence of the prophecies of the O.T. (Ps. 16:8-11).

Others, however, (A. Meyer, P.W. Schmiedel, A. Loisy) for the determination of the "third day" appeal to Hosea 6:2; 2 Kings 20:5¹¹; although in these places nothing is said about the Messiah and therefore they are not quoted in the N.T.

4) *The historical-comparative religion theory* wants to explain the resurrection from the influence of the oriental religions: that the first Christian communities derived the idea of the resurrection from a desire to have their own glorious god like the other pagan religions; that the idea of a resurrecting god was very prevalent in the whole East. Thus among the peoples cultivating earthly deities, as in winter nature as it were dies and with the coming of spring it revives, so also the gods of these peoples are said to revive: Osiris, Attis, Adonis....¹²

5) *The historical-morphological theory* describes the origin and evolution of the idea of resurrection from the influence of popular literature (folklore), by dissolving the historical narratives and reports into their primitive elements. For popular literature is wont to use two motives in order to extol the life of its heroes: disappearance and theophany (the body of the hero is not found and therefore he is assumed among the

7. *Leben Jesu* (Heidelberg 1928); Dieckmann, n.845.887.

8. *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet* (Leipzig 1874) 298; Grandmaison translated the German into French, 2,410; but in German, Müller, *De vera religione* 447.

9. *Die Auferstehung Jesu* (Göttingen 1918); Dieckmann, n.846.887.

10. See Tromp, *De revelatione* p.274 (1.2 prop.6, prenotes, n. 5,b).

11. See Mangenot, *La résurrection de Jésus* 74-82; Dieckmann, n.850.

12. See Grandmaison, 2,369.428-434, 510-532 (note P₂).

gods; for example, Aeneas, Romulus...). Thus E. Bickermann.¹³

6) *The symbolical theory*, which especially *Harnack and the modernists* cultivated: according to them, faith in the resurrection was not so much about the historical fact itself, as it was about a symbolical resurrection, that is, about the immortal life of Jesus with God (D 3437; see D 3436, 3485). For the resurrection was understood by the primitive Christians not as real, but as ideal.

According to Harnack, a distinction must be made between the news about the empty tomb and the apparitions (*Osterbotschaft*) and the paschal faith: that the crucified has conquered death (*Osterglaube*); St. Paul speaks about this faith (1 Cor. 15).¹⁴

546. *The psychological theories*. There are many who hold that a conviction so widely diffused about the resurrection of Jesus cannot be explained in a merely symbolical way or by a certain mythical or literary evolution; they say that some historical fact must be admitted: that the Apostles saw Jesus... and that this should be explained *psychologically*. Hence we can call the following theories *psychological*.

7) *The pathological explanation through subjective visions*: that is, the Apostles, especially Peter, who influenced the others, or Mary Magdalene with her vivid imagination and desire to see Jesus, with a purely subjective hallucination projected him as being real... Thus with his lyricism Renan¹⁵; and more recently A. Meyer.¹⁶

8) *The explanation by an irrational or pneumatic experience* (R. Otto): the resurrection of Jesus was made known to Paul and the other Apostles not in a conceptual or intellectual way, but by a higher way, namely a

13. See Grandmaison, 2,411.504f.; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 276 (1.2 prop.6, prenotes, n.5,i).

14. *Das Wesen des Christentum*. Akademische Ausgabe (Leipzig 1902) 101; Dieckmann, n.849.

15. "Dans quelle conditions l'enthousiasme, toujours crédule, fit-il éclore l'ensemble de récits par lequel on établit la foi en la résurrection? C'est ce que, faute de documents contradictoire, nous ignorerons à jamais. Disons cependant que la forte imagination de Marie de Magdala joua dans cette circonstance un rôle capital. Pouvoir divin de l'amour! moments sacrés ou la passion d'une hallucinée donne au monde un Dieu ressuscité" (*Vie de Jésus*¹³ c.26 p.449f.).

And elsewhere the same Renan describes the illusion of the Apostles regarding the resurrection of Jesus: he introduces the Apostles as being anxious in their expectation, in spite of their depression and fear; the gospels in a historical way bear witness to this and in spite of their remorse of conscience. All are present at the same time: "Pendant un instant de silence, quelque léger souffle passa sur la face des assistants. A ces heures décisives, un courant d'air, une fenêtre qui crie, un murmure fortuit arrêtent la croyance des peuples pour siècles. En même temps que le siffle se fit sentir, on crut entendre des sons. Quelques-uns dirent qu'ils avaient discerné le mot *shalom*, 'bonheur' ou 'pais.' C'était le salut ordinaire de Jésus et le mot par lequel il signalait sa présence... Ce fut donc une chose recue que, le dimanche soir, Jésus était apparu devant ses disciples assemblés: quelques-uns prétendirent avoir distingué dans ses mains et ses pieds la marque des clous..." (*Les Apôtres* [Paris, no year given] c.1 p.22-23). See Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'étude comparée des religions*³ (Paris 1929) 2, § 381 p.148f.).

16. *Die Auferstehung Christi* (Tübingen 1905); Dieckmann, n.855.

mystical way, so that by this internal experience “they saw” Jesus.¹⁷

9) *An explanation by objective visions*, such as take place in mystics: faith in the resurrection takes its origin from a truly objective foundation in order to establish the reality of the apparition of Jesus, that is, from the miraculous apparitions of Jesus with a pneumatic body, like the body he had in his mortal life... Thus E. von Dobschütz, Th. Korff.¹⁸

10) There is also an amazing *occultist opinion*: there was a materialization of the body of Jesus composed of matter taken from the disciples, as in spiritistic seances where there is the occurrence of “ectoplasms”; afterwards, perhaps in the cloud which took him up out of their eyes (Acts 1:9), there was a dematerialization... Thus R.A. Hoffmann and also W. Kuhaupt.¹⁹

11) Others, not satisfied by the preceding explanations, confess that something mysterious remains in the resurrection and in the effects it produced (H. Gunkel); or they ask themselves how psychic experiences turn out to be the beginnings of a religion like Christianity (K.G. Goetz).²⁰

547. Doctrine of the Church. *Regarding the first part*, that Jesus predicted his own resurrection, the matter is plainly one of faith, which is contained clearly in Holy Scripture; and moreover it is proposed in the preaching and ordinary magisterium of the Church as said by God, as something expressed in the sacred writings.

Regarding the second and third parts, that Jesus truly died and rose from the dead, this matter not only is contained in Scripture and is taught as such by the Church; but in addition it is defined in the creeds (D 11ff., 44, 72, 189-190, 76, 105, 125-126, 150, 539, 681) and in the professions of faith (D 502, 791, 801, 852, 1338, 1862, 2529). Especially it is explained that “he died his own true bodily death, rose again by a true resurrection of the flesh and the true resumption of his body by his soul...” (D 791; see D 852) and he did this “by his own power” (D 539); and to confirm his resurrection he ate with his disciples (D 681).

That the testimony and legation of Jesus is proved by the resurrection as a true historical fact is contained in the written divine revelation and is proposed by the ordinary magisterium of the Church as affirmed in the revelation of Jesus and the Apostles; also it is certain from D 2754 (Bautain), D 2779 (“Qui pluribus”); and that it is dealing with a true historical fact from D 3436f., 3485) (Modernists).

17. *Aufsätze das Numinose betreffend* (Göttingen 1923) 159-170 (Das Auferstehungserlebnis als pneumatische Erfahrung): Dieckmann, n.852.887.171.

18. E.v. Dobschütz, *Ostern und Pfingsten. Eine Studie zu 1 Kor 15* (Leipzig 1903); Th. Korff, *Die Auferstehung Christi und die radikale Theologie* (Halle 1908). See Dieckmann, n.853.887.

19. R.A. Hoffmann, *Das Geheimnis der Auferstehung Jesu* (Leipzig 1921); W. Kuhaupt, *Die okkulten Erscheinungen und das Wunderbare um die Person Jesu* (Braunschweig 1925) 125. See Dieckmann, n.854.

20. See Dieckmann, n.854.

Theological note. The thesis, therefore, from what has been said, under every aspect and as to all its parts, is *divine and Catholic faith*.

548. Proof of the first part: *Jesus predicted his resurrection*, and he appeals to it in confirmation of his testimony.

a) For Jesus often spoke about this matter: to the Pharisees asking him by what authority he cleansed the temple, he replied: *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up* (John 2:13-22; Matt. 26:61; Mark 14:58). Likewise to the Scribes and Pharisees wanting to see a sign from him he promised *the sign of Jonah*: “For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Matt. 12:38-40; Luke 11:29f.). Likewise elsewhere again he gives *the sign of Jonah* to those asking for a sign (Matt. 16:1-4; Mark 8:11f.). And *after the confession of Peter*, when he predicts his passion and death, he adds *that it is necessary for the Messiah and Son of man after three days to rise again* (Mark 8:30-32; Matt. 16:20-22; Luke 9:21f.).

b) The same prediction recurs *after the transfiguration* when he commands them “to tell no one about the vision, *until the Son of man is raised from the dead* (Matt. 17:9; Mark 9:9). And to the disciples in Galilee talking about him he says: *he will be raised on the third day* (Matt. 17:23; Mark 9:31); he says the same thing to them as they are going up to Jerusalem (Matt. 20:19; Mark 10:34; Luke 18:33). See also Matt. 26:32 (Mark 14:28): “*but after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee...*”

c) *In the Gospel of John this prediction recurs often*: in the dispute with the Jews (*I lay down my life, that I may take it again* [John 10:17]; *when you have lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am he* [John 8:28f.]; and to his disciples (*I go away, and I will come to you* [John 14:28]; *I will see you again* [John 16:22]).

549. Among these many predictions it should be noted what is found under a), in which the resurrection is predicted *as a sign of his own mission and confirmation of his own testimony* (see also Luke 24:44-46).

But from all these quoted texts it is certain that the prediction of the resurrection *is not something merely accidental in the gospels*, but it is absolutely substantial: not only *because of the number of verses* pertaining to this matter, *in different places* and occasions, but *also because of their organic connections with other passages*. Thus questions about the resurrection cohere organically in the gospels with those which are narrated about the passion and with others, and also among themselves, as will be clear to the reader: for, the predictions are repeated in the same gospel (v.gr., Matt. 16:20-22; 17:9; 17:23; 20:19; 26:32); the discourse in John alludes not rarely to the resurrection; the sign of Jonah is given twice; the

comparison of destroying the temple and rebuilding it is repeated by the false witnesses in the account of the passion (Matt. 26:61; Mark 14:58); those who mock him on the cross refer to it (Matt. 27:40). Add also the coherence of all these texts with the narrations about the resurrected Jesus in the gospels and in the Acts and in the letters of St. Paul. Therefore, since it concerns a substantial matter in the gospels, the claim is excluded that these predictions were interpolated after the gospels had been written.

But if the evangelists always deserve historical credence for the strict historicity of these books, much more must the same thing be said when the question concerns something substantial in them. For, the only reason for not admitting the prediction would be the supernaturalness of this event; but this would hold true for all the miracles and prophecies that are in the gospels and then nothing genuine would remain in them. Moreover, if the prediction of Christ had been invented by them, it would have been expressed from the beginning in the sense of a true resurrection, nor would the slowness of the disciples in understanding it have been recorded, but *a tendentious interpretation would have been added* (see. John 2:22; Luke 18:34; Mark 9:32).

The prediction was not made with equivocal words, but clearly, so that it might be understood by his enemies, who asked to station guards at the sepulcher (Matt. 27:63f.), and finally clearly by his friends (John 2:22; 20:9). For the matter was predicted to many—to friends and enemies—often and continually.

Therefore, it is certain that Jesus predicted his own resurrection, and he did it in confirmation of his own testimony.

550. Objections. 1. The disciples “understood none of these things; this saying was hid from them, and they did not grasp what was said” (Luke 18:34); likewise “they did not understand the saying [resurrection]” (Mark 9:32). Therefore the resurrection was not clearly predicted.

I distinguish the antecedent. The disciples did not understand that it concerned the resurrection *at least after the fulfilled prophecy*, which suffices for a true prophecy, *denied* (see John 2:22; 20:9); before the fulfillment of the prophecy, *I subdistinguish*: they did not understand the material saying and the popular concept of the matter, *denied*; they did not understand how the resurrection and the passion [*none of these things*: Luke 18:34] could be reconciled with the messianic hope, *conceded*; and *so they kept the matter to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant* (Mark 9:10).

Likewise I distinguish the consequent. The resurrection was not clearly predicted to the extent that is required for a true prophecy, *denied*; otherwise, *I bypass the consequent*.

2. The prediction about the destruction of the temple was equivocal, and could be understood materially to be about the temple in Jerusalem, because a time was coming in

which the true adorers would adore not in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth (John 4:21-23).

Response. In the prophecy about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple there is no allusion to a cessation of the Mosaic worship; and Jesus says that he is going to rebuild it. Therefore, there is no equivocation regarding the cessation of the worship. Moreover, if anyone admits that, he is also admitting a true prophecy.

551. Proof of the second part: *Jesus truly died*, not apparently or fictitiously, as the naturalistic theory contends.

For such is the convergence of so many arguments and witnesses about this matter, that historically there cannot be any doubt. Those bearing witness to the death of Jesus are:

- 1) *The four evangelists*, historically reliable, who affirm it: Matt. 27:50; Mark 15:37; Luke 23:46; John 19:30.
- 2) *The soldiers* before breaking the bones: John 19:32-34.
- 3) *The centurion* (Mark 15:39) and *Pilate* from his information (Mark 15:44f.).
- 4) *The high priests and Pharisees*: Matt. 27:63. For, the hatred of his enemies was such that they would not rest, until they were certain about his death.²¹
- 5) *The mother of Jesus, John, and the other friends* standing beneath the cross certainly would not allow his body to be placed in the sepulcher, if they had the least suspicion that Jesus was only apparently dead or had fainted.
- 6) *The people*, who had witnessed his suffering, later accepted the preaching of *Peter and the Apostles*: Acts 2:23 (...*this Jesus... you killed*); 3:15: (*you killed the Author of life*); 4:10...; see also 1 Pet. 3:18.21.
- 7) *St. Paul* (1 Cor. 15:3) preached the death of Jesus as something accepted by him and in turn handed on and accepted by others.
- 8) *In the Acts of Pilate* he spoke about his death.²²
- 9) *Also the thrust of the lance* (John 19:34) would have been a cause of death; similarly, *the whole passion and burial*; and a natural healing was not possible in a sealed and guarded sepulcher.

552. Objections. 1. Pilate was surprised at his death (Mark 15:44). Therefore the passion and sufferings were not enough to produce death.

Response. Pilate “wondered if he were *already* dead; and summoning the centurion, he asked him whether he was *already* dead. And when he learned from the centurion...”

21. Concerning the death of Jesus, Renan says this: “A vrai dire, la meilleure garantie que possède l’historien sur un point de cette nature (i.e. concerning the death of Jesus), c’est la haine soupçonneuse des ennemis de Jésus. Il est très douteux que les Juifs fussent dès lors préoccupés de la crainte que Jésus ne passât pour résuscité; mais, en tout cas, ils devaient veiller à ce qu’il fut bien mort...” (*Vie de Jésus*¹³ c.26 p.444).

22. See St. Justin, *Apolog.* 1,35: MG 6,384; see above, n.380,4.

(Mark 15:44f.).

2. It is not natural immediately before death to emit a loud cry, as the evangelists say. Therefore Jesus was not at the point of death.

I concede the antecedent. Certainly it is not natural; but *I deny the consequent and the consequence*, because the emission of that loud cry could be *supernatural*. Thus it is made clear by the whole work accomplished by Jesus that in this way he would show that his death was completely voluntary: *I give up my life*; but about his death no reasonable doubt is possible.

553. Proof of the third part: *Jesus truly resurrected.*

The notion of resurrection. Resurrection, or a repeated rising up, supposes a preceding life and death; therefore it is *the change of a human body from a dead state to a living state through the information of the numerically same soul as before*. But it is not necessary that the body be found with the same properties and qualities as before.

Resurrection can be of such a nature that a resurrected man must die again (Lazarus); likewise it can have the same defects as before. But a resurrection is understood to be *perfect* if the resurrected man now no longer has to die, and has in his body those glorious qualities, which we know that Jesus Christ had in his resurrected body.

We prove the resurrection of Jesus *not in its taking place*, because none of the witnesses saw it²³; but we are dealing with his resurrection *after the fact*.

554. Proof 1. *By introducing the witnesses of the apparitions.* We will build our argument in such a way that: A) from an overview presented of the apparitions of Jesus, B) we will examine their witnesses in the first evangelists, and C) we will prove the preaching and acceptance of the resurrection of Jesus in the primitive Church; then D) we will explain more at length the special testimony of St. Paul in 1 Cor.15; and E) we will exclude any fraud in these given testimonies, and F) subjective deception of the witnesses; and finally G) we will demonstrate that there is no basis of any kind of objective mystical vision, but H) that there is a real identity of the resurrected Jesus with the living [historical] Jesus.

A) *The apparitions of Jesus, according to the history taken from the gospels, Acts and 1 Cor. 15, were the following:*

23. The prayer in the Liturgy for Holy Saturday sings about the resurrection in its actual happening: "O truly blessed night, which alone deserved to know the time and hour in which Christ rose again from the grave."

Apparitions of the Risen Jesus

	Matt.	Mark	Luke	John	I Cor.	
1	—	16:9 ²⁴	—	20:11-17	—	Magdalene
2	28:9	—	—	—	—	Pious women ²⁵
3	—	—	24:34	—	15:5	Peter
4	—	16:12	24:13-33	—	—	Disciples at Emmaus
5	—	16:14	24:36-43	20:19-23	—	To disciples, Thomas absent
6	—	—	—	20:24-29	15:5	To apostles with Thomas
7	—	—	—	21:1-14	—	To disciples at Tiberias
8	28:16-17	16:15	—	—	—	To the apostles
9	—	—	—	—	15:6	To more than 500 brothers
10	—	—	—	—	15:7	To James
11	—	16:19	24:44-52	—	15:7	To apostles; Acts 1:4-9
12	—	—	—	—	15:8	To Paul. See Acts 9:17-27; 22:14-19; 26:16 ²⁶

24. On the authenticity of the conclusion of Mark (Mark 16:9-20), see v.gr. Rosadini, *Instructio in Evangelia* (Rome 1938) n.149. Recently about this pericope, H.M. Bover, *El final de S. Marcos (16:9-20)*: EstBibl 4 (1944) 561f.: *Mayor pars codicum id habet* (namely, this conclusion of Mark, canonical and accepted by Trent [D 1502-1505], and by Vatican I [D 3006, 3029], whose author is the same Mark [D 3569]; *but a few codices* (B, S...) *omit it, while others introduce another final apocryphal pericope*, that is, a shorter one (L...) or a longer one (W...). The reason for this lack of full unanimity (which certainly does not destroy the historical certitude of its authenticity) seems to lie in the fact that Mark reproduces, as is known, the catechesis of Peter, even in the style; but this catechesis did not seem to contain a proof of the resurrection of Jesus, by his apparitions and about those things mentioned in Mark 16:9-20, but these things were proposed to those who did not yet believe as a previous apologetic demonstration. Therefore *Mark added it on his own initiative*; and so there is a difference in style with what went before. This also is the source of the doubts among some, who either suppressed the pericope or substituted another apocryphal one.

25. See J.M. Bover, *La aparición del Señor resucitado a las piadosas mujeres*: EstBibl 4 (1945) 5-13: this author with others distinguishes the apparition to Mary Magdalene from the apparition made to the other women. For a contrary view, J. Leal, *Las apariciones a María Magdalena en la exégesis postridentini*: ArchTG 9 (1946) 5-52.

26. On the conversion of Paul and on the apparition of the Lord to him, see v.gr. E. Jacquier, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1926) at this place, p.280f.796-802 (Excursus VIII).

555. B) *Above all, the evangelists in their narration of this matter and the Acts 1:3-12 bear witness to the true resurrection of Jesus; and all those to whom he appeared. But if the evangelists and the Acts have full historical authority, it is much more so in the affirmation of this matter, which in their writings is absolutely substantial and organically coheres with the predictions of the resurrection and with the whole teaching of the primitive Church.*

Moreover the resurrection of Jesus *is narrated in a very sincere way*, omitting the *happening* itself of the resurrection, which was suitable matter for an imaginary description and idealization. Furthermore, they do not avoid apparent contradictions or differences in their narrations, nor do they intend to produce a clear harmony between the narrations; nor are they bound by a preoccupation of defending the related fact, which is thought to be beyond controversy.

556. C) *And this was the preaching and acceptance of the primitive Church.*

Thus St. Peter in a special way bears witness to the resurrection, treating it often: Acts 1:21f. (when a new apostle is sought, who must be a witness of the resurrection); 2:22-36 (by applying to Jesus the prophecy in Ps. 16:8-11); 3:15 (after the cure of the lame man by saying to the people: *you killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead...*); 4:2.8-10 (before the Sanhedrin); 5:30 (before the council); 10:39 (in the conversion of Cornelius); 1 Pet. 1:21.

Thus *all the Apostles*: Acts 4:33.

Thus *all who heard the sermons of Peter and the Apostles*, in a matter that could easily be contradicted, which of course they would have done, unless the fact of the resurrection was most evident: Thus 120 persons in the Upper Room (Acts 1:15); thus those 3,000 and 5,000 who believed (Acts 2:32-41; 4:2.4)....

Thus *St. Paul and the churches* to which he writes. But concerning the witness of Paul, because of its great importance, it will be treated now in a special way.

557. D) *The testimony of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15.*²⁷ The importance of this testimony is in the fact that it is *independent of the preceding*, as even the adversaries admit; and thus it has a special note of authenticity. Moreover, since the letter to the Corinthians was written probably in the year 55,

27. See E.B. Allo, *Saint Paul. Première épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris 1934 p.387f.; F. Prat, *La Théologie de S.Paul* I¹² (Paris 1924) p.157-167.

certainly not much later than that,²⁸ in it we have *a very early testimony* of the preached resurrection, and so already previously accepted.

558. Explanation of the text. The state of the primitive Church is apparent in 1 Cor., since St. Paul in chs. 1-6 speaks about the abuses, and in ch. 7ff. he responds to questions sent to him by the Corinthians.

In ch. 15 he responds to the “wise ones” who, because of their Hellenistic prejudices (see Acts 17:32 where Paul is mocked in the Areopagus for speaking about the resurrection), denied the bodily resurrection of men or had doubts about it, or thought some kind of spiritualism would suffice for the immortality of the soul.—Paul fought against this error because it would, logically and by going backwards, deny the bodily resurrection of Christ, which is the foundation of the Christian faith. Afterwards he would also oppose this error when it was growing in Asia Minor (2 Tim. 2:17f.). But if he speaks about the resurrection of the dead who are saved, and not about the damned, the resurrection of the damned is not thereby denied; but his purpose now is to strengthen the hope of Christians, not their fear.

In the first place Paul treats in v.1-11 the fact of the resurrection of Christ; *then* in v.12-34 he argues from that fact to demonstrate the fact of our own resurrection; *finally*, in v. 35-58 he treats the manner of the resurrection and the final victory of Christ.

V.1. *Now I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel* [therefore the resurrection of Christ was the object of his preaching], *which you received* [this corresponds to “I delivered to you” in v.3; therefore it is that preaching, which took place in the year 49 or 50, and was already then accepted in Corinth as an article of faith], *in which you stand* [i.e., you are holding on to that faith], v.2 *by which you are saved, if you hold it fast—unless you believed in vain* [said ironically].

V.3. *For I delivered to you* [παρέδωκα παράδοσις, a technical term for the oral tradition], *as of first importance* [the most important, not what he at first preached], *what I also received* [see 1 Cor. 11:23: “For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you...”; a technical term for the oral tradition: therefore Paul delivers the matter orally, just as he received it orally, even though he also knew it supernaturally; he received it in his conversion, twenty years before, perhaps from Ananias (Acts 9), afterwards confirmed by Peter and James. This does not have to do with his own personal teaching, but with the common teaching: *what I also received*; this is also certain from the following fixed formula or creed. Therefore this matter was commonly accepted, and it is supposed as fully known and beyond controversy, because from it he plans to argue for the future bodily resurrection]: *that* [ὅτι, explanatory, not expressing the cause] *Christ died*

28. Paul, according to 1 Cor. 16:8, wrote this epistle in Ephesus; but he had arrived there in the autumn of 54; and after an apostolate of three months and some other persecutions (Acts 19:8f.), to which he seems to allude in 1 Cor.15:30-32 and 16:9, he must have written the letter during the following spring. See Gaechter, *Introductio in Novum Testamentum* n.250.

[really, as is evident] *for our sins* [therefore with an expiatory death] *in accordance with the Scriptures* [v.gr., Isa. 53; therefore it is not a Pauline invention].

V.4. *that he was buried* [see Isa. 53:9. Therefore he really died; and he did not have an apparent body, as the docetists said later; and St. Paul knew the argument about the empty tomb. The Lord also “slept,” as he will say later about the faithful], *that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures* [see Ps. 16:10 (Acts 2:27); the determination “in accordance with the Scriptures” does not necessarily modify “on the third day”; rather it modifies “he was raised”; see John 2:1 (Matt. 12:38-40; 16:1-4 and parallels)].

559. St. Paul affirms in these verses the *real* resurrection of Christ: a) because he wants from it to deduce an argument for a *real* resurrection of bodies; b) he preached this *real* resurrection in the Areopagus and so he was ridiculed (Acts 17:32); c) the resurrection of Christ was reckoned with his death and burial, which were *real*; d) the determination of the “third day” doubtless refers to a *real* event; e) the verbs *ἐγείρω*, *ἀνίστημι* are the same and are used when dealing with a *real* resurrection in Matt. 9:25 and parallels (on the daughter of Jairus), and in Luke 7:14 (on the son of the widow) and in John 11:24 (on Lazarus); f) the apparitions which St. Paul treats immediately both in their obvious meaning and in actuality are proved to be completely *real*.

560. V.5 *and that he appeared to Cephas* [in the first place because of his primatial authority, which Paul acknowledged in this way and by calling him Cephas]; *and then to the twelve* [τοῖς δώδεκα, a collegial name; or there were only eleven or ten in the absence of Thomas].

V.6. *Then* [ἐπειτα, as before εἶτα; but per se not necessarily in chronological succession; see 1 Cor. 12:28] *he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time* [only Paul narrates this apparition, unless it is identified with the one in Galilee, mentioned by Matt. at the end of his gospel; but Matt. refers the words spoken then to the eleven disciples. Paul now by speaking about the brethren adduces testimony of the “learning Church”]: *most of whom* [οἱ πλείονες, many] *are still alive, though some have fallen asleep* [for this happened only 25 years after the fact].

V.7. *Then* [ἐπειτα, not in chronological succession] *he appeared to James*: [the Less, in Jerusalem, who was very important among those Christians; only Paul relates this; but it is treated more extensively in the gospel of the Hebrews], *then* [εἶτα] *to all the Apostles* [that is, when Thomas is found together with the others; or before the Ascension].

Therefore St. Paul does not intend to mention all the apparitions, since without doubt he knew about the apparitions made to the women; but he was seeking authentic or “official” testimonies, and therefore he remained silent about the apparitions made to the women; perhaps he did this because the latter were preparatory to those of the

Apostles and were not thought to be “official.”

V.8. *Last of all, as to one untimely born* [έκτρωμα, a premature fetus born dead. For St. Paul in an unforeseen way and without preparation, suddenly and violently, as from a dead mother (the synagogue) was born into the Church], *he appeared also to me* [ώφθη, seen bodily].

Therefore St. Paul equates his vision with the visions of the Apostles, for like them he is an official witness, an authentic one of the resurrection. Therefore also, after a digression in v.9-10, he continues.

V.11. *Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed* [for it is a unanimous testimony of the whole college of Apostles].

561. St. Paul, therefore, solemnly and with certainty speaks in these verses; and he proposes objective facts, known from tradition, and previously already preached and accepted without hesitation; and also the very form of narrating (καί οὕτω... and that...) seems to reflect the form of the creed and the universal catechism, that is, the general teaching of all the Apostles, by which orally the Christian truths were handed on.

In the second part, v.12-34, Paul, having supposed the unshaken truth of the bodily resurrection of Jesus, explained just above, argues *for the bodily resurrection of the elect*. For, if anyone denies this resurrection of men, he must also deny the resurrection of Christ. For, the resurrection of Christ is the cause and pledge of our resurrection, because of the unity of the Mystical Body, whose head is Christ: so it would be something monstrous, if the Head were to live, but the members were dead. And this is an example of theological thinking, that is, how from a better known teaching an argument is made to something less known.

562. *From other places in St. Paul's writings* it is made clear how this teaching of the resurrection of Jesus was deeply embedded in his preaching, and accepted everywhere: 1 Thess. 1:9f.; 4:14; Rom. 1:4; 8:11.34; 10:9; these are texts in his epistles that are admitted by all to be genuine.

But this matter is clearly evident also other letters: see Heb. 13:20; Eph. 1:20; Col. 1:18; 2:12; 3:1.

And it is also preached elsewhere, as is certain from Acts 13:29-31; 17:3-31; 25:19; 26:23.

563. E) *Fraud is excluded in these testimonies given by the Apostles*. For, *they had no motive to make things up in this matter*: it is certain that they themselves resisted before they accepted the fact; in some respects they did it with singular pertinacity. The fear and the hope, fluctuating back and forth among them, which gripped the Apostles, correspond to human psychology.

They had no reason to deceive: for they would have devised a story to

defend their own deceiver, from whom they could hope for nothing; and they would get nothing from God because of their lie; nothing from men (the Sanhedrin was opposed to them and full of hatred), nothing except persecutions, flogging....

It was impossible to deceive: a notable fear took control of the Apostles; but fear produces depression, not the audacity of lying. The tomb was guarded by soldiers and sealed. After the disappearance of the body, the guards were not punished, nor were the disciples convicted of fraud, for coming and taking away the body, nor were they punished for theft. All of these things indicate that there was no fraud.

564. F) Subjective deception of the witnesses is excluded. For, hallucinations or illusions (they are called illusions if some objective foundation is present) do not begin for all at the same point in time—and with a fixed duration (from the third day and for forty more days, and not otherwise)—and unexpectedly—and in different places.

Hallucinations by their very nature are projected outwards and, when there is no contact with the projected thing, they vanish.²⁹ However, here the witnesses not only see and hear, but *they also touch*, i.e., they not only have visual and audio images, but also tactile sensations: *Handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones...* And Jesus ate with them (Luke 24:39-43).

Many of the witnesses, by nature robust and sober-minded, were not prone to hallucinations; in fact Jesus had to reprehend them for their lack of faith (Mark 16:14; Luke 24:22-26). And they could easily have been convicted of hysteria by the Jews. The powerful and firm preaching, by which the world is converted, is not born of such hallucinations.

And Paul, traveling extensively in search of converts, was not inclined to see Jesus, in whom he did not believe, raised from the dead; a difficult, constant and universal preaching is not begun by someone laboring under a hallucination.

565. G) Nor can it be a matter of a mystical objective vision.

First of all, if someone admits that, he is admitting some kind of miracle while he wants to avoid another one.

Then, such an error in the Apostles would redound to God who permits it. For, the witnesses knew very well how to distinguish between visions and bodily appearances: thus *St. Peter* in his vision before the conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10:10ff), both points out the difference which he stated between this *being in a trance* (Acts 11:5) and

²⁹ *Las alucinaciones se proyectan y tienen la contraprueba del tacto.* The origin and functioning of hallucinations is treated by J. Lhermitte, *Origine et mécanismes des hallucinations*: EtCarm 18 (1933) 109-132.

the apparitions of the Lord *to us who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead* (Acts 10:41). And *St. Paul* speaks in a similar way, when he equates his vision with the visions of the Apostles (1 Cor. 15:3-9); and elsewhere he speaks about the vision of the Lord granted to him on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:17; 22:14-15; 26:16) and about the other visions he had (Acts 16:9f.; 18:9f.; 22:17-21; 2 Cor. 12:1-4).

566. H) On the identity of the living Christ with the resurrected Christ. For, from the testimony of all the witnesses it has to do with the raising of the same body of Christ, and also with the same soul. This is indicated by the same way of acting; and by this: *See my hands and my feet, that it is I* (Luke 24:39).

The same thing is certain *from an absurd assumption*: For, in the gratuitous supposition of a quasi-information of a *similar* body by the same soul, or of the same body by a *different* soul, whether by an angel or by an evil spirit, or by some other creature, then this would be nothing but a preternatural fact, which is excluded. For, God would not permit that, because of the fraudulent deception which would be involved in it; this would be a contradiction to the preaching of such an excellent legate as Jesus was, and it would contradict the true resurrection, which Jesus and the Apostles appealed to.

567. Proof 2. From the empty tomb.³⁰ *The body of Jesus was truly buried*, as is certain without any doubt, in a new sepulcher—cut out of rock—in a nearby place, – and closed with a large stone—and guarded by the diligence of the Jews and by Pilate’s soldiers. – The body was also prepared for burial, with spices and wrapped in a shroud (Matt. 27:57-60; Mark 15:42-46; Luke 23:50-55; John 19:38-42; 1 Cor. 15:4).

But the sepulcher, where the body was buried, on the third day was found to be empty. This also is certain from the evangelists, and from the way of acting of the Jews, who said that the disciples had stolen the body (Matt. 28:12ff.).

Therefore, either the body was taken away, or Jesus truly rose from the death.

But the body was not taken away. Not removed by theft, because of the fear of the disciples and because of the guards. It was not absorbed into the rock after the earthquake, because the napkin and the linen cloths were still there (John 20:5-7), and the splitting in the rock would have been visible and the Jews would have sought the body. Not by a removal done by the Jews or by the Sanhedrin, because they could easily have disproved the claim of the resurrection by producing the body.³¹ Not by a removal

30. See Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.878f.; Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* n.195.

31. Ironically Tertullian says: “This is [Jesus] whom they took away secretly in order to say that he rose from the dead, or the gardener removed him lest his lettuce be damaged by the coming of the frequent visitors” *De spectaculis* 30: ML 1,737).

done by Joseph of Arimathea, because he feared lest his own sepulcher be defiled with ignominy; but this does not agree with the noble nature of this friend of Jesus, who also is not punished by the Jews or by Pilate.³²

Therefore Jesus truly rose from the dead.

568. Proof 3. *From the change produced at the same time in the Apostles, in the crowd of the Jews, in the adversaries of Christ, from the time of the Passion to the day of the Ascension.*³³

a) *For it is certain that the Apostles* out of cowardice and fear at the time of the Passion, and after the death of Jesus out of desperation into which very likely they had fallen, had a change of heart into an ardent zeal and to a fruitful preaching of the resurrection of Jesus—all the way to their death—in spite of the greatest difficulties and persecutions.

b) *The people who were in Jerusalem*, at the time of the Passion being indifferent towards Jesus, or even hostile, after Pentecost, i.e., after his death, admit his teaching and his resurrection; and immediately 3,000, 5,000 are converted.

c) *The adversaries of Jesus*, formerly during his Passion bitter and all-powerful enemies..., after Pentecost cannot convict the Apostles of fraud, or prevent them from preaching about the resurrected Jesus (Acts 4:18-21; 5:28-30.40...); indeed one of them, Gamaliel, fears lest he be acting against God (Acts 5:34-39).

569. All these points establish a fact that is completely historical: from the Acts and from all of history, put together from different sources and from the basic fact of the preaching of the risen Jesus...; and the effects continue throughout all of Christianity. And this is all the more surprising, because the false prophets, like Theudas (Acts 5:36) and Bar-Cochba (see n.507-520) left no influence.

Therefore this matter has to do either with the fraud of the Apostles, or with their illusion, or with the true resurrection of Jesus.

But *fraud* would not make the Apostles so constant and strong in the midst of persecutions, and becoming martyrs....³⁴

Illusion would not persevere after torture and persecutions, nor would it make men so faithful, nor their adversaries so weak...

Therefore the resurrection of Jesus was true.

32. And please note the edict of Caesar forbidding the violation of sepulchers, which was published recently, and belongs to the time of Augustus or Tiberias; on this see M. Cumont, *Un rescrit impérial sur la violation de sépulture*: RevHist 163 (March-April 1930) 241-266; J. Lebreton, *La vie et l'enseignement de Jésus Christ N.S.*³ (Paris 1931) 2,439f.

33. See Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1930) V § 3.

34. See St. Chrysostom, *Homil.* 4 and 5 on 1 Cor: MG 61,36.43-48.

570. Proof 4. The truth of the resurrection was admitted either from the evidence of the matter and from the miracles, or without evidence and without miracles. If the first alternative, the resurrection is true, since it is proved with such signs. If the second, there is no sufficient reason for this admission, and “this one great miracle is sufficient for us, that the whole world believed it without any miracles.”³⁵

571. Objections. 1. St. Paul compares the visions that the Apostles had of Jesus with his own vision (1 Cor. 15:5-8). But the vision that Paul had of Jesus was not objective. Therefore the visions that the Apostles had were not objective.

I bypass the major; although properly in the place cited (1 Cor. 15) he does not compare the visions of the Apostles with his own, but vice versa: *he compares his own vision with the visions of the Apostles. I deny the minor.*

2. Paul, wanting to prove the resurrection of Jesus, does not use the argument of the empty tomb, or the messages and visions that the women had and which the evangelists narrate when they are dealing with the resurrection of Jesus. Therefore he does not understand it as a true resurrection from the tomb, but only *in a spiritual sense.*

I deny the consequence. If Paul does not mention *directly* the argument from the tomb and those witnesses, that is because he adduces other arguments that are more effective and convincing; and he wants to present testimonies that are, so to speak, “official,” that is, of those who have public authority, or a large group of witnesses like the 500 and more of the brothers. But he also refers *indirectly* to the empty tomb, when he says that Jesus was buried and rose from the dead; and he understands this resurrection as real, since it is mentioned together with the death and burial of Jesus, which were surely real, and all of this is according to the Scriptures.

3. But the resurrection is understood by Paul in a spiritual sense. *Proof:* From the use of the N.T. to *resurrect* supposes to be “like the angels of God” (Matt. 22:30). But this supposes a resurrection in the spiritual sense.

Response. 1) Resuscitation in the N.T. is not always understood to be about a certain spiritual state; but sometimes real and bodily resurrections are narrated: Matt. 9:25 (daughter of Jairus); Luke 7:14 (the young man at Naim); John 11:23ff.; 12:1.9. (Lazarus).

2) “To be like the angels of God” supposes a certain spiritualization, because in a perfect resurrection the vegetative and generative functions cease; but thereby the real resurrection of the body is not denied.

4. But the real resurrection of the body is denied. *Proof:* According to the parallel text (Luke 20:36) the resurrected will be “equal to angels.” But angels do not have bodies. Therefore neither the resurrected.

I distinguish the major. They will be “equal to angels” by reason of the absence of the generative life, which pertains to this question, *conceded*; by reason of the loss of a real body, like a complete assimilation of the human and angelic nature, *denied*. For

35. St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22,5: ML 41,757.

the texts of the gospels must be understood in a coherent way with other texts where the question about a real resurrection of the body is very evident: for the hour is coming “when all *who are in the tombs* will hear his voice” (John 5:28); and Paul in the Areopagus was ridiculed because he spoke about a real resurrection (Acts. 17:31ff.). And the argument of Paul in 1 Cor. 15 is not valid, unless the resurrection of Jesus is real, that is, of the same species as the real resurrection of bodies.

5. Paul in 1 Cor. 15 wants only to prove *immortality*, which he especially intends to prove (in verses 19.32.58).

Response. Paul indeed wants to prove immortality, but at the same time he proves it *by stressing the real resurrection of bodies*.

6. The resurrection of bodies, which Paul is speaking about, is spiritual. For he says in v.44: *It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body*; and see v.42-50.

Response. St. Paul says that because of the glorious qualities which the body of the elect will have in the resurrection; like the seed which is the germ of new life, without itself being totally destroyed in the ground (v.37ff.).

7. St. Paul insists only on a spiritual resurrection. For he says in v.45: *the first man Adam became a living being... the last Adam became a life-giving spirit*; and in v.47f.: *the second man is from heaven... and as is the man of heaven, so are those who are of heaven*.

Response. All of these points refer, as before, to the spiritualization of the body and to its spiritual conformation with Christ. But the bodily resurrection is absolutely certain from what is said in v.53: *For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality*. See 2 Cor. 5:4.

8. St. Paul speaks about his visions of Jesus in such a way that they seem to be merely internal. *Proof:* a) Gal. 1:15f.: *he was pleased to reveal his Son in me (not to me)*; b) 2 Cor. 4:6: *God himself has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ*; c) 2 Cor. 12:1ff.: *If I must boast... I will go on to visions and revelations of the Lord*.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul wishes in these places to deny the objective reality which he had about Jesus, *denied*; he wishes in various ways to mention and extol others, *conceded*. Certainly *concerning a*) he wishes to mention, because he had to evangelize, the internal illumination of his own spirit; similarly, *concerning b*) he wishes to say that he was internally enlightened in his heart not only externally but also internally; *concerning c*) Paul talks about his own mystical visions.

9. The resurrection of Jesus was predicted in such a way that the Son of man would be “*three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*” (Matt. 12:40). But this circumstance did not happen. Therefore the prophecy was not fulfilled exactly.

Response. It would be surprising if the evangelists themselves did not notice the defect of the prophecy in this matter, if there was any.

But it should be noted that this determination of time is expressed in different ways also by the same evangelist. Thus Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19 have *on the third day*. The same Matt. 27:40 has *in three days* (Greek: Vg. has *in a space of three days*). Matt. 27:63 says *after three days*; and hence the Pharisees say according to Matt. 27:64:

“Therefore order the sepulcher to be made secure *until the third day*.”

The difficulty completely disappears, if you recognize that a part of a day in the manner of Jewish thinking can be counted as a whole day (day and night) and de facto it was so computed.³⁶

10. From Matt. 28:17 the Apostles at the end “doubted” about the resurrection of Jesus.

Response. The Apostles “*when they saw him they worshipped him,*” οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν : “but some doubted”; or “certain ones doubted,” since Jesus was a long way off; therefore “and Jesus came...” (Matt. 28:17f.).

11. The narrations of the evangelists contradict each other.

I distinguish the antecedent. In substantial things, *denied*; in the accidentals, *I subdistinguish*: a true contradiction is present whether objectively or concerning us, *denied*; there is a difficulty of bringing them into a certain and clear harmony, *conceded*. This is certainly not something to wonder at when different men narrate the same event, and the listeners do not know all the circumstances; this is especially the case if they recount something very recent, where not all the circumstances and details are described.

12. But the sources contain two accounts that mutually do not agree, in narrating the resurrection: one of them is *more ancient and Galilean* and according to it the apparitions take place in Galilee; but the other is *more recent and Judean* and according to it the apparitions take place in Judea.

Response. In the narration of these apparitions there is no contradiction. For, Matt. 28:9f.; Mark 16:9.14.19; John 20:11-29; 1 Cor. 15:5.7 place the apparitions in Judea. But the same evangelists also place apparitions in Galilee: Matt. 28:16-20; Mark 16:15f.; John 21:1-23; 1 Cor. 15:6f. Hence there is no opposition between the evangelists and each one is consistent with himself; for even though Christ wished to manifest himself in a special way in Galilee, that does not imply that he did not manifest himself in Jerusalem.

13. The idea of resurrection arose from the increasing religious syncretism of that time, and from the myths of the gods dying and coming back to life.

Response. That is said gratuitously, and *the facts are opposed to the argument*. The resurrection of Jesus as a historical fact, at a certain place and time, was predicted and immediately accepted; *no cloud of mystery or fable is involved*, as are involved in the myths of the resuscitated gods. And in this matter the Apostles are true witnesses, if we admit the historicity of the gospels and Acts, and the letters of Paul.

Furthermore, the differences are so great between the Christian resurrection and the resurrection of these pagan gods that *in no way can a dependence on the latter be proved*. For, the resurrection of Christ for

36. See 1 Sam. 30:12; Esther 4:16; Jon.2:1; A. von Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris 1908) 330; Mangelot, *La résurrection de Jésus* 80.

Christians is a *pledge of the future resurrection of men*, which the Gentiles scorned (Acts 17:32; 26:23f.); and the impurities of the Gentiles in these natural religions *have nothing in common with Christian purity*. For the saving gods of this kind, dead and resurrected, generally are only vegetative gods in their resurrection, making nature fruitful as the masculine principle.³⁷

14. The idea of resurrection comes from the messianic expectation of the Jews; and the determination of the times as “on the third day” arose from the O.T. (Hos. 6:2; 2 Kings 20:5); therefore Jesus was said to have risen according to the Scriptures.

Response. The resurrection really was predicted in the O.T. (see n.599); but among the Jewish people there was not the type of expectation as is supposed. For, the Apostles hardly understood resurrection, and the people were expecting a glorious Messiah, not one of suffering and death.—The texts cited for “the third day” have nothing to do with the Messiah, and therefore they are not quoted by the Apostles in the N.T.

15. If Jesus wanted all to admit his resurrection, “*he should have shown himself also to his adversaries, to his judge, and to absolutely everyone.*”³⁸

I distinguish the antecedent. He should have made himself accessible to his adversaries and to the whole world by proving the truth of his resurrection, at least with mediated arguments, *conceded*; he should have presented himself to all immediately so they could see him and touch him, *denied*. For, God *made him manifest not to all the people, but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses* (Acts 10:40f.).

16. In the year 1931 someone thought that he probably had a sepulchral inscription of Jesus found in a common grave, because an *ostotheca* (reliquary) was found with a Hebrew-Aramaic inscription “Jesus, son of Joseph.”

Response. It is easy to think that this inscription comes from the time of the Lord; but the inscription can belong to the 150 years before Christ up to 150 years after Christ; and also, those names recur often in inscriptions.³⁹

17. Just as sometimes angels, who appeared to men, spoke and ate as if they were real men, v.gr. Gen. 18:8 “and while they ate”; 19:3 “and they ate”; so likewise Jesus also after the resurrection with his apparent body.

Response. The angels in these circumstances did not say that they were “real men” and “really ate,” but rather (Tob.12:19): “*I merely appeared to you and did not eat or drink, but you were seeing a vision.*” But Jesus said expressly (Luke 24:37-39): “*See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have.*” Hence our error in this case would redound to God permitting it.

37. See Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2,369,428.434.510-532 (note P2); Tromp. *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.6 part 2 n.3.

38. Celsus in Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2,63: MG 11,896.

39. See RevHistEccl 28 (1932) 930..

ARTICLE III

ON THE PROPHECIES MADE ABOUT JESUS

572. After the miracles performed *in Jesus* and *by Jesus*, the next step is to consider the miracles performed *about Jesus*: they are like rays from afar illuminating the image of Christ, who of himself is already wonderfully resplendent – or like some voices from afar acclaiming Him as the divine Legate.

These miracles are:

a) those which on the occasion of his annunciation, or nativity, or transfiguration or death... are narrated in the gospels¹;

b) *the messianic prophecies* uttered about Jesus. Concerning these prophecies we state the following thesis.

573. In these prophecies of the O.T. *the image of Christ* is found as sketched out before his earthly life. In this regard, note that for many men their *life* is written after their death; and for a very few, even while they are living, v.gr., of the Supreme Pontiffs; but of whom is a life written before he is born?

That can be said only about Christ. The individual prophets presented only one characteristic, or just a few; but at the end the whole and clear figure appears. The individual prophecies are, if you please, like small rivulets, or like water falling down from a distant summit which increases as it winds its way... until the confluence of all becomes a large and deep river, gathering together the water from different sources and going through the valley. So also the prophecies about Jesus: in the beginning the individual ones did not seem to be completely clear... until from the joining together of all of them the prophecy becomes clear. And it is not surprising that, when the prophecies are fulfilled in the New Testament, the prophecies in the O.T become clear. For there is the axiom: *the New Testament is hidden in the Old, and the Old is made clear in the New.*

Thesis 35: The fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament prove the divine legation and testimony of Jesus the Nazarene.

Besides the authors cited below for the various prophecies, in general the following should be mentioned:

1. See on this briefly Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.760-763. Also what can be considered connected with the work of Jesus the Nazarene and building it up are *the miracles that are narrated in the Acts of the Apostles*. J.A. Hardon, S.J., wrote about this, *The Miracle Narratives in the Acts of the Apostles: CathBiblQuart* 16 (1954) 303-318. – Similarly, among the prophecies connected with the work of Jesus the Nazarene, this one can be considered *which was proclaimed by the Mother of the Lord, Mary*, in her canticle, *The Magnificat* (Luke 1:48): "... *all generations will call me blessed.*" which we see fulfilled throughout the centuries; this shows that the devotion shown to Mary is pleasing to God; and this fulfilled prophecy is intimately connected with the truth of the work and testimony of Jesus the Nazarene.

Raymundus Marti,² *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Iudaeos* (1276-1278; edit. Lipsiae 1687); F. Ceuppens, *De prophetiis messianicis in Antiquo Testamento* (Rome 1935); and authors of Fundamental Theology like Ottiger, *Theolog. fundament.* 1,640-748; Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* 1 part 1 s.3 a.3; Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiae fundam.*²³ n.299-342; Muncunill, *De vera religione* n.359-491; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.750-756; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.8; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog.fundam.* n.208-223; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1930) 1V; L. Murillo, *El cumplimiento de los vaticinios proféticos*: Bibl 5 (1924) 113-139, 259-295.

574. *Jesus of Nazareth* often appealed to this argument; thus in general when he engaged the Pharisees in a debate: *You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness to me* (John 5:39). And to the disciples on the road to Emmaus *and beginning with Moses and all the prophet, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself* (Luke 24:27); and so those disciples, as if this argument were not difficult, were called by Jesus *foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken* (Luke 24:25). And he said the same thing to all the disciples, namely, *that everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled. Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures* (Luke 24:44f.).³

575. Likewise *the evangelists*, like Matthew and John, and *the other Apostles* employ the argument from the prophecies of the O.T. St. Peter, among other things, said: *To him [Jesus] all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name* (Acts 10:43); *And we have the prophetic word made more sure. You will do well to pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a dark place...* (2 Pet. 1:19).⁴ And *St. Paul*, while under guard in Rome, to the many Jews who came to see him in his residence *expounded the matter to them from morning till evening, testifying to the kingdom of God and trying to convince them about Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets* (Acts 28:23).

-
2. Raymundus Martí, born in Subirats (Catalonia), having entered the Order of Preachers, by a commission of the Chapter made at Toledo in 1250 studied the Arabic language and was sent to Tunisia to convert the Saracens. He mastered not only Arabic, but also the Hebrew and Chaldean languages; and he acquired great erudition in Hebrew. Among his various works, the most famous is his *Pugio fidei*, which was written in Latin and Hebrew, in order to prove the true God and that the Messiah had already come; and also that the faith of Christians was the same as that of the old Patriarchs and Prophets... Also the Jewish encyclopedia (*Jewish Encyclopedia* t.8, London 1907) says that Raym. Martí was accurate in citing the teachings which he refuted. See *Enciclopedia Espasa* at this word.
 3. In other places he also alludes to what the prophets say about himself: Matt. 11:4 (see Isa. 35:5f.); 26:64 (see Dan. 7:13); Luke 4:17-21; 18:31.
 4. See also Acts 2:25-35; 3:18; 1 Pet. 1:10-12.

576. And it should not be surprising that this argument, especially in an apologetics for Jews, who treasure and know the Scriptures, was very much in use,⁵ and *that it was of great importance in the tradition of the Fathers of the primitive Church.*⁶ Therefore it is not proper for us to omit this argument.

577. Regarding the way of proceeding, which we will observe, we will expound the prophecies in the order in which they are found in the books of the O.T.: thus the order will be more continuous and the development will be clearer and also it will show how, in the course of time, the image of the Messiah became clear; afterwards they can be brought together into some unity through the order of Christ's life and through the most important questions.

In these prophecies, *having supposed the historicity of the books of the O.T.* (see n.215-219 and the treatise *On the Introduction to the O.T.*),

1) the meaning of the words will have to be explained, which we will offer especially in glosses placed between brackets [];

2) it will have to be shown that the texts refer to the Messiah, and that will be established either from an analysis of the context—or from an analysis of the wonderful things that are predicted, which cannot be applied to anyone but the Messiah—or from the tradition of the Jews, which the Rabbis and the targums taught, or the popular opinion testified to, as it is found in the gospels as historical books... Thus the reasons of a *natural exegesis* will have been used, prescinding for now from the sources of revelation as such; because in this demonstration of the messiahship of Jesus from apologetic and purely historical sources we cannot use the sources as *revealed* without begging the question.

In using these reasons *it is not necessary now to engage in rather long explanations*, and to propose and examine all the interpretations which have been given to each one of the texts; but instead *we will select the interpretation which we consider to be either certain or more probable.* That certainly will not be useless in order to construct as best we can in this treatise *on Jesus the divine Legate* an integral image of Jesus.

3) *The fulfillment of the prophecies*, and indeed in Jesus alone, will have to be shown; having presupposed the narration of the gospels, that is something that can be done without difficulty.

4) We will pass over many things that could be cited that concern the messianic kingdom or the Church, but not its King; that is, things that are said only figuratively or symbolically.

578. The Adversaries are more or less in agreement with those who attack the prophecies made by Jesus (see. n.501). And according to several recent *Protestants and liberals* the prophets, when they uttered their prophecies that are called messianic, were not thinking about those events of the history of Christ and the Church, to which the writers of the N.T.

5. V.gr., in Scripture *St. Stephen* (Acts 7:52; *Philip* (Acts 8:35).

6. Concerning this argument *among the Fathers* there is a long treatment in Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ p.303-306; and see A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Iudaeos. Christian "Apologiae" until the Renaissance* (Cambridge 1935); likewise R at the theological index n.24.

apply the prophecies as their fulfillment. Thus G. Rosenmüller, B. Weiss, A. Dillmann, C. Steuernagel, W. Sanday.⁷

579. The doctrine of the Church regarding the prophetic character of the O.T. in reference to Christ is proposed in various places: in the Council of Florence (D 1347), in the Syllabus of Pius IX (D 2907), in Vatican Council I (D 3009), in the Responses on the nature of the book of Isaiah (D 3505-3509), and on the first chapters of Genesis (D 3517), and on the prophetic and messianic Psalms (D 3528), and also on the Gospel of Matthew (D 3566).

580. Theological note. That the divine legation and testimony of Jesus is proved from the prophecies of the O.T. is contained in divine revelation, that is, in the places cited above in which Jesus and the Apostles appeal to this argument (n.574f.). Therefore, from this fact *the thesis is at least a matter of divine faith*, and expresses an argument of itself sufficient, although perhaps *now* for some it cannot be proposed with the clarity it had when it was proposed to the early Jews. On the other hand, the Church teaches that we have as something *written* “the prophetic word made more sure” and at the same time she says that the prophets uttered prophecies as the most certain signs in order to manifest the divine revelation (D 3009); hence the thesis can also easily be seen as *a matter of divine and Catholic faith*.

581. Proof. In the presentation of our proof 1) *we will explain the prophecies*, and at the same time we will show their fulfillment in the N.T.; 2) we will also show that all these prophecies, out of which at the same time we construct our argument, *are referring to one definite person, i.e., the Messiah*; 3) *we will then treat explicitly the historical, philosophical and relative truth of these prophecies*.

1. Explanation of the prophecies or a sketch of the image of Christ.

582. The protoevangelium or the first announcement of the Savior.⁸ In Gen. 3:1-7 the seduction is described of the woman by the serpent, and of the man by the woman; and, after the excuses for the sin given to God (v.8-13), God himself is introduced speaking to the serpent, to the woman and to the man: at the same time he utters

7. This point is treated by L. Murillo, S.J., *El cumplimiento de los vaticinios proféticos*: Bibl 5 (1924) 115-128.

8. On the protoevangelium and on Genesis see, in the respective place, A. Bea, *De Pentateucho*² (Rome 1933); F. de Hummelauer, *Commentarius in Genesim* (Paris 1908); P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis* (Bonn 1930); Simón-Prado, *Praelectiones biblicae, Vetus Testamentum* I³ (Taurini 1940) n.59-64 (the author also treats the following prophecies); A. Colunga, *Las promesas mesiánicas del Génesis*: EstBibl 13-14 (1927) 9-13.

On the historical nature of the first chapters of Genesis see D 3514; EB 338 [334]. But more recently there is the *letter of the Secretary of the Biblical Commission to the Archbishop of Paris*, January 16, 1948: EB 577-581; D 3862-3864.

an oracle about a future salvation to be obtained over the serpent who was the recent victor (v.14f.). But his oracle is a certain comfort among the sufferings and hardships which are predicted for the woman and for Adam (v.16-19). We will now consider each of these points:

V.14 *The Lord God said to the serpent...*, that is, to the special animal mentioned in v.1⁹; this animal appears as a very rational being, because he speaks, and he is said to be “more subtle than any other wild creature”; but it is a rational being acting in an evil way and intending evil, because he brings them to disobedience and to ethical independence of God (v.4f.: “You will not die, ... you will be like God [the norm of morality] knowing good and evil”). It is namely “the great dragon, that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan” (Rev. 12:9), who is mentioned passim in the Scriptures of the Jews; here he is probably using the animal by way of possession.

Judgment is passed on the serpent by subjecting him to the woman, as the woman is subject to the man, as if the one who led another into sin should himself be subjected to another:

Because you have done this, cursed are you above all cattle, and above all wild animals; upon your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat all the days of your life, that is, the serpent is a symbol of your subjection and humiliation.¹⁰

V.15 *I will put enmity between you* [serpent, devil, mentioned earlier] and the woman [that is, “the woman” already mentioned, Eve, whom God also addresses in v.16; and at the same time “woman” in the collective sense, as it seems, because the punishment of hardships and subjection (v.16) is a general punishment. However, “a *certain* woman” is intended to be designated in a special or eminent way. This is not Eve, because Eve did not have the *special* enmities with the devil that are indicated—and also she does not conquer him—and not by the future Redeemer, because that which posterity does, according to the Hebrew way of thinking is to be ascribed to the father Adam, not to the woman. – In a special way, therefore, a *certain woman* is designated by whom the victory over the devil is to be accomplished; she will have special enmities with him—the very same ones that are proclaimed immediately to exist between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman], *and between your seed* [the seed of the serpent, i.e., devils, who are known from the wickedness of the prince of devils, and are in a metaphorical sense generated by him] *and her seed* [i.e., the posterity of the woman, namely, an immediate son, since he is not said to be “from the seed”; and fittingly he will be a virginal son, since the father is not mentioned].

From this woman designated in a special way (in the literal fuller sense—as it seems), who has the very same enmities with the devil as her son has, namely absolute and perpetual,¹¹ comes also the complete victory over the devil.

9. In verse 1 the *serpent*, hannahash, with the article; according to the Hebrew meaning, it should be understood as a *certain* serpent, individual and definite, who speaks with the woman (v.2), and upon whom falls the divine curse (v.14). On this point and on the serpent there is a recent article by J. Hofbauer, S.J., *Die Paradiesesschlange (Gen 3)*: ZkathTh 69 (1947) 228-231.

10. The words *upon your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat* are a way of speaking of Orientals to signify a profound humiliation: see Ps. 72:9; Isa. 49:23; Mic. 7:17.

11. Hence there is the immaculate conception of this Woman.

She [TM has the pronoun in the 3rd person masculine, הוּ', hu', that is, the son; the LXX has the masculine αὐτός. Hence the son, the seed of the woman will obtain the victory soon to be announced; but nothing hinders us from saying that the mother herself through her son may be said to conquer him: thus the reading of “she” could prevail in the Vulgate] *shall bruise your head* [TM “shuf” = bruise; that is, she will gain a complete victory over the serpent, whose head is made subject and is destroyed¹²], not however without some loss of the victory, because *and you shall bruise his heel* [TM *you will bruise*, the same verb as before, “shuf”; the LXX has σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτοῦ πτέρναν = you shall experience his deceits (lying in wait for). Hence the victory comes with some suffering and treacheries coming from the serpent against the lower part of the future Savior].

Thus from this place it is clear that special roles are being reserved *for the future Savior, and indeed it is a spiritual battle against the seed of the devil—and for the Mother of the Savior.*

583. Afterwards **in the words of Noah**, by which he curses Canaan and blesses Shem among his sons, the desire is expressed that *God may dwell in the tents of Shem* (Gen. 9:25-27); as later it will be said that he will dwell in the tents of Israel,

584. Several promises are made **to the patriarch Abraham**, which show the *universality* in a certain future salvation.

Gen. 12:2f. contains in seven members (so that even by the number the universality of the goods might be signified) the blessing of God bestowed on Abraham: *I will make of you a great nation* [numerous: see 22:17]—*and I will bless you* [I will enrich you with all riches; see 30:27; 39:5]—*I will make your name great* [I will make it glorious]—that is, *so that you will be a blessing*. — *I will bless those who bless you* [therefore this blessing will be extended to others blessing you]—*and I will curse those who curse you* [therefore there will be a curse on those opposing you]—*and by you* [in your seed; see 22:18] *all the families of the earth shall be blessed* [therefore the blessing and grace will be universal, although it will be an occasion of ruin for those opposing you; see Luke 2:34].

In the change of the name of Abraham he is called “the father of many nations,” and this is added: Gen. 17:6 *And I will make you exceedingly fruitful; and I will make nations of you* [among the nations] *and kings shall come forth from you*; and a blessing is promised or his son Isaac, about to be born from Sarah: v.16. *I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her; I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of peoples shall come from her.*

In Gen. 18:17f. the same universality of salvation is promised: *Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do, seeing that* [TM “most certainly”] *Abraham shall become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall bless themselves by him?*

12. The LXX has: αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλὴν, i.e., *he will bruise your head*; but this is so that finally it is subdued and destroyed.

But in a more solemn manner in Gen. 22:16-18, after his obedience regarding the sacrifice of his son, the same promise of the Lord is found, by confirming in a more definite way what had been said before. And “since he had no one greater by whom [humanly speaking] to swear” (Heb. 6:13): Gen. 22:16: *By myself I have sworn, says the Lord, because you have done this, and have not withheld you son, your only son, v.17 I will indeed bless you, and I will multiply your descendants as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore. And your descendants shall possess the gate of their enemies [that is, by a complete triumph]: v.18 and all the nations of the earth shall bless themselves [in your posterity and in him who especially is the seed and is extolled in your posterity—the future Savior] because you have obeyed my voice.*

In Gen. 26:4f. the promise of Isaac made to Abraham is repeated, with a note of *universality*; and similarly in Gen. 28:14 in the vision of the ladder: *and by you and your descendants shall all the families of the earth bless themselves.*

In Gen. 35:11 the blessing and promise of a future progeny is repeated to Jacob, the son of Isaac, after the change of his name to Israel.

585. The Jacobean prophecy.¹³ Jacob himself being about to die, according to the custom of the ancient fathers in blessing their sons, having gathered them together in order to tell them what would happen to them in the days to come (Gen. 49:1), pronounced a very special oracle about Judah in preference to the others. Thus, passing over Ruben because of his incest (Gen. 49:3f.; see 35:22) and Simeon and Levi because of their slaughter of the Shechemites (Gen. 49:5-7; see 34:25), he transfers the right of primogeniture to Judah for the part that concerns the promises of the future Savior.

Gen. 49:8 *Judah* [i.e., praise], *your brothers* [Judah had sinned, but by his penance he had atoned for his crime; see Gen. 37:36; 38:26; 44:18ff.; therefore it is not surprising that he is blessed by his father] *shall praise you* [paranomasia from the meaning of his name]; *your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies* [hence you will obtain a complete victory over your enemies, and therefore] *your father's sons shall bow down before you* [thus the tribe of Judah will truly be praised because of its warlike praises and because of its preeminence among the other tribes. For the tribe of Judah was always strong and noble: it will be the first one to dare to enter the Red Sea; it will be first in the order of the camps and of those sacrificing; leader of the other tribes after the death of Joshua; finally, from this tribe will come David, Solomon, and the kings until the Babylonian captivity, and Zorobabel the leader of the returning people; and the Messiah will be called the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev. 5:5)].

V.9 *Judah is a lion's whelp* [he is likened to a lion, the king of animals; now whelp in the presence of his father]. *From the prey* [from the prey: LXX ἐκ βλαστοῦ], *my son, you have gone up. He stooped down, he couched as a lion* [as a victor and returning from the prey: later it will be said of the Messiah “the Lion of the tribe of Judah has conquered” (Rev. 5:5)] *and as a lioness* [she, while nursing her whelps, is a more fierce

13. See the authors cited above for Genesis. Not a few things said about this prophecy and about the immediately following prophecies are borrowed from the lectures of R.P. Joseph Linder, S.J. (+); they were given at the University of Innsbruck.

and stronger lion]: *who dares rouse him up?*

V.10 *The scepter* [i.e., the preeminence] *shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet* [i.e., the staff or scepter like a walking-stick touching the ground and placed between his legs, as is found in the monuments of the Assyrians and of others], *until he comes to whom it belongs* [several codices of TM have "Shiloh," accordingly: "until he comes to Shiloh" (in the occupation of Palestine); but then in the occupation from the time of Joshua up until Samuel no preeminence or dominion was given to Judah.—St. Jerome says: "until Shiloh comes (peace)"; probably by reading another similar letter.—But more probably the word comes from a contraction of the other two, and should be translated with the LXX: "until he comes to whom they belong (the scepter and kingdom), ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ (another reading: ὡ ἀπόκειται, to whom these things belong); thus also in the Targums;— and this agrees with Ezek. 21:27 who prophesies about the leadership and taking the throne away from the Judean city of Jerusalem, until he shall come who has the kingdom: "A ruin, a ruin I will make it; there shall not be even a trace of it until he comes whose right it is; and to him I will give it"], *and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples*. To him, therefore, to whom the preeminence belongs, the obedience of the people is promised: here there is a note of *universality* that will be a characteristic of the messianic kingdom.

586. Hence this oracle is messianic: a) because of the note of a universal kingdom, which will become even clearer in the following oracles; b) because of the universal conviction of the Jews about the future Messiah from the tribe of Judah (see Heb. 7:14; Rev. 5:5); c) because of the agreement with the prophecy in Ezek. 21:27; d) because of the tradition of the Jews and the Targums when interpreting this oracle.

The fulfillment of this prophecy as to the preeminence of Judah is certain from the later history of the people of Israel, and it is had also in the relative hegemony of Judah during the Babylonian captivity, where the judges were Judean; likewise when the Maccabees, of the tribe of Levi, ruled the people: for they did it in the name of the tribe of Judah. But if the scepter is taken away from Judah by Herod the Idumaeum, who ruled in the name of the Romans, and especially if the religious preeminence perishes in the destruction of the temple: this is a sign that the Messiah, to whom the kingdom belongs, has already come (then the material kingdom is transformed into a spiritual one).

587. V.11 *Binding* [Judah] *his foal to the vine, and his ass's colt to the choice vine* [thus is indicated the abundance of the vine which will be at the time of the Messiah, as is mentioned passim, and also for tying up donkeys]. *He washes his garments in wine and his vesture in the blood of grapes* [there will be such an abundance of wine that hyperbolically it is said that it will be used for washing, not just for drinking; some see here an allusion to the Redeemer, who will wash his garment in his blood]. V.12 *His eyes shall be red with wine* [his eyes are glittering with wine] *and his teeth white with milk* [they shine with milk]: Thus the future prosperity is described by an abundance of wine and milk, which will be in the land of Judah, as some interpret it; or more probably the messianic blessings are being described.

Therefore, from this prophecy the powerful future and praise of the tribe of Judah are extolled; *from it the future victorious lion is predicted*; in his *universal* empire an abundance of good things is also predicted.

588. The oracle of Balaam.¹⁴ In Num. 22-24 are narrated the historical occasion and the event of Balaam's oracles, forty years after the exodus of the people of Israel from Egypt. Balak the king hopes through divinations and curses to overcome Israel, and so he calls Balaam and sends him to do it; but God, in order to stop the enemies and to build up Israel, being mindful of his covenant, refuses to hear Balaam and turns his curse into a blessing, because of his love for Israel (Deut. 23:4f.).¹⁵

In the first oracle (Num. 23:7-10) Balaam, while looking at Israel, extols the separation of this people from others; for Israel lives alone and it does not reckon itself among the nations (v.9); then he praises its fecund posterity (the dust), and he both truly desires to die the death of the just and he truly hopes to have his end just like that of this people (v.10).

In the second oracle (v.18-24), since the decrees of God are immutable, he cannot recall his blessing (v.19f.), and in Israel there is not iniquity and idolatry, and Yahweh is the strong king of Israel: he has the horns of a wild ox (a ferocious bull known from Babylonian and Assyrian images) (v.21-23); therefore the people like a lioness rises up and does not lie down until it devours its prey (v.24); this contains a threat against Moab.

In the third oracle (24:3-9) Balaam protests that he is a prophet of the true God, whose eye is opened (v.3f.) [TM; but in the Vulgate: *closed (obturatus)*]; and by him the tents of Israel are compared to a verdant forest, like large trees planted by Yahweh (v.5-7); and the fortitude of Israel is celebrated: for he rises up against Agag (the whole kingdom of the Amalekites then flourishing) and he will devour his enemies, and he shall break their bones in pieces (v.7f.).

Finally in the fourth oracle (24:15-24) a prophecy is uttered about a future king, whose magnificence and power are extolled:

589. V.15 *The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor, the oracle of the man whose eye is open* [i.e., while in an ecstasy the eyes are closed; but it is better with TM: with eyes opened; not closed, as the Vulgate reads it]. v. 16 *the oracle of him who hears the words of God, and knows the knowledge of the Most High, who sees the vision of the Almighty, falling down, but having his eyes uncovered*; v.17 *I see him* [that is, like the one who will be said to be a star, not the people], *but not now* [therefore after a long time]; *I behold him, but not nigh: a star shall come forth out of Jacob* [that future king clothed in splendor, who will come out of Israel; not the star of the Magi, out of the East, as St. Jerome interpreted it], *it shall crush the forehead of Moab* [TM "both sides of Moab," i.e., the

14. F. de Hummelauer, *Commentarius in Numeros* (Paris 1899); P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Numeri* (Bonn 1936).

15. Balaam then was a true prophet, because the things predicted were fulfilled, and both Jewish and Christian tradition considered him to be a prophet. He seems to have acknowledged the true God, but he loved the reward of iniquity—the money offered to him; therefore he proceeded with the base intention of cursing, until he was admonished (Num. 22:5ff.; 2 Pet. 2:15f.); later he wanted to destroy Israel with idolatry and fornication (Num. 31:16; Jude 11).

whole region; therefore a complete victory] *and break down all the sons of Sheth* [other read the Hebrew as: the head of the sons of rebellion; others interpret it to apply to the Ammonites]. V.18 *Edom shall be dispossessed, Seir also, his enemies, shall be dispossessed, while Israel does valiantly.* V.19 *By Jacob shall dominion be exercised, and the survivors of cities be destroyed.*

In v.20-23 a victory over the Amalekites is announced (at the time a powerful nation; or the first to fight against Israel: *first of the nations*), whose posterity will perish forever; also the destruction of Kain (Medianites) by Ashur is announced (in the East: Assyria, Babylon, Persia); but also they will come forth and dominate from the region of the West (Greeks and Romans): however they also will perish.

590. Therefore in this fourth oracle the concern is with *the future magnificent and powerful king*, who is the Messiah: so this is certain from the tradition of the Jews (v.gr., Targum Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan...); and during the time of Hadrian there was a false Messiah with the name “son of a star,” Bar-Cochba.¹⁶ But with the more common opinion, uniquely and directly it has to do with the Messiah, who in a spiritual sense really won a definitive victory over all peoples: Moab, Edom, Amalek, Greece, Rome...; for the victories of David over Moab and Edom were not complete; and afterwards also Herod, an Idumaeon, ruled in Israel.

591. The prophecy about the future prophet.¹⁷ Moses teaches the people in Deuteronomy the things that they do for the public society: thus he deals with the institution and office of judges (16:18—17:13), with the institution and office of king (17:14-20), with the office of priests (18:1-8); and finally, against the different kinds of superstitions he treats the promise of God concerning the human prophet to be raised up (v.15-17) from the people and brothers of Israel, like Moses:

V.18 *I will raise up for them a prophet like you [Moses] from among their brethren; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him.* V.19 *And whoever will not give heed to my words which he shall speak in my name, I myself will require it of him.*

592. That this text must be referred to the Messiah was held by the Jewish tradition, as is sufficiently clear from the words of the N.T. For, from the gospel it is certain first of all that at the time of Jesus the Nazarene there was expectation about the arrival of a great and extraordinary prophet to be sent by God: thus John the Baptist was asked (John 1:19-21) whether he was that special prophet (ὁ προφήτης, with the article), who was expected; and elsewhere the people, after the multiplication of the loaves, say that Jesus truly is ὁ προφήτης, [singularly and definitely] who is going to come into the world (John 6:14); and after the feast of the Tabernacles they say: “This is really ὁ

16. See Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 4,6: Kch 429.

17. F. de Hummelauer, *Commentarius in Deuteronomium* (Paris 1901); H. Junker, *Das Buch Deuteronomium* (Bonn 1933).

προφήτης” (John 7:40). On the other hand, Jewish tradition held that Moses would speak in advance about the Messiah who was to come: thus the discussion is about “him of whom Moses *in the law* and also the prophets wrote” (John 1:45), that is, the expected Messiah is said by a common man to have been foretold *in the law* of Moses; but the Samaritan woman, only admitting with her people the Pentateuch, speaks about the coming Messiah who “will teach” (John 4:25), i.e., who will be a prophet; Jesus then appeals as to a messianic text, with none of the hearers contradicting him, to the one where Moses wrote about himself (John 5:46). And the preaching of St. Peter refers to it in the same sense (Acts 3:22; 7:37), also with none of the hearers contradicting him. *Therefore the Mosaic prophecy about the prophet refers to the Messiah.*

593. However the texts seems to have to be referred not only to one Christ; but, as several say, to the whole institution of prophetism. The reasons given are the following: a) as before (Deut. 16:18f.) the discourse was about the institution of judges, kings, priests, and so now about the institution of prophets; b) but for the false prophets the norms are given in the context (Deut. 18:20-22), which could not be applied to one Christ; c) the word “prophet,” נביא , nab’, even though it is in the singular number, still it admits a collective meaning, concerning all future prophets.

Therefore the more probable opinion is that a series of future prophets is signified in this place together with *a certain specially designated and expected prophet, who was going to be the greatest of all the prophets.*

594. The song of Hannah.¹⁸ In *1 Sam. 2:10* Hannah, the mother of Samuel, giving thanks to God for her young son, but rising above her private gifts to the higher *public* gifts of God and speaking *publicly*, and therefore—as it seems—inspired by the prophetic spirit, speaks about the future Messiah. This is the first place where this naming of the future King and Savior appears: *The Lord will judge the ends of the earth; he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power of his anointed;* this can refer to the anointed David and to the whole royalty from Judah, but especially to the future Messiah, to whom this denomination really belongs.

595. The prophecy of Nathan.¹⁹ *2 Sam. 7:4-17 (1 Chron. 17:1-15)*. On the occasion of David’s proposal to build a temple to the Lord (see also Ps. 132:1-5), the Lord reminds him through the prophet Nathan of the benefits bestowed on him formerly and to be bestowed in the future. And he says: v.11 ... *moreover the Lord declares to you that the Lord will make you a house* [i.e., the Lord will give you descendants; the meaning of this promise is made clear in what follows].

V.12 *When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers* [therefore

18. See F. de Hummelauer, *Commentarius in libros Samuelis* (Paris 1886); K.A. Leimbach, *Die Bücher Samuel* (Bonn 1936).

19. See the same authors as in the preceding note.

after David's death] I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body [that is, the son of David not yet born, Solomon, about whom he will speak next; and also all his descendants and the kings after David, since he will immediately speak about the eternity of his kingdom and Ps. 89:21-38; 132:11-13 are understood in this sense; at the same time also among his descendants and later kings, one king from the house of David is designated in a special way as the head and summit; to him in a special way must belong those things that are being promised: see Acts 2:30 where St. Peter, interpreting the Jewish tradition (and without contradiction from the Jews) applies some of the words from this passage to the Messiah], *and I will establish his kingdom* [the perpetuity of the Davidic kingdom is hinted at, and it is also said more clearly in the following verses].

V.13 *He shall build a house for my name* [this hold true for Solomon, who afterwards built the temple and dedicated it], *and I will establish his throne and his kingdom forever* [therefore the eternity of the Solomonic kingdom is predicted, just as later in v.16, and this is in the proper sense, not just in the sense of a long duration as eternity in the O.T. is often understood: Eternity in the proper sense is being stated from the emphasis of the gracious actions of David, v.24-29; and because without a condition it is said that his mercy will never be taken away from him, v.15; it is also certain from the way in which later Israelites understood the matter: Ps. 89:29f.37f. (*his throne as the days of the heavens*), and Luke 1:32f. agreeing doubtless with the Jewish tradition and alluding to this prophecy concerning the Messiah: *the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever and [negatively but said more clearly] of his kingdom there will be no end*].

V.14 *I will be his father, and he shall be my son* [this holds true for Solomon and for the entire royal offspring of David, but in a special way for the Messiah; and since St. Paul applies it to Christ (Heb. 1:5), supposing without doubt that it will be accepted by the Hebrews to whom he writes, as part of their tradition]. *When he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men* [certainly these words do not apply to the sinless Christ; therefore under the name of *son* and *offspring* it is not Christ alone who is designated, as we have said].

V.15 *But I will not take my steadfast love from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you.* V.16 *And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before me; your throne shall be established for ever* (see Luke 1:33).

596. Therefore from this prophecy, without doubt messianic from the frequent allusions to it in Holy Scripture, *the Messiah will be a son of David and heir of the Davidic kingdom; and this kingdom is predicted to be absolutely eternal*, in a very certain sense. But since elsewhere (from Ps. 132:12) observance of the law is said to be the condition that the sons of David sit on its throne forever, this is a sign that the everlasting temporal kingdom is conditioned; but the spiritual and messianic kingdom, as is certain also from other prophecies, is absolutely eternal.

See the thanksgiving of David in 2 Sam. 23:1-7.

597. From the book of Psalms.²⁰ Psalm 2. This psalm certainly is Davidic²¹ and messianic, from the testimonies of the Apostles and of the Christian community (Acts 4:24-28) reflecting the tradition of the Jews, and also from a comparison with Ps. 110, which is certainly Davidic and messianic (see n.609f.).

Another argument for the messiahship of the psalm, besides the interpretation of the old Synagogue and of the Fathers, is its frequent citation as messianic and allusions to it as such in the N.T. (Heb. 1:5; 5:5; Acts 4:24-28; 15:32f.; Rev. 2:26-28; John 1:49).

There are also internal reasons in this psalm that establish this messiahship, because the description which is given of the *universal* kingdom and over all nations cannot apply to a purely earthly kingdom.

598. *In the first stanza* (v.1-3) the sedition of the nations and the peoples who are in disarray is described; and so *the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and his anointed* [the first community in Jerusalem sees this fulfilled in Herod and Pontius Pilate conspiring together with the Gentiles and the people of Israel against Jesus (Acts 4:27f.); and in general this must be said about all those who conspire against the work and teaching of Christ].

In the second stanza (v.4-6) God, in a dramatic antithesis, *laughs* at the attempted works of his enemies, *the Lord has them in derision* and says: *I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill* [that is, the king of the messianic kingdom, whose beginning and type is Zion].

And this king promulgates *in the third stanza* (v.7-9) the decree of Yahweh: *The Lord said to me: You are my son, today I have begotten you* [therefore God is the father of this Messiah king, in whom the supreme dignity of Christ is contained, and at the same time the reason is given why the universal kingdom must be subject to him (v.8f.).

Is the concern here with the natural sonship of God or merely an adoptive one?

St. Paul understood it as affirming the natural sonship of God, because, applying those words to Christ, he says that none of the angels was ever addressed in this way (Heb. 1:5); the angels however are the adopted sons of God.

Regarding the words *today I have begotten you*, some authors hold (St. Augustine, St. Thomas) that they are explanatory of what went before: for they give the reason why he is the son, that is, not by creation or adoption, but by generation; *today*, that is, in the

20. For the interpretation of the Psalms, among the many authors who treat his matter, see J. Knabenbauer, S.J., *Commentarius in Psalmos* (Paris 1912); F. Zorell, S.J., *Psalterium ex hebraeo latinum*² (Rome 1939); A. Vaccari, *I salmi tradotti dell'ebraico* (Turin 1937); S. del Páramo, *Los salmos traducidos del hebreo y anotados* (Santander 1941); J. Cales, *Le livre des Psaumes* (Paris 1936); A. vander Herren, *Psalmi et cantica* (Brughes 1932); H. Herkenne, *Das Buch der Psalmen* (Bonn 1936); J. Prado, C.S.S.R., *Nuevo Salterio latino-español* (Madrid 1947).

For the Psalms we are using the translation made recently by the Pontifical Biblical Institute, which can be used for the recitation of the Breviary.

21. According to the Response of the Pontifical Biblical Commission the Davidic origin in particular of this psalm and others—16, 18, 32, 69, 110 (see D 3525)—cannot be denied.

permanent reality of eternity.

Others (St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, Theodoretus...) think that in these verses he is speaking about the temporal generation of Christ in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mother, because the psalm is dealing with the incarnate Son of God and King, and the "today" signifies the present time: but it can be opposed to this view that the Messiah is not being described as an infant, but as a powerful king.

Therefore some others, and in a more probable way (St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, C. Alapide, Vázquez, Linder...) interpret those words in this way: "today *I have manifested* that you are generated from me," and indeed not on the day of your baptism (because then he was not established in a special way as king), but on the day of the Resurrection of Christ, when the royal dignity and power of Christ is manifested very clearly, and Christ is as it were born into the glorious life in which it is necessary for him to reign. Thus also, and especially, from the interpretation of St. Paul (Acts 13:33), where he says clearly: "God... by raising Jesus; as also it is written in the second psalm: Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee..."; and likewise in Rom. 1:4: "[Jesus Christ] is designated [i.e., declared] Son of God in power... by his resurrection from the dead..."

V.8 *Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession* [as a result of his natural sonship of God, proper to the Messiah, and of the absolute power which is given to him in heaven and on earth (see Matt. 28:18), with these words what is promised to him is a universal kingdom and dominion over all the nations, which are called to belong to his kingdom].

But with regard to the rebels he says in v.9: *You shall break them with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.*

599. Psalm 16. This psalm is also *Davidic*, like the preceding one.²² This is certain from the title of the psalm, and from the statements of St. Peter (Acts 2:25) and St. Paul (Acts 13:35), which were accepted by the Jews. It is also *messianic*, because of the messianic allusions which St. Peter (Acts 2:25-28) and St. Paul (Acts 13:34-38) made to it; and, as seems to be the case with several authors, it is directly messianic, not merely indirectly and in a figurative way, as if it were directly about David or some troubled person who confides in God; for one verse in the psalm (v.10) cannot be applied to David.

600. David describes in this psalm *the prayer of a man subject to tribulation*, fleeing to God [just as it will be said about Jesus concerning his prayer to the Father before his passion, with the trust and tranquility of mind that is found in this psalm: John 12:27f.; 17; Matt. 26:36-45].

Also he goes to his death with confidence, for he is certain about his future resurrection: V.8 *I keep the Lord always before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.* V.9 *Therefore my heart is glad, and my soul rejoices; and my body also dwells secure.* V.10 *For thou dost not give me up to Sheol, or let thy godly one see the Pit* (TM

22. See D 3525. Also, from the Response of the Biblical Commission, approved on July 1, 1933, it is not allowed to interpret Ps. 16:10-11 in such a way as to say that the sacred author was not talking about the Resurrection of the Lord; see D 3750.

she'ol, the same as corruption.—St. Peter interpreted it to be about the predicted Messiah: Acts 2:25-28; likewise St. Paul: Acts 13:34-38. For it is not said about David: *For David... was laid with his fathers, and saw corruption* (Acts 13:36).

601. Psalm 22. The psalm is of David, as the title and tradition indicate. It is also directly messianic, since many things in it cannot be understood to be about David himself (v.2.17-20) and some things concern the universal messianic kingdom (v.28-30).

In the first part (v.1-12) a sorrowful complaint is proposed of a man placed in tribulation and calling upon the Lord: V.1 *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Why art thou so far from helping me, from the words of my groaning?* [Later Jesus the Nazarene quoted this on the cross, applying this psalm to himself: Matt. 27:46]. A trusting prayer of that man follows, who then says: *But I am a worm and no man* (see Isa. 53:4), *scorned by men, and despised by the people* [and actually Jesus the Nazarene afterwards was mocked and, after being compared with Barabbas, was rejected and crucified among thieves; see Matt. 27:27-30].

V.7 *All who see me mock at me, they make mouths at me, they wag their heads. V.8 He committed his cause to the Lord; let him deliver him, let him rescue him, for he delights in him!* [like those going by who *blasphemed* Jesus the Nazarene hanging on the cross, *were wagging their heads... So also the chief priests, with the scribes and elders, mocked him, saying:... He trusts in God; let God deliver him now, if he desires him; for he said, "I am the son of God."* And the robbers who were crucified with him also *reviled him in the same way* (Matt. 27:39-44)].

In the following verses, v.10f., his mother is mentioned, but nothing is said about his father, even alluding to the custom according to which the father acknowledged his son: V.10 *Upon thee was I cast from my birth, and since my mother bore me thou hast been my God.*

In the second part (v.12-21) the sorrowful image of man is described: V.12 *Many bulls encompass me, strong bulls of Bashan surround me. V.13 They open wide their mouths at me, like a ravening and roaring lion* [thus the people of Israel (many young men), thus the leaders (strong bulls) who cried out against Jesus: "Crucify him..." (Matt. 27:20-23), and afterwards, "Away with him, away with him, crucify him!" (John 19:15)].

V.14 *I am poured out like water and all my bones are out of joint* [not broken]: *my heart is like wax, it is melted within my breast* [an image of internal sorrow and fear and desolation].

V.15 *My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaves to my jaws* ["Jesus... to fulfill Scripture said: I thirst..." (John 19:28f.) *and thou dost lay me in the dust of death.*

Again there is a description of his jeering adversaries: V.16 *Yea, dogs are round about me; a company of evildoers encircle me; they have pierced my hands and feet* [thus clearly in the crucifixion of Jesus; something that cannot be said of David]. V.17 *I*

can count all my bones—they stare and gloat over me [see Luke 23:35: “And the people stood by, watching; but the rulers scoffed at him...”].

V.18 *They divide my garments among them, and for my raiment they cast lots* [see Matt. 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34; John 19:23f.].

In the third part (v.22-31) the salutary effects of this passion are proposed.

V.22 *I will tell of thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the congregation I will praise thee* [thus again the character of the teacher is established which will be proper to the Messiah] and the praise of the Messiah follows (v.25) *in the great congregation* [certainly in the universal society; see v.27-29]; and *his vows* [Eucharistic sacrifices] he will pay *before those who fear him*; so that the afflicted will eat and be satisfied (v.26); that is, in the universal kingdom.

V.27 *All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the Lord* [the following verses repeat this universality]: *And all the families of the nations shall worship before him*. V.28 *For dominion belongs to the Lord, and he rules over the nations*. V.29 *Yea, to him shall all the proud of the earth bow down; before him shall bow down all who go down to the dust*.

V.30 *Posterity shall serve him*. This fruit of the blessing is for his offspring, that is, for those whom he has acquired by his passion. For, *men shall tell of the Lord to the coming generation, and proclaim his deliverance to a people yet unborn: “The Lord has done this.”*

602. Psalm 45. This psalm celebrates the wedding of a particular king with a queen who is special. For, the things that are said from the beginning cannot apply to Solomon, nor can they be applied to just any queen, but only to a very singular and divine king. And, according to the tradition of the Jews and the Fathers, an allegory is given in this psalm, just as in the Song of Songs.

But St. Paul, writing precisely to the Hebrews (1:8f.), applies some things from this psalm to the Messiah. There is also a certain harmony of this psalm, while describing the royal dignity of the Messiah, with other psalms that are without doubt messianic (Ps. 2 and 110). Hence it follows that this psalm is not said about Solomon, nor is it a profane song of love; rather, it is *directly messianic*; therefore it is not merely indirectly (typically) about the Messiah and directly about Solomon (as Bossuet thought).

603. *After the introduction* (v.1), *in the first part* (v.2-9) the spouse is described: V.2 *You are the fairest of the sons of men; grace is poured upon your lips* [see Luke 4:22], *therefore* [I know that] *God has blessed you for ever*.

In the following verses 3-5 he is described as a mighty hero, who bears his sword, and his right hand wins the victory for him over his enemies, who fall under him.

V.6-9 *Your throne, O God* [in the vocative: O God!; therefore this king is called God] *endures for ever and ever. Your royal scepter is a scepter of equity* [see Ps. 72

where the justice of the messianic kingdom is extolled]. V.7 *You love righteousness and hate wickedness. Therefore God has anointed you* [in the vocative: O God!; see Heb. 1:8f. where Paul cites this verse to prove the dignity of Christ over the angels], *your God, with the oil of gladness above your fellows* [certainly: above other kings, or he has anointed you with grace and gladness above the others who (like Christians) will be said to be partakers in the divine nature (see 2 Pet. 1:4)].

It is not surprising he says that of such a king V.8 *your robes are all fragrant with myrrh and aloes and cassia*, and that to him V.9 *the daughters of kings come* [that is, the Gentile nations] and *at your right hand stands the queen in gold of Ophir* [his Church, which Christ is said to love (see Eph. 5:25); also the souls that are joined to him by grace, and first of all his immaculate Virgin Mother].

In the second part (v.10-17) the bride is described and her nuptial companions, and the spiritual fecundity of this marriage is proposed, and its sons will fill the earth: v.16 *Instead of your fathers*—words said to the bride—*shall be your sons; you will make them princes in all the earth*. V.17 *... therefore the peoples will praise you for ever and ever*.

604. Psalm 69. The psalm contains a plea to God of a man immersed in a sea of tribulations. The author is David, as the title indicates,²³ who, while treating the tribulation of the just man, proceeds from the opinion of many in order to describe, at least in a typical way, the supreme distress of the just man by using antonyms, namely, of the Messiah burdened with tribulation. But in the N.T. some of the affirmations of this psalm are understood to apply to the Messiah: v.9 (John 2:17; 15:24-26; Acts 1:20; Rome. 15:3...).

605. Many things in this psalm agree with what the gospels bear witness to concerning Jesus. Thus the description in v.1-4, *for the waters have come up to my neck. I sink in deep mire*, reminds us of Jesus' sorrow unto death (Matt.26:38f...); thus also the hatred of many: v.4 *More in number than the hairs of my head are those who hate me without cause* (see John 15:24-26). And the crimes that are imputed to the just man: *What I did not steal must I now restore?*; v.5... *the wrongs I have done are not hidden from thee*: this corresponds very well with vicarious satisfaction, which it is certain from other texts was offered to God by the Messiah (see Isa.53:5...; n.623).

It is not to be wondered at if, as the just man says, v.8 *I have become a stranger to my brethren, an alien to my mother's sons...* v.9 *For zeal for thy house has consumed me* [the disciples of Jesus applied this also to him; see John 2:17] *and the insults of those who insult thee have fallen on me* [which St. Paul applies to Christ: Rom. 15:3].

All of these breathe supreme sorrow and ignominy, and a confident plea (v.13-21), so that the just man says: v.20 *Insults have broken my heart, so that I am in despair. I looked for pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none* [see Matt. 26:40.43.56...].

23. See also Rom. 11:9 and D 3526.

V.21 *They gave me poison for food, and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink* [see John 19:28-30].

The author demands in the following verses (22-28) punishment for those who have acted so wickedly, so that v.25 *May their camp be a desolation, let no one dwell in their tents* [which St. Peter (Acts 1:18-20) applies to the punishment of Judas]. V.26 *For they persecute him whom thou hast smitten, and him whom thou hast wounded, they afflict still more.* And St. Paul (Rom. 11:9f.) applies some of this (v.23f.) to unbelieving Jews.

A plea and thanksgiving are given to God by the just man (v.30-33); but the last verses (v.34f.), in which the hope of the restoration of Jerusalem is stated, seem to indicate an addition coming from the time after the Babylonian captivity.

606. Psalm 72. Under the form of a deprecation in this psalm a kingdom is described in which *supreme justice, perpetual duration, universality and a great abundance of good things are contained*; so that these qualities must apply not to an earthly kingdom, but to the messianic kingdom. Therefore, the king of this kingdom is the Messiah; so it is not concerned with celebrating the enthronement of an ordinary king.

The messianic meaning of this psalm is also certain, beyond the tradition of the Jews and the Fathers, from its affinity with the other messianic psalms, like Ps. 2 and 110; and from other parallel and certainly messianic places (v.17: Gen.12:3; 22:18.—v.4: Isa.11:4.—v.8: Zech. 9:10).

607. *In the first part* (v.1-4) the good things of this kingdom are celebrated.

V.1 *Give the king thy justice* [your kingdom], *O God, and thy righteousness to the royal son* [the Messiah will be a king (Ps. 2:6...) and at the same time from the royal family of David (see n.595f.); hence he will also be the son of a king.—St. Bellarmine understands this first part to be about Solomon, and only typically about the Messiah].

V.2 *May he judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with justice*: peace, justice and the protection of the humble will be the rule in this kingdom (v.3f.) [see Isa. 11:4; Luke 4:18].

In the second part (v.5-7) especially the perpetuity of the kingdom is stated: v.5 *May he live while the sun endures, and as long as the moon, throughout all generations*; and v.7 *In his days may righteousness flourish, and peace abound, till the moon be no more.*

In the third part (v.8-11) the universality of the kingdom is extolled in various ways: v.8 *May he have dominion from sea* [Indian ocean] *to sea* (the Mediterranean), *and from the River* [Euphrates] *to the ends of the earth* [see Ps. 2:8; Zech. 9:10]; v.9 *May his foes bow down before him, and his enemies lick the dust.* V.10 amplifies the idea of the universality of the kingdom: *May the kings of Tarshish* [in the extreme southern and western part of Spain] *and of the isles* [in the Mediterranean] *render him tribute; may the kings of Sheba* [in nearby Arabia] *and Seba* [in distant Arabia] *bring gifts* [a sign of recognizing a king]. A parallelism or repetition of the same ideas follows: v.11 *May all the kings fall down before him, all nations serve him.*

In the following verses (v.12-17) the goods of justice, mercy to the poor, abundance and prosperity in that kingdom are briefly state; at the same time both its perpetuity and universality are repeated: v.17 May his name endure for ever, his fame continue as long as the sun. May men bless themselves by him, all nations call him blessed [see Gen. 12:3; 22:18].

608. Psalm 109, composed by David, as the title says, contains the sorrow of the prophet because of the detractions of his enemies. And David was a type of Christ, whose enemies accused him in place of loving him; *however he prays for them* (see Luke 23:34).

The words of the impreator, if they are not placed in the mouth of David's enemies directed against David himself,²⁴ but in the mouth of David, amplify with a certain oriental hyperbole the just petition of the humiliation of the sinners rebelling against God, and at the same time they are a prediction of a future punishment. And St. Peter (Acts 1:20) applied this to Judas or adapted the words of v.8 *May his days be few; may another seize his goods* (his episcopacy).²⁵

609. Psalm 110. This psalm also is certainly by *David*,²⁶ and *messianic*, from the testimonies of Jesus (Matt. 22:41-46) and St. Peter (Acts 2:34f.), which are accepted by the Jews and indicate their well founded tradition.

Moreover in this psalm a singular King is being celebrated, whose qualities cannot be applied to another earthly king: for he is a *universal king, at the same time both king and priest*. This also agrees with other psalms that are certainly messianic, like Ps. 2, 45, 72.

Hence it is not surprising if in the N.T. there is frequent mention of this psalm in the messianic sense (1 Cor.15:25; Col. 3:1; Eph. 1:20; Heb. 1:3.13; 5:6.10; 6:20; 7:17ff.; Rev. 3:21).

610. In the first part (v.1-3) the Messiah is celebrated as a King.

V.1 *The Lord says to my lord* [David therefore, the author of the psalm, calls the Messiah his Lord, acknowledging in him a superior dignity, since he is his son: Matt. 22:43; Mark 12:35-37]: *Sit at my right hand* [i.e., be a partaker of my royal power, on the throne of my glory; see 1 Kings 2:19 about Solomon's mother sitting on the throne at the right hand of her son. The Apostles understood this prophecy to be about Jesus glorified after his Ascension: Mark 16:19; Acts 2:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3.13], *till I make your enemies your footstool* [that is, until I subject your enemies to you perfectly and, in the oriental way, they are put under your feet; thus you will tread on their necks (see Deut. 33:29).—For, after the ascent of Christ into heaven his enemies are still not

24. For this opinion take a look at v.5.20 and to what we say in the treatise *On Holy Scripture* n.126.

25. On this whole psalm see what we say in the treatise, *On Holy Scripture* n.126.

26. See also D 3525. Recently this psalm was examined by Eloíno Nacar, *Rey y Sacerdote. Salmo 110: EstBibl* 5 (1946) 281-302.

yet completely vanquished; but whether they will it or not they will be conquered.—However, after the complete triumph of Christ, Christ does not cease to sit at the right hand of the Lord, but he continues to reign; see the similar way of speaking with the adverb “until”: Matt. 1:25; 1 Cor. 15:25].

V.2 *The Lord sends forth from Zion your mighty scepter* [“for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem”; Isa. 2:3. For the spread of the gospel and the new spiritual battle begins there]. *Rule in the midst of your foes.*

V.3 *Royal dignity has been yours in the splendor of holiness* [therefore the Messiah is already a king because of his origin]: *before the dawn* [therefore before the establishment of the world] *like the dew* [LXX: “from the womb”; i.e., from the divine nature] *I begot you* [Therefore the divine and eternal generation of the person of the Messiah is indicated. This text therefore is eminently dogmatic; however a doubt remains why precisely this verse is not quoted in the N.T. to prove the divinity of the Messiah, since verses 1 and 4 are often quoted.—The TM puts it this way: *Your people will offer themselves freely on the day you lead your host upon the holy mountain. From the womb of the morning like dew your youth will come to you.*—But the reading of the LXX is to be preferred, which can be read with the same Hebrew letters, but with a vocalization different from that of the TM].

In the second part (v.4) the priestly dignity of the Messiah is celebrated: The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind [therefore with a firm and immutable decree he decrees what follows]: *You are a priest for ever* [according to the Christian interpretation it means: a) that Christ lives for ever; b) that the effect of the one sacrifice on the cross remains for ever (Heb. 7:23-25; 10:14); c) that Christ himself, the principal priest, through his ministers and his vicars will offer his sacrifice until the end of the world] *according to the order of Melchizedek* [i.e., like, or after the fashion of Melchizedek (see Gen. 14:18f): a) because Melchizedek was at the same time both king and priest, like the Messiah; b) because Melchizedek according to the meaning of his name was “king of justice,” and he was also the king of Salem (peace): so also is Christ (Heb. 7:2); c) Melchizedek is presented in Scripture without a genealogy and without a beginning and end of his days (Heb. 7:3): so also Christ succeeds no one and no one succeeds him, but he has an everlasting priesthood (he remains the principal priest, while other Christian priests are his vicars and ministers); d) Melchizedek offered a sacrifice of bread and wine: so also Christ; Christian traditions highlights this similarity.²⁷]

In verses 5-6: there is the war of the Messiah against his enemies, also kings, whom he overcomes and conquers thoroughly. V.7 *He will drink from the brook by the way* [some have: from the torrent of tribulation and suffering], *therefore he will lift up his head* [see Phil 2:8-11].

27. This similitude can also be added: just as Melchizedek as the superior blessed Abraham and his successors, the priests of Levi; so also the priesthood of Christ exceeds the Levitical priesthood of Aaron. On the tradition of the Fathers concerning Melchizedek, see R. Galdos, *Melquisedec en la patristica*: EstEcl 19 (1945) 221-246.

611. Prophecies from Isaiah.²⁸

Isa. 2:1-4. V.1 *The word [i.e., thing] which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem* [since the same oracle is found in Micah in almost the same words, and Micah was a contemporary of Isaiah, there is a disputed question as to whether Isaiah borrowed the oracle from Micah, or vice versa; or also whether it comes from a common source].

V.2 *It shall come to pass in the latter days* [a frequent allusion to the messianic times, which represent the final economy of salvation] *that the mountain of the house of the Lord [i.e., mount Moriah, on which is located the temple of the Lord, a symbol of the future Church] shall be established [i.e., solidly built] as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills* [that is, not materially above Tabor and Carmel, but metaphorically because of the sublime noteworthiness that the messianic kingdom will have, so that it may be truly visible and that the nations can come to it] *and all the nations shall flow to it, v.3 and many peoples shall come* [the universality of the future kingdom is indicated, which will be the only center for legitimate worship] *and say: Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may teach us his ways* [the doctrinal character of the magisterium is indicated, which will exist in the kingdom of the Messiah] *and that we may walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem* [here the reason is given by the prophet why the nations go up and walk on the paths of the Lord; therefore the divine law is proclaimed as going forth from Jerusalem, and at the same time also the word of the Lord].

V.4 *He shall judge between the nations* [therefore it will be a universal kingdom] *and shall decide for many peoples* [i.e., he will proclaim the laws and he will be the judge]; *and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks* [the future peace is described, in which the instruments of war are converted into agricultural tools, plows and pruning hooks; the same peace is described in the following sentence]: *nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*

612. Isa. 4:2-6. V.2 *In that day the branch of the Lord shall be beautiful and glorious* [this branch of the Lord, that is, what the Lord will make to grow, or which will grow from God, does not designate the material and physical abundance of the earth,

28. See. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam* 2 v. (Paris 1887); 2nd ed. By F. Zorell (Paris 1923); J. Fischer, *Das Buch Isaia*s 2 t. (Bonn 1937-1939); A. Condamin, *Le livre d'Isaie* (Paris 1905).

On the value of the prophecies that are read in Isaiah and passim in Scripture, see the Responses of the Biblical Commission (June 28, 1908): D 3505-3509; EB 291 ff. [287ff.].

nor the salvation generally obtained from the Lord; but it indicates someone definite, who is later distinguished from “those who were saved of Israel,” for whom is the beauty and the glory], *and the fruit of the land* [this means the same thing as “the branch of the Lord,” but made known in a different way, as if it were also an origin from the earth with regard to his human nature], *shall be the pride and glory of the survivors of Israel* [that is, those who escape the predicted divine punishment in Israel].

V.3-6 here the holiness and protection which will be present in the messianic kingdom are described.

613. Isa. 7:14-15.²⁹ Ahaz, of the house of David and the king of Judah was very upset because the two kings of Syria and Israel were planning to come up to Jerusalem and to wage war against it (v.7:1ff.). The Lord through Isaiah desires to strengthen the mind of Ahaz by telling him “it shall not stand, and it shall not come to pass” (v.3-9); moreover the Lord is ready to give him a favorable sign (v.10f.). But Ahaz hesitates and says that he does not want to put the Lord to the test; so Isaiah reacts against the injury done to God (v.13) and utters an oracle:

V.14 *Therefore* [that is, since you refuse to ask for a sign] *the Lord himself will give you* [the house of David] *a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son* [TM העלמה, ha’almah, with the article: this *unmarried maiden*³⁰—who in a definite way is designated by pointing to a singular person—and who without the cooperation of a man is introduced as conceiving, truly a virgin, and a virgin giving birth; since the miracle and sign of conception and birth are indicated, it is the Blessed Mother of Immanuel; see for the pristine interpretation of the Jews Matt. 1:22f. and the Targum] *and shall call his name Immanuel* [that is, God is with us. This Immanuel is the Messiah himself, because to him alone belong the things said about Immanuel in this book, that is, the land of Judah, which is the land of Yahweh, is called the land of Immanuel (8:8), and the names given to him (9:6f.) can apply only to the Messiah and to the divine king; and for the interpretation made by the Jews regarding the Messiah see also Matt.1:22f.]; v.15 *he shall eat curds and honey* [food of the poor; or as the infancy of the Savior is described in a poetical way] *when he knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good* [i.e., until he comes to the age of discretion; or, having lived a life of poverty, so Immanuel will know how to refuse the evil and to choose the good; see Heb.5:8].

Therefore, the miraculous birth of Immanuel is a sign of the will of God, who desires to save Judah. However, since Immanuel the Savior is seen by the prophet as present, the prophetic perspective joins this vision with the present circumstances: v.16 for before the child knows how to refuse the evil and to choose the good [i.e., when he reaches the years of discretion] *the land before whose two kings you are in dread will be*

29. See EB 74 [59]; Pius VI in the year 1779 condemned the opinion that this prophecy about the divine Emanuel born of the virgin is not messianic.

30. Aquila in his version has νεάνις, young girl, for παρθένος, virgin; the Jews have preferred to follow this interpretation, which favors their view: see A. Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* I 1.3 n.133.

deserted [i.e., either “the land which you detest (Ephraim and Syria) will be deserted,” or “before that boy ends his infancy, the land of Judah will be deserted, for which you are the leader in the face of these kings”].

The description of the punishment of Judah by the Assyrians follows (v.17-25); but salvation will come through Immanuel (8:8-10; 9:1-7).

614. Isa. 9:1-7. V.1 *In the former time* [i.e., before, formerly] *he brought into contempt* [it was made insignificant and unknown] *the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali*, but now, *he will make glorious* [i.e., it is made important and glorious] *the way of the sea* [Galilee or the Mediterranean], *the land beyond the Jordan* [Perea], *Galilee of the nations* [see Matt. 4:12-16).

Afterwards the effect of the illumination, of the increase of the people, is described, *and also* of the joy (which he magnified; thus the context demands) and of rejoicing because of the messianic goods (v.3). For the Lord has broken the yoke of his burden, the staff on the shoulder of Judah and the rod of his oppressor (v.4) as on the day of Midian (Judges 7). V.5 *For every boot of the trampling warrior in battle* [will cease] *and every garment rolled in blood will be burned as fuel for the fire.*

V.6 *For to us a child is born, to us a son is given* [in the prophetic perfect; see Luke 2:11], *and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.* V.7 *Of the increase of his government* [i.e., it will be vast] *and of peace there will be no end; upon the throne of David, and over his kingdom, to establish it* [recall the prophecy of Nathan, n.595f.], *and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time forth and for evermore* [behold the messianic goods of peace and holiness in an everlasting kingdom. These qualities of the kingdom, and especially the names just applied to the king, can belong to no one else but the Messiah. See Luke 1:32.33]. *The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this.*

The description and threat of punishments that Israel and Assyria endure follow (ch. 9:8—10:34).

615. Isa. 11:1-10. V.1 *There shall come forth a shoot* [a sprout] *from the stump of Jesse* [i.e., from the trunk of Jesse buried in the earth after the tree has been cut down, as it were from the family of David lost in oblivion], *and a branch* [I plant, I renew, the same shoot or branch, which comes from the trunk of Jesse: thus because of parallelism] *shall grow out of his roots.* V.2 *And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him* [according to A. Vaccari this is the *central or fundamental* gift given by the Messiah, like the stem

of a candelabrum with seven branches³¹], *the spirit of wisdom and understanding* [speculative gifts], *the spirit of counsel and might* [practical gifts], *the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord*; v.3 *And his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord* [these gifts look directly at the Lord for his knowledge and reverence.—Note that in the TM the gift of “piety” is not found; therefore the number of the “seven” gifts is not found in the TM, unless you follow the method suggested by A. Vaccari above. But if the TM is held to be the original in this matter, and the number of seven gifts is desired, the explanation of Knabenbauer is to be recommended; according to him the words of the TM *yir' at Iahveh* are not exhausted by “the fear of the Lord,” and so “piety” is included in them].

In the following verses *the perfect justice and power and faithfulness* of this Messiah king are described (v.3b-5); also allegorically the *peace* that will reign in this kingdom is indicated (v.6-9).

And v.10 follows: *In that day the root of Jesse* [i.e., that sprout mentioned earlier] shall stand as an ensign to the peoples [as a standard for the peoples], *him shall the nations pray earnestly to* [or seek; note the universality of the kingdom], *and his dwelling shall be* [i.e., his mansion where he lives] *glorious*.

The liberation and gathering of the remnant of Israel is described in the following verses (v.11-16). And after these *a song of praise*, which he will utter in that day: For since God was angry, his anger turned away (ch. 12:1); therefore the people of God will act faithfully (v.2) and will draw water from the wells of the Savior (v.3; see John 4:13f.; 7:37-39), and he will announce all of this to the whole world (v.4-6).

616. Isa. 28:16. In chapter 28 an oracle is spoken, a woe against Samaria, whose way of acting the citizens of Jerusalem are imitating; they depend on a lie and they place their hope in it. But there is someone else in whom they should place their hope: v.16 *Therefore thus says the Lord God: Behold, I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone* [the foundation of a new theocracy which will rise out of Zion], *a tested stone* [i.e., chosen, apt for this work], *a precious* [whose nature is far superior to the other parts of the building] *cornerstone* [the basis and union and directive norm of the whole building], *of a sure foundation* [i.e., immobile, offering certain stability]; *he who believes* [in him] *will not be in haste* [i.e., he will not fear].

617. Isa. 35:1-10. In contrast to the devastation of the land of Edom (34:5-17), suddenly the liberation and the exultation which will be in Israel is described. In a poetic way these things are described (35:1ff)... V.4... *God himself will come and save you*. V.5 *Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped*; v.6 *then shall the lame man leap like a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy* [see Matt. 11:4f.].

618. Isa. 40:1ff. Already at the beginning of this consoling part, which successively will be in the prophecy of Isaiah, there is an exhortation

31. See Spiritus septiformis ex Is 11,2: VerDom 11 (1931) 129-133.

to trust: V.1 *Comfort, comfort my people...* for it is the end of evils for Jerusalem, v.2... *she has received from the Lord's hand double for all her sins* [a twofold punishment, said as a hyperbole]. And in v.3 *A voice cries in the wilderness: prepare the way of the Lord* [see Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4-6; John 1:23; where this prophecy is applied to John the Baptist]... v.5 *And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken.*

619. Prophecies about the servant of Yahweh:

Isa.42:1ff. The servant of Yahweh is introduced who will be the Savior of Israel: V.1 *Behold my servant, whom I uphold* [i.e., I will protect him], *my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have put my Spirit upon him, he will bring forth justice to the nations* [i.e., he will proclaim a just law also to the nations, or he will exercise dominion and a kingdom over the nations]. V.2 *He will not cry* [Vg. *and he will not accept a person*] *or make his voice heard in the street* [i.e., he will be known for his modesty]. V.3 *A bruised reed he will not break, and a dimly burning wick he will not quench* [he will bring help to the afflicted and to sinners; see Matt. 12:18-21], *he will faithfully bring forth justice* [i.e., he will make true judgments]. V.4 *He will not fail or be discouraged* [i.e., he will not suffer weakness in his mind nor will he be disturbed] *till he has established justice in the earth* [namely, the just law and his kingdom mentioned above]; *and the coastlands* [the more remote regions] *wait for his law*

620. Isa. 49:1ff. V.1 *Listen to me, O coastlands* [the more remote and maritime regions], *and hearken, you peoples from afar* [therefore what must be said now is not just particular, but universal]; *The Lord called me from the womb* [the choice made by God of this servant who speaks is being proposed], *from the body of my mother he named my name* [i.e., he gave me my nature and my office; therefore he has a vocation that is very selective, determined and effective, as from God, as is expressed in what follows] v.2 *and he made my mouth* [my word] *like a sharp sword* [see Isa. 11:4; Heb. 4:12], *in the shadow of his hand he hid me* [like a sword that is hidden under the protection of the left hand; therefore he is established in security and consolation], *and he made me a polished arrow* [TM “polished,” clean, with which he hits from a distance, as a sword strikes close at hand; see Ps. 45:4.6], *in his quiver he hid me away* [therefore he is brought forth when it pleases the Lord]; v.3 *And he said to me: You are my servant* [therefore it concerns the servant of Yahweh], *Israel* [if this word pertains to the original text, it is not dealing with the whole people, because afterwards, in v.5-6, this people is said to have to be gathered together; but the name of the whole body is given to the Head, especially since it is the name of an individual person, Jacob, and this new “Israel” by prayer and patience is “God’s warrior”], *in whom I will be glorified* [TM “in

you I will show myself glorified”].

After having proposed his exceptional election, the servant of Yahweh laments that his labor was in vain: V.4 *But I said: I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for nothing and vanity* [see John 12:37 and the later obstinacy of the Jews...]; *yet surely my right is with the Lord, and my recompense with my God* [TM “however my right is with the Lord and my work is with my God”].

V.5 *And now the Lord says, who formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob back to him* [now what the Lord says is proposed in order to console and to show the efficacy of the action of the one who has been called by such a noble vocation to bring back Jacob] *and that Israel might be gathered to him* [and Israel does not wish to be gathered? – or, as it were by asking and admiring: for it could be the contrary, that is, that Israel will not be gathered? – or by reading רָל to him, for אָל not; Israel will be gathered to him. Therefore] *for I am honored in the eyes of the Lord and my God has become my strength.*

V.6 *And he says* [God consoling me]: *It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel* [those remaining; TM the preserved of Israel; and to him is proposed a much greater glory, which will come from his own labor]; *I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth* [therefore he is speaking about a universal and spiritual salvation, from him who will be the light of the world (see Luke 2:32; John 8:12), bringing back all the nations from ignorance and sin; this cannot be said about any prophet, but only about the Messiah].

V.7 *Thus says the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel and his Holy One, to one deeply despised* [i.e., with recent authors: to him who from the heart is despised by many], *abhorred by the nations* [i.e., by him who is an abomination to the nation], *the servant of rulers* [who—in the Christian interpretation—coming from a subject people he was so humiliated that he had to stand before Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, Herod...]; *Kings shall see and arise; princes, and they shall prostrate themselves; because of the Lord, who is faithful, the holy one of Israel, who has chosen you* [thus there is a contrast between his future glory and his humiliation].

V.8 *Thus says the Lord* [by proposing some more particular things about the exaltation of the servant of Yahweh]: *In a time of favor I have answered you* [hence a request and prayer made by the servant of Yahweh to the Lord, which is heard; see John 17:1ff; Heb. 5:7] *in a day of salvation I have helped you* [see Isa. 50:7; 49:7]; *I have kept you and given you as a covenant to the people* [that is, in the new covenant to be established between God and the people, because the old one has been violated; a sign of this violation is evident now in the abduction of the people into exile. On the new covenant see Jer. 31:31; Hos. 2:18; Mal. 3:1] *to establish the land, to apportion the desolate heritages* [thus the devastated land will again be restored, and the abandoned heritages will again be distributed, that is, everything will be renewed in a better way], v.9 *saying to the prisoners: Come forth, to those who are in darkness: Appear* [that is, to those who are in prison and groan in obscurity. A poetic description of the future prosperity follows]: *They shall feed along the ways, on all bare heights shall be their pasture* [i.e., every-

where, even on the formerly barren hills they will find a pasture and their journey will not be difficult]. V.10 *They shall not hunger or thirst, neither scorching wind nor sun shall smite them, for he who has pity on them will lead them, and by springs of water will guide them* [better: "he will carry them" with TM, LXX; see Rev. 7:17.—So the Lord is described as a pastor full of mercy and solicitude. The same sense of caring appears in the following verses]. V.11 *And I will make all my mountains a way* [that is, the rough ways will become smooth] *and my highways shall be raised up* [they will become high and easy and visible so that no one gets lost].

V.12 *Lo, these shall come from afar, and lo, these from the north and from the west, and these from the land of Syene* [thus St. Jerome by interpreting the Hebrew *sinim*, which is Mount Sinai in the south; but others prefer to interpret it, from the context, as being a more remote region, and contrast it with the west mentioned before, so that they understand it to be the east, that is, Sinarum].

V.13. *Sing for joy, O heavens, and exult, O earth; break forth, o mountains, into singing! For the Lord has comforted his people, and will have compassion on his afflicted* [thus all creatures exult with praise because of the comfort obtained through the servant of Yahweh].

Consolation for Zion follows in ch. 49:14-16, which is intimately connected with the glory and work of the Messiah. This solace is extended *up to* ch. 50:3. In what follows the qualities of the servant of Yahweh are spelled out.

621. Isa. 50:4-11. The servant of Yahweh (for v.6 clearly is about him, and so he cannot be Isaiah) proposes his obedience, through which God (a loud complaint in v.2 which no one hears) can save: V.4 *The Lord has given me the tongue of those who are taught* [TM "the tongue of disciples," that he may hear like a disciple, and thus be taught by the Lord; see Isa. 11:2; 49:2], *that I may know how to sustain with a word him that is weary* [therefore this will be the work of the Messiah]; *morning by morning he awakens, he awakens my ear to hear as those who are taught* [therefore the Lord in whatever morning he speaks to him, and the teaching, which this servant offers, comes from him who sent him; see John 7:16.46; 8:26.40; 12:50; 14:24; 15:15].

V.5 *The Lord God has opened my ear* [he has taught me], *and I was not rebellious, I turned not backward* [because he always does what is pleasing to him; see John 8:29; 14:31... He is so obedient that he shows great fortitude, as will be shown in the following verses]. V.6 *I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to those who pulled out the beard; I hid not my face from shame and spitting* [as in a most despicable place which is chosen for this, and extreme insult (see Job 20:10; see Ps. 22:7; 69:7.—For the fulfillment in Jesus the Nazarene see Matt. 27:30; Mark 14:65; Luke 18:32; 22:64; John 18:22)].

V.7 *For the Lord God helps me; therefore I have not been confounded; therefore I have set my face like a flint* [These things are also said about the servant of Yahweh, as related to the preceding statements (ch. 49:1.2.6.8) about the promised divine help] *and I know that I shall not be put to shame* [see John 16:33 where Jesus is said to obtain victory over the world.—Therefore he goes on:] V.8 *he who vindicates me is near* [he

assumes my just defense]. *Who will contend with me?* [see John 8:46]. *Let us stand up together. Who is my adversary? Let him come near to me.* V.9 *Behold, the Lord God helps me; who will declare me guilty?* [therefore he is established in the Lord with complete security and confidence]. *Behold, all of them will wear out like a garment; the moth [certainly a small agent] will eat them up.*

An exhortation to similar trust follows: V.10 *Who among you fears the Lord and obeys the voice of his servant, who walks in darkness and has no light, yet trusts in the name of the Lord and relies upon his God?*

As a contrast, a warning for his adversaries follows: V.11 *Behold, all you who kindle a fire, who set brands alight* [i.e., TM attacking with fire-darts and flaming arrows, with the tongue and with impiety]. *Walk by the light of your fire, and by the brands which you have kindled* [said ironically, because they will be turned against them]. *This shall you have from my hand: you shall lie down in torment.*

In ch. 51—52:12 the Lord consoles Zion with the hope of salvation; but in chapter 53:13ff. the discourse is again about the servant of Yahweh.

622. Isa. 52:13ff. Again the discourse returns to the servant of the Lord, who was mentioned before (49:1-13; 50:4-11), so that now Isaiah proposes his humiliation more distinctly and, because of this, his exaltation.

V.13 *Behold, my servant* [the same one spoken about before in 49:1-13; 50:4-11] *shall prosper* [he will be wise (see Jer. 23:5), since he has the Spirit of the Lord (see Isa. 11:2; 42:1), and therefore he acts wisely; although the matter is treated with the foolishness of the cross], *he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high.* V.14 *As many* [seeing the humility and the affliction of the people] *were astonished at you* [i.e., at the people of Israel, whom the Lord is addressing; or at the servant of Yahweh, by reading “at him”] *his appearance was so marred, beyond human semblance* [the servant of the Lord] *and his form beyond that of the sons of men* [thus the affliction and ignominy of the people of Israel is an image of the affliction of the servant of the Lord; but afterwards he will rise in glory].

V.15. *He* [TM,LXX: “so”] *shall sprinkle many nations* [with a sprinkling whereby they are expiated and cleansed and consecrated, according to the meaning of the word *passim* in Lev. and Num. only where it is used (if we follow this reading of TM)]. But this sacrificial sprinkling is done only by a priest; hence the servant of the Lord is designated as a *priest*, and it is hinted that he will inaugurate a new covenant greater than the old preceding one when Moses sprinkled the people (Exod. 24:8); indeed, he will sprinkle not just one people, but *many nations* (see Heb. 9:11-22; 12:24). For at the price of his own blood the Messiah is often described in the N.T. as redeeming, expiating and cleansing all men³²], *kings shall shut their mouths because of him* [they will keep quiet because of their amazement and reverence], *for that which has not been told them they shall see* [that is, because they have seen something that was not told to them], *and that which they have not heard they shall understand* [see Rom. 15:21].

32. See Matt. 20:28; 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; Acts 20:28; Rom. 3:25; 5:9; 1 Cor. 11:25; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:14.20; Heb. 9:12.14; 12:24; 13:12.20; 1 Pet. 1:2.19; 1 John 1:17; 5:6....

623. 53:1ff. However, with the announcement of that future exaltation, it will be difficult to believe in the humiliation of the servant of the Lord,³³ unless the power of God is recognized in it. Therefore the prophet says:

V.1 *Who has believed what we have heard?* [therefore few believe it], *and to whom has the arm of the Lord* [that is, his power which is shown in this and it is necessary to believe it] *been revealed?* [to whom has it been made known?; doubtless this is said about the Jews, because the kings were said before to hold their tongue about him...]. V.2 *For he grew up before him like a young plant* [he grows like a shoot from a hidden stump (see Isa. 11:1) that is humble before the Lord], *and like a root out of dry ground* [that is, out of the ground that is both arid and humble, and certainly from a humiliated and oppressed people; others understand it as ground made fecund not by rain or by human labor, that is, from the Virgin Mother: but this seems to pertain not to humiliation, but to glory]. *He had no form or comeliness that we should look at him, and no beauty that we should desire him* [that is, he did not have a handsome form so that we might desire him]; *he was despised and rejected* [the vilest of men] *by men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted* [having well experienced] *with grief* [wounds and torments], *and as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised* [others: as one hiding his face out of shame], *and we esteemed him not* [that is, the people of Israel did not esteem him].

V.4 *Surely he has borne our griefs* [that it, here indeed (with emphasis) he assumed to himself our sorrows and our punishments, which we have merited (or better: *took away*; thus by a parallelism with the following sentence), and consequently he also took away the results of sin, infirmities; see Matt. 8:17; 1 Pet. 2:24] *and carried our sorrows* [that is, our burden; therefore the servant of the Lord will offer vicarious satisfaction for us], *yet we esteemed him stricken* [that is, a plague inflicted by God] *smitten by God and afflicted* [because of his iniquities, but since he is suffering for us].

V.5 *But he was wounded* [TM pierced] *for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities* [thus in various ways, up to four, the same idea is repeated], *upon him was the chastisement that made us whole, and with his stripes* [TM with wounds or with black and blue marks] *we are healed* [see 1 Pet. 2:24].

And he gives the reason for our iniquities: V.6 *All of us like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way* [following our own concupiscences by deviating from the right path], *and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.*

But he freely and willingly suffered all these things: V.7 *He was offered up* [as a

33. In this chapter it is very evidently apparent that *the servant of Yahweh is not just an idealization*, because very real things are said about him; *nor is it the people of Israel*, as some non-Catholics contend; for the innocence that is attributed to him (v.6) and the atonement of the iniquity of the nations which he carries out—these cannot be applied to the people of Israel; it is contrasted with this servant: ch. 49:5; 50:10; 53:8.—Likewise *the servant of Yahweh cannot be a complex of the good things of the Israelites*, because also these, and especially these, are the people of Israel, and the servant of Yahweh is placed in contrast with the people of Israel; indeed he is plainly contrasted with these believers (50:10). Moreover, the prophetic preaching will announce to these believers good things, not the atonement of sinners. Therefore, also having passed over some other gratuitous comments, the servant of Yahweh is only a real person: the Messiah. That is what the holy Fathers thought based on the accepted tradition and from the words of the N. T. (Matt. 12:17; Luke 22:37; 1 Pet. 2:21-25); this is the view of all Catholics and of the ancient Jews. Therefore, in Jesus the Nazarene alone, who also elsewhere is proved to be the Messiah, we see that these predictions have been entirely fulfilled.

sacrifice and immolation, or by placing and offering himself to those apprehending him and to the judges] *because he willed to do it* [see John 18:4-11; TM has: “he was oppressed and he submitted himself,” or he bore it patiently] *yet he opened not his mouth; like a lamb that is led to the slaughter* [TM “as a sheep is led to the slaughter”] *and, like a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, and he opened not his mouth.*—And in these words the supreme example of the gentleness and patience of the Messiah is expressed; see Isa. 50:5 and what the evangelists said about the silence of Jesus in his passion: Matt. 26:63; 27:14; Mark 14:61; 15:5; Luke 23:9.

V.8 *By distress and judgment he was taken away* [surely because of oppression and because of an unjust judgment (as the cause) he was taken away from life; as will be said immediately: because he has been cut off from the land of the living]. *As for his generation, who considered it?* [There is no constant explanation of this sentence. Besides those who here correct the TM by introducing a different reading (his way, his death, his sorrow), many recent authors understand generation (γενεά) as referring to the group of his contemporaries, like a prophet admiring their malice and cruelty. Among other interpretations these stand out: 1) “Who has numbered his aged offspring?” (see v.10; Ps. 22:31; 72:17); 2) which is recommended by the holy Fathers and the ancients: “who will narrate his eternal generation in the bosom of the Father—or (according to others) his temporal generation in the womb of Bl. Virgin Mother, and his birth—or his glorious generation because of his resurrection?”; see the different explanations for Ps. 2:7; above n.598], *because he has been cut off* [therefore by a violent death] *from the land of the living; stricken for the transgression of my people* [TM striking him].

V.9 *And they made his grave with the wicked and with a rich man in his death* [St. Jerome explains it thus: “for his burial or death he will share it with the Gentiles (the godless) and the Jewish (rich) people.” But the TM renders it like this: *and they make his grave with the impious, and (i.e., however) with the rich after his death*; in which the future will appears of placing the burial of the Messiah with the wicked, but actually he was buried in the tomb of a rich man; see Matt. 27:57.60]³⁴ *because* [TM “and although’] *he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth* [therefore also from this it is apparent and very clear that this servant of Yahweh is not the people of Israel, which certainly was guilty of iniquity. See also 1 Pet. 2:22].

624. The reward of the servant of Yahweh. Isa. 53:10ff. V.10 *It was the will of the Lord* [TM it pleased the Lord] *to bruise him* [doubtless because of the good things to come from it, and because of the glorification and commendation of the wisdom and power of God, which are in the passion of the servant of Yahweh].

When he makes himself an offering for sin [i.e., if he makes himself an atoning sacrifice for sin: see 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb.9:14; 1 John 2:2] *he shall see his offspring* [i.e., he will see his descendants, who will obtain life from him] *living for a long time* [TM “he shall prolong his days,” i.e., he will have perpetual life (see Rev. 1:18), which he will hand on to his offspring] *and the will of the Lord* [that is, what is pleasing to the

34. Recently this matter was treated by J.M. González Ruiz, *Una profecía de Isaías sobre la sepultura de Cristo (Is 53,9)*: EstBibl 6 (1947) 225-232.

Lord—the redemption and restoration of the human race] *shall prosper in his hand* [that is, with his help they shall be right].

V.11 *He shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul* [because of his empty labors or in place of his labors] *and be satisfied* [certainly with the joy from the gained victory and from the effects of beatitude for himself and for others]. *By his knowledge* [that is, through the knowledge that he possesses and communicates: see Isa. 11:2; 42:6f.; 49:2.8f.; 50:4] *shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous* [since—from the words of Jesus—“this is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent” (John 17:3); “that he himself is righteous and that he justifies him who has faith in Jesus” (Rom. 3:26); hence also he will justify by the communication of knowledge about himself] *and he shall bear their iniquities*.

V.12 *Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great* [see Ps. 2:8: I will make the nations your heritage...], *and he shall divide the spoils with the strong* [as the victor after the battle], *because he poured out his soul to death, and was numbered with the transgressors* [see Mark 15:28; Luke 22:37; John 18:30] *yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors* [see Luke 23:34]. Thus with these four members a summary of the whole passion is given.

625. Fruit of the passion of the servant of Yahweh. Isa. 54ff. After those prior statements, the gained fruits are proposed afterwards (ch. 54...) more abundantly; they are truly outstanding—from the humiliation and from the sorrows of the servant of Yahweh: the New Zion will have innumerable sons and—as added to this—*your descendants will possess the nations* (v.1-3). There is nothing to fear in the future, because “the one who made you will rule over you” “*and with everlasting love I will have compassion on you, says the Lord, your Redeemer*” (v.4-10).

The security of the new Zion (v.11-17) and the universality of the good which it contains are now proposed ch. 55:1ff.): because ch. 55:5 *Behold, you shall call nations that you know not, and nations that knew you not shall run to you, because of the Lord your God, and of the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you*.

After threats made to the people, once again the glory of Jerusalem is celebrated (ch. 60); because the Lord will arise upon you, and his glory will be seen upon you (60:2); v.3 *And the nations shall come to your light*—he says to her—*and kings to the brightness of your rising* [again note in this, and in what follows, the universality of the described kingdom].

And the same servant of Yahweh about whom before such wonderful things were said, now (ch. 61) is introduced announcing the work of his redemption.

Ch. 61:1 *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me* [formerly about the same servant: Isa. 11:2; 42:1] *because the Lord has anointed me* [it is to be noted (see n.384) that it was customary in the O.T. to anoint kings, priests and prophets]; *to bring good tidings* [that is, TM happy news] *to the gentle* [i.e., to the afflicted], *he has sent me* [therefore to evangelize the poor was a messianic sign: see Matt. 11:5], *to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound*.

v.2 *to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor* [because of the obtained atonement of guilt] *and the day of vengeance of our God* [for those who continue as enemies]...

For the messianic interpretation of this place from the understanding of the Jews, and for its application to Jesus the Nazarene, recall the words of Jesus in the Synagogue at Nazareth: "today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 4:21).

... *that all nations may be consoled*, which in what follows is amplified, and at the same time also there is a treatment of the establishment of a new theocracy (v.4-9).

v.9 *Their descendants shall be known among the nations, and their offspring in the midst of the peoples* [note the catholicity of the future kingdom, and in what follows also the holiness of the good people in it:] *All who see them shall acknowledge them, that they are a people whom the Lord has blessed*. Therefore Jerusalem in joy will rejoice in the Lord and *the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations* (v.10-11).

The glory of Jerusalem and salvation are again considered (ch. 62). Her Savior comes (v.11). And the image of the victorious Messiah is described.

Ch. 63:1 *Who is this that comes from Edom* [from the enemies of Israel, the Edomites], *in crimsoned garments from Bozrah, he that is glorious in his apparel, marching in the greatness of his strength?*—But the Messiah answers: *It is I, announcing vindication, mighty to save*. His courage, by whom alone the victory has been obtained, is extolled beautifully in what follows (v.2-6).

626. Therefore in these prophecies of Isaiah so many and such wonderful things are said about the Messiah that you would almost have to say that all of his qualities and prerogatives, almost his whole life, as patient as it is glorious, are contained in these prophecies.

627. Micah 5:2-3.³⁵ This prophet, at the time of king Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, and a contemporary of Isaiah, announces in the first part of his prophecy (1:1—3:12) the coming of the Lord to punish Israel because of her sins, and therefore "because of you Zion shall be plowed as a field; Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the house a wooded height" (3:12) [therefore he is talking about the destruction of the city and the temple; but it does not seem to be after the coming of Christ].—The future exaltation of the mountain of the house of the Lord in the last days is placed in opposition to this punishment (see Isa. 2:1-4), also the peace and liberation from enemies *through the king and future counselor* (v.4:1-13). About this ruler in Israel there are the following words:

628. Ch. 5:2 *But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little* [that is, few people] *to be among the clans of Israel* [among the cities is Judah that have a thousand people]: *but from you shall come forth for me* [he takes his origin] *one who is to be ruler in Israel,*

35. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Prophetas Minores* I (Paris 1886); A. van Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris 1908); J. Lippl-J.Theis, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* t.1 (Bonn 1937); A. Clamer, *Michée*: DTC 10,1652-1668.

whose origin is from old [that is, from long ago], *from ancient days* [i.e., most ancient; but since from other sources it is certain that the Messiah is God, rightly we interpret this text to be about his eternal origin, rather than about his origin from the old family of David].

V.3 *Therefore* [that is, because the Messiah will come from an obscure place] *he shall give them* [the Israelites, that is, he will give the suppressed; see 5:1] *up until the time when she who is in travail has brought forth* [see Isa. 7:14], *then the rest of his brethren shall return to the people of Israel* [therefore the brothers of the Messiah, according to nation, formerly dispersed, will return to the true Israel].

Finally, having described the judgment of God with his people (6:1-16), the repentance and beautiful prayers of the people are described (7:1-20).

629. Prophecies of Jeremiah.³⁶ Jeremiah the prophet in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, wrote, at the command of the Lord and with the help of his disciple Baruch, the words that the Lord spoke to him against Israel and Judah and against all the nations (Jer. 36:1-4); this scroll was written and read before the people, and it was thrown into the fire by the king (36:5-26). But again at the command of the Lord and with the help of Baruch he wrote “from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim the king of Judah had burned up with fire; and also many more words were added than had existed before” (36:27-32).

Among these divine oracles, directed to the reformation of Judah, some consoling ones are found, which look towards the messianic times.

Therefore, after the rebuke made to the *shepherds* [i.e., the kings] *who destroy and scatter the sheep of the pasture* of the Lord (Jer. 23:1f.), the Lord promises the restoration of his people, that he will gather together the remnants of his flock from all the countries after the dispersion and that he will give them good shepherds (v.3f.): Thus the restoration in the land of Israel after the captivity seems to be predicted, along with another universal restoration, of which the former is a symbol.

But the Lord speaks especially about an extraordinary shepherd: V.5 *Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, and I will raise up for David a righteous Branch* [the Messiah will be from the seed of David: see 2 Sam. 7:14ff.; Isa. 11:1... See Zech. 3:8; 6:12 where the name *Branch, Descendant*, is applied properly to the Messiah]; *and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land.* V.6 *In his days Judah will be saved, and Israel will dwell securely* [therefore the Messiah will be a king, and justice and peace will be the properties of his kingdom]. *And this is the name by which he will be called: the Lord is our righteousness* [some older authors, like Maldonado, Mariana..., saw here the divinity of the Messiah being expressed, since to him is attributed the incommunicable name of Yahweh; but many recent authors, like Knabenbauer, Condamin, interpret this composite name “the Lord is our righteousness” in such a way that in the days of the Messiah it will happen that, “by his work and gift, the Lord will be our righteousness”; thus the work of justification and

36. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Ieremiam Prophetam* (Paris 1889); A. Condamin, *Le livre de Jérémie*³ (Bonn 1934).

sanctification by the future Messiah is expressed; and so his spiritual kingdom].

Because of this not only the wonders in the liberation from Egypt appear, but also new wonders through a new restoration (v.7f.).

Again he speaks about the restoration in ch. 30:1—31:30; and also about the future messianic goods. And the future Messiah, as a branch from David, is called David; therefore the Lord says: ch.30:9 *but they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I shall raise up for them.*

While the discourse continues about the future good things, we read this: ch. 31:22... *for the Lord has created a new thing on the earth: a woman protects a man.* But St. Jerome and others, like Knabenbauer, understand this to be about the virginal conception of the Messiah in the womb of the Bl. Virgin Mother.³⁷

And while the prophet again speaks about the establishment of a new covenant and about the future messianic goods, *the earlier prophecy (23:5f.) is repeated (33:14-16).*

630. The messiahship of the preceding texts, as in general from chapter 30 to 33, seems already to be certain from the context, while paying attention to other things we know about the messianic kingdom from other sources. The prophet describes the renewal of the Israelite theocracy after the exile; but this is either the messianic kingdom, or by God's intention it tends towards the messianic kingdom, and it is a symbol of it.

631. Prophecies of Ezekiel.³⁸ Ezekiel prophesied during the time of the captivity in the land of the Chaldeans (Ezek. 1:1-3); and with symbols and visions he proposed to the people the threats of the Lord against Judah (ch. 3-24).

Among these threats the calamity of Judah is described with the allegory of the sword "of great slaughter" (21:1-27); and the kingdom—it is said (v.25-27)—will be destroyed: 21:27 *A ruin, ruin, ruin I will make it; there shall not be even a trace of it until he comes whose right it is [his right to the kingdom]; and to him I will give it [the Messiah previously often foretold as king (Gen. 40:10; Ps. 2:7; 110:1; Isa. 11:4...) will have the kingdom as his own and as what is due to him; see above the prophecy of Jacob n.585].*

Therefore, after these threats against Judah (ch. 3-24) and also after the oracles against the nations (ch.25-32), the prophet explains the consolation which will exist through the future restoration of Jerusalem (ch. 33-39). Among the diverse promises of the Lord one stands out in ch. 34—the *promise to raise up a good shepherd.*

The evils inflicted by bad shepherds *who fed themselves* are reflected upon (34:1-10); therefore the Lord says that he himself will search for and visit his sheep (v.10-12): 34:11 *I myself will search for my sheep, and seek them out: v.12 as a shepherd seeks out his flock when some of his sheep have been scattered.*

The duties of the good, gentle, watchful and divine shepherd are explained; he brings back the sheep who have been scattered (v.13-22), and the same Lord says: v.23

37. St. Jerome, *In Ieremiam* 1.6 c.31: ML 24,914f.; I. Knaenbauer, *Comment. In Ierem.* 386. G.E. Cloesen, S.J., treated this point: "*Femina circumdabit virum*": *VerDom* 16 (1936) 295-304.

38. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Ezechielem Prophetam* (Paris 1890); P. Heinisch, *Das Buch Ezechiel* (Bonn 1923).

and I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David [namely, the Messiah, king of the house of David (2 Sam. 7L14ff.; 23:5; Isa. 9:7; 11:1; Mic. 5:2; Jer. 23:5; 30:9; 33:15; Hos. 3:5). He will be the *one* who really is king and shepherd, from whom salvation will be sought and in whom hope will be placed]; *he shall feed them* [the sheep] and be their shepherd.

v.24 *And I, the Lord, will be their God, and my servant David shall be prince among them* [in this way the benevolence of Yahweh for his sheep, and the office proper to the Messiah is designated; see John 10:14 where Jesus the Nazarene calls himself the good shepherd]; *I, the Lord, have spoken* [these words refer to the solemnity of the prophecy].

v.25 *I will make with them a covenant of peace and banish wild beasts from the land, so that they may dwell securely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods* [these things look towards the goods of peace and prosperity, which are messianic goods (see Ps. 72; Isa. 9:6f...), like those that are contained in the following verses, v. 26ff...].

A new promise concerning the restoration of Israel from the dispersion is proposed in ch. 37 with the allegories about the dead bones coming to life and about the union of the two pieces of wood. The future Savior is described again: 37:24 *my servant David shall be king over them; and they shall all have one shepherd*. And, just as David again appears as a type of the Messiah, so also Jerusalem and the restoration of the people in the city is a type of the new messianic kingdom to be established.

The remaining messianic goods of holiness and peace (that is, goods that are primarily spiritual are mentioned in v.24-28; surely it refers to those who are sanctified and are subject to the Messiah king. The perpetuity of the kingdom of the Messiah is also foretold: v.25 ... *and David my servant shall be their prince for ever* [see Luke 1:33].

632. The prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27.³⁹ The prophet Daniel, after a beautiful prayer that God for his own sake will bring salvation to Jerusalem (Dan. 9:1-19), namely, after the seventy years of desolation predicted by Jeremiah 25:11-13; 29:10 (Dan. 9:2), receives from Gabriel at the time of the evening sacrifice (v.20-23) the following prophecy, not indeed about the seventy years, but about the seventy “weeks.”

633. The messianic meaning of the prophecy is certain a) not only from the ancient Rabbis (according to Raymundus Martí),

but also b) from the nature of the goods promised in v. 24, namely, really messianic goods, as is known from other prophecies: thus the end of transgression, the end of sin, atonement for iniquity, the introduction of everlasting righteousness....

39. I am following, for the most part, the excellent commentary of P. Joseph Linder, S.J., *Commentarius in librum Daniel* (Paris 1939) 352-425. Other books on this are: J.M. Solá, S.J., *La profecía de Daniel* (Barcelona 19190; F. Ogara, *El libro de Daniel en lecciones sacras* (Madrid 1921); P. Caballero Sánchez, C.M., *La profecía de las setenta semanas de Daniel y los destinos del pueblo judío* (Madrid 1946); J. Goettsberger, *Das Buch Daniel* (Bonn 1928); F. Borgongini Duca, *Le LXX Settimane de Daniele e le date messianiche* (Padua 1951).

c) The violent death of the “anointed” (which is the name of the Messiah) agrees with the other oracles about the passion (Ps. 22; Isa. 53).

d) The things predicted appear to be completely fulfilled in Christ: thus (v.24) the cessation and fulfillment of the oracles of the O.T., “for all the prophets and the law prophesied until John” (Matt. 11:13); the abolition of the worship of the O.T. and the confirmation of the new covenant (v.27); the destruction of the city and the temple (v.26f.); the calculation of the weeks fits in very well with the time of Jesus of Nazareth, and so the messianic expectation is explained, which was his time.

It is not surprising if, with almost unanimous consent, Catholic interpreters consider this prophecy to be messianic,⁴⁰ although they do not agree on the numbering of the weeks regarding the point from which they begin, and from a defect of certain chronological knowledge.

634. But Gabriel says to Daniel “a beloved man,” that is, a man loved by God and pleasing to him.

V.24 *Seventy weeks* [a definite number, not symbolic and indefinite; because they are said immediately to be *precise*, i.e., decreed and determined and later subdivided into parts: 7 + 62 + 1.

These weeks are not of days, since the angel announces the destruction of Jerusalem (v.27) and, desiring Daniel to be consoled while praying for the city, he brings no consolation by announcing the immediate destruction of the city; and in such a short space of time it was not possible to do the many things mentioned in v.25-27.

Therefore they are weeks of years, or it has to do with seventy sabbatical years; this way of speaking was not foreign to the Jews (Lev. 25:2.4.8; 26:34.43). Thus it corresponds to the seventy years which Daniel in v. 2 thought necessary in order to end the captivity.

It would be very gratuitous for anyone to say that he is dealing with the weeks of jubilees or centenaries...].

are decreed [i.e., cut out from the line of time: definite, established; not like the time that comes quickly] *concerning your people* [for whom Daniel poured out his prayers] *and your holy city* [holy because God placed his temple and throne there, and it was a sign of the messianic kingdom after the restoration], *to finish the transgression* [i.e., the transgression will have an end, as is said in what follows], *to put an end to sin* [i.e., sins will be stamped out, hindered, stopped], *and iniquity will be destroyed* [TM “iniquity will be atoned for.”—It is certain that all these points are messianic goods from the preceding prophets: Isa. 4:4; 53:4-12; 60:18; Jer. 3:17; 31:34...], *to bring in everlasting righteousness* [also a messianic good, as found in Ps. 72; Isa. 11:9; see also 1 Cor. 1:30 where Christ is said to have been made our justice].

and both vision and prophecy will be fulfilled [TM “to seal both vision and proph-

40. Some recent authors (Lagrange, Ceuppens) say that only v. 24 has messianic meaning; see Linder, *Commentarius in lib. Daniel* 376.

et”; that is, either by the fulfillment of the old visions, or because the visions in the ancient way cease (but not in the new way, as said by Joel 2:28 and Acts 2:17) and the Lord speaks to us in his Son (Heb. 1:10; “for all the prophets and the law prophesied until John,” as Matt. 11:13 says].

and to anoint a most holy place [TM “to anoint the holy of holies.” But with which anointing is it concerned? All the goods so far announced are messianic, and in the following verses he speaks *about a certain anointed person*. Undeservedly, therefore, it would be said about the dedication of the temple at a later period, because there is no mention of any anointing, neither in the dedication of the second temple (Ezra 6:14-17; 3:2f.), nor in the purification during the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 4:52-58).

Recent authors (Palmieri) explain it to be about the anointing of the new temple, that is, the Church, with a mystical anointing. But it is understood better, according to the Fathers and to the versions, to be *about the Christ himself*, who is said to be anointed by the Holy Spirit (Isa. 61:1; Ps. 45:7; Luke 4:18; Acts 18:38) and, also having been anointed with divinity, he is made known as the anointed—according to the Christian interpretation—in the baptism of Jesus the Nazarene. Then begins the seventieth week in the middle of which Christ is killed].

635. V.25 *Know therefore and understand* [TM “and you will know and understand”; as a further explanation]: *that from the going forth of the word* [that is, the decree] *to restore and build Jerusalem* [this decree by which the building of the city is the beginning point from which the weeks are to be counted. It has to do with a decree to be given in the future, and it can be applied to the edict of Artaxerxes in the 7th year of his reign, that is, in the year 458, which Ezra mentions in ch. 7:1-7.11-16. In this decree ample authority was given to the scribe Ezra, from which seems to follow the authority to build the city, with walls; this also seems to follow from the deeds and words about Ezra and Nehemiah.

For, power was given to Ezra to organize public life: a) and that community was to be established in safety against hostile attacks, which without walls and trenches could not be done;—b) and Ezra seems to have begun the building of the walls, which was stopped because of the accusation made by the Samaritans to Artaxerxes (Ezra 4:12-16); so the king writes back to them forbidding the building of the walls, i.e., that is cease “until if perchance it will be commanded by myself” (Ezra 4:21); wherefore, since the decree of the king does not forbid it in a severe way, it is not licit to infer that Ezra without the authority of the king began the building of the city. c) But this building of the city, both started and then impeded, is confirmed by the way of acting of Nehemiah (Neh. 1:1-3; 2:1ff.), who makes a request for Jerusalem (a useless question, if nothing in it had been started), and he poured out tears when he heard that the wall had been torn down.

Thus it is not necessary to apply the prophecy to the edict of the 20th year of the

reign of Artaxerxes I, in the year 445, about which Nehemiah speaks in 2:5-8⁴¹]

to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks [therefore from the year of the decree of Artaxerxes I, in 458—according to the given interpretation—until the manifestation of Christ, the prince, in his baptism, in the year 26 after Christ, they add up to 7 + 62 weeks].

Thus *it shall be built again* [Jerusalem] *with squares and walls* [trenches] *but in a troubled time* [i.e., amidst many troubles and vexations, which are mentioned by Ezra 4:12-16 and Neh. 1:3; 4:1ff.; 6:1ff.].

636. V.26 *And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one will shall be cut off* [TM he will be destroyed: solemn words for serious crimes, when the punishment is announced; Christ is the one spoken of before in v.24f., who will die a violent death; as also Isaiah had predicted and Ps.22.—This oracle was fulfilled in Jesus the Nazarene 62 + 7 weeks after the edict of Artaxerxes, that is, 483 years after that edict, and after the year 26 after Christ] *and it will not be his people who will deny him* [thus according to the Vg., by supplying in the TM the word “people,” that is, such a people ceases to be the people of God; but many interpretations have been proposed for this text] *and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary* [this is an oracle about the city, placed immediately after the preceding, because this event has a causal connection—according to the interpretation of Christians—with the killing of Christ; although it does not necessarily have to take place immediately after the death of Christ, but when the city will be occupied by the Roman army under the command of Titus.—According to other versions: “both the city and the sanctuary will perish under the leader who is to come,” that is, with Christ himself, who was called ὁ ἐρχόμενος (see above n.393), in whom appears a moral connection between the death of the leader who is to come and the destruction of the city and the sanctuary],

its end [the city and temple] *shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed* (see n. 518-520)].

637. V.27 *And he shall make* [the leader who is to come, the Messiah] *a strong covenant* [this covenant is often mentioned in the Scriptures regarding the establishment of the future messianic kingdom, v.gr. Jer. 31:31f.] *with many* [τοῖς πολλοῖς, that is, with all; see this way of speaking universally in Matt. 20:28. And it will be universal future kingdom] *for one week* [that is, the last week; therefore between the years 26-33 the new perpetual covenant will be confirmed] *and for half of the week* [more probably therefore around the year 30, when the death of Jesus took place]

41. P. Caballero Sánchez, *op.cit.*, 32f. thinks that the starting point from which the weeks are to be counted is the 20th year of the reign of Artaxerxes I, in which the permission was given to Nehemiah; not in the 7th year according to Ezra. F. Borgongini Duca also wrote in favor of this hypothesis, *Le LXX Settimane di Daniele e le date messianiche* (Padua 1951); he believes that the words in Matt. 24:15: “let the reader understand” can allude to the number of words that are in this prophecy of Daniel and to the mystery of the numbers hidden in numbers; and that Jesus invites us to understand this matter.

he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease [TM “sacrifice and cake offerings”; that is, bloody and unbloody sacrifices: and so the abolition of the old sacrificial worship is declared abolished].

With a logical connection, although not necessarily with an immediate chronological succession, there next comes an oracle about the destruction of the temple: *and upon the wing of abomination shall come one who makes desolate* [see above Flavius Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews*, where he says that thieves and zealots occupied the temple before the siege of the city and converted it into a fortress of their violence and plundering⁴²; and he goes on to say that the temple was defiled by the images of the gods of the Gentiles, which were erected by the Roman soldiers⁴³; and see Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14], *until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator* [TM: “and until the destruction and the decree which will be poured out over the desolation”; see n.518-520].

638. Haggai 2:6-9.⁴⁴ Haggai the prophet says (1:1) that the word of the Lord came to him “in the second year of Darius (I) the king,” that is, in the year 520; and, exhorted to build the second temple in Jerusalem, he sees the future glory which will be in this temple. And the Lord says: ch. 2:6... *my Spirit abides among you; fear not.*

V.6 *For thus says the Lord of hosts: Once again in a little while, I will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land; v.7 and I will shake the nations, and the Desired of all nations will come* [TM and LXX: “and choice things will come (precious, eagerly desired) from all the nations”; this is understood better to be not only about bringing precious metals, but about the other stronger desires of the nations, namely, about the Savior and about the messianic goods that are eagerly desired] *and I will fill this house with splendor, says the Lord of hosts....*

V.9 *The latter splendor of this house shall be greater than the former, says the Lord of hosts; and in this place I will give peace* [a messianic good], *says the Lord of hosts* [these words refer to the coming of the Messiah to the second temple in Jerusalem...].

639. Prophecies of Zechariah.⁴⁵ The prophet Zechariah carried out his mission from the second year the king Darius I (Zech. 1:1).

In a vision of the future glory of Jerusalem (2:1-13) he sees the magnitude of this city built without walls (v.1-5): v.4 *Jerusalem shall be inhabited as villages without walls, because of the multitude of men and cattle in it.* The Lord mentions the dispersion of the people (v.6-9), but he consoles them with his own coming: v.10 *Sing and rejoice,*

42. Flavius Josephus, *De bello iudaico* 4,3f.: Opera 2,191ff; see above n.512.

43. Flavius Josephus, *De bello iudaico* 6,4f.: Opera 2,287ff; see above n.514.

44. I. Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Prophetas Minores* t.2 (Paris 1886); A. van Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris 1908); H. Junker, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* t.2 (Bonn 1938).

45. See the pertinent places in the authors mentioned in the preceding note. Moreover on the piercing of the Messiah, as in general concerning the oracles about the passion, there is a treatment by R. Criado, S.J., *La Sagrada Pasión en los Profetas* (Cádiz 1945).

O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of you, says the Lord; and he announces to them the future conversion of the nations, which will also be the people of God:

V.11 *And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of you, and you shall know that the Lord of hosts has sent me to you.* V.12 *And the Lord will inherit Judah and his portion in the holy land, and will again choose Jerusalem....*

In the vision of Joshua the high priest (3:1-10) the Lord says: v.8 ... Behold, I will bring my servant the rising Sun [TM "Branch"⁴⁶; which refers either to the Messiah, since in the following verses he speaks about the special abundance and prosperity, or at least to Zerubbabel, a type of the Messiah]....

In the vision of the coronation of the high priest Joshua, son of Jehozadak (6:9-15)...., v.12 Thus says the Lord of hosts: Behold, the man whose name is the rising Sun [TM "Branch"], for he shall grow up in his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord [this can be understood to be about the material temple to be built by Zerubbabel, or about a spiritual temple, of which the former is the symbol, to be built by the Messiah]. V.13 It is he who shall build the temple of the Lord, and shall bear royal honor, and shall sit and rule upon his throne....

In the description of the future messianic kingdom (chapters 9-14), after having described, like a total victory, the conquered neighboring nations who were the enemies of Israel, then the prophet says: ch.9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter Zion! Shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem! Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on an ass, on a colt the foal of an ass [a truly peaceful king⁴⁷; see Matt. 21:5; John 12:15]. And so he proposes peace to everyone in the universal kingdom: v.10 ... and he shall command peace to the nations; his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.

640. Alluding to the last days in the rest of the prophecy, the prophet speaks about the protection of the Lord for Jerusalem (12:1-8), and the Lord continues: ch. 12:9 *And on that day I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem;* and the spirit of grace diffused over Jerusalem is proposed, so that they look towards the Lord himself "whom they have pierced": v.10 *And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of compassion and supplication, so that, when they look [Hebrew: they will look with admiration and reverence...] on him whom they have pierced⁴⁸ [the fulfillment looks to the last times; but from that it follows that the inhabitants of Jerusalem have pierced the Lord, which John 19:37 applies to the death of Jesus of Nazareth, who also was pierced with a lance. The same John in Rev. 1:7 alludes to this passage (Zech. 12:10ff.) when he speaks about the Lord who is going to come "with the clouds, and every eye will see him (therefore all the nations of the universal kingdom), every one who pierced him (that is, the dwellers in Jerusalem who killed the*

46. See Fr. Luis de León, *De los nombres de Cristo* 1.1 § 3 (Pimpollo): Obras (Rivadeneira) 74-80.

47. A. Skrinjar, *Messias Rex pacificus (Zech 9,9-10)*: VerDom 12 (1912) 248-253.

48. See A. Skrinjar, "Aspicient ad me quem confixerunt" (Zech. 12,10): VerDom 11 (1931) 233-242.

Lord); and all the tribes of the earth will wail on account of him”: which also is said in Zechariah in what follows]: *they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for an only child, and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn...* A description of this mourning follows for all the families [this conversion of the people of Israel has not yet taken place, as is evident].

Ch. 13:1 *On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to cleanse them from sin and uncleanness.* And there will be no idolatry or false prophets in the land (v.2-6).

There is also mention of a shepherd in v.7: *Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered* [this is quoted in Matt. 26:31: it should be understood to be about Christ, at least in a symbolic and typical way].

641. Mal. 1:11. On the sacrifice to be offered everywhere in the world.⁴⁹ Malachi prophesied during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. In the first part of his prophecy, after speaking about the sins of the priests who *despise the name of the Lord* and offer *polluted food* and sick animals (v.6-9), the Lord says: 1:10 *Who is there among you who would shut the doors and [not] kindle fire upon my altar [sacrifices] gratuitously? [in vain: i.e., it would be better if you closed the doors and offered nothing]. I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord of hosts, and I will not accept an offering from your hand* [and he then proposes a new sacrifice to be offered everywhere on earth, in place of the former ones]: v.11 *For from the rising of the sun to its setting great is [LXX it is worthily glorified] my name among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name [TM *minhah*, an unbloody sacrifice] and a pure offering* [therefore here a sacrifice in the proper sense is understood, both from the words used, and from the opposition which refers to the rejected sacrifices of the Hebrew priests; thus the future sacrifice must be much more excellent than the sacrifices of the Hebrews; and it should not be understood in a metaphorical sense, v.gr., about a sacrifice of praise, of prayers... because the Hebrews also had such sacrifices], *for my name is great among the nations, says the Lord of hosts.*

This sacrifice (unbloody), which is offered everywhere on earth and by which God is especially honored, cannot be understood anything other than the sacrifice of Catholics, which Jesus of Nazareth instituted at the Last Supper (Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22f.; Luke 22:19f.), and told his disciples to do it in remembrance of him (1 Cor. 11:24-26).

642. On the precursor of the Messiah. In the second part the prophet speaks about judgment and the punishment of sinners. But for this he quotes the Lord as saying: Mal. 3:1 *Behold, I [the Lord] send my messenger [see Isa. 40:3] to prepare the way before me* [Jesus of Nazareth interpreted this text to refer to John the Baptist, his precursor; see Matt. 11:10] *and suddenly the Lord whom you seek* [in answer to their question (2:17): “Where is the God of justice?”] *will come to his temple* [TM “*ha’adon*,” that one (by antonomasia) the Lord; therefore also God], *and the messenger of the covenant* [that is, he who is sent (this pertains to the notion of an angel) to establish the covenant] *in whom*

49. On this prophet see the authors cited in note 44.

you delight. Behold, he is coming, says the Lord of hosts.

In what follows the work of purification through this messenger of the covenant is described; and finally at the end of the prophecy the statement about the coming of the precursor is repeated:

Mal. 4:5 *Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.* V.6 *And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers...* [which Jesus of Nazareth interpreted to be about John the Baptist (Matt. 11:14; 17:11-13); since also John the Baptist—as had been said—“will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, and he will go before them *in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared*” (Luke 1:16f.). Hence John the Baptist is introduced as a type of Elijah who is going to come at the last times.⁵⁰

643. *From the preceding prophecies it will be easy to arrange their order through the chronological course of the life of the Messiah, and to establish a synopsis of the other properties that belong to him.*

644. 2) **All of these prophecies refer to one definite person**, i.e., they constitute one large prophecy of the Messiah, as an individual person; therefore, not in general about some vague and nebulous hope of a better situation for the people of Israel. This is certain

a) because those very particular and minute details about the Messiah which we explained in the preceding prophecies often clearly designate a very definite person.

b) The firm conviction of the Jews at the time of Jesus, as it appears in the gospels, makes the same point. Thus they were expecting *him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote* (John 1:45), and *the Christ who remains forever* (John 12:34); and Jesus appeals, with no contradiction from the Jews, to the testimony of the Scriptures *about an individual person* (John 5:39; Luke 18:31; 24:27.44), i.e., *about himself*; for the Lord had raised up *a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets of old* (Luke 1:69-70).

c) And the Samaritans thought the same thing, since they were expecting the Messiah who would teach them (John 4:25).

d) This matter can be clearly confirmed from an analysis of the documents which bear witness, after the life of Jesus, to the same conviction of the Jews: thus from Acts and the letters of St. Paul; and also from the *Talmud and Maimonides*.⁵¹

50. See A. Skrinjar, S.J., “*Elias quidem venturus est*”: VerDom 14 (1934) 361-367; F. Durwell, C.S.S.R., “*Elias cum venerit primo*”: VerDom 19 (1939) 269-278.

51. See Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* (1927) n.220.

645. 3) It is certain from the historical, philosophical and relative truth of these prophecies. *Concerning the historical truth*, it is certain from the already proved (or to be proved) historicity of the books of the New and Old Testaments, both for the historical utterance of the prophecies, and for the historical fulfillment of them.

Concerning the philosophical truth of these prophecies it is certain:

a) because the predictions refer to *future free events* or to *free decrees of God* directed to future events:

b) and with words whereby the things predicted *are not expressed as the mere longings of contemporaries*: for, that would be said gratuitously and absurdly, where the discourse is about concrete and literally indifferent things, like the place and time of the birth of the Messiah, or other small things—or where it concerns the Messiah who is going to call all nations to his kingdom—or about the desolation or destruction of the temple and city—or if the passion and killing of the Messiah is mentioned;

c) these predictions *are not mere conjectures* fulfilled by chance, because many very definite things are predicted.

Therefore, the prophecies were made on the basis of knowledge divinely communicated to the prophets, and they fulfill everything required for a true prophecy.

Concerning the relative truth of these prophecies, or that these prophecies are referred to the legation and to the testimony of Jesus, this is certain not only from the predicting prophets themselves, but also from Jesus who appeals to the prophecies as having been said about himself (John 5:39; Matt. 11:4; Luke 4:17-21; 18:31; 24:27.44), as giving testimony of his own mission. Nor is there any apparent reason (having considered the person of Jesus and his way of acting, the purpose intended and the fruits derived from it) to suspect that the connection between these prophecies and the mission and testimony of Jesus is not approved by God.

Therefore, the prophecies of the O.T. prove the divine legation and testimony of Jesus of Nazareth.

646. Objections. 1. Some things from the messianic prophecies have not been fulfilled, v.gr. perfect peace and justice (Ps. 72:2.7.12-14; Isa. 11:6-9...)

Response. 1) The messianic prophecies are looking at the whole economy up until the final glory of Christ (see Dan. 7:13f.; 12:1-2; Joel 3:14ff.): hence some things not yet fulfilled can be fulfilled in the future.

2) Many things can be predicted with allegories and symbols and some things not rarely in a hyperbolic way, and de facto they are so predicted; because the prophetic inspiration adapts itself to the character of the prophet and to that of those in whose favor the prophecies are being uttered. Hence the promised peace is to be understood

especially in a spiritual way.

2. In the messianic prophecies the restoration of the kingdom of Israel is promised, together with its temporal prosperity (Isa. 11:12: "He will raise an ensign for the nations, and *will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth*"; Amos 9:12: "...that they may possess the remnants of Edom and *all the nations...*"; v.15: "I will plant them upon their land, and they shall never again be plucked up").

Response. 1) Although certain prophecies seem to concern promised material goods, still the complex of the prophecies clearly and abundantly deals with a salvation offered to all nations that is *primarily spiritual and universal*; this should certainly prevail over the other material and national goods.⁵²—Moreover temporal happiness, in order to promote spirituality in society and in individuals, also pertains to the kingdom of Christ, at least with a certain fittingness.

2) Prophecies are explained at times in different ways. There are those who prefer to explain them *in a spiritual sense*; but others *in a temporal sense*, so that *with the coming of Christ they finally acquire a spiritual meaning*; others then prefer to explain them *in a temporal sense—as promised temporal goods but conditionally*, depending on the fulfillment of the law and the covenant on the part of the Jews, and this condition was not fulfilled.—Of these solutions those are to be preferred and used that are more suitable to different places.

3) Regarding the texts cited in the objection, please note that those texts *can be understood in a spiritual sense*⁵³; and especially see Acts 15:15f. (which cites Amos 9:11f.) and Rom. 11:25f. (which pertains to gathering in the dispersed people of Judah "for a hardening has come upon part of Israel, *until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved...*").

4) The difficulties that in general come from the prophetic style depend especially on this: a) that the prophets often locate events, that are distant in time, on the same plane without clear foresight; therefore "prophetic vision is not like historical vision"; b) the prophets know and express only fragments or outlines, not the total image and the whole figure, which becomes fully clear only at the end; c) and this often takes place under images and symbols; d) and under certain formulas, which are less known to us; e) added to this is the fact that the prophets are speaking in a concrete historical context, which likewise is unknown to us or turns out to be less evident....⁵⁴

52. See Fr. Luis de León, *De los nombres de Cristo* l.2 § 1 (*Brazo*): Obras (Rivadeneira) 114f.

53. See Knabenbauer at this place.

54. See J. Coppens, *Les particularités du style prophétique*: NouvRevTh 59 (1932) 673-693; Tobac-Coppens, *Le prophétisme en Israel* (Malines 1932); L. de Grandmaison, *Prophète et Prophétie*, in the book *Jésus Christ* 2 (Paris 1928) 246-255.

CHAPTER IV

On other criteria to prove the testimony of Jesus

647. Up to this point we have dealt with external criteria, namely, with miracles and prophecies, which we said are the primary criteria and sufficient by themselves alone to prove a certain revelation. Now it is necessary to treat some other criteria, that is, *internal ones*, which confirm the divine testimony of Jesus, and therefore the divine origin of the revelation given by him and of the Christian religion coming from it.

The internal criteria of revelation concern the revealed doctrine *in itself* (see n.132,5; 142-144)—and *in its effects* in those who have accepted it (see n.132,5; 146,d). Therefore these internal criteria can look at 1) *the doctrine preached* by Jesus and by his ambassadors—and 2) *the religious movement resulting from it*, that is, the work itself of Jesus of Nazareth: and in this work a) the fruits of holiness flowing from the teaching of Jesus can be considered, and b) the admirable way in which this teaching was propagated and c) has been preserved; and finally d) how his followers gave testimony for it. According to these points we will construct just as many arguments.¹

And this way of arguing, from the work of Jesus to Jesus himself, from the Church to Christ the Head, is an *ascending way of arguing*, as it is called, or *regressive* (see *Introduction* n.59).

ARTICLE I

ON THE DOCTRINE OF JESUS OF NAZARETH

Thesis 36. The internal excellence of Christian doctrine confirms its divine revelation.

Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 s.2; Lercher, *Theolog. fundamentalis* (1927) n.226-235; Muncunill, *De vera religione* 343-353; Ottiger, *Theolog. fundament.* 1,608-628; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundament.* 1³, 732-742; Pinard de la Boullaye, *Confer. De Notre-Dame* (1934) V; A.M. Weiss, *Apologia del cristianismo* tom.4.5 (Barcelona 1905, 1906); J. Balmes, *El protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilización europea* (1841-1844); I. Soueen, *L'esthétique du dogme chretien* (Paris 1898); J. Zaragüeta, *El cristianismo como doctrina de vida y como vida* (Madrid 1939).

1. There can be some diversity in the way of considering these arguments: whether they should be considered as the internal criteria of the teaching by examining the effects or in some other way. And the authors do not agree on this. Thus Lercher-Schlagenhaufen number them among subjective criteria, although they recognize that it can be called an internal criterion—an aptitude for religion so that it satisfies man's needs: *Theolog. fundam.* n.102; and they call those criteria that are connected with religion as its *effects* (amazing propagation, conversion of morals, holiness of believers, constancy of martyrs...) *partly external and partly internal criteria*; *ibid.*, n.100.

648. This apologetic argument was common among the Fathers²; and theologians in the 16th and 17th centuries used it when treating divine faith.³ In the 19th century, especially at the time of the influence of romanticism, many authors emphasized criteria of this kind. Among others, those who developed it were J. Balmes, Donoso Cortés, Chateaubriand, Lacordaire, Monsabré, P. Felix, A.M. Weiss...,⁴ as also several more recent authors like Karl Adam⁵ and others.

And it is not surprising, since this argument, presented with intellectual vigor and warmth, is especially suited to dispose people well towards the Catholic religion; for, its beauty, its holiness and purity of doctrine, its usefulness for the individual, for the family and for the whole society, its value for life are made manifest in a significant way.⁶

649. The adversaries to be mentioned are those *rationalists* who claim that there is opposition between reason and faith (D 3017) or that it is not necessary for man to be taught through revealed doctrine about God and about the worship to be rendered to him (D 3027).

650. Doctrine of the Church. The strength of this argument is pointed out in the letter of Pius IX "*Qui pluribus*" (D 2779), where its power is stated together with the other arguments which can be given in favor of the Catholic faith: "For, in truth, this faith is the teacher of life, the guide to salvation... confirmed by the wisdom of its divine author and consummator, Christ Jesus... everywhere resplendent with the light of a supernatural teaching and enriched with the treasures of heavenly riches... revealing the salutary laws of Christ... it has illuminated with the light of divine knowledge all peoples, races, nations, however savagely barbarous and diverse in disposition, customs, laws and institutions; and has subjected them to the most sweet yoke of Christ himself, announcing peace to all, announcing good" (D 2779).

651. Theological note. In the preceding encyclical it is not said whether this argument taken by itself proves with certainty the credibility of the Catholic faith. From the proofs to be given below it seem to us that this argument is *morally certain*, and that it is effective in order to prove

2. Tromp has collected testimonies about this, *De revaluatione*⁶ 1.2 s.2. n.2 (p.209f.).

3. See above in the historical outline of Apologetics, *Introduction to Theology* n.77.

4. See above, *Introduction to Theology* n.82-85.

5. *Das Wesen des Katholizismus*¹² (Düsseldorf 1949).

6. See n. 154-159. And very many adversaries from the other religions sense this keenly, and they admit the efficacy of the argument, when they try to prove and extol the excellence of their own religion by comparing it with Christianity as the terminus of a *higher* comparison, and without any doubt.

the truth of Christian revelation.⁷

652. Proof. In Christian doctrine is found 1) *proved truth or absolute conformity with healthy reason*; 2) *the sublimity and perfection complementary of natural religion*; 3) *the singular aptitude to satisfy the just aspirations of the individual, of the family and of society*.

But the discovery of all of these, taken adequately, is not explained by mere diligence and by human genius alone.

Therefore, Christian doctrine is the result of a supernatural intervention, confirming the divine legation and testimony of its author, Jesus Christ.

653. Proof of the major. 1) *Proved truth is found in Christian doctrine*.

Regarding truths of the natural order. Everything that is said in the Christian religion about God, about human acts, about the world and about human psychology agrees completely with natural religion, especially with natural ethics and with natural theology, and also with the other natural disciplines; indeed, by reason these truths are also demonstrated to be absolutely true in Christian Philosophy, where the opposed doctrines are shown to be erroneous.⁸

654. In all truths, both natural and in supernatural mysteries, *absolute conformity with reason* is found: there is no opposition between science and faith. And there is no one today who speaks about the double truths mutually opposed, one on the natural level, and the other on the supernatural level⁹; or who fears seriously that there can be such opposition, since from the ancient and modern attacks on the faith from the field of science, the faith has always triumphed undefeated. "The deceptive appearance of such

7. The authors do not speak with one mind on the value of this thesis. Thus Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* (1927) n.226 says that *it is convincing*; Ottiger, *Theolog. fundam.* 1,620, says "that it indicates that the divine origin of Christ's doctrine is *at least very probable*"; Muncunill, *De vera religione* 346: "From the Christian doctrine itself its truth is *very persuasive*"; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n. 788: the argument from the wisdom of Jesus, taken separately from his holiness, "to some does not seem to have the same grade of certitude," "like the stronger argument, truly morally certain," from the holiness of Jesus; Tromp, *De revelatione* 209 says: the examination of the doctrine of Jesus is *convincing of its divine origin*, and 217: "the doctrine of Christ for every soul, which sincerely seeks the good, the holy and the true, is a wonderful miracle of the intellectual and moral order"; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* 1³, 739: "the argumentation both considered in itself and looked at under divine providence *begins to lead us to certitude... until finally we arrive with full certitude to recognize the supernaturalness and the divinity of the same doctrine*," especially if the doctrine is looked at both as excellent and the way in which it is proposed as so extraordinary, from its simplicity, efficacy and "with certainty from the highest approval of miracles." Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundam.* n.227 says: "the doctrine of the Church looked at in itself is not a moral miracle; but from a comparison with other religious doctrines it can be proved that it is a moral miracle; but this way seems to be too difficult..."

8. The existence and function of Christian philosophy are treated by J. Iriarte, S.J., *La realidad de un pensamiento filosofico cristiano*: RazFe 125 (1942) 533-544; *La fe y la razón que filosofa*: RazFe 127 (1943) 33-47.

9. See D 1441 (*Lateran Council V*).

a contradiction is mainly due to the fact that either the dogmas of faith have not been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church or fanciful conjectures are taken for verdicts of reason” (D 3017).

655. *The mysteries, however, not only cannot be shown to contradict reason, but also among themselves they are harmoniously connected to form one complete system, adapted to the intellectual ability of all, simple and at the same time very profound: so that even children and the uneducated, after having learned the Creed, can respond quickly to serious questions, better and more certainly than pagan philosophers who have developed their own conclusions in an unstable area. But theologians can speculate on the internal harmony of dogma and so obtain a fruitful understanding of the mysteries (D 3016). And all of these (consider, v.gr., the mystery of the Holy Trinity, where there are so many connections so sublime and harmonious) you will rightly say could not be the fruit of human discovery.*

656. But if, as Suarez says beautifully,¹⁰ where there is a mingling of falsehood, it is a sign that the doctrine is not from God: in the Catholic religion, where no falsehood is demonstrated, it is a sign, also regarding other things about God which cannot be demonstrated, that it is correct in those things too.

657. 2) *A sublime complement of natural religion is found in Christian doctrine.* This happens above all in those questions which, although they can be grasped by reason, still only with difficulty can the reason of an individual attain them; on the other hand, by all those who embrace Christian doctrine they can be known with facility, with firm certitude, and with no admixture of error (D 3005). And this especially should be considered, since Christian doctrine gives a simple and secure answer to many questions which Philosophy asks: “how should God be worshipped, [how should sacrifice be offered]; whether and how the forgiveness of sins can be obtained from God; why are there so many physical and moral evils in the world; whether the time of probation is finished irrevocably with death; whether there are created pure spirits, who involve themselves in the destinies of men; whether there will be and of what nature will be the end of the history of the human race; whether there will be a future resurrection of the body; whether men, now dealing with each other in good times and in bad, after death will find and see each other again in another life. To these and other questions the Christian faith unhesitatingly gives answers,

10. *De fide* d.4 s.3 n.2.

which have to be recognized by reason as worthy of approval.”¹¹

658. *However, the doctrinal sublimity* of the Christian religion shines forth very much by considering how *extreme opposites* are wonderfully joined together in a simple, secure and harmonious connection.

Thus between truths about God: God the origin of all things, the end of all things. God is immutable, but in himself living. There is only one God, but he is three in persons—a most fruitful life living by intellection and love. God binding man to himself as a servant, but at the same time adopting man as a child. God glorifying himself, and at the same time making man happy through creation and through adoption. God justly punishing, but mercifully redeeming. God infinitely holy, justly angry because of the sins of men, but condignly working out satisfaction to be made to himself; truly justice and peace have kissed (Ps. 85:10). God the ruler of men, but also the God-man, the first-born among many brethren (Rom. 8:29).

Between the truths about Christ: Christ is perfect God, Christ is perfect man. The eternal God, being born in time. He is in the form of God, and he emptied himself taking the form of a slave (Phil 2:6f.). He is the king of all and everything consists in him; and he was made obedient unto death (Col. 1:17; Phil. 2:8). And when he was rich, he became poor so that by his poverty we might become rich (2 Cor. 8:9). “Fast doth he sleep, where straw doth spread / A humble manger for his bed / A mother’s milk that strength renewed / Which gives the birds of heaven their food.”¹² Dying on the cross, but triumphing through the cross. Handed over, abandoned; but redeeming the whole universe but joining to himself a chosen people.

His Mother: A daughter of Adam, but without the sin of Adam. A Mother and at the same time a Virgin. A sorrowful Mother, but all generations will call her blessed (Luke 1:48). Dead, but she did not see the corruption of the grave, having been assumed into heaven. Mother of God and Mother of men: her face if full of grace.

The kingdom of Christ is social and external, but it is primarily internal: it is not of this world (John 18:36). It is universal, but wonderfully adaptable to each people. It is eschatological, but not merely eschatological, having a role on earth. It suffers persecutions, but it triumphs. It is monarchical, but from the people all are members of Christ and they are, or at least can be, partakers of the divine nature.

The ideal of Christian perfection: for a man to live, let him die to self, let him deny himself; to rise again with Christ, let him die with Christ; let him lose himself in order to find himself.—Among many troubles, let him act as being without trouble; not like one torpid, but by a certain prerogative of a free mind, which does not cleave by an inordinate affection to anything created.¹³—If he is involved in action, let him be a

11. Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* (1927) n.229.

12. Hymn for Laudes on Christmas Day.

13. *Imitation of Christ* Bk. III, ch.26 n.1.

contemplative in action¹⁴; if he is dedicated to contemplation, let him burn with zeal for souls.—Let him be a child in simplicity and purity; let him be an old man in prudence and counsel: simple as a dove, wise as a serpent (Matt. 10:16).—Let him be diligent in acting, and at the same time docile so as to be ruled by the Spirit. Let him do what he can, but let him be diffident about himself and hope in Him who is above him.—Let him be a servant of God, and at the same time a son of God. Let him love God in all things, only let him fear to offend God in anything.

659. 3) *In Christian doctrine there is an aptitude to satisfy the just aspirations of men.* a) *For the individual.* First of all, many men bear witness to this from every race and condition; they say that in this religion they have found satisfaction and ineffable peace; and the *history of conversions* shows this abundantly.¹⁵

Moreover “man is troubled by many problems and doubts which are peacefully solved by the teaching of Christ; for example: problems of passion and human misery; of moral evil and internal struggles; of inequality and social injustice; of death and eternal life; of separation from friends and relatives; of discord between peoples and nations.”

“In man there are many holy desires that are fulfilled in Christianity. The desire for *love* is fulfilled by the supernatural communication of God, by the birth of Christ, by the maternity of the Immaculate Virgin; the desire for *a more intimate knowledge of God* by the revelation of mysteries; the desire for *religious and moral certitude* by the visible teaching and rule of God; the desire for *happiness* by conformity with God on this earth, and by the beatific vision in heaven; the desire for *the ideal life* by the example of Christ as a child and as a perfect man, by the example of Mary, both Mother and Virgin; the desire for *activity and contemplation* by the active and mystical religious life; the desire for *a mediator and moral helper* by the person of Christ and the help of the sacraments; the desire for *beautiful liturgy* by Christian art which is beautiful and at the same time holy, and finally by the beatific vision of God; the desire for *perpetual life* by immortal life and heavenly glory.”¹⁶

These doubts and these desires are met in Christianity not by the fluctuating opinions of men, but by the certain revelation of God which is wondrously secure and which is demonstrated to be completely reasonable, credible and acceptable. This is the source of the firm assent and the *certitude of the principles of the moral life*, which are had through faith.

14. From an image of St. Ignatius Loyola used by Jerome Nadal, S.J., *In examen annotationes*: Monum. Hist. S.J., *Epist. Nadal* 4,651.

15. For the history of conversions, see S. Lamping, O.F.M., *Menschen die zur Kirche kamen* (Munich 1935); one can also consult Th. Mainage, O.P., *La psychologie de la conversion* (Paris 1915); M. Nicolau, *Valores teológicos en la psicología de la conversión* (Granada 1943).

16. Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 215.

From this is the knowledge of the sublime example of Christ and of the Bl. Virgin...; from this the desire to practice heroic virtues. But it is also the source for the *exercise of friendship with God* and the enjoyment of that communication... so that from thence man may go out to announce peace, to announce goods....

And *this peace, these treasures, which are known especially in the cross*, are not a harsh flight from the world, but can be fully united with intimate cheerfulness and joy (see Phil. 4:4-9). And these things are not just for the rich or for the educated; indeed, they are especially suited for and destined for *the poor and the humble and the simple*.

660. b) *For the family* Christian doctrine offers the example of the Family at Nazareth “established by God, in which all men may see an absolute model of a domestic society, of every virtue and of holiness....” In it they have the norm for family living, in it mothers, in it children, in it those of noble birth, in it workers and all those who are deeply disturbed by the problems of family life or of failing health...¹⁷—Against the sins of conjugal egotism and lack of education for the children, and also against the tyranny masters in relation to servants and laborers, the Christian religion offers a pure and lofty doctrine.¹⁸

661. c) *For civil and political society*, Christian doctrine with great security points out the deep roots why the state is troubled with disturbances and why nations do not get along with each other or fail to enjoy peace¹⁹; this is because, ignoring authentic international law founded on God, and having abandoned public honesty, the people and their leaders immoderately seek material and temporal things, and they have no concern for things that are spiritual and are in accord with their last end; this is the case in international relations and in the public and social life of the various nations. The result of this is that, since the just ordering of things has been lost, peace, which flows from such order, cannot be present.

However for all, both for individuals and for families and nations, the words of the divine Master hold true: *Come to me, all who labor and are*

17. Leo XIII, Letter “*Neminem fugit*” (June 12, 1892), in the lesson for the second nocturne of the *Breviary* for the feast of the Holy Family.

18. See the encyclicals dealing with these problems: “*Casti connubii*” (December 31, 1930), “*Divini illius Magistri*” (December 31, 1929), “*Quadragesimo anno*” (May 15, 1931).

19. See the encyclical of Pius XII “*Summi Pontificatus*” (October 20, 1939) on the spiritual, social and political necessities of the present time; and also the other frequent addresses of the Pope. But for the just concord between the rights of the state and of the individual, which Catholic doctrine protects, see especially Leo XIII, “*Immortale Dei*” (November 2, 1885); “*Libertas*” (June 20, 1888); and Pius XI “*Mit brennender Sorge*” (March 14, 1937).

heavy laden, and I will give you rest (Matt. 11:28).

662. d) Culture, however, which is the noble aspiration of the individual and of society, is fostered splendidly, as history bears witness, by the Christian religion. And “it is far removed from the truth to say that the Church opposes the study of human arts and sciences; on the contrary, she supports and promotes them in many ways. She does not ignore or despise the benefits that human life derives from them. Indeed, she acknowledges that, just as they have come forth from God, the Lord of knowledge, so too, if rightly pursued, they lead to God with the help of his grace” (D 3019).

663. Therefore, accordingly, the internal excellence of Christian doctrine and its transcendent sublimity is absolutely certain, both in comparison with other religions (*relative transcendence*) and considered in itself (*absolute transcendence*).

664. Proof of the minor. *This doctrine, taken adequately, could not be discovered by human ingenuity and diligence alone.* For, from the history of the human race it is certain that it is morally incapable of finding, without divine revelation, in the present condition in which it is, suitable knowledge of natural religion, and much less knowledge of a religion so sublime and pure and adapted to itself.²⁰ It is also right to believe that such a complex of doctrine, in its totality, could not come from some individual person, even someone of great genius. For this view, based on a prudent judgment derived from history, is also morally impossible, at least with morally broad impossibility, as it seems (see n.78). But if anyone considers that *the author of this doctrine was Jesus, who did not study* (John 7:15) and did not attend the schools of the Rabbis, then one immediately sees the disproportion between the effect and the purely natural causes; and with the greatest probability, indeed also with moral certitude it is evident that there was the supernatural intervention of God in favor of this doctrine.

665. For, Jesus did not receive this from Judaism; but he added many things to the Jewish teaching; he also perfected many things from the teaching and prophecies of the O.T. either by illustrating them or by explaining them; and he did it with great certitude and as one *having power* (see n. 459f.). Much less did Jesus receive this from other religions or from the philosophy of the time, which obviously did not have and today does not have such sublimity and purity. Therefore, he had to receive it from the

20. See thesis 4 in the treatise on revelation, n.76ff.

supernatural intervention of God; wherefore also he could say: *My teaching is not mine, but his who sent me* (John 7:16).²¹

666. Objections. 1. The Christian religion does not satisfy the just aspirations of the mind, because *in it the matter is not understood, but believed.*

I deny the antecedent and distinguish the added reason. In it the matter is not understood, but believed: in the next life, *denied*; in the present life, *I subdistinguish*: regarding all truths, *denied*; regarding the mysteries, *I subdistinguish again*: it is not understood what they mean and to a certain extent how they agree with each other, *denied*; they are not fully understood as to their internal reasons, *I subdistinguish again*: so that this is a reasonable submission and very fitting, in order that in the state of probation we can subject our intellect to God when he speaks to us, *conceded*; so that this is something irrational, *denied*.

2. Christian doctrine represents the natural evolution from an imperfect state to a perfect state.

I deny the antecedent. For natural evolution, i.e., having considered the historical laws which are recognized in the evolution of the human race, in religious matters there is a corruption to what is worse, not evolution to what is better. See n. 18.

Furthermore, Christ the Lord did not attend the rabbinic schools, therefore he could not develop the teaching of the Rabbis, besides the popular Jewish thinking; but to this he added so many and such marvelous things and he explained them so sublimely, that it cannot prudently be thought to be a merely natural evolution.

3. The present Christian doctrine is only an evolution of the imperfect doctrine which existed at the time of Christ.

Response. This is what the modernists say. But note that Christ preached a fixed and dogmatic doctrine, as we explained above (n.422), and that the contemporary doctrine of the Catholic religion does not differ from the pristine doctrine, and it has not added substantially anything to it and to the teaching of the Apostles, ambassadors of Jesus, since real dogmatic progress in Christianity has been excluded (on this matter see the thesis in the treatise *On the Church*). Therefore there can be evolution only *in our fuller and more explicit understanding* of the original preaching of the Apostles.

4. Christian doctrine is too *severe* and therefore it is not suited to the needs of the human heart.

Response. Christian doctrine *is not gratuitously severe, but it is pure and sublime*, completely in harmony with natural ethics and the more noble aspirations of man. And this is rightly to be expected in a religious doctrine—that it not give approval to man's lower passions and foster depravity of the heart, but rather that it elevate his tendencies to a higher level.

5. Christian doctrine has little regard for the *natural affections* for country and family; it does not have high regard for the temporal things of business and commerce and

21. This argument was more amply worked out by Ottiger, *Theolog. fundam.* 1,620-628. Also regarding the independence of Christian doctrine in reference to other religions, see Pinard de la Boullaye, *Confer. De Notre-Dame* (1934) V, VI, Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 I.6 p.535ff.; Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.779-782.

it contemns warlike praises; in a word, it teaches people to pray: make us despise all earthly things... Therefore, Christian doctrine does not encourage culture and progress.

Response. Christian doctrine teaches us to consider all these things not as an end in themselves, which is true, but that everything must be subordinated to the final, higher supernatural end; it teaches that this end must be loved above other things, and that the other things are only a means to the final end, and *should be used only inasmuch as they help us to attain that end.* And we must not deny that sometimes the higher end is obtained through the sacrifice of common things. However, it does teach that all things *are to be considered in God and because of God.*—Moreover, what the Christian religion has offered for the institution of the family and for the homeland of peoples, what its monks and missionaries have done even for temporal institutions, what the military orders and peoples attacked by infidels have done gloriously in war to defend themselves... history teaches all of this.

667. Scholium 1. *The value of this criterion.* This internal criterion, based on the examination of Jesus' teaching, *is not just negative* (which would be the case, if the teaching were in conformity only with natural religion and with truth); but it is also a *positive* criterion, because it concludes positively that the teaching was given through the divine intervention of God. But *it is not the primary criterion*, because it does not demonstrate the matter with ease and in a way that is adapted to all, since it demands a lengthy study, and through all Theology and by a comparison with the teaching of the other religions it could go on indefinitely.—However, it does have great value, *as a disposition* to consider the other criteria, and *as a confirmation of them.*

668. Scholium 2. *How the immanentistic argument rejected in n. 138-140 differs from this internal examination of doctrine, inasmuch as it is apt to satisfy the aspirations of the heart.*

In the first place, according to the immanentists, the immanentistic criterion *alone*, without the aid of anything else, can serve and suffices to demonstrate the fact of divine revelation. But here the consideration of the aspirations of the heart and likewise of the suitability of the doctrine to satisfy those aspirations *is not used by itself* as the argument, but additionally the truth and the sublimity of the doctrine are considered. And other arguments and proofs are not excluded.

Furthermore, according to the immanentists the examination of the tendencies of the heart takes place as it were directly, and the doctrine corresponding to them is examined as it were indirectly; in our presentation, the examination of these tendencies occurs indirectly, *but the doctrine itself is examined directly*, and from it we conclude to the miraculous intervention of God. Hence the traditional method of arguing from miracles is not neglected.

ARTICLE II

ON THE WORK OF JESUS OF NAZARETH

Thesis 37. The fruits of holiness flowing from Christian doctrine prove its divine revelation.

Ottiger, *Theolog. fundam.* 1,869-877; Hurter, *Compendium Theolog.* 1.1 (1903) th.19 p.98-102; Müller, *De vera religione*² th.44 p.566-593; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* 1³, 787-800; Lercher, *Theolog. fundam.* (1927) n.236-240; Fr. Luis de Granada, *Introducción del simbolo de la fe* p.2. c.10 (ed. Cuervo) Obras t.6 p.82-90; A. Ehrhard, *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932) 338-352.

669. After the internal criterion of the examination of the doctrine in itself, the next point connected with the internal criterion is the examination of the doctrine itself according as it produces some fruits or effects in those who have accepted it.

These fruits of holiness, which we will now have to treat, are not considered as the fulfillment of the prophecies of Christ (John 4:23; Matt. 13:33), but as a *moral miracle*, i.e., as a fact surpassing the psychological laws by which the customs of men and their activity are governed.

Thus we will have a valid criterion for the proof of the legation and of the religion of Jesus; and although these internal criteria generally are not primary, nothing prevents them from sometimes, namely, when an external miracle clearly shows itself, being considered *accidentally* (as we said in n.157,b) as primary and sufficient.

The power of the present argument in favor of the doctrine and Christian religion, certainly the Catholic religion, is present *in the proof of this miracle*; and *this process is different from the demonstration of the Catholic religion by establishing its note of holiness* (in the treatise *On the Church*); for there an appeal is not made to a miracle, but against the Reformers of the 16th century it is shown that the note of holiness (and the other notes of unity, catholicity and apostolicity) must be part of the true Church and is found only in the Roman Church.

670. The adversaries to be named are those who try to give a natural explanation for the correction of morals and the abundance of good works introduced by Christian doctrine.

671. Doctrine of the Church. *Vatican Council I* considers “*the eminent holiness, and inexhaustible fruitfulness in everything that is good*” of the Church as a motive of credibility and as a testimony of her legation (D 3013); but, as it seems, such a motive, which Vatican I speaks about, is constituted by the propagation, holiness, fruitfulness,

stability and unity of the Church *taken all together*, namely, *from the fact of the Church.*¹

And Pius IX, while reviewing the motives of credibility of faith, mentions how this faith “*is the teacher of life, the guide to salvation, expelling all faults, and in fruitfulness giving birth to and nurturing the virtues... the glory of so many saints, revealing the salutary laws of Christ ... having overcome the deceits of idols... it has illuminated with the light of divine knowledge all peoples... and has subjected them to the most sweet yoke of Christ himself...*” (D 2779).

The Fathers often appealed to this argument (see R, the theological Index at the end, n.29f.; and below n.675ff.).

672. Theological note. This thesis, *taken together with* the propagation, unity and stability of the Church, based on Vatican I (D 3013) must be considered an inviolable argument and it contains *at least Catholic doctrine*. I say “at least,” in case anyone should think that there is no certainty about the intention at Vatican Council I to define the *reasons* why the Church per se is a great and perpetual motive of credibility (see. n.65 in the note). But if the thesis is considered *separately*, its theological note is not sufficiently clear (from D 3013, 2779); but it is *apologetically certain*.

673. Proof. The eminent fruits of holiness and the great improvement of morals flowed from Christian doctrine a) *in individuals*, b) *in domestic society*, c) *in civil society*.

But this required a proportionate cause—supernatural—which cannot be given by God to confirm a doctrine that is said falsely to be revealed.

Therefore the fruits of holiness flowing from Christian doctrine prove its divine revelation.

674. Proof of the minor. a) *The improvement of morals: in individuals.*

1) First of all, the vices of the pagans of that time are considered or *the starting point* from which that change was introduced.

Christian authors speak about the corruption of morals in paganism.

Let us read what St. Paul says (Rom. 1:21-32) about the abominable

1. This was the argument proposed by Cardinal Dechamps, which was accepted by the Vatican Council. Emendation 71, proposed for the previous schema, contained these words: “because of her marvelous propagation, eminent holiness, inexhaustible fruitfulness in all good works, because of catholic unity and invincible stability” then the following was added to it: “the Church per se is a great and perpetual motive of credibility...”—The committee on faith thought that this addition should be admitted “as a beautiful *explanation* of the motive of credibility which is contained in the Church” (CL 7,161.180).

vices of those who, calling themselves wise, became foolish²; there also (v.29-31) he composed a list of sins among the pagans, as he did in a similar way later, when he said that some of the Corinthians had done these things before their conversion: 1 Cor. 6:9-11.

The Fathers also in this matter, as something very evident, frequently contrast the vices of the Gentiles with the virtues of Christians, like Tertullian,³ Cyprian,⁴ Minucius Felix,⁵ Augustine.⁶ In this regard, let us hear Eusebius Caesariensis, recounting the Gentile crimes in various places:

“... thus by his doctrine [our Savior], spread throughout the world, by words and sermons began to attract the ears of men, and it happened continually, so that those who formerly shared in the wild and barbarous customs of all the nations became tame with more gentle and human arrangements. Thus the *Persians*, once they had accepted that discipline, no longer entered into marriage with their mothers. The *Scythians*, since the gospel of Christ also penetrated into their regions, now no longer eat human flesh; and other races of barbarians no longer defile their bed with the incest of daughters and sisters; men are not drawn to other men with a raging storm of desire, and they do not pursue the other urges of the body which violate the laws of nature; they do not expose the cadavers of relatives and friends to dogs and birds, which formerly was their custom; they do not set traps for old men as they did before; according to an ancient rite, they do not grow fat on the flesh of friends after their death; according to the custom of their ancestors, they do not sacrifice men to devils as to gods, and they do not kill their dear ones, after being deluded by a false sense of piety. These certainly are the facts, and many others almost of the same kind, by which formerly the precarious life of men was controlled... [He goes on to recount the immoral things done by *Massagetae*, *Derbices*, *Tibareni*, *Hircani*, *Caspian* and *Bactrii*].”⁷

But not only Christians, as adversaries of the pagans; *the pagans themselves* also acknowledge the obvious relaxation of morals:

Thus Tacitus narrates the state of morals in Rome at the time of Nero: “Moreover gradually the paternal customs were abolished, to be entirely overturned by a borrowed wantonness so that whatever could corrupt or be corrupted, in the city is seen, and the youth is degenerated morally by external works—by exposure in gymnasiums, by idleness and by shameful loves, authorized by the emperor and the senate, who not only

2. Historians write about the vices of the pagans. Regarding pederasty, see Io. Doellinger, *Heidentum und Iudentum* (Regensburg 1857) 1.9, 1.2 n.32ff.; and 1.9,11,4 n.86ff. (among the Greeks and Romans); the French version: *Paganisme et judaisme* (Brussels 1858) t.4,36ff.86ff.

3. *Apolog.* 9.15.46: ML 1,366ff.412ff.566ff.

4. *Epist.* 1,6ff.: ML 4,208ff.

5. *Octav.* 28: ML 3,340ff.

6. *De civitate Dei* 4,23: ML 41,129ff.

7. *Praepar. Evangel.* 1,4: MG 21,40f.

permitted this licentiousness, but also encouraged it.”⁸

Thus it came about, because of the luxury and riches coming from the political prosperity, that they fell into this corruption. As Juvenal wrote: “Now we are suffering from the evils of a long peace. We are more rugged when under arms.—Luxury overburdens us, and our way of living punishes the world.—No crime is lacking, and there are the bad deeds of wantonness, from which—Roman virtue perishes...—At first filthy money brought in foreign morals.—It brought them in, and shameful persons destroyed the world with their debauchery.—Riches bring in softness....”⁹

And Seneca said: “All are full of wickedness and vices: more things are done than can be healed by restraint. There is a struggle with a huge fight of wickedness: today there is a greater desire of sinning, while there is less sense of shame. Since respect has been lost for what is better and more fair, however it is viewed, wantonness takes over. The crimes are not now done in secret: they are done before our eyes; and so wickedness has gone public, and it has grown strong in the hearts of all, so that innocence is not just rare—it is non-existent.”¹⁰

675. 2) Above all, the ecclesiastical writers bear witness to the good moral state that resulted from conversion; they would not have appealed so strongly to the virtues of the Christians, unless they were very obvious, so that they could generate faith in their own cause.

Acts 4:32-37 bear witness to the harmony and voluntary poverty of the Christians of the first church.

St. Paul extols the good things conferred on Christians by their conversion: 1 Cor. 6:11; Eph. 2:1-10.

Among the other ecclesiastical authors, first of all let us hear the summary contained in the *Letter to Diognetus* (2nd century), extolling the virtues of Christians through beautiful contrasts:

“Christians... live each in his native land—but as though they were not really at home there. They share in all duties like citizens and suffer all hardships like strangers. Every foreign land is for them a fatherland and every fatherland a foreign land. They marry like the rest of men and beget children, but they do not abandon the babies that are born. They share a common board, but not a common bed. In the flesh as they are, they do not live according to the flesh. They dwell on earth, but they are citizens of heaven. They obey the laws that men make, but their lives are better than the laws. They love all men, but are persecuted by all. They are unknown, and yet they are condemned. They are put to death, yet are more alive than ever. They are paupers, but they make many rich. They lack all things, and yet in all things they abound. They are dishonored, yet glory in their dishonor. They are maligned, and yet are vindicated. They are reviled,

8. See regarding these vices, Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theolog. fundam.* 22, n.484. They are treated more at length in Doellinger, *op.cit.*, and by the historians.

9. *Satir.* 6,292-300.

10. *De ira* 2,8,

and yet they bless. They suffer insult, yet they pay respect, they do good, yet are punished with the wicked. When they are punished, they rejoice, as though they were getting more of life. In a word, what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world.”¹¹

St. Justin also extols the marvelous change of morals:

“Formerly we rejoiced in debaucheries, now we embrace bodily purity alone; also those of us who used the arts of magic have consecrated ourselves to the good God; those of us who followed the ways of money and possessions, now donate for common use the things we possess and share them with the indigent; those who were fighting with mutual hatred and killing and with those who did not belong to our class of people we did not have common association because of diverse customs, now, after Christ has appeared, we live together and we pray for our enemies....”¹²

676. Likewise many other testimonies could be cited, which other authors have handed down to us, like St. Clement of Rome,¹³ Athenagoras,¹⁴ Tertullian,¹⁵ Minucius Felix,¹⁶ Lactantius,¹⁷ St. Cyprian,¹⁸ St. Augustine.¹⁹

677. Similarly from the profane authors, like Plinius Minor, who in writing to Trajan gave the reason why the Christians gathered before daylight: “to sing a song together to Christ as to a god and they bind themselves by an oath not to do something wicked, but that they should not commit theft or robbery or adultery, that they might not lose their faith, that they might not refuse to return a deposit to its owner.”²⁰ Also Lucianus, dealing with the death of a foreigner, reports about the charity of Christians.²¹ Likewise Julian the Apostate; for since “he thought that the religion of the Christians is greatly to be commended because of the life and morals of those who follow it,” wishing to obtain a similar effect, wrote to Arsacius, a Gentile priest in Galatia, asking why they do not pay attention to “what the Christian religion chiefly promotes: namely, kindness towards strangers, and careful diligence in burying the dead, and feigned [!] gravity of morals. I think that we should practice each one of these good things... For it was a disgrace among the Jews that anyone should go begging; *but that the impious Galileans,*

11. *Epist. ad Diognetum* c.5f.: MG 2,1173-1176; R 97.

12. *Apolog.* 1,14: R 118. See also *ibid.*, c.15: R 119.

13. *Epist. I ad Cor* c.1:2.45: MG 1,208-212.320.

14. *Legatio pro Christianis* n.11.12: MG 6,912-916.

15. *Apolog.* 44: ML 1,560-563.

16. *Octav.* 31: ML 3,349-353. And elsewhere, c.38: “... we condemn the arrogance of the philosophers, whom we know to be corruptors and adulterers and tyrants; and we always speak out against their vices. We prefer a wisdom not of appearance, but of the mind. We do not say great things, but we are living. We glory in the fact that we have obtained what they have sought with supreme effort and have not been able to find it” (ML 3,372f.).

17. *Instit. divin.* 3,26: ML 6,431-433.

18. *Epist.* 60,3: ML 4,371f.; *Epist.* 61,2: ML 4,373f.

19. *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae* c.30-33 (belle): ML 32,1336ff.

20. *Epist.* 1.10 96: Kch 30.

21. *Luciani opera* ed. Dindorf (Didot) (Paris 1840) n.12f. p.69.

besides their own poor, also should nourish ours...."²²

678. 3) *Among the special virtues*, which in those dark days of corruption shone forth, and which being formerly unknown were illustrious with a brilliant light, the ones that can be mentioned are: *love of neighbors as brothers and the love of enemies, love of God, chastity and virginity....*

Special documents and individual manifestations can be quoted about these virtues.

Concerning the charity of Christians, St. Augustine wrote: "Charity especially is observed; food is adapted to charity—and talk to charity, clothing to charity, the countenance to charity; it assembles and is united in one charity: to violate this is thought to be like offending God; if anything is opposed to it, it is overcome and ejected; if anything offends this, it is not allowed to continue for one day. Thus they know that it has been recommended by Christ and the Apostles, so that if this one thing is lacking, there is emptiness; if it is present, everything is full."²³

On the fraternity among Christians in doing works of mercy, in giving and distributing alms, in offering hospitality, in helping very remote communities, in fostering truly fraternal relations—the historians write about these things and they proclaim that it is something truly marvelous.²⁴

679. *On the love of enemies*, Athenagoras rightly observed: "Therefore what are the teachings by which we are nourished? *I say to you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven...* (Matt. 5:44). Through you in this place it is permitted for me, while pleading my cause before kings and philosophers, to speak more freely in a loud voice that will be heard. For who is there among them who construct syllogisms and clarify ambiguous sayings, and explains the words contained in them; or of those who teach what homonyms and synonyms are, and predicaments and axioms, and what a subject is and what a predicate is, and promise that they will make us happy hearers of these and similar discourses; who, I ask, among them lives so purely and innocently, that not only do they not hate their enemies, but also love them, and those whom formerly they cursed, now not only do not curse, which would seem to be quite moderate, but also bless them and pray for them who plot against their own life?... But amongst us you will find unskilled men and artisans and old women; if they can, they offer with fewer words assistance, which follows from our teaching, and with deeds they will give the assistance which springs from their own good intentions. For they do not just utter words, but they rightly manifest

22. In Zozomenon, *Hist. eccles.* 5,26: MG 67,1261-1264.

23. *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae* c.33 n.73: ML 32,1341. And Tertullian says this: "But the practice of this kind of love marks us indelibly in the eyes of some: *See, they say, how they love one another...*" (*Apolog.* 39: ML 1,534).

24. See Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*⁴ (Leipzig 1924) I 1.2; P. Batiffol, *La Iglesia primitiva y el catolicismo* (French version by Ph. Robies Dégano, Freiburg Br. 1912) c.1 III, p.23f.

deeds; they do not seek revenge against persecutors, they do not sue those who steal from them, they give to those who ask, they love their neighbor as themselves."²⁵

680. But such love of neighbor, which is sublime, originates from the love of God.

The love of God was so unknown among the Gentiles that Aristotle wrote: "For it would be strange, if someone said that he loves Jupiter."²⁶ Likewise Cotta asks in a work of Cicero: "Whether anyone, because he is a good man, ever gave thanks to the gods."²⁷ But that which Christians have offered out of the purest love, the martyrs have borne witness to by the shedding of their blood; later we are going to speak about this (n.740ff.), since martyrdom as imitation of Christ, as union with Christ is thought to be the ideal of perfection.²⁸ The virgins also bear witness to this—a subject that we will now consider.

681. *Virginity and chastity* have always been highly esteemed by Christians. Tertullian said very well: "For after that, by condemning a Christian woman to a procurer (Latin: *lenonem*), rather than to a lion (*leonem*), you have admitted that the loss of chastity among us is thought to be more terrible than any punishment and any death."²⁹

Virginity is seen as the ideal and as the state of perfection.³⁰—The triumph obtained by Christianity from the universal and severe suffering, and this also in the midst of the allurements of the world, which continues and is verified today—this is light in the darkness, great purity in the midst of a wicked and perverse nation....

682. 4) *But one should not think that all of these things were only pristine and remote, but in no way present today and contemporary.* For, the entire history of the of the Roman Catholic Church shows that in all ages there have been outstanding examples of holiness. Consider the *monastic life* diffused far and wide by the Church³¹; consider the *Catholic priesthood* dedicated to celibacy, so that they can seek God as their portion and inheritance, and pursue those things that pertain to Christ and the Church; consider *the military orders* who defended ecclesiastical property courageously and devoutly; consider *the mendicant orders* who enhanced their preaching by the example of poverty; consider *the other religious orders* engaged in different tasks and works of mercy—

25. *Legatio pro Christianis* 2: MG 6,912f.

26. *Magn. Moral.* 2,11,6.

27. *De natura deorum* 3,36.

28. See M. Viller-K.Rahner, *Ascese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1939) c.2; J. Madoz, *El amor a Jesucristo en la Iglesia de los mártires*: EstEc 12 (1953) 313-344.

29. *Apolog.* 50: ML 1,603.

30. See M. Viller-K.Rahner, *Ascese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* c.3; and the beautiful things said by F. Vizmanos, S.J., *Las virgenes cristianas de la Iglesia primitiva* (Madrid 1949) throughout the entire book; but for the apologetic value from this fact of virginity, see especially p.47-84.

31. M. Viller-K.Rahner, *Ascese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* c.5-8.

whether care of the sick, or of the education of the poor and ignorant, or of other works for the glory of God in their homeland or in foreign countries, and so missions, leper colonies, etc. Indeed you can also add to that the *religious congregations* and *secular institutes*...: all of these manifest the vibrant sanctifying power of the Church and of the evangelical teaching about the counsels.

Add to the above the men and virgins who have dedicated their lives to contemplation and penance, to serving the poor and the homeless, motivated by zeal for souls and also going to the remotest parts of the earth... Add to this the lay people collaborating with the hierarchy in the apostolate with a sense of self-denial and dedication... And from all races and states of life consider the many canonized saints, even in the most recent times.³²

Anyone who considers these points will really confess that a wonderful and absolutely extraordinary holiness flows from the teaching of Christ.

683. b) *The improvement of morals in domestic society.*³³ *The starting point* from which a change took place *concerning children* is certain from the statements of the ancients. Thus Aristotle said: "Let there be a law of destroying and nourishing infants, so that nothing deformed or weak is kept. However, because of the large number of children some infants should be destroyed, unless the laws of the people forbid it: for the number of children allowed to live must be determined. But if some children are conceived beyond what is desired, it is best to have an abortion before the fetus attains sensation and full life."³⁴ And so *Lycurgus* introduced this practice among the Greeks.

But among the Romans the *Law of the twelve tablets* had this: "The father should kill quickly a seriously deformed child."³⁵ And Seneca said: "We do away with monstrous infants, and also children, if they become weak and deformed we drown them: not out of anger, but the reason is to separate the useless children from the healthy."³⁶

684. *But the final state* of the change brought about by Christianity is anticipated in the words of Jesus about the diligence and example with which the children in a family are to be treated. And Jesus gave a singular example of this: Mark 10:14; Matt. 18:5-15... and parallels. But consider

32. See C. Kempf, S.J., *Die Heiligkeit der Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert* (and the version from the 7th German edition) (Einsiedeln 1927) where the multitude of saints, blessed and servants of God is presented... Charismatic holiness, inasmuch as it is an *ordinary* indication of moral holiness, was always and is now present in the Church. See on this matter the thesis in the treatise *On the Church* and Batiffol, *op. cit.*, c. I III, p.21f.

33. See Tanqueray, *Synopsis Theolog. fundam.*²² n.485.

34. *Politic.* 7,14,10.

35. Tab.IV.

36. *De ira* 1,15.

what abnegation of nuns and religious the Catholic Church manifests *in the education of children*—both in Catholic areas and in the missions. With what solicitude the Catholic Church provides the things that concern the education of the already baptized; finally with what efficacy also *in young people the grace of a mature holiness* among Catholics is evident; it is not hard for anyone to see this.

685. *Concerning wives*, a firmer permanence to the bond of marriage has been given by Christianity; *polygamy has been done away with*, and so better provision has been made for the dignity of women.

Concerning slaves, the ancient fault of pagans has been noted. But the Christian religion at first tried to moderate the practice. It advised kindness in the treatment of slaves and then the freeing of them by their masters; finally it was able to abolish slavery.³⁷ Today servants are considered part of the family.

The Church elevated pristine slaves to the priesthood, indeed to the supreme pontificate (St. Callixtus); it also made manual labor recognized as something noble.

686. c) *On the improvement of morals in civil society.* It has been noted how much the Christian religion contributed abundantly to *civil society*³⁸; also how it promoted the genuine freedom of subjects in opposition to tyranny and despotism; how it introduced charity *as opposed to the cruelty of men without mercy* who in games and circuses made a spectacle of other human beings; how it developed a true and genuine *law of the nations*, or international law, based on Christian teaching and philosophy and rejected hostile relations; and also how the Church has never ceased to promote *works of beneficence and social works*.

687. Proof of the minor. *All of these things suppose the help of God surpassing the common course of nature, which is supernatural help.* For, philosophy and the other religions never provided such lofty works. And that is not surprising. For, if supernatural help is required in the present plan of divine providence for most people in order to have at least suitable *knowledge* of natural religion, much more help of this kind will be required for the *praxis* of natural religion; and much more for such a *consistent praxis* which has been and is found in the large number of those who have

37. The history of slavery and how the Church gradually abolished it is amply covered by P. Allard, *Esclavage*: DAFC 1,1457-1522. Also by the same author, *Los esclavos cristianos*, translated from the 4th French edition (Madrid).

38. On this question see Leo XIII, "*Immortale Dei*" (November 2, 1885).

embraced Christian doctrine.

In this lofty practice of Christian doctrine and in the fruits of holiness produced by it, *consider the equilibrium and harmony in associating the different virtues that to a certain extent are opposed to each other*. Surely this is even more sublime and more difficult: namely, how austerity of life is joined great joy, prudence with simplicity, obedience with dignity, humility with magnanimity, firmness with pleasantness, goodness with efficiency....

Fruits of holiness of this kind, in spite of good desires and attempts,³⁹ are not at all found where Christian doctrine is not cultivated (for when did philosophy or the other religions accomplish such sublime fruits?). Hence we argue rightly to the moral impotence of the great multitude left to themselves to reach this kind of holiness.⁴⁰

Indeed also the consideration of only one Christian virtue, like the *chastity and virginity of so many men and women*, who like a triumphant army have overcome and still do overcome themselves and a hostile world in order to make a perpetual sacrifice out of a lofty love, certainly cannot be explained on the basis of natural powers alone.

Therefore if such fruits of holiness are found elsewhere, it must be supposed that the supernatural help of God is there. But this help cannot be offered in confirmation of a teaching which is falsely said to be revealed. With reason therefore Origen said: "Who ever said that he was led by deception to amend his life and daily to diminish his malice more and more?"⁴¹; and again: "There are so many men in the Church who witnesses of the Divinity [of Christ], who have turned away from the filth of vices and dedicate themselves totally to the Creator, and they strive to please him in all things."⁴²

688. Objections. 1. There are those who deny the fact of holiness in the Catholic religion, especially in some individuals and societies, or at some times.

I bypass this now: We do not have to defend the fact that the Church is holy; this will take place later (in another treatise); our task is to explain *the fact of some holiness*, which is an argument in favor of supernatural assistance.

I respond also with Tertullian: those who act badly, do not act according to Christian teaching, but against Christian precepts. And "it is necessary in the body, inasmuch as you want it to be integral and pure, that nevertheless a mole may appear, or a small wart, or dark freckles. Such purified serenity rules in the sky that it is not disturbed by

39. The words of *Medea* in the *Metamorph.* 1.7 v.18-21 are well known: "If I were able, I would be more sensible, but a hidden force draws me against my will, and so I desire something else, my mind urges something else. *I see what is better and I approve of it, but I do what is worse....*"

40. Actually, even in individual persons a change takes place through the supernatural assistance of internal grace. But ordinarily we cannot appeal to this, because from the point of view of apologetics we are not aware of its existence; therefore for apologetics it is allowed to refer to it only to the extent that the divine supernatural assistance *manifests itself externally*. But ordinarily this becomes manifest only *for the large multitude*, but not when one is dealing with individual persons.

41. *Contra Celsum* 2,50: MG 11,876 C.

42. *Contra Celsum* 1,47: MG 11,748 B; see also on this whole matter the words in Eph. 2:1-10.

the presence of a small cloud...."⁴³

2. The fact of some holiness does not prove supernatural assistance, v.gr., from the virginity of many; for the pagans also had *vestal virgins*.

Response. "The vestal virgins should not be contrasted with Christian virgins; for 1) the former were few in number (at first 4, then 6), the latter are innumerable; the virginity of the former was rewarded with honors and privileges, but the latter were exposed to injuries and martyrdom; 3) the virginity of the former was not perpetual; after a certain amount of time (after age 30) they could enter into marriage; that of the latter was perpetual; 4) the virginity of the former was forced and protected with penalties, but that of the latter was fully spontaneous and exposed to many difficulties."⁴⁴

But to those six vestal virgins set in contrast, if you please, the multitude of so many priests and religious, men and women, who observe voluntary and perpetual chastity....

43. Tertullian, *Adversus nationes* 1,5: ML 1,635.

44. Hurter, *Compendium Theolog. dogmat.* I¹¹ n.87, 3 p.99. See also F. Vizmanos, *Las virgenes cristianas* 68-84.

Thesis 38. The marvelous propagation of the Christian religion confirms its divine origin.

S.Th. *Contra Gentes* 1,6; Wilmers, *De vera religione* 1.4 c.2 a.2; Ottiger, *Theolog. Fundam.* 1,850-869; Müller, *De vera religione* th.43; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* 1³, 773-787; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.9; Garriou-Lagrange, *De revelatione*⁵ 2,256-264; Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* 2,611-617; Muncunill, *De vera religione* n.518-534; J. Rivière, *La propagation du Christianisme dans les trois premiers siècles* (Paris 1907); Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1932) V.

689. *This propagation* here is not understood a) as the fulfillment of the prophecies of Christ¹; nor b) as the testimony of a great multitude concerning the historical facts, whose sufficient reason cannot be anything but the objective truth of the things witnessed to; but c) it is considered as a *moral miracle*, inasmuch as without the proportionate natural means there is the fact surpassing the psychological laws of customs by which the activity of men are governed. But we are going to consider especially *the first three centuries*, up until the peace of Constantine (314), because the obstacles then existing and almost the lack of any external human assistance shows very clearly the necessity of divine supernatural assistance.

This classical argument is found in the earliest apologists; they considered three important points contained in it, namely, fulfilled prophecies, testimony to the truth, and miracles.²

This criterion, which we have now selected, in order to prove the divine legation of Jesus, *seems to agree with the internal criterion of the teaching* by the examination of its effects, which we covered recently in the consideration of the fruits of holiness produced by that teaching; namely, the astonishing propagation of Christian teaching, especially its theoretical and practical acceptance, *which can be conceived as the manner of the fruits and effects* which took place because of the teaching itself.

690. The adversaries are the *rationalists*, who try to explain in a natural way this fact of the extraordinary expansion, which being clearer than daylight cannot be denied. Thus E. Gibbon, Lecky, F.C. Bauer...,³ and also: Renan, Harnack.

E. Renan says rather that it is surprising that the Christian religion took such a long time to conquer the Roman Empire.⁴

Harnack tries to explain the expansion through different elements of the religious

1. See Matt. 8:11; 13:32; 28:18-20; John 12:32....

2. On this argument in the Fathers, see Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.9 prenote n.2 (p.330). See also St. Chrysostom, *Quod Christus sit Deus* n.12ff.: MG 48,829ff.

In general, the propagation of the faith in the course of all ages is treated by A. Brou, *Propagation de l'Évangile*: DAFC 4,362-386.

3. E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* t.2 (Paris 1840) c.15; Wilmers, n.499 p.506. Lecky, *History of European Morals* t.1 c.3 p.386f.; Tanqueray²³, 307; F.C. Bauer, *Das Christentum und die Kirche der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte* 449; Wilmers, n.508-517, p.515-525.

4. See *Les Apôtres* c.19, p.366ff.; *Marc-Aurèle* c.25, p.585; Wilmers, p.515-528.

teaching, namely, a) through monotheism; b) through the good news or through the gospel of Jesus—a gospel of love and good will; c) through the many different aspects under which that religion could be considered; d) through its amazing capacity for adaptation. Thus it was a simple religion for simple people and peasants; it was to be admired by wise intellectuals; it attracted all because of its benevolence and charity... Hence he wants to conclude that Christianity was a *syncretism* which used to its own advantage all the powers of the world and the preparation already made by the other religions: thus, by abandoning Jewish nationalism, it attracted to itself diverse peoples; thus it appropriated to itself the elements of worship from other religions and also Hellenic philosophy.⁵... Therefore, this is not the problem: how Christianity won over so many Greeks and Romans that it might become a larger and more powerful religion; but it should be put this way: how it formed and developed itself so that it might become a universal and exclusive religion; the history of dogmas and worship answer this question, not just the history of the missions at that time....⁶

691. Doctrine of the Church. *Vatican Council I* considers “the marvelous propagation” of the Church as *a great and perpetual motive of credibility* (D 3013); but, as it seems, such a motive is combined from the propagation, holiness, fruitfulness, stability, and unity of the Church, *taken all together; namely, from the fact of the Church.*⁷

Pius IX, while giving a beautiful enumeration of the arguments to prove that *the Christian faith is the work of God*, has this to say: “This faith... every day... acquiring greater strength, has pervaded the whole earth, land and sea, from the rising to the setting of the sun, under the one standard of the Cross...” (D 2779).

692. Theological note. If this thesis is taken together with the other elements of holiness and stability... of the Church, it is *at least Catholic doctrine.*⁸

The thesis taken separately is *apologetically certain* and venerable in the tradition of Apologetics.

693. Proof. The Christian religion was propagated a) *with great geographical expansion and at the same time in numbers*; b) *in every class of society*, c) *rapidly*, d) *in the midst of grave obstacles.*

But this is an argument for a proportionate supernatural cause, which

5. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*⁴ (Leipzig 1924) t.21.4 c.4 (*Ergebnisse*) p.957; t.1 l.2 *Schlussbetrachtung* 324-331.

6. *Ibid.*, t.1 l.3 *Schlussbetrachtung* 527. See L. de Grandmaison, *L'expansion du Christianisme d'après M. Harnack*: Et 96 (1903) 300-329, 451-476.

7. See what we said above in n. 671.

8. See what we say in n.672, where we consider *the theological note*.

cannot be given by God in confirmation of a false revealed religion.

Therefore the marvelous propagation of the Christian religion confirms its divine origin.

694. Proof of the major. a) *Geographical expansion together with large numbers.*⁹ *During the time of the Apostles.* The expansion of the Christian religion is certain from the Acts of the Apostles *in Jerusalem and to Samaria, Damascus and Antioch*, where for the first time the disciples were called “Christians” (Acts 11:26); likewise *to Asia...*; and *the journeys of St. Paul* are narrated so that it would be possible to say: *from Jerusalem and as far round as Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ* (Rom. 15:19). And when writing to the Romans he said: *Your faith is proclaimed in all the world...* (Rom. 1:8; see the same idea in Col. 1:6.23) and to the same Romans he says that he is going to travel to Spain (Rom. 15:28) in order to preach there. He also wrote letters to Christian communities very remote geographically, namely, to the *Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians*; likewise to Titus, the bishop on the island of *Crete*; and he also mentions the communities in *Macedonia and in Achaia* (1 Thess. 1:7f.).

St. Peter wrote to “the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia” (1 Pet. 1:1).

St. John wrote to “the seven churches that are in Asia” and he directed the book of Revelation “to Ephesus and to Smyrna and to Pergamum and to Thyatira and to Sardis and to Philadelphia and to Laodicea” (Rev. 1:4.11).

The dispersion of the Apostles is certain from the *History* of Eusebius: “Thomas, as has been handed down to us, chose Parthia, Matthew Ethiopia, Bartholomew India, Andrew Scythia, John Asia, so he lived and died in Ephesus; Peter selected Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and the other neighboring provinces...”¹⁰

With this geographical diffusion there was also *an extraordinary increase in numbers*: Thus in Jerusalem at the beginning there were 120 (Acts 1:15), 3,000 (Acts 2:41), 5,000 *men* (Acts 4:4); afterwards the number of men and women believing in the Lord continued to increase (Acts 5:14)... And the elders said to Paul: “You see, brother, how many *thousands* (Greek *μυριάδες*) there are among the Jews of those who have believed” (Acts 21:20).

But in *Rome* there was a “great multitude” of Christians, about whom

9. This extension is treated more at length by H. Leclercq, *Expansion du Christianisme*: DACL 5,978-1014. On the number of Christians at the beginning of the 4th century, see L. Hertling, S.J., *Die Zahl der Christen zu Beginn des vierten Jahrhunderts*: ZkathTh 58 (1934) 243-253.

10. *Hist. eccles.* 3,1: Kch 428. See *Hist. eccles.* 5,10,3: R 660.

Tacitus speaks, when he wrote about the martyrs in the time of Nero¹¹; and as St. Clement of Rome says: "Besides these men who lived such holy lives [Peter and Paul], there was a great multitude of the elect who suffered many outrages because of jealousy and became a shining example among us."¹²

695. *During the post-apostolic time* (2nd century) a great diffusion is apparent from the way of speaking of the authors:

Thus, in Bithynia about the years 111-113 the greatest part was Christian, since *Pliny* consulted Trajan about the Christians "especially because of the dangerous number of them. For, many of every age, of every class, of both sexes are brought to trial and will be brought. The contagion of this superstition has pervaded not only the cities, but also the villages and countryside...."¹³

In the *Letter to Diognetus* (2nd century) a summary of this matter is given: "What the soul is to the body, this is what the Christians are *to the world*..."¹⁴

St. Justin in the year 155 said: "Now it is evident that no one can terrify or subdue us *who have believed in Jesus over all the world*..."¹⁵ And again, by applying to Christians *the prophecy of Malachi, about every place in the world* where the sacrifice will be offered (Mal. 1:11): "For there is absolutely no race either of barbarians, or Greeks, or however they are called, or of Scythians who live in wagons, or nomads who lack homes, or tent-dwellers who pasture their flocks, there is no nation, I say, in which there are not prayers and thanksgiving offered to the Father and Creator of the universe though the name of Jesus crucified..."¹⁶

And St. Irenaeus in the same century extolled the unity of the preaching and tradition of the Church in the whole world: "For, although the languages of the world are dissimilar, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. For the churches which have been planted in Germany do not believe or hand down anything different, nor do those in Spain, nor those in Gaul, nor those in the East, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those which have been established in the central regions of the world. But as the sun, that creature of God, is one and the same throughout the whole world, so also the preaching of the truth *shines everywhere*, and enlightens all men that are willing to

11. "At first those who confessed it were rebuked, then it became clear that a great multitude of them without being convicted of the crime of the burning of the city gained the hatred of the human race..." (*Annal.* 15,44: Kch 34).

12. *Epist. 1 ad Cor* 6,1: R 11.

13. *Epistularum liber* 10,96: Kch 30; see above n.380,1.

14. *Epist. ad Diognetum* 6,1: R 97; Kch 97; above n. 675.

15. *Dialog. cum Tryphone* 110: R 144.

16. *Ibid.* 117,9: Kch 59.

come to a knowledge of the truth....”¹⁷

But from the *Acts of the martyrdom of Carpus, Papyrus, Agathonians* (probably between the year 161 and 180), Papyrus was interrogated: “The Proconsul said: Do you have children? Papyrus answered: Indeed, very many through God. Then someone from the crowd cried out and said: Because of his Christian faith he says that he has many children... The Proconsul said: Why do you lie and say that you have children? Papyrus said: Do you want to know that I do not lie, but speak the truth? *In every province and city I have children through God....*”¹⁸

Then from the controversy at the end of the 2nd century *about the time of the Paschal celebration* it is certain that there were 5 provincial synods.¹⁹

Finally, Tertullian in the year 197, in his *Apologetics*, was able to write eloquently: “We are but of yesterday, yet we have filled every place among you—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, marketplaces, camps, tribes, town councils, the palace, the senate, the forum; we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods. For what war would we not have been fit and ready, even though unequally matched in military strength...? ... Without a doubt, you would have been exceedingly frightened at your loneliness, at the silence of your surroundings, and the stupor, as it were, of a dead world. You would have had to look around for people to rule; there would have been more enemies than citizens left to you.”²⁰ And the same Tertullian also said: “... there are more [Christians] than can be counted. They cry out that the city has been occupied, that there are Christians in the fields, in the fortresses, in the islands....”²¹

696. In the 3rd century the same Tertullian, writing *Against the Jews* (in the time between 200-206) recalled the preaching of the Apostles, so that the sound of their voice went out to the whole world, and their words to the ends of the earth (Ps. 19:5; see Rom. 10:18), and “so that now there are varieties of Gatulians and the many territories of the Mauritorians, all the limits of the Spaniards, and the diverse nations of the Gauls and the areas of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans, but all are subject to Christ; and the lands of the Sarmatians and the Dacians and Germans and Scythians and the inhabitants of many nations, and of many provinces and islands unknown to us” believe in Christ.²²

And by the year 212 in Africa the major part was Christian: “Though our numbers are so great—constituting all but the majority in every city—we conduct ourselves so quietly and modestly....”²³

It also seemed to Origen to be a wondrous matter, as he wrote at the middle of the 3rd century in his book, *Contra Celsum*: “Could it have come to pass without divine

17. *Adversus haereses* 1,10,2f.; R 192; Kch 104f. See *ibid.*, 1,10,1: R 191.

18. Kch 83f.

19. See Kch 91-101.

20. *Apolog.* 37: R 279.

21. *Apolog.* 1: Kch 165f.

22. *Adversus iudaeos* 7,4-7: Kch 07.

23. *Ad Scapulam* 2: R 369.

assistance, that Jesus, desiring during these years to spread abroad his words and teaching, should have been so successful, that everywhere throughout the world, not a few persons, Greeks as well as Barbarians, learned as well as ignorant, adopted his doctrine, so that they struggled even to death in its defense, rather than deny it, which no one is ever related to have done for any other system?...²⁴

Harnack himself proves the great diffusion of Christianity in the 3rd century; as conclusion of his study, he distinguished for the beginning of the 4th century different categories or the various regions regarding the spread of Christianity:

1) Regions where the Christian religion *had almost half the population and more extension and influence*: all of Asia, with a few exceptions; Thrace, Armenia, Cyprus probably, Edessa.

2) Regions where *a notable part of the citizens were Christian, and exercised influence on the direction and cultural life of the community*, and at the same time could very well oppose the other religions: Antioch and Coele Syria, Alexandria with Egypt and Thebais, Rome and some parts of southern and central Italy, proconsular Africa and Numidia (unless they belong in the first category), southern Spain, the coast of Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia and the islands; likewise the maritime regions of Gaul with the Rhone valley.

3) Provinces in which Christianity was propagated less, as far as we know: Palestine in the countryside, Phoenicia, Arabia, some parts of Mesopotamia, the interior parts of Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia, Epirus, Dardania, Dalmatia, Moesia, Pannonia; the northern and interior parts of central Italy, and the upper eastern part of Italy; southern Gaul, and the regions near the Roman roads and in their large cities up to Belgium, Germany and Rhetia; Mauritania and Tripoli; some parts of Spain that do not belong to the preceding category.

4) To the fourth category belong those regions in which, as far as we can know (from a careful and detailed investigation), there were few Christians: thus the cities of Philistia, the northern coasts of the Black Sea; the western part of upper Italy; northern and central Gaul; Belgium, Germany, Rhetia, except those belonging to the third category.—Likewise outside of the Roman provinces: Persia, India, Scythia, and perhaps western Persia is to be added to the third category.²⁵

697. b) *The social diffusion*. Already above Tertullian and Origen have spoken about this in their testimonies.

But in particular some courtiers were already mentioned by St. Paul: *All the saints greet you, especially those of Caesar's household* (Phil. 4:22); and in his letter to the Romans he mentions many nobles. Mention

24. *Contra Celsum* (in the year 248) 1,26: R 516. On the number of clerics in the Roman Church at the middle of the century, see Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6,43,11ff.; Kch 255. And on the state of the Church before the persecution of Diocletian (a. 303), see Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 8,1: Kch 444.

25. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentum*⁴ t.2 l.4 c.4 (*Ergebnisse*) 949-953.

is made of *Acilius Glabrio and Flavius Clemens*,²⁶ whose wife *Domatilla* was related to Domitian.²⁷ And others are mentioned, like *Carpophorus*, a faithful man from the family of Caesar whose slave, *Callixtus*, later was Pope.²⁸

Without doubt many poor people were evangelized; but also the rich and noble, besides those cited above, the proconsul *Sergius Paulus* (Acts 13:7-12); and from the Jews “a great many of the priests” (Acts 6:7), like *Crispus* (Acts 18:8); likewise *Apollos* (Acts 18:24ff)... From the Greeks *Dionysius the Areopagite* (Acts 17:34... Likewise *Pomponia Graecina*²⁹ and many others, as the funereal inscriptions in the cemetery of Callixtus sufficiently indicate.³⁰

Among *soldiers* those cited are, besides *Cornelius* (Acts 10:1ff.), *Legio*,³¹ *Marinus a centurion*,³² *Nereus and Achilles*,³³ *Marcellus, Maximilian, Theodore, the 40 martyrs of Sebaste, Julian, Sebastian*...

Learned men were not lacking, like *Dionysius the Areopagite, Clement of Rome, Quadratus, Aristides, Justin, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian*... and all the apologists. Thus St. Jerome could write: “Therefore let Celsus, Porphyry, Julian—mad dogs opposed to Christ—learn, and let their followers learn (who think that the Church had no philosophers or orators, no doctors) what great and worthy men founded her, built her up and adorned her; and let them cease to argue that our faith appeals only to peasant simplicity, and let them rather admit their own ignorance.”³⁴

698. c) *All of these things happened quickly or in a short space of time. This is certain from the many testimonies already cited, like that of Origen*,³⁵ and from the whole early Christian history. Therefore it is also celebrated by the apologists, when they refer to our present argument.

Thus Arnobius (+ ca. 327) praises this motive of credibility: “Do not even these proofs at least give you faith to believe, namely, that already, in so short and brief a time, the oaths of this vast army have spread abroad over all the earth? That already there is no nation so rude and fierce that it has not, changed by His love, subdued its fierceness, and with tranquility hitherto unknown, become mild in disposition: that men endowed with so great abilities, orators, critics, rhetoricians, lawyers, and physicians, those, too, who pry into the mysteries of philosophy, seek to learn these things, despising those in

26. Suetonius, *Vita Domitiani* 10,2; 15,1: Kch 43f.

27. Dio Cassius, *Historia Romana* 67,14: Kch 226.

28. See Hippolytus Romanus, *Philosophumena* 9,12: Kch 228.

29. See Tacitus, *Annal.* 13,32: Kch 32.

30. See P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions* 191; Dorsch, 777.

31. See Tertullian, *Apolog.* 5,8-12: Kch 177.

32. See Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 7,15: Kch 441.

33. See *Epigramma Damasi*: Kch 585.

34. *De viris illustribus Prolog.*: ML 23,634.

35. *Contra Celsum* 1,26: R 516; above n.696.

which but now they trusted?"³⁶

Wherefore also St. Jerome, exulting, proclaimed the Christian triumph: "Paganism endures loneliness even in the city. The gods formerly of the nations have remained with the owls alone up on the roofs. The standards of soldiers now bear the sign of the cross. An image of this salutary yoke adorns the purple robes of kings and the shining gems of their diadems. Now the Egyptian Serapis has become Christian. Marnas of Gaza [a deity], having been abandoned, weeps and greatly fears the destruction of his temple. From India, Persia, Ethiopia daily we hear about crowds of monks. Armenia has put down her quivers, the Huns are learning the Psalter, the cold regions of the Scythians are glowing with the warmth of faith: the red and yellow army of the Gaetulians surrounds the tents of the Churches; and therefore perhaps they fight against us in an indecisive way, because they believe firmly in the same religion."³⁷

699. d) Concerning the most serious obstacles. The obstacles were on the part of doctrine, on the part of the evangelizers, on the part of the evangelized, and on the part of the culture or atmosphere in which the preaching took place.

The author of the doctrine is: a Jew ("the most despised member of servants," Tacitus³⁸), and he was put to death by the ignominious punishment of the cross, "and the very name of the cross should be absent not only from the body of Roman citizens, but also from thought, from eyes, from ears..."³⁹; and therefore he is "a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles" (1 Cor. 1:23).

Theoretical doctrine: this crucified man is adored as God; there are other very important points of doctrine, mysteries surpassing the capability of reason; the doctrine is exclusive. Not rarely there were heresies and divisions because of different ways of explaining the doctrine.

Practical doctrine: it is difficult, opposed to passionate desires; vices must constantly be resisted; sensual pleasures avoided; chastity is to be cultivated; injuries forgiven; enemies are to be loved; honors are to be spurned...; one must stay away from the theater and the games.

The evangelizers: of humble origin, timid, hated Jews, most of the Apostles were uneducated.

The evangelized: The Jews were expecting a political, nationalistic Messiah; they abhorred associating with Gentiles; they tenaciously adhered to the ceremonial precepts of the worship and religion of Moses; they produced calumnies against Jesus as much as possible; therefore the synagogues of the Jews were said by Tertullian to be "fountains of

36. *Adversus nationes* (ca. 3050 2,5: R 621.

37. *Epist.* 107 (to Laetam) n.2: ML 22,870.

38. *Hist.* 5,8. The difficulties for Christianity coming from Jews and what the Romans thought about Christians is treated by Wilmers, p.507-509.

39. Cicero, *Pro Rabirio* 5,16.

persecution."⁴⁰

The pagans had to embrace a difficult law—purity of matrimony, even internal chastity, love of enemies, martyrdom... all of which in a special way were difficult for them.

The social community was especially hostile: the emperors were enemies and hostile to Christians, since they had to be removed from the highest dignity and from the supreme pontificate; *the empire, the magistracy...*, to these Christians were opposed, because they were founded on a religion that was assailed by Christians; hence from the time of Nero the Christian religion was considered a social crime and was forbidden. Greedy and avaricious *priests* were necessarily opposed to the new religion. Hence the *people*, sharing in the public opinion promoted by their leaders, were very hostile to Christians. Therefore they thought that “the Christians were the cause of every public disaster and of every public misfortune. If the Tiber flooded over its walls, if the Nile did not cover the land, if the heavens stood still, if there were earthquakes, if famine, if a plague—immediately they cried: *Christians to the lions!*”⁴¹

The whole culture: if among the *barbarians* their savageness was a problem for Christianity, among the *educated* and wise their philosophy was inconvenient; and the philosophers were not the first converts. The whole culture had to be changed: jurisprudence, art, religion, philosophy... and often also the economy (Acts 19:23ff.).

The vibrant *syncretism*, and Gnosticism and other philosophical sects were a huge obstacle for this exclusive religion⁴²; it was also a serious danger for the teaching and institutions of the new religion, lest it fall away from its purity and its internal vigor.⁴³

700. Proof of the minor. *This propagation requires a proportionate cause, that is, a supernatural one.*⁴⁴ For, the proportionate causes that explain such propagation are either the external doctrines or the internal doctrines. But neither of these can be natural. Therefore proportionate supernatural causes are required.

For, *the external natural causes*, like those that can be thought, the synagogues dispersed throughout the Roman world, the unity of language (although it is certain that interpreters were necessary⁴⁵), the unity of the

40. *Advers. Gnosticos scorpiace* 10: ML 2,166.

41. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 40: ML 1,542f.

42. That the Christian religion is exclusive is already a big sign of its truth, for truth is exclusive. But the only exclusive religion is the Catholic religion. Therefore it is the true religion.

43. On the manner of Christian preaching, see Batiffol, *La Iglesia primitiva y el catolicismo* c.2, p.47ff.

44. This argument is extolled beautifully and eloquently by Fr. Luis de León, *De los nombres de Cristo* 1.2 § 1 (*Brazo*) towards the end: ed. Rivadeneira (Madrid 1872) 121-123.

45. See above n.278ff., about St. Mark, interpreter for Peter.

empire... these were *common*; they also served the adversaries, and were very suitable for the persecution of Christians.

There were other external causes, like eloquence, arms, nobility and riches, which certainly often help very much to persuade others; likewise numbers, organization, power... these *were much more in the favor of the adversaries*.

Therefore causes of this kind, as also the active philosophy and contempt for Gentile superstitions and other aspects that can be imagined, certainly do not offer a sufficient reason for its propagation: they are of course favorable reasons for the preaching or *occasions* for that preaching, or also at most *disposing causes*, but in no way and adequately efficient causes of that acceptance

701. *But the causes of the internal doctrine*, such as its sublimity, its harmony with reason, its satisfaction of man's higher aspirations, cannot explain its acceptance. For thus there is no explanation for so many conversions—in such a short time; if these cited reasons may seem to offer some reason for a few conversions, certainly they do not offer a sufficient reason for the *acceptance* of that religion—having *mysteries that must be believed firmly and permanently*—and regarding the practical doctrine requiring a *difficult law—with the prospect of martyrdom*. Therefore, the *constant acceptance* so repugnant to human passions, *swiftly* and *by many* certainly is contrary to the psychological laws by which the activity of men is governed. Therefore, it is necessary to recur to the extraordinary *supernatural* intervention of God, which cannot be given in confirmation that is falsely said to be revealed.

702. Nor can you say that the acceptance *is explained by the miracles accompanying* the first preaching of the gospel. For if you hold those as true miracles, then you are already admitting a supernatural work confirming the divine religion of Jesus; but if you say they are false, then certainly it cannot be understood how the world accepted that religion without any credible signs, and you must explain a great prodigy.⁴⁶ But, even having supposed miracles, in this matter there is not a sufficient reason *for the acceptance by faith* of a doctrine that is both theoretically and practically opposed to the sensual passions of men.⁴⁷

Therefore St. Augustine appealed to this argument *for the present Church*: “Listen to me, the Church says to you, listen to me, whom you see even if you do not want to see. For the faithful, who were in those times in the land of Judea, were present at, and

46. See St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22,5: ML 41,756ff.; above n.570. S.Th. I CG 6.

47. Moreover, proceeding dogmatically, remember that faith is acquired, even having supposed the certain knowledge of credibility, through a free command of the will; and this is had, like the final judgment of credibility and the need to believe, through supernatural elevating grace.

learned as present, Christ's wonderful birth of a virgin, and his passion, resurrection, ascension; all his divine words and deeds. These things you have not seen, and therefore you refuse to believe. Therefore behold these things, fix your eyes on these things, these things which you see reflect on, which are not told to you as things past, nor foretold to you as things future, but are shown to you as things present. What? Does it seem to you a vain or a light thing, and do you think it is none, or a little, divine miracle, that in the name of One Crucified the whole human race runs?⁴⁸

703. Scholium. *On the nature of the extraordinary supernatural help given by God for the propagation of Christianity.*⁴⁹ In the first place, *the supernatural providence of God* ordained the favorable circumstances for the preaching and the external situation of the world so that they might be suitable (although only inadequately) for that propagation. Furthermore, *various supernatural facts in themselves* were ordained immediately for the confirmation of the gospel: such were *the wonderful conversion of the Apostles*, especially of Paul, *the charisms conferred on them and on the first Christians*, *the excellence of the doctrine as truly an intellectual miracle*, other signs and virtues and *the miracles performed by the Apostles and Christians*; *heroic and persevering virtue* in very many Christians and especially in the martyrs; all the Christian virtues, particularly *mutual charity and examples of edification*.

But besides these, *internal supernatural grace to embrace the faith* was required, certainly for the act of faith itself and for the preceding free command of the will, and for the judgments about credibility and the need to believe. These points are established in dogmatic theology.

But if this help is necessary for faith, much more will it be required *for the practical exercise of a fervent religious life*.

704. Objections. 1. This extraordinary propagation can be explained by the zeal of the Apostles, especially by the fervor of Paul.

I distinguish the antecedent. Thus the formal *acceptance* of this doctrine can be explained, *denied*; thus the preaching of the doctrine can be explained, *I subdistinguish*: as if this were the total cause, *denied*; as a partial cause, *again I subdistinguish*: as a natural cause, *denied*; as a supernatural cause, *conceded*. For at the beginning the apostolic preachers were few, but later there were certainly many; but this ardent zeal without human advantages, in fact with many disadvantages for many, this zeal, I say, in order to promote *this* religion, is not something natural.

2. This propagation is explained by the favor of emperors, in particular by the favor of Constantine.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the first three centuries, from which mainly we are making our argument, *denied*; in other centuries, *I subdistinguish*: as a partial cause *sometimes* (not always) they favored the preaching, *conceded*; as a cause explaining the

48. *De fide rerum quae non videntur* 4,7: R 1614. See by the same St. Augustine, *De vera religione* 3: ML 34,123-125.

49. This matter is treated by Müller, th.43, n.35; Tromp⁶, 343-346; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen n.246.

acceptance of the religion, *denied*.

3. This acceptance is explained by an itching desire to believe and by a love of superstition.

I deny that. For, at that time there were many skeptics, atheists...; and one does not easily believe a religion opposed to the sensual passions.

4. The matter is explained because this religion is more in conformity with rational truths.

I deny that. For, although it is true that the Christian religion has sublime conformity with reason, with the aspirations of the heart..., but it is one thing to consider something theoretically, and something else *to accept* something, since it is more difficult, and to put it into practice: "I see what is better and I approve of it, but I do what is worse."⁵⁰

5. The dispersion of the Jews and the unity of the Roman Empire explain this propagation.

Response. The spread of Christianity among the Jews was not easy, and also after the year 64 a distinction was made between Christians and Jews. Moreover, both the dispersion of the Jews and the unity of the Roman empire explain, at most, as has been said, the occasions or favorable circumstances for the preaching, but by no means give a sufficient reason for the *acceptance* of this religion by so many Christians in such a short time.

6. The hierarchy and organization of the Roman Empire was the exemplary cause of the organization and propagation of Christianity, which should be explained because of that.

I distinguish the antecedent. In its accidentals, *I bypass*; in its essentials, *denied*; for it has been proved that these things are from Christ and were already present in Jerusalem and in Asia.

7. The oneness of God, which was preached, favors the propagation.

I distinguish the antecedent. Among some people of good judgment, as a favorable cause, *conceded*; among many, *denied*; for the reigning polytheism was opposed to it.

8. The mutual charity of the first Christians explains the propagation.

I distinguish the antecedent. As an occasion for considering that religion, for some people with a healthy mentality and good judgment, *conceded*; as a cause sufficient for *accepting* it, *denied*; since this religion wants acts of charity and love not only to be accepted, but also to be put into practice, and demands total abnegation of self and this is not naturally accepted.

9. The holiness of the first Christians together with their charity and good works for each other and for the poor explains the propagation.

I distinguish the antecedent. As an *occasion* of considering and loving the religion, or also as a partial *favorable cause*, *I bypass*; as an adequate explanation, *denied*. Note moreover that that holiness was not natural, as is certain from the preceding thesis, nor also that wonderful mutual charity and beneficence. Furthermore, even having supposed the very holy examples, human nature is not moved *efficaciously* to practice virtue without divine assistance.

50. See what we said above, n.687.

10. The hope of redemption from injustice and from sins together with the hope of eternal happiness explains that propagation.

Response. That hope of redemption and that hope of eternal happiness, which are present in the human heart, were already mentioned previously, as is certain from ancient authors and philosophers, and nevertheless they were not able efficaciously to attract to themselves such a multitude. Moreover, those hopes in the specific sense of the Christian religion could not naturally be persuaded by so many unlearned men, unless they were absolutely certain about the authority of that religion; at the most a few philosophers could naturally be led to a certain approximation of the Christian doctrine; but they would have no authority to bring it to the whole world as a doctrine to be believed and affirmed.

11. The syncretism flourishing then and the way of acting in a syncretistic manner, that is, assimilating elements from every religion and all favorable tendencies, favored the diffusion of the new religion and explain that diffusion.

Response. The flourishing syncretism did not favor, but rather was opposed to a religion so exclusive, whose principles were those of unity and integrity: *One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God...* (Eph. 4:5f.); and the Christians had to take care not to lose what had been handed on to them: *See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition, according to the elemental spirits of the universe, and not according to Christ* (Col. 2:8); and again: *So then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter* (2 Thess. 2:15).

Note also that the *Christian religion had been forbidden* as a crime since the time of Nero; and that syncretism made all religious reformers to have equal authority and permitted the observance of the ancient praxis.⁵¹

But if *ritual analogies* are given between the ancient religions and the Christian, first of all it is to be carefully discerned where the principal analogate is; then it helps to note that analogies of this kind are not univocal, but differ specifically, especially from the different intention and the different dogma by which they are informed.⁵²

12. All the preceding causes (of the proposed difficulties) taken together give a sufficient reason for this wonderful propagation.

I deny that. For, if the individual causes do not have the logical power to give a sufficient reason for *the constant acceptance* of this religion, then all of them together will not explain it. And please note that the obstacles were much more powerful on the part of the doctrine and on the part of the evangelizers and the evangelized, and also on the part of the social medium and the culture... (as is certain from the proof), than all those that could have favored it.

13. Mohammedans and other sects, like Buddhism, Protestantism, Arianism,

51. See Pinard de la Boullaye, *L'étude comparée des religions* t.I⁴ § 28, p.53.

52. See Pinard de la Boullaye, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1934) V, note 13; by the same author, *L'étude comparée des religions* t.I⁴ § 40 (p.70-72) § 51 (p.88f.) § 52 (p.90).

On the mysteries and syncretism, see Tromp⁶, Excursus, 388-417; and by the same author a copious bibliography, *ibid.*, 480-492. See especially for these questions, K. Prümml, *Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt* 2.t. (Leipzig 1935).

Mithracism..., were also propagated rapidly.

I distinguish the antecedent. With supernatural means and method, *denied*; with natural means, *conceded*. Therefore their propagation is not wondrous as in Christianity.

Mohammedanism was spread by the power of arms—and by promising temporal rewards—and indulging the passions.⁵³

Buddhism obtained the favor of the princes as a philosophical system; also it has practically no fixed dogma. It has also suffered a difference of classes, against the dogma of Brahmanism. It promises happiness in abstaining from labor and finally nirvana... And with the passage of time it has split into several very diverse sects, more than among Christians.⁵⁴

Protestantism from the beginning obtained the favor of temporal princes and their encouragement, who applied the rule that each region should have its own religion. And it did not have a consistent and exclusive body of doctrine as the Catholic religion has.—But it was propagated because of the politics and greed of the princes, because of the ignorance of the people and because of calumnies against the Church⁵⁵; and add to these the corruption of morals among many ecclesiastics and monks.

Arianism obtained the favor of princes. But if St. Jerome says: “*The whole world groaned, and was amazed to find itself Arian,*”⁵⁶ he wants to say nothing else, and indeed through a hyperbole, but that many bishops were led by the fraud to endorse a formula whose meaning was heretical.

Mithraicism cannot be said to be so propagated, since only soldiers and Roman magistrates embraced it, not the people or the Hellenistic regions. But the reason why they adopted it was, besides the dispersion of the soldiers in the East and the presence of oriental merchants, the favor of the emperors together with the character of the religion which fit in with military virtues and vices.⁵⁷

14. Like contemporary communism, so also the communism of the primitive Church spread naturally among the poor (Acts. 4:34; 1 Cor. 1:20.26).

I distinguish the antecedent. The communism of the primitive Church was propagated naturally among the wealthy who gave up their possessions, *denied*; it was propagated among poor people, so that they were expecting the mortification of their passions and martyrdom, not exactly temporal conveniences like contemporary communists, *I subdistinguish*: and this happened naturally, *denied*; it happened supernaturally, *conceded*.

Some doctrines (for example communism, and in the 19th century other political and social movements) sometimes spread rapidly, because, given the public mood of the

53. See *Contra Gentes* 1,6; Müller, th.43, n.39-42.

54. See the authors cited above in n.469; briefly Müller, *ibid.*, n.46.

55. See the statement of the German historian A. Menzel when treating the spread of Protestantism: “Politics, greed and the power of princes, the ignorance of the people and the calumnies against the old Church by the leaders of the movement were the most important factors in its spread” (*Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen* 2,86 [translation by K.B.]). And perceptively Frederick II (*Memoires de Brandenbourg*): “Si on veut reduire les causes du progrès de la reforme à des principes simples, on verra qu’en Allemagne ce fut l’ouvrage de l’intérêt, en Angleterre celui de l’amour, et en France celui de la nouveauté” (from Müller, 565).

56. *Dialog. contra Luciferianos* 19: ML 23,181.

57. See A. D’Ales, *Mithra (la religion de)*: DAFC 3,578-591; Trompé, 346f.

time, they find what is called a propitious atmosphere; often they provide advantages to many individuals, namely, for their ambition, prejudices, and also to certain sects and classes... Hence they are received with ardor and run like an electric shock; add to this the fact that they do not always use fully licit means... until, with the passage of time, reflection and consideration bring about a crisis of the doctrine and its defects become evident.—There was nothing of this in the spread of the Christian religion, but the contrary was the case.

705. On conversions as an apologetic argument. We understand a *conversion* not just as a change to a better life by a partial internal transformation of one's moral or psychic life, v.gr., by acquiring a better political ideology, etc.; we understand conversion, if we do not want to misuse the word, as *the profound and radical transformation of one's whole moral life concerning a new inner reality*, as a change that moves the whole man. Thus we speak about the conversion of St. Paul, of St. Augustine, of St. Ignatius....

If the conversions are authentic, they are recognized in the *breadth* of the transformation made, which is joined together with the *profundity* of their psychic life; hence the *permanence of the acquired change* easily follows.

Conversions can be *conversions to faith*, since a new intellectual foundation, that is, of faith, is added to one's psychological make-up; *conversions to a good moral life*, or to charity, since the change takes place from a sinful and wicked life; and finally, *conversions to perfection*, that is, to fervent charity.

By reason of the way they take place and according to what *appears* primarily as the motivating cause, conversions can be *intellectual* and they are either *discursive* or *intuitive*, according as they take place especially by way of discursive thinking or a sudden intuition; also they can be *volitive* or *affective*, if they appear primarily to be a work of the will or of the affections.⁵⁸

There are also other divisions of conversions, according to the cause or occasion. This *apparently* plays the most important part in the final transformation. Thus, conversions will be *exogenous* or *endogenous*, according to whether what moves someone to conversion is extrinsic or intrinsic to the converted individual. Also, they can be *slow* or *fast*; *pathological* or *normal*....⁵⁹

706. On their apologetic value. The conversions that took place in the course of centuries in the Catholic Church, namely, the very rapid *propagation of Christianity* in the first three centuries, and *the very profound change of morals* introduced by the Christian religion without doubt are valid apologetic arguments, as we have seen. For they are moral miracles, and they also manifest themselves externally in a way that is adapted to all. Therefore they are *primary criteria*.

58. See on this M. Nicolau, S.J., *Valores teológicos en la psicología de la conversión* (Granada 1943) 4ff.

59. L. Penido considers the divisions and typology of conversions, *La conscience religieuse. Essai systématique suivi d'illustrations* (Paris 1935) 41-115. See M. Nicolau, *op. cit.*, p. 7-14. In general conversion and its problems are treated by H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., article, *Conversion*: Dict.Spir. t. 2,2224-2265; D. Grasso, S.J., in various articles: CivCatt 104 (1953).

707. There is a question about conversions *inasmuch as they are internal religious experiences* of individuals. For, many converts are said to feel within themselves a certain dualism: that is, besides their own activity, another internal power, which moves them to enter the Church...; but in this they find peace. Hence Th. Mainage wanted to develop a new apologetic argument, which would not suppose a demonstration of the fact of revelation, nor would appeal to a miracle properly as such, but would consist in examining this new power, hidden and internal, which directs converts to the Catholic religion, without being confused with their own activity. Therefore it would be easy to conclude to the divine causality of this new transcending element....⁶⁰

708. If this religious experience is considered *as it is in particular individuals*, not collectively in all, we do not deny and in fact will affirm that there are cases of such conversion; in them there has been *a truly extraordinary and miraculous* internal experience, where the light was so bright and the impulse so powerful that for the one who has this experience there is no doubt about the truth of the matter at hand, or about the divine origin of this movement. Thus, v.gr., we find this in the conversion of St. Paul and of others. But this evidence *immediately is for the one who has such an experience*. For others it is convincing to the extent they are certain about the knowledge and veracity of the witness who narrates it, i.e., if it is certain that he is not under the influence of an illusion or fraud. For the most part, however, experiences of this kind do not constitute a valid criterion that can be accommodated to others easily and with certainty.

709. We do not deny the value of *religious experience of the ordinary kind*, that is, coming from the ordinary divine influence in those who devote themselves to the spiritual life; this includes consolations and desolations and the discernment of the various spirits.⁶¹ For in these matters, if not from an immediate conscience, certainly from a reflection of preceding, concomitant and subsequent psychic acts, a person will be able, after having taken the necessary precautions, to come to a knowledge of the divine origin of the matter that he experiences and of the tendency to which he is moved. But these matters require consideration and spiritual direction, lest anyone succumb to an illusion. Therefore it cannot serve as a primary criterion for everyone.

710. Now what if the experiences are considered not as single events in individuals, but *collectively* in many converts, since they believe they have experienced some action

60. Th. Mainage, *La Psychologie de la conversion*, Leçons données à l'Institut Catholique de Paris (Paris 1915) 368.

61. On this matter, see the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola, Rules for the discernment of spirits and for making a choice of a way of life: n.175f.313f.329ff.

moving them towards the Catholic religion?

Among all these conversions there are indeed some, well proved, absolutely extraordinary, which in no way can be explained by some natural hypothesis; but in these cases *one does not exclude the nature of a miracle*, as is evident.

There are different hypotheses which can be proposed to explain naturally all conversions and the internal transcending activity, which converts think they have experienced; v.gr., it is said to come from the intellectual effort of the convert himself, or from his will, or from his affections, or from the social context in which he is involved, or from a mental sickness, or from the subconscious...; these *singular* hypotheses certainly are not able to explain *all* conversions⁶²; certainly in the individual hypotheses there will always be cases that are not explained by it, but rather go beyond that hypothesis.

But for this argument to be effective in Apologetics, it would be necessary (at least in our judgment) that in a large number of well validated conversions, with regard to this internal experience moving someone to the Catholic religion, not only could they not be explained by a hypothesis of a natural causality, *but by none of them*; so that, having recognized the transcendence of these factors, the enemies of the Church would be forced to admit the divine action. And it would also be necessary to make a distinction between these claims of Catholic converts to their own internal experiences (which we know from dogma come from divine grace) and similar claims of heterodox persons to phenomena which they say they have experienced. Therefore this argument does not lack a certain difficulty.⁶³

62. Th. Mainage explains this in the seven first readings in his book.

63. See M. Nicolau, *Valores teológicos en la psicología de la conversión* 25-29.

Thesis 39. The invincible stability in Catholic unity of the Christian religion confirms its divine origin.

Hurter, *Compendium*¹ th.18 n.83; Wilmers, *De religione revelata* n.649-652; Müller, *De vera religione* th.45; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* I³, 800-807; Muncunill, *De vera religione* n.553-566; Van Noort, *De vera religione*² (1907) n.123-127; Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* I n.618-623; Perrone, *De vera religione* n.391-410.

711. *Stability* means the *permanence or conservation* of some thing. But here it is said to be *invincible*; this refers to the difficulties and attacks, both external and internal, which the Christian religion has encountered.

This stability and conservation is asserted so strongly, since it has not suffered any kind of dissolution or separation or multiform evolution, but it is understood *in Catholic unity*, that is: since this religion comprehends many diverse men, nations, times (and therefore it is catholic), nevertheless it has remained *one and the same in its internal essence*.

The argument then is not of such a nature that it should be considered a fulfilled prophecy¹; but as *a moral miracle* which is found in *such* stability.²

712. The adversaries in general to be mentioned are the *Protestants and schismatics*, who say that change has taken place in the Catholic Church; and, among the liberal Protestants, Harnack, for whom the Church today is not the same as the primitive Church.

713. The doctrine of the Church is proposed in Vatican Council I where the argument is made from the fact of the Church: "... with her catholic unity and invincible stability" (D 3013).

It is also given by Pius IX in his Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*" among other arguments for the Catholic faith: "and acquiring greater strength every day from these most cruel persecutions, [this faith] has pervaded the whole earth, land and sea, from the rising to the setting of the sun, under the one standard of the cross... and triumphed over enemies of every kind, it has illuminated with the light of divine knowledge all peoples, races, nations, however savagely barbarous and diverse in disposition, customs, laws, and institutions..." (D 2779).

714. Theological note. If the thesis is taken with the preceding ones, to which the Vatican Council alludes, it is *at least Catholic doctrine*; but

1. See Ps. 89:34-38; Dan. 2:44; Luke 1:32f.; Matt. 16:18; 28:18-20....

2. The propagation of Christianity as a moral miracle is evident especially in the spread of it during the first three centuries; but the conservation of this religion as a moral miracle shines forth even more, if the consideration is not restricted to the first three centuries, but is expanded to the twenty centuries in which it has sustained so many persecutions and disturbances.

taken separately *it is found among the Fathers*³ and seems also to be *certain* as an apologetic argument (see n.671f., 691f.).

715. Proof. The stable religion of Christ has continued a) *the same for twenty centuries*, b) *in the whole world with great diffusion*, c) *and with internal difficulties*.

But these factors require an extraordinary cause that is not natural, but supernatural, which cannot be given by God in confirmation of a religion which is said falsely to be revealed.

Therefore the invincible stability of the Christian religion in Catholic unity confirms its divine origin.

716. Proof of the major. a) *The Christian religion has continued the same now for twenty centuries.* This real religious identity, with what it was in the beginning, is very important for establishing our argument, because such identity or unity is found to be so rare, or even hardly found, in human affairs, which by their very nature are perishable.

But the Christian religion is the same as it was in the beginning regarding its substantial principles, namely:

1) *In doctrine*, which has been set forth in the books of the Apostles and in their preaching, also in the Creeds and in the declarations of the councils and in the definitions of the Supreme Pontiffs. What we believe now, the first Christians believed; what we believe here, the same is believed also in faraway places, by the most diverse inhabitants of the world.

2) *In the goal of holiness and in the ways to obtain it*: namely, with the same sacrifice, with the same seven sacraments, with the same substantial liturgy.

3) *In government and hierarchical organization*, that is, with the Roman Primacy, to which all are subject, and with the bishops who, as single rulers, preside over the particular churches.

3. Thus Chrysostom said: "Nothing is like the Church. Don't tell me about walls and arms: for in time walls deteriorate, but the Church never gets old. Barbarians demolish walls, but the demons do not conquer the Church. The matter itself bears witness to the fact that these are not just words. How many who have attacked the Church have themselves perished? But the Church transcends the heavens. Such is the greatness of the Church; when attacked, she conquers; she survives the plots of her attackers; when the object of lies, she survives more renowned than ever; she receives wounds, but she is not subject to ulcers; tossed by waves she does not sink; caught in storms she does not suffer shipwreck; she is attacked but not knocked down; she fights with a boxer, but is not overcome. Therefore why is this war permitted? So that she might win the trophy in a brilliant way..." (*Homilia de capto Eutropio*: MG 52,397f.). The same Chrysostom develops the idea of the triumph of the Church in persecutions: *Quod Christus sit Deus* n.12-15: MG 48,829-835. St. Augustine speaks about the stability of the foundation of the Church: *In Ps 103* serm.2 n.5: ML 37,1353. Already previously St. Hippolytus used the image of a ship tossed about by waves: *Demonstratio de Christo et Antichristo* n.59: MG 10,777-780.

717. b) *With great diffusion in the whole world.* For that unity and identity, mentioned above, is not found in just one region or among a few select men only; but it appears even more amazing, if one considers its social penetration into all classes, but in every area of the world and with a number that exceeds one billion Catholics.

718. c) *In spite of serious external opposition.* 1) *External enemies* were responsible for these attacks: Consider the time of the persecutions by Jews and by pagans in the first three centuries; this will become clearer when we treat the martyrs (thesis 40). Consider from Church history the attempts of Julian to restore the earlier superstition; it was in vain, as he himself—as it is reported—said on his death bed: “You have triumphed, O Galilean!”—Consider the attempts of the barbarians against the religion in the occupation of the Roman Empire. Consider the attempts of the Moslems against the Christians in Asia, in Africa, in Spain and western Europe, in eastern Europe and in the occupation of Constantinople and throughout the Mediterranean Ocean... And during these disruptions new peoples and nations, which were flourishing afterwards, were opened up for the gospel: namely, the English, Germanic and Slavic peoples... and across the ocean in America, in India, in Japan...; recently in central and southern Africa; and finally in missions throughout the whole world...

2) *Caesaropapism* was a serious enemy of the Church, because its intention was to subordinate religion to the princes for their advantage: Thus, just to mention a few of these princes, there was Frederick Barbarossa, Henry IV, Napoleon I, Joseph II... And with this politics of the princes there were also errors, like Gallicanism, Josephinism, etc.

3) *Then there have been the secret societies* whose influence in the governance of states has been so great that they promoted a pure naturalism and, through the separation of church and state, a new paganism. And with all their strength they have tried to wipe out religion with laws enacted against religious education, against canonical matrimony and the holiness of the family, against the ministers of the Church and their freedom.

4) *Consider the weapons these adversaries have used* or are still using in order to obtain their goals: namely, power and force, money, fraud, calumnies, seductions, secret machinations, false science..., especially among their recent weapons: the printed word.⁴ Add to this the *hatred of Christ and his Church*, which we will speak about below (n.727).

4. In France alone from the year 1817 to 1824, setting aside the 600,000 volumes of the library of the 18th century, there were 2,741,000 printed volumes of the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, Diderot, etc.; in 1827 they numbered about 5,000,000. See Ioannes Perrone, S.J., *Praelectiones theologicae* I (Paris 1897); *De vera religione* n.395, p.103.

5) There are also *the attacks on the part of science*, that is, from false science: from Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Pelagianism...; from Averroism, from the pantheism of the middle ages...; from humanism during the renaissance; from encyclopedism and its related errors...; from rationalism and skepticism...; from idealism and from erroneous social, economic and political doctrines.

719. d) Among serious internal difficulties.

1) *For there were internal heresies and divisions*: Arianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Monothelism... Likewise the long-lasting schism of the Orientals; the Avignon exile and the prolonged confusion and difficulty in acknowledging the legitimate supreme pastor of the Church... Then there was the violent Protestantism supported by the favor of the princes in Germany, France, England....

2) There were also the *inclinations of corrupt nature*, against which the whole religion had to fight and still does fight; added to this is the fact that at times the pastors of the Church were not equal to their task of sanctifying others; and, either sleeping or caring for themselves, they abused their flock or allowed it to be abused. Not rarely there were scandals, even public ones; corrupt discipline in some periods; likewise weak morals, as for example at the time of the renaissance, or in modern times with the influence of a material and technical culture. But constantly, even in the times of major corruption, which is a sanctifying power for the Christian religion, there were and there are saints and reformers....

720. Proof of the minor. *All of these factors require an extraordinary, supernatural cause.*⁵ For, *ordinarily* human institutions, if they acquire some stability, are preserved by arms and force, by which they extort submission; or by winking at sensual pleasures and even encouraging them, or with money and other things..., or for a certain amount of time (certainly not for a long time) with eloquence... The Christian religion does not use these methods; but by self-abnegation, by an eloquence this is not human... she triumphs in Christ Jesus.

Add this also: Even if human institutions by these means obtain a certain conservation, *they do not retain it for a long time.*

Empires, even the most flourishing, fail; other human societies grow old and disappear...; by making accommodations they lose not only their pristine character but also their primitive constitution... and so they are changed. Philosophical systems succeed

5. On this argument, see Luis de Granada, O.P., *Introducción del simbolo de la fe* 2.^a p. c.8: ed. Cuervo t.6 p.65ff.

one another and disappear... Persecutors pass away and their power evanesces...; so that anyone could say about those enemies of the Church whom we see: "I have seen a wicked man overbearing, and towering like a cedar of Lebanon. Again I passed by, and lo, he was no more; though I sought him, he could not be found" (Ps. 37:35-36).

But if you see some societies in Asia or empires lasting for a long time..., that stability is not really *a vital stability*, but you will say that it is the immutability of a mummified cadaver.

721. *But the Christian religion*, and as we acknowledge it in Catholicism (about which we are making our argument), *has remained unchanged now for twenty centuries* in its purpose, in its means of sanctification, in doctrine, in organization and hierarchy, in an uninterrupted series of Roman Pontiffs⁶; this is very wonderful and extraordinary, since so many nations, cultures, peoples, customs... constitute a difficulty for its unity, and must submit themselves to the same doctrine... and to the same organization..., and to the same pastor..., and in this institution submission is required also for internal things and for particular things....

But from persecutions the Christian religion *revives and flourishes*; thus we can apply to it: "the trimmed bush flourishes"; and also this: "salvation

-
6. Protesting also in a beautiful way, Thomas B. Macauley wrote about the stability of the Roman Church: "There is not, and there never was on the earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of the Church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. *The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs.* That line we trace back to an unbroken series from the pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable [!]. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern, when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains. *The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life, and youthful vigor.* The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustine, and still confronting hostile kings, with the same spirit, with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. *Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated her for what she has lost in the Old...* Nor do we see any sign, which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New-Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.
- "We often hear it said that the world is constantly becoming more and more enlightened, and that his enlightening must be favorable to Protestantism, and unfavorable to Catholicism. We wish that we [Protestants] could think so. But we see great reason to doubt whether this be a well-founded expectation..." *Critical and Historical Essays* (Von Ranke, October 1840), ed. B. Tauchnitz (Leipzig 1850) 4,98f.
- On the machinations of *Julian*, as an example of malice and diligence against Christians, see St. Gregory Nazianzen, *Contra Iulianum* I c.57-112: MG 35,580-649.

from our enemies” (see Luke 1:71).⁷

From persecutions and attacks she appears not only unchanged and more vigorous, but daily *more fruitful*, so that constantly we are amazed not at her old age, not at her fatigue, but at her youth together with her maturity.

722. For this reason, it is absolutely certain that the invincible stability of the Christian religion in strict unity together with its universal diffusion *has been accomplished outside of the common order of nature*; for this an extraordinary intervention of God is required, which cannot be given in favor of a religion which is said falsely to be revealed.⁸

723. Objections. 1. The Christian religion has used the secular arm to preserve itself.

Response. It did not have this help in many circumstances, and those very difficult ones, namely, at the time of the persecutions in the first centuries, and afterwards successively in different places—you might say throughout her whole history.—But even on the supposition of this help, *an adequate explanation is sought* why the religion obtained this help and exercised such influence on princes and governments, which gave her assistance.

2. The Church is subject to evolution and does not remain one and the same.

I distinguish the antecedent. In accidental things, *conceded*; in substantial things, *denied*. But even the adversaries admit that the contemporary Church is the same as it was in the time of St. Clement of Rome (at the end of the 1st century), and also at the time of St. Paul. But even if someone says that the Church has remained the same only from the 3rd century: this also must be explained, namely, how for so long a time and in the midst of so many storms it has remained one and the same.

3. The Church maintained its unity because it expelled protesting and dissident members.

Response. That is surely true. But *still there must be an explanation* for how, even with so many dissidents attacking her, she still remained not just a national religion, but universal and unified.

4. This is explained because of the organization and social constitution of the Church, especially through the principle of authority.

Response. But *a natural explanation is still desired* why it was able to have such organization, and *to preserve* it, since there are so many internal passions of men limit-

7. St. Hilary says it very well: “For this is proper to the Church—that when she is attacked she conquers, when she is accused then she is understood, when she is abandoned then she obtains” (*De Trinitate* 7,4: ML 10,202).

8. Therefore also it must be said that it takes its origin from him *with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change* (James 1:17); who also said to Peter: *on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it* (Matt. 16:18); and again to his disciples: *And lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age* (Matt. 28:20).

ing freedom, and there are and have been so many external attacks directed against that organization.

5. Mohammedanism and Buddhism are also conserved naturally for a long time.

Response. We are not arguing from mere conservation, nor from long-term conservation, but *from the way in which the Christian religion has been conserved*; namely, from Catholic unity and the invincible stability in spite of internal difficulties and external attacks. On the other hand, it has been noted how Mohammedanism and Buddhism and other rapidly propagated religions have used purely natural means. See n.704, 13.14.

6. Judaism has also been severely attacked and it continues to exist dispersed throughout the world.

I distinguish the antecedent. And this responds above all to the prophecies uttered in favor of the Christian religion (see n.512-520, 535-539), which therefore is confirmed by this fulfillment, *conceded*; this indicates a special assistance of God in favor of the Jewish religion, as it were confirming it, *denied*. And note that Judaism is preserved *as a people*; but as a religion it has lost its temple in which it was necessary for them to give adoration, likewise the priests (although they have Rabbis), likewise the sacrifice, likewise the ritual and ceremonial precepts of the Mosaic Law have become impossible for them. Indeed these things pertaining to their religion are quite substantial, so that the religion cannot be said to be conserved in its essential elements.⁹

7. If the stable Christian religion consists and will consist in the special assistance of God, then it will not be necessary for Christians to defend it during the time of persecutions, nor for civil laws or governments to protect it.

Response. 1) *Let each one take care of his own office.* For that special help of God does not exclude, in fact it supposes, the helping graces of God that the social and public offices of Christians towards their religion will be fulfilled; but this fulfillment is subject to divine providence which provides protection for the religion.

2) That special assistance for the Christian religion is not affirmed for the religion that it may remain stable *here and there*, but as a whole; hence the prosperity of the religion in this or that part of the world can be conditioned by the cooperation of men in promoting and defending the religion.

724. Scholium. On the mystery of love and hatred for Jesus.¹⁰ 1) *The fact of love for Jesus.* About other renowned men in history we have a remembrance, we have admiration...; concerning Jesus we have love in a true sense—a love that is very true and really complete.

Men are content if they are loved by a few persons, familiar to them and living; but from strangers in the future, non-relatives, and much more by the whole world they do not ask for love after their own death. But Jesus asks for this love *and he made himself the universal center of all hearts.*¹¹

9. See above n.535ff.

10. This matter is treated by Hurter, *Compendium*¹¹ n.88; Müller, *De vera religione* th.46; Dorsch, *Theolog. fundam.* 1³ 807-810; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fundam.* n.250.

11. See Matt. 10:37; 16:24f.; Luke 14:26; John 12:32; 14:15.21-24; 15:10; 17:3.20-26.

And *Jesus de facto* has obtained this burning and intense love. For, he has been loved vehemently, for example as by Mary Magdalene, John the Evangelist¹² and Peter the Apostle,¹³ by the ardent Apostle Paul,¹⁴ by the martyr Ignatius and by the whole church of the martyrs who, for love of him, desired to pour out their life, blood and faculties¹⁵; he has been loved steadfastly by the disciples serving him faithfully and courageously and bringing his kingdom to the end of the earth; he has been loved by innumerable virgins, by Agnes, by Cecilia (read their office in the Breviary¹⁶), by Teresa of Avila, by Magdalene dei Pazzi, by Margaret Mary Alacoque, by Theresa of the Child Jesus¹⁷...; by youths, by old men, by the learned, by the unlearned and by peasants....¹⁸ Amazing stories of love for Jesus can be narrated more at length and without end; but this is not necessary, because the matter is very evident for our purpose. And still: "The tongue cannot say, nor words express: only one who has experienced it can know what it means to love Jesus...."¹⁹

But this love should not be thought to come *from a weak and infirm disposition*, especially among the outstanding lovers of Jesus, since it has powerful effects, pacifying, manifesting itself in the accomplishment of great works....

725. Why this love?—In explaining this love *many apologetic arguments can be brought together*.

And first of all, that Jesus asked for such love, since certainly he was not out of his mind (see n.456ff.), *is a sign that he is not only the Legate of God, but also God* (see n.435, c). For, no one prudently dares to constitute himself as the universal center of all hearts.

Then, in this fact of love there is given *the fulfillment of the prophecy made by Jesus*.²⁰

Finally, the sufficient reason for this love is not found except *in a certain fact beyond the common course of nature*, which confirms the religion in which such love is found.

12. 1 John 1:1-3; 2:1f.; 4:16; Rev. 22:20.

13. 1 Pet. 2:3.21-25.

14. Rom. 8:35-39; 1 Cor. 16:22; Eph. 3:8-19; Phil. 1:21.

15. See J. Madoz, S.J., *El amor a Jesucristo en la Iglesia de los mártires*: EstEcl 12 (1933) 313-344.

16. In the antiphons and responses of *the office of St. Agnes* you will find some beautiful expressions of her love for God and for Jesus; as v.gr.: "The sun and the moon admire his beauty"... "Behold, what I desired I now see, what I hoped for I now hold on to: I am joined to him in heaven, whom while I am on earth I have loved with my whole heart..."

17. Read for example from St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, *The History of a Soul Written by Herself* ch. 11 and 12.

18. About this matter Fr. Luis de León wrote extensively and eloquently, *De los nombres de Cristo* l.3 § 3 (*Amado*): ed. Rivadeneira, p.189-197.

19. Hymn for the feast of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, at vespers. Read the whole song distributed through the whole feast, for it is a very beautiful expression of love for Jesus.

20. John 12:32; Luke 12:49; John 17:20-26....

For, men love those who are present or their contemporaries, but their love certainly tends to diminish for those who are far away or already dead. But Jesus *after his death is loved above all*.

Men love relatives, friends..., mutually and within certain limits. But Jesus *is loved universally*.

Men love especially because of favors received or to be received, especially when they are sensible things. But Jesus *asks for one's own self-abnegation and death, and he does not promise or confer sensible goods, but insensible ones*.

Human love decreases, although it is promised forever, "often in a few days it cools off or is turned into hate; *but the love of Christ grows continually, and offers a taste of eternity.*"²¹

Therefore love for Jesus—which is *so great—tender—universal—constant—and heroic* is supernatural and requires special divine assistance.

726. This is also confirmed by considering *the fruits produced by this love*—wonderful and excellent and noble... Likewise by considering *the astonishing effects coming from this love into the soul*.²² Therefore this love was and is good—conforming and responding to its object as something true. Therefore Christ was God, because otherwise from a vitiated, false and perverse love good and excellent fruits would have resulted, in true wisdom and holiness. But this would be contrary to the principle of causality and contrary to the order of providence.²³

727. 2) On hatred for Jesus and his religion. It is usually called *the mystery of hatred*,²⁴ because really it is not understood why men act in this way, and it can hardly or with difficulty be explained by natural psychological laws alone.²⁵

For, this hatred a) is *unjust* and does not have a sufficient reason; really they have hated and do hate Jesus gratuitously, *who went about doing good* (Acts 10:38). Similarly the hatred for the Church is unjust, which carries on the work of Jesus, and has provided innumerable benefits to the private and public life of men, on science and culture, on art, on the suffering and abandoned....

21. Müller, th.46 n.8.

22. Read, for example, *The Imitation of Christ*, Book III, chapter 5: "The wonderful effects of divine love."

23. See Müller, th.46 n.10.

24. Müller, th.46 n.11-16; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. Fundam.* n.250.

25. Stenstrup, *Apolog.* th.32, wants to conclude from this perpetual, universal and raging hatred to a cause outside of man, namely, to that principle which is opposed to the good and true as such, and is opposed to God and to everything that takes its origin from God. Müller, th.46 n.16, on the other hand, says that the existence of the devil cannot be demonstrated naturally, and furthermore that the hatred is explained psychologically with sufficient probability [from the vices and passions of men, because Christ and his Church resist them and effectively fight against them]. But then Müller concludes and we fully agree with him: "Also it can be conceded, having supposed the existence of the devil and his pursuit of men known mainly from revelation, that this hatred is *explained also partly as coming from his instigation*, provided, however, that the causes mentioned above are not excluded."

b) This hatred is *perpetual* and implacable; since also monsters of the human race, like Nero and some of the other Roman emperors..., after their death are despised.

c) This hatred is *singular*. For it is not directed against other founders of religions, like Buddha and Mohammed....

d) This hatred is *effective and intense*, that is, because it is exercised not just with a certain theoretical or Platonic displeasure and aversion, but it strives to achieve its objective with diligence and with all kinds of machinations.

728. *What can we conclude from this hatred?* First of all, there is the *fulfillment of the prophecies*,²⁶ and Christ becomes a sign that is spoken against (Luke 2:34). Then, since *the effects of this hatred are not good, but perverse*, and they do not lead to moral perfection or to holiness, as the love of Christ does, they lead to moral corruption and the ruin of the people and of individuals: this is a sign that *this hatred is not in conformity with the objective order of things*, or that actually Christ is not deserving of hatred, but of love.

The authors of this hatred are not men of virtue or saints, but on the contrary they are men who are corrupt, proud and addicted to pleasures. But since *the Church resists these passions* and strives to cure them, from this it becomes clear why she is hated. The difference in the fact that the Catholic religion is hated and the other religions are not hated comes to this: it is a sign that the other religions either indulge those passions or at least do not effectively fight against them.

26. Matt. 5:11f.; 10:17dd.; Luke 2:34f.; 21:17f.; John 15:18ff.; 1 Pet. 2:7f....

Thesis 40. The martyrdom of so many Christians proves the divine origin of Christian revelation.

S.Th. II-II, q. 124; Ottiger, *Theolog. fundam.* 1,877-902; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.10; Wilmers, *De religione revelata* 1.4 c.2 a.3; Müller, *De vera religione* th.42; Muncunill, *De vera religione* n.541-552; Paul Alard, *Dix leçons sur le martyre*⁶ (Paris 1921); article by the same author, *Martyre*: DAFC 3,331-492.

729. This new criterion to confirm the divine revelation of the doctrine taught by Jesus seems able to be reduced to *an internal criterion like the examination of the doctrine in the effects produced*, inasmuch as martyrdom is the fruit of a consoling doctrine even unto the shedding of blood.

730. The notion of martyrdom.¹ The word *martyr* means a *witness*. The disciples of Jesus had to be *his witnesses* (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8.22; 2:32...). Since the Christians were accused because of their religion, generally they were interrogated; and they responded by giving *testimony* for Jesus and his teaching. Because of this testimony the Apostles and many others were killed, and so they testified not only with words, but also with facts, that is, with their death. This was and is a *perfect testimony*.

To what did the martyrs give testimony?—The martyrs were and are witnesses of the Christian truths which they profess; they are really witnesses *of the truths of the faith and of all the facts which the faith itself supposes*, whether they have seen these facts themselves (immediate witnesses and a strictly historical testimony), or they only heard about them or accepted them (mediate witnesses), or in one way or another they have conviction about them.

731. The conditions of martyrdom. The martyrdom we are now considering and which is treated in Theology² is a) *a voluntary suffering*, b) *of capital punishment*, c) *patiently and firmly endured*, d) *because of hatred of the faith or of the Christian law*.

a) It is a *voluntary suffering*, since it is an act of virtue and for that voluntariness is required. This voluntariness must be at least habitual, that is, out of a disposition habitually conceived of enduring death in testimony

1. On the concept and evolution of the meaning of the word *martyrdom*, see E. Hocedez, S.J., *Le concept de martyr*: NouvRevTh 55 (1928) 81-99, 198-208. Likewise D. Ruiz Bueno, *Actas de los martires* (Madrid 1951), Introducción general, p.3-67; and expressly in St. Cyprian, E.L. Hummel, *The Concept of Martyrdom according to St. Cyprian of Carthage* (Washington 1946).
2. This idea recurs in the treatise on baptism, where it is said why martyrdom supplies for baptism, indeed, because from a privilege firmly established it justifies as it were through the work done (*ex opere operato*), and it takes away all guilt and punishment; this is according to what the Lord said: *He who loses his life for my sake will find it* (Matt. 10:39; 16:25).—On martyrdom, especially in its theological and canonical context, see R. Hedde, *Martyre*: DTC 10,220-223. Also Benedict XIV treats the conditions of martyrdom, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et canonizatione* 1.3 c.11-20.

of Christ; therefore anyone who unexpectedly or in his sleep suffers such thing is thought to be a martyr. But the voluntary suffering better appears and is more certain, if the choice of deliberating or of freeing oneself by denying the faith is present.

In the case of infants, in whom there cannot be this presence of voluntariness, nevertheless there can be true martyrdom, as happened for the *Holy Innocents* killed by Herod.

732. b) *Capital punishment*, so that the testimony may be perfect and proved by something truly precious, namely, with one's life. But the death can follow immediately or in the torments themselves, or mediately as a result of the torments; thus there can be martyrs who did not die by the shedding of their blood, but only as a consequence of their wounds, pains and cruelty—from their torments. If they endure suffering only, but do not die, then they are called *confessors* (see Matt. 10:32).

732. c) *Patiently and firmly endured*, that is, *inspired by patience* (see n.746), in imitation of Christ, who suffered as a lamb (see Isa. 53:7); therefore not reluctantly and protesting, nor like someone stolid, or a Stoic, or temerarious, who through an excess of audacity and carelessness would seem to condemn his life... Martyrdom pertains formally to the act and virtue of fortitude, because fortitude is its motive *by way of the eliciting virtue*, but “charity inclines one to the act of martyrdom, as its first and chief motive, *being the virtue commanding it*... Hence martyrdom is an act of charity as commanding, and of fortitude as eliciting. For this reason also it manifests both virtues. It is due to charity that it is meritorious, like any other act of virtue: and for this reason it avails not without charity.”³ This is from the teaching of St. Thomas and of others, but not of all, theologians.

Of these things, for martyrdom the state of grace is required and charity no matter how obtained. And “of all virtuous acts martyrdom is *the greatest proof of the perfection of charity*: since a man's love for a thing is proved to be so much the greater, according as that which he despises for its sake is more dear to him, or that which he chooses to suffer for its sake is more odious... he hates death more than anything, especially when it is accompanied with the pains of bodily torment...”⁴

734. d) *Because of hatred for the faith or the Christian law*, in those who have suffered this is the cause, at least morally... And although *other motives may be feigned* by the persecutors (v.gr., for political reasons), – or *some juridical formula is the pretext* (v.gr., a crime against the injured majesty of the emperor, or the superstition of magic...),

3. S.Th. II-II, q. 124, a. 2 ad 2.

4. S.Th. II-II, q. 124, a. 3 c.

– even if there is *some other remote motive* (v.gr., an eager desire for riches...): nevertheless, *the proximate motive of the persecutor must always be this hatred for the faith*. And we profess the faith either explicitly with the mouth, or even implicitly with deeds, when anyone holds and does not want to abandon the Christian law. Therefore there are also martyrs who die because of the observance of a virtue and the law (v.gr., St. Maria Goretti, St. John Nepomucene...)⁵ ; however, the profession of faith must always be present explicitly or implicitly.

Therefore someone is not a martyr if he is killed because of philosophical views or for political motives. But the defense of some truths of science can be the cause of martyrdom, lest someone tell a lie “inasmuch as a lie is a sin against the Divine Law”; and also the defense of the good of the state “since human good may become divine, for instance when it is referred to God.”⁶

Heretics can be considered martyrs in the eyes of God, if the motive for killing them is hatred of the true Christian faith, which they partially retain; and also they must be in good faith in their particular errors and have grace and charity, if we follow the teaching of St. Thomas about martyrdom as explained above (n. 733). But the Church does not honor them as martyrs, because they died not being in union with the Catholic Church.⁷

735. Appositely St. Augustine presents the conditions of a true martyrdom: “... the martyrs were martyrs of this faith, that is, they were witnesses of this faith; by giving testimony to this faith they suffered from a very hostile and cruel world; they conquered it not by opposing it, but by dying...”⁸

736. State of the question. Martyrdom, that is, the constancy and fortitude in giving witness for the faith, can be considered 1) *as the fulfillment of the prophecies of Christ* about persecutions of the disciples and about divine assistance in them (Matt. 10:17ff.; Luke 21:12ff.; John 16:2.13; Acts 1:8); 2) it can be considered as we will consider it here—

5. Thus St. Thomas says: “... all virtuous deeds, inasmuch as they are referred to God, are professions of the faith whereby we come to know that God requires these works of us, and rewards us for them: and in this way they can be the cause of martyrdom” (II-II, q. 124, a. 5 c). See also Suarez, *Defensio fidei catholicae* 1.6 c.11, especially n.10-15: Opera (Vivés) 24,722ff.

6. S.Th. II-II, Q. 124, A. 5 ad 2 and 3.

7. See St Cyprian: “Anyone who is not in the Church cannot be a martyr; he cannot enter into the kingdom if he has abandoned she who is going to reign...” (*De unitate Ecclesiae* 14: ML 4,526). The same Cyprian says: “For, the adversary of Christ pursues and attacks only the fortresses and soldiers of Christ. He scorns and passes by prostrate heretics and their works; he seeks to cast down those whom he sees are standing” (*Epist.* 58 [elsewhere 61], to Lucius the Pope: ML 3,1005). Also St. Augustine, *Epist.* 108 n.9 and n.14: ML 33,410-413; *In Ps. 14:2,13*: “The cause, not the punishment, makes Martyrs”: R 1465.

For more on the *Catholicism* of the martyrs, see Suarez, *Defensio fidei catholicae* 1.1 c.20: Opera 24, 99-102. Likewise Benedict XIV, *De servorum Dei beatificatione...* 3 c.19f.; P. Allard, *Martyre*: DAFC 3,337-342.

8. *De civitate Dei* 22,9: ML 41,771.

as a *moral miracle* performed by God as confirmation of the teaching of Christ; 3) it can also be considered *as the valid testimony of the conviction of many* about the truth of Christian doctrine, given indeed in the face of death; it will also be considered by us under this aspect (n.759). Thus, based on this last point, we will have *a logical argument* for the credibility of the historical facts which are supposed in the Christian religion and, in general, for the truth of this religion; thus from the consideration of this moral miracle, which is found in the martyrdom of so many Christians, we will have *a divine argument*.⁹

737. Adversaries. Henry Dodwell wrote in his *Dissertationes Cyprianicas* “De paucitate martyrum” (Oxford 1684) and contended that their number was not so great; his teaching was then refuted by Th. Ruinart in his book, *Actorum martyrum*.¹⁰

Afterwards Edward Gibbon (18th century) and Ernest Havet (19th century) said the same thing. And recently (1951), H. Grégoire said that the number of martyrs was small.¹¹

Theodore Mommsen and Harnack said that they were killed for political reasons; thus these authors do not distinguish between the true cause of martyrdom and a juridical formula.¹²

G. Boissier acknowledges the large number of martyrs, but says that their testimony is a sign of their subjective conviction, not of the objective truth of religion.¹³

738. Doctrine of the Church. Pius IX while enumerating the different motives of credibility said that it is proved, or at least confirmed with other arguments, that the Christian faith is the work of God “*by the constancy of*

9. Martyrdom can also be considered *ascetically* according as it is *the imitation of Christ and union with Christ* suffering on the cross; and therefore it can be considered, as it was in antiquity, as the “ideal” practice of perfection; also one can live up to this by bearing the daily cross. See Viller-Rahner, *Ascese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* c.2 p.29-40; there you will also find an extensive modern bibliography on martyrdom. Chateaubriand spoke lyrically and oratorically about martyrdom, *Les Martyrs*.

10. Theodore Ruinart, O.S.B., *Acta primorum martyrum sincere et electa* (Paris 1689; Amsterdam 1713); the Spanish version: *Las actas verdaderas de los mártires* 3 t. (Madrid 1844).

11. E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776) c.16: DTC 10,237; DACL 10,2476; Ernest Havet, *Le Christianisme et ses origines* (Paris 1884) c.4: DTC 10,237; DACL 10,1477. H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'empire romain*, fasc.1 in “Mémoire de l'Académie Royale de Belgique,” p.161-163; see also E. De Moreau, S.J.: *NouvRevTh* 73 (1951) 814f. [H. Grégoire says that before the 4th century there were only hundreds, but in the 4th century there were at most 2,500 to 3,000 martyrs]; and E. Griffe, *Les persécutions dans l'empire romain de Néron à Dèce*: *BullLittEccl* 53 (1952) 129-160.

12. See C.A. Kneller, *Hat der römische Staat das Christentum verfolgt?*: *Stimm* 55 (1898) 1-12, 122-131; by the same author, *Theodor Mommsen über die Christenverfolgungen*, *ibid.* P.276-291; likewise *Die Märtyrer und das römische Recht* *ibid.*, 349-367; see DAFC 3,375. A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*⁴ 1.3 c.5 p.501-504.

13. See Gaston Boissier, *La fin du paganisme* (Paris 1891) I, Appendix, 399-459; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.10, prenote n.8 c.

so many martyrs" (D 2779).

Among the arguments given by Vatican Council I (D 3013), the martyrdom of so many Christians is contained implicitly in his words about the "invincible stability" of the Church¹⁴; but there he is not making a different argument.

739. Theological note. This thesis is *traditional and solemn* in patristic literature¹⁵ and among the authors. For it is *apologetically certain*.

740. First proof. Martyrdom is a moral miracle.

The fact of the martyrdom of many in the Catholic Church is absolutely certain, both in the first centuries and in more recent times.

But *this is an argument for extraordinary help from God, a moral miracle*, which cannot be given by God in favor of false doctrine.

Therefore the martyrdom of so many Christians proves the divine origin of Christian revelation.

Proof of the major. A) *The fact of the martyrdom of many is absolutely certain*¹⁶; above all this took place during the twelve persecutions from the year 64 (under Nero) to the year 363 (under Julian the Apostate).¹⁷

a) *There was a great multitude of martyrs in every province of the Roman Empire*; but the number cannot be determined mathematically.¹⁸

First of all, *the sacred books* give indications of various persecutions, especially on the part of the Jews: Acts 6:8ff. (about Stephen); 8:1ff. (a large persecution of the Jerusalem Church); 12:2 (the killing of James); see 14:18; 21:30f. Likewise 1 Pet. 4:12ff. (... sharing in Christ's sufferings...);

14. It was said explicitly in the explanation of the first schema of the Constitution on Catholic doctrine, note 19, II: "in the manner and multitude of martyrs," as an argument: CL 7,532 d.

15. See R 11, 144, 243, 279, 285, 516, 640, 1465; Tromp, *De revelatione*⁶ 1.2 prop.10, prenote n.6f.; Ottiger, 894-897.

16. On the history of martyrdom in the persecutions, both Roman and Persian, Donatist and Arian, also at the time of the reformation and the French revolution, and among the Mohammedans and schismatics, and in the missions, see P. Allard, *Martyre*: DAFC 3,342-492. Likewise Luis de Granada, *Introducción del simbolo de la fe* p.2 c.19-23. Briefly, *Martyre*: DTC 10,233-246; *Christenverfolgungen*: LTK 2,912-917.

On the Acts of the Martyrs, see the Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum*: Th. Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta...* (above note 10); J. Zameza, *La Roma pagana y el Cristianismo* (Rome 1941); D. Ruiz Bueno, *Actas de los mártires. Texto bilingüe* (Madrid 1951).

17. On these early Roman persecutions, see P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*⁴ 3 v. (Paris 1911-1924); the same author, *Le christianisme et l'empire romain de Néron à Théodose*¹⁰ (Paris 1925); also his article, *Martyre*: DAFC 3,342-375. Likewise A. Ehrhard, *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932) 8-121.

18. L. Hertling, S.J., tries to compute the number, *Die Zahl der Märtyrer bis 313*: Greg 25 (1944) 103-129; he says: thousands of names are known to us, and to someone inquiring about the number of churches that suffered persecution, "probably the number is much below 200,000; it would not be too little, if there were about 100,000 (p.128). Objections against statistical determinations are given by E. de Moreau, S.J., *Le nombre des martyrs des persécutions romaines*: NouvRevTh 73 (1951) 812-832.

Rev. 20:4 (I saw... the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus...).

741. *Gentile authors* speak about the large number of those killed. Tacitus, speaking about the persecution of Nero in Rome, says: “Therefore first the accused who confessed, then with their discovery *a huge multitude* of them were not at all convicted for the crime of the fire but for hatred of the human race.”¹⁹ And Dio Cassius, referring to the persecution of Domitian, said: “In the same year Domitian killed many others, both Flavius Clement the consul, even though he was his first cousin and he had as wife Flavia Domitilla, a relative of Domitian, both accused of the crime of impiety towards the gods; *for this crime they and many others were condemned who had erred by embracing the customs of the Jews. A part of these were killed and a part were deprived of their possessions.*”²⁰ And Plinius Minor in the year 111 consulted Trajan about what he should do with the Christians “*especially because of the dangerous number of them.* For, many of every age, of every class, of both sexes are brought to trial and will be brought. The contagion of this superstition has pervaded not only the cities, but also the villages and countryside....”²¹

742. *Ecclesiastical authors* extol clearly the large number of martyrs; although at times they do this in a rhetorical manner, it supposes a very evident reality. Thus Clement of Rome speaks about the great number of the elect who have been joined to the martyrs, Peter and Paul.²² And Irenaeus agrees with him, and at the same time he mentions the universality and the exclusiveness for the Church found in the martyrs: “Wherefore the Church does in every place, because of that love which she cherishes towards God, send forward, throughout all time, a multitude of martyrs to the Father; while all others not only have nothing of this kind to point to among themselves, but even maintain that such witness-bearing is not at all necessary.”²³ Therefore also Clement of Alexandria could say, when comparing Christian martyrs with some fanatical Indians: “But from among us there are *daily overflowing fountains of martyrs*; they are seen with our own eyes—they are burned, they are tortured, they are beheaded. The fear of the law, which like a pedagogue has led them to Christ, moves all of

19. *Annal.* 15,44: Kch 34.

20. *Hist. Roman.* 67,14: Kch 226.

21. *Epist.* 1.10,96: Kch 30.

22. *Epist. ad Cor* 1,6: R 11: Kch 11.

23. *Adversus haereses* 4,33,9: R 243.

them, so that they might show their piety even by shedding their blood.”²⁴

743. But Eusebius Caesariensis reports different things about the various persecutions...; among them he says this about the persecution of Diocletian: To the martyr Antimus, bishop of the church of Nicomedia, *was added a vast multitude of martyrs*; a little later in Melitina, in the region of Armenia, and in Syria the prisons were full of bishops, priests, deacons, lectors and exorcists, so that no place remained for those who were condemned for a crime.²⁵ And when the third edict of Diocletian was promulgated, *“the number now hardly could be estimated of all who after that suffered martyrdom in the various provinces, and especially of those who were killed in Africa and Mauretania, in Thebais and Egypt...”*²⁶ And of those who suffered in Egypt (in the persecution of Diocletian): *“There ten thousand (μυρίοι τόν ἀριθμόν) with women and children, spurning their temporal life, for the teaching of our Savior endured various kinds of death...”*²⁷ *“The torture and suffering that the martyrs in Thebais endured really surpasses anything that could be said in words... And all these things were carried out not in a few days or in a short space of time, but continuously for several years: since now ten, or twenty and more, at times from thirty to sixty, and sometimes even a hundred men together with women and children were killed in one day, by the application alternately of various tortures.”*²⁸—And *“armed soldiers besieged a certain city in Phrygia, and having set it on fire, they totally burned the city together with the men, women and children, as they prayed to Christ the God of all things. The reason for this was that all the inhabitants of the city, the overseer and the magistrate, with all the officials and people, proclaimed that they were Christians, and when commanded to sacrifice to the Roman gods refused to obey.”*²⁹—Later when the persecution was renewed, *in the city of Caesarea in Palestine, “the whole city everywhere was strewn with bones and bodily parts; so that nothing was ever seen that was so cruel, so horrible, even in comparison with what had happened to us before....”*³⁰

744. Therefore it is not surprising if Theodoret speaks about it in the following words: *“... who does not know about what Diocletian, and Maximian, Maxentius, Maximin and Licinius did against the piety of Christians? For they did not assail individuals or two or three Christians at a time, but many of them in groups, and they massacred thousands and tens of thousands. Also in some cities they burned whole churches filled with men, women and children.”*³¹

24. *Strom.* 2,20: MG 8,1069 B.

25. *Hist. eccles.* 8,6: Kch 448f.

26. *Hist. eccles.* 8,6: Kch 450.

27. *Hist. eccles.* 8,8: MG 20,757.

28. *Hist. eccles.* 8,9: Kch 451.

29. *Hist. eccles.* 8,11: MG 20,767.

30. *De martyr. Palaest.* 9: MG 20,1406 A.

31. *Graecarum affect. curatio* 9: MG 83,1041 C.

Inscriptions,³² martyrologies, and the words used by authors all say the same thing: the martyrs were innumerable.³³

745. And the martyrs were not just in one province, but, as is clear from the preceding quotes, in many; in fact, the Fathers were able to preach about the martyrdom of Christians in all the provinces. Thus Irenaeus says: “the Church *in every place*...”³⁴; St. Justin: “Now it is evident that no one can terrify or subdue us who have believed in Jesus over all the world. For it is plain, that though beheaded, and crucified, and thrown to wild beasts, and chains, and fire, and all other kinds of torture, we do not give up our profession....”³⁵ *But according to the fourth edict of Diocletian* “by a general command it was ordered that *all persons in every place and nation* must offer sacrifices and libations publicly to the idols.”³⁶ And “*the edicts of Maximin* against the Christians were sent to every place throughout all the provinces.”³⁷

Therefore at the time of Diocletian Lactantius could write about the persecutions: “*The whole world was shaken* (i.e., the Roman Empire), and besides Gaul, from East to West three angry beasts were raging.”³⁸ And St. Hilary, while speaking about the persecutions because of the confession of the truth, said: “For there are *in the whole world* blessed and holy martyrdoms of faithful confessors. Hence many have been deprived of their property, sent away into exile, chained, beaten, burned, killed....”³⁹

746. b) *The martyrs were of every age, sex and state of life.*⁴⁰ To prove this it is sufficient to have read the martyrology; in it every grade, every social condition, every age and sex of the martyrs is recorded: They were nobles and peasants, learned and ignorant, boys and girls, men and women,

32. This was found in the *Catacombs*: “Marcella and the martyrs of Christ CCCCCL [550]”; “CL [150] martyrs of Christ.” See P. Allard, *Rome souterraine* (Paris 1877) 216ff.; Tanqueray²², 218.

33. Prudentius also sang about this elegantly: “*Countless are the graves of saints* I have seen in the city of Romulus / Valerian, Christ’s dedicated servant / You ask for the inscriptions cut on their tombs / And their individual names / But it is hard of me to be able to repeat them / Such great multitudes of the righteous did ungodly rage devour / While Trojan Rome still worshipped the gods of her fathers / Many a grave is lettered / And tells the martyr’s name or bears some epitaph / But there are mute marbles too / Which shut up the tombs in silence / And only indicate the number / You may learn what masses of men’s bodies lie gathered together in heaps / But read the name of none of them. / I remember finding that the remains of sixty persons were buried there under one massive stone, / Whose names Christ alone knows, / Since he has added them to the company of his friends” (*Peristephanon* hymn 11: ML 60,530-534).

34. See the whole text above in n.742.

35. *Dialog. cum Trypho* 110: R 144.

36. Eusebius, *De marty. Palaest.* 3,1: Kch 468.

37. Eusebius, *De marty. Palaest.* 9,2: Kch 469.

38. *De mort.persecut.* 16: ML 7,217.

39. *In Ps 118*, 18,9: ML 9,624.

40. See P. Allard, *Dix leçons sur le martire*, leç.5.

youths and old folks... Lactantius considered this matter: “Robbers and men of robust frame are unable to endure lacerations of this kind: they utter exclamations, send forth groans; for they are overcome by pain, because they are destitute of patience infused into them. But in our case (not to speak of men), *boys and delicate women* in silence overpower their torturers, and even the fire is unable to extort from them a groan... Behold, the *weak sex and fragile age* endure to be lacerated in the whole body, and to be burned: not of necessity, for it is permitted them to escape if they wished to do so; but of their own will, because they put their trust in God.”⁴¹

747. c) *The torments of the martyrs were severe, both the physical and the moral.*⁴² This severity of their sufferings is clear from what was said above.⁴³ And Tacitus had this to say about the martyrs during the time of Nero: “And derision accompanied their end: they were covered with wild beasts’ skins and torn to death by dogs; or they were fastened on crosses, and, when daylight failed were burned to serve as lamps by night. Nero had offered his Gardens for the spectacle, and gave an exhibition in his Circus, mixing with the crowd in the habit of a charioteer, or mounted on his car.”

⁴⁴ On the severity of the persecution of Diocletian in Thebais Eusebius says: “It would be impossible to describe the outrages and tortures which the martyrs in Thebais endured. They were scraped over the entire body with shells instead of hooks until they died. Women were bound by one foot and raised aloft in the air by machines, and with their bodies altogether bare and uncovered, presented to all beholders this most shameful, cruel, and inhuman spectacle. Others being bound to the branches and trunks of trees perished. For they drew the stoutest branches together with machines, and bound the limbs of the martyrs to them; and then, allowing the branches to assume their natural position, they tore asunder instantly the limbs of those for whom they contrived this... We, also being on the spot ourselves, have observed large crowds in one day; some suffering decapitation, others torture by fire; so that the murderous sword was blunted, and becoming weak, was broken, and the very executioners grew weary and relieved each other....”⁴⁵

748. Among these and other innumerable cruelties it is necessary

41. *Div. Instit.* 5,13: R 640.

42. On the torments of the martyrs, see H. Leclercq, *Martyr* § XIII-XXIX: DACL 10, 2387-2430. Likewise with an appendix of illustrations, D. Galonio, *Libro de los tormentos de los mártires*, in the Spanish version of the work of Th. Ruinart, *Las actas verdaderas de los mártires* (Madrid 1844) t.3 p. 179-447.

43. See n.741ff.; on St. Justin: R 144.

44. *Annal.* 15,44: Kch 34.

45. *Hist. eccles.* 9,1-4: Kch 451f.

to mention *the often long duration of the torments* and a slow death. As Lactantius said about Donatus: “Having been nine times exposed to racks and diversified torments, nine times by a glorious profession of your faith you foiled the adversary; in nine combats you subdued the devil and his chosen soldiers; and by nine victories you triumphed over this world and its terrors....”⁴⁶

749. Add to this the often more painful *moral torments*: by being condemned *to the seducer rather than to the lion*.⁴⁷—And the looks and prayers and tears of relatives; about this St. Augustine says beautifully: “... what did the temptations of the persecutors do to them (the martyrs)? The eyes of their weeping friends had more effect than the persecutions of their tormenters. How many did the children hold lest they suffer! How many wives threw themselves on their knees, lest they be left widows! How many children forbade their parents to die, as we know and read in the passion of blessed Perpetua! These are the facts. But no matter how great the tears may be and how strongly they may flow, when did they ever extinguish the flame of charity?....”⁴⁸

750. d) *The martyrs suffered with great courage and constancy* and therefore with complete voluntariness. For Lactantius said that just above (n.746), where you should note that they suffered such horrible things “of their own will, because they put their trust in God.”

And Eusebius speaks more explicitly about the martyrs in Thebais under Diocletian, after he described their torments (as above in n.747): “And we beheld the most wonderful ardor, and the truly divine energy and zeal of those who believed in the Christ of God. For as soon as sentence was pronounced against the first, one after another rushed to the judgment seat, and confessed themselves Christians. And regarding with indifference the terrible things and the multiform tortures, they declared themselves boldly and undauntedly for the religion of the God of the universe. And they received the final sentence of death with joy and laughter and cheerfulness; so that they sang and offered up hymns and thanksgivings to the God of the universe till their very last breath.”⁴⁹

751. Examples can be multiplied. Thus *in the passion of the holy Scilitanarians* (in the year 180) according to the proconular Acts, after the condemnation of Speratus and some others, *they all said: Thanks be to God*.⁵⁰ We find the same fortitude and voluntariness *in the martyrdom of Carpus, Papyrus and Agathon* under Marcus Aurelius or under

46. *De mort. persecut.* 16: ML 7,218.

47. *Apolog.* 50: R 285.

48. *In Ps 47*, 13: ML 36,541. Similarly St. Hilary, *In Ps 118*, 15,3: ML 9,600.

49. *Hist. eccles.* 8,9: Kch 452. See *ibid.* 8,6: Kch 448.

50. Kch 71-76.

Decius.⁵¹ Similarly St. Cyprian, after his sentence: *The bishop Cyprian said: Thanks be to God.*⁵² Also voluntarily *Marinus, a centurion* under Galienus, preferring to choose the book of the gospel rather than the military sword, was crowned with martyrdom.⁵³ And *St. Laurence* “when he saw Xystus his bishop being led to martyrdom, began to weep, not because of his suffering, but for being left alone. Therefore he began to call out with these words: Where are you going, father, without your son? Where are you hastening, holy priest, without your deacon? You never offered sacrifice without your minister; therefore, father, what is it in me that displeases you? Have you found me unworthy? You know for sure that I am a suitable minister....” And Xystus replied: “I am not leaving or deserting you, my son; but greater tests are due to you. We as old men are receiving the course of an easier fight; a more glorious triumph over tyranny remains for you as a young man....” And Laurence “after three days, having laughed at the tyrant, and having been placed on a gridiron over burning coals, said: *I’m well done. Turn me over and eat.* Thus he conquered the nature of fire by the virtue of his soul.”⁵⁴

752. e) *The martyrs suffered all these things because of their faith, as witnesses to that faith.*⁵⁵ Already at the time of the persecution of Nero Suetonius refers to this: Christians afflicted with punishments, *a class of men with a new and wicked superstition.*⁵⁶ And Plinius Minor did not condemn those “who denied that they are or had been Christians, when in my presence they invoked the gods and paid honor to your image [the Emperor Trajan] with incense and wine, and in addition spoke badly about Christ....”⁵⁷; Trajan in his reply to Plinius confirms this by saying that: “whoever denies that he is a Christian and he really makes it clear, that is, by invoking our gods, although he was suspected in the past, may seek pardon from any punishment.”⁵⁸ The same cause of the Christian faith is apparent in the above mentioned *Acts of the passion of the Scilitanian martyrs, and of Carpus, Papyrus, Agathon* and others.⁵⁹ Both Christians and Gentiles knew about this. Therefore St. Justin was able to write: “For it is plain, that though beheaded, and crucified, and thrown to the wild beasts, and chains, and fire, and all other kinds of torture, we do not give up our confession.”⁶⁰

Tertullian sums up this matter briefly: “You say we are atheists, and will not be at the ex-

51. *Acta proconsularia* 4: Kch 78-90.

52. *Acta proconsularia* 4: Kch 304. On the confession of St. Cyprian, *ibid.*: Kch 301-306.

53. Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 7,15: Kch 442.

54. St. Ambrose, *De officiis ministrorum* 1,41,204-206: ML 16,84-86. There is more about the courage and the voluntariness of the martyrs in Ottiger, 884-886.

55. Wilmers has more on this point throughout all of proposition 113, p.540-547.

56. *Vita Neronis* 16,2: Kch 40.

57. *Epist.* 1.10,96: Kch 29.

58. *Ibid.*, 97: Kch 31.

59. See Kch 71-76, 78-90....

60. *Dialog. cum Tryphone* 110: R 144; above n.745.

pense of a sacrifice for the life of the emperors... It is upon this account, therefore, that we are considered as guilty of sacrilege and treason; this I take to be the main article, and may be looked upon as the sum of the charge against us...."⁶¹

753. Wherefore, although *the juridical judgments of condemnation* imposed on them was that of sacrilege, or magic, or the crime of offending the emperor or of impiety...; and, although other remote motives sometimes were political reasons, greed (v.gr., in the martyrdom of St. Laurence), the real reason was hatred of the Christian religion...: so the martyrs died really *because of the faith and their witness to it*.

754. B) *The palms of martyrs have never been lacking in the Church*; not only in the first three centuries was the Church made red with their blood. Let us here recall the more famous persecutions which came later and the large number of martyrs: before the middle of the 4th century in Persia under Sapor II, in the 5th century in Africa the persecution of the Vandals; in the following centuries because of the invasion of the barbarians there were many martyrs in Europe; in Spain there were many because of the invading Mohammedans and also in the 16th century in the rebellion at Alpujarras; at the time of the reformation there were many martyrs in England, in Germany, in France, in Ireland...; because of the spread of the gospel there were constant martyrs in Japan, in India, in China, in America...; during the time of the revolution in the 18th century again there were martyrs in France; in the 19th century there were many martyrs in the Asian missions... Also in our time there have been many martyrs in Russia, in Mexico, in Spain and in China... and there are so many of them that we will find it difficult to count them.⁶² Indeed there are also the recent ones who have been canonized, like St. Maria Goretti: *As the lilies of virgins have never been lacking in the Church, so also the roses and palms of the martyrs*.

755. **Proof of the minor.** *But all of these facts are an argument for the extraordinary help of God.* For, these facts taken all together evidently and clearly cannot be attributed to:

1) *nature considered in itself* as if it were capable of such fortitude; because it naturally flees from torments and the thought of them, especially if someone finds himself in them in a merely passive way: "endurance is

61. *Apolog.* 10: ML 1,380f.

62. On the martyrs after the Roman persecutions, see Allard, *Martyre*: DAF 3,375-492. On the martyrs at Alpujarras, F.A. Hitos, *Mártires de la Alpujarra en la rebelión de los moriscos* (Madrid 1935). On confessors of the faith in Japan in the 19th century (1868-1874) among the first Christians, see A. Villion, *Cincuenta años por el Japón*, Spanish edition (Madrid) c.5-10 p.35-88 (there were about 4,000 Christians who were forced into exile).

more difficult than aggression” (St. Thomas).⁶³ However, a few men, as *exceptions to the general rule*, by their natural virtue are ready to die for their own particular “ideal,” or personal conviction; but situations of this kind are *rare and rarely happen* and they are celebrated as heroes, as rising above the normal way of acting: thus, for example, all consider as heroes the deeds of Mucius Scaevola and Regulus, who suffered for the “ideal” of the fatherland.⁶⁴ Therefore deeds of this kind are due not to nature alone, but to a *great ideal*, which is not found naturally in a large multitude; but the martyrs were innumerable.

756. 2) Nor are they due to *the internal passions of the vigorous nature a) of stoic pride*, despising sufferings with contempt, and so wishing to overcome fate and humiliate the adversary: for, the martyrs suffered with gentleness and humility. And such stoic pride is not characteristic of many, but only a few philosophers or of others trained in warfare and austerity: but the Christians were old men, boys, girls, women..., from every state of life.

b) *And the martyrs were not animated by passions of obstinacy or fanaticism*: for from the reports there is certainty about their serenity and patience in answering questions; in no way did they respond with violence, arrogance and the imprudence of fanatics... so that reports of this kind at times were destroyed by the Gentiles themselves, lest, from the marvelous serenity and prudence of the martyrs in responding, they themselves would appear to be overcome.⁶⁵ Moreover, such fanaticism would not be possible in so many men. And the martyrs did not repel force with force, as obstinacy is inclined to do, but they embraced their enemies with heroic love and kindness.⁶⁶

c) *And not by passions of imprudent temerity or fearlessness*,⁶⁷ or because of the lack of a just fear; neither because of audacity of excess in daring⁶⁸: for often they did not receive the crown *voluntarily*; many others fled or hid themselves⁶⁹; and often the decrees of the bishops forbade

63. II-II, q. 123, a. 6 c and ad 1.

64. *Caius Mucius Scaevola* in the war against Porsena, having entered into the land of the enemy, wanted to kill Porsena; but, having been captured, he burned up his hand in a fire (in a brazier).—*Marcus Atilius Regulus*, leader of the Romans, when he was captured by the Carthaginians, was sent to Rome to seek peace, under the condition of returning to captivity. But he persuaded the Romans not to seek peace but to continue the war; again he turned himself over to the Carthaginians, who loaded him down with torments.

65. See Ruinart, *Acta martyrum* preface c.1 n.4; Müller, n.20.

66. See v.gr. Eusebius, *De marty. Palaest.* 8: MG 20,1489 B.

67. S.Th. II-II, q. 126.

68. S.Th. II-II, q. 127.

69. On the voluntary ones, see *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4: Funk, *Patres apostolici* I², 318. On flight during the persecutions, see St. Athanasius, *Apologia de fuga sua* 17,22: MG 25,665-673.

Christians to offer themselves voluntarily to the Gentiles.⁷⁰

d) *And the martyrs did not do that because of plain foolishness*: for many of them were wise persons, but all responded wisely and prudently.

757. 3) Nor can all of these things be attributed *to extrinsic motives of an insecure nature*:

a) *of temporal gain*: evidently there was none of that;

b) *of the desire for glory*: many died unknown and as a member of a group,⁷¹ some boys or old men; but all were shown to be upright persons, not vain, but while distrusting themselves, they trusted in God alone and they sincerely sought him.

c) Certainly the motives *of hope for a happy eternity in God and of fulfilling one's obligation because of the love of God* were present. But they were there with extraordinary enlightenment and strength from God. For, given man's normal fragility these motives could not be effective without supernatural assistance; for, nature is not greatly moved by the thought of insensible goods—or future ones for that matter—; many people do not overcome even ordinary temptations and difficulties.

758. Therefore the martyrdom of so many Christians is an argument for extraordinary and supernatural help⁷²; it is an argument for *a moral miracle*, conferred by God as confirmation of Christian revelation.⁷³

759. Second proof. Martyrdom as the testimony of a great multitude.

The testimony of such a great—and such a diverse—multitude,—of very prudent men,—offered peacefully—in the face of torments—and of a very cruel death,—indicates a firm conviction of the truth of Christian doctrine—;

70. See St. Chrysostom, *Epist.* 81: Kch 300,4. See also Kch 301,10. The Council of Illiberitanus (in the year 300) canon 60, says this: "If anyone broke an idol and because of that was killed... it seemed good that he not be received into the number of the martyrs" (Kch 342).

71. Thus those confessors who, by letters or by familiar conversation were called *martyrs* "did not suffer us to address them by this name. If any one of us, in letter or conversation, spoke of them as martyrs, they rebuked him sharply. For they conceded cheerfully the appellation of Martyr to Christ the faithful and true Witness, and firstborn of the dead, and prince of the life of God; and they reminded us of the martyrs who had already departed, and said, 'They are already witnesses whom Christ has deemed worthy to be taken up in their confession, having sealed their testimony by their departure; *but we are lowly and humble confessors.*' And they besought the brethren with tears that earnest prayers should be offered that they might be made perfect... But they refused the title of Martyrs as distinguishing them from their brethren, being filled with the fear of God." See Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,2: MG 20,433-436.

72. The martyrs often had this conviction about divine extraordinary help for the suffering of torments, like *St. Polycarp*; and St. Felicity said: "there will be another one in me who will suffer for me"; and there were others. See Ottiger, p.893f.

73. Other miracles, performed during the torments of the martyrs, are also *further arguments* in favor of the matter for which they gave their witness.

and there is no historical fact, or any other doctrine, to which so many thousands of persons bore witness at the cost of their life.

But the sufficient reason for this conviction and this witness cannot be in ignorance, in inconsiderate haste, in obstinacy, in fanaticism...; but only in the objective truth of the motives that enticed that multitude in the face of death. You can say only that it came from the supernatural assistance of God, which cannot be given for anything false.

Therefore the martyrdom of so many martyrs is a valid witness to Christian truth.

760. *St. Jerome* speaks beautifully about this matter: “The suffering of the martyrs is God’s triumph; there is joy both at the shedding of blood in the name of Christ and among the torments. For since anyone can see that the martyrs stand with such great perseverance, and to be tormented, and to glory in their sufferings, the odor of the knowledge of God is spread out among the nations, and *the hidden thought creeps in that, if the Gospel were not true, it would never be defended with blood.* For the confession is not delightful, secure and eager for riches; but it consists in prisons, in blows, in persecutions, in hunger, in nakedness and in thirst. This triumph is the victory of God and of the Apostles.”⁷⁴

761. Objections. 1. Many men fight bravely and die for their country or for something erroneous. Therefore....

I distinguish the antecedent. Many fight *actively*, not passively, and they fight in any way they can, that is, often infuriated with anger, and with mutual compulsion, and to flee severe punishments or ignominy which would be involved in flight, or because of the hope of a temporal reward, and also they are not exposing themselves to certain death, *conceded*; also many do this in a heroic manner, *denied* (for those acts are not then heroic, which are always assumed to be extraordinary).

But there were *many* martyrs who suffered—*passively*—and truly *freely*—and *without the hope of a temporal reward*—and *without compulsion*. But with reference to the heroic acts of some men, these heroes are rare, and generally hardened in their work or in resisting others: but there were many martyrs, and many of them were frail, like old men, women, young girls....

2. The martyrs sometimes rebuked the judges. Therefore they did not bear their torments patiently.

I distinguish the antecedent. They rebuked and reproached judges because of the torments that they themselves suffered or were about to suffer, *denied* (on the contrary, St. Cyprian and others responded with “Thanks be to God”; see n.751); sometimes they rebuked the judges because of their cruelty towards others, v.gr., holy virgins and old people, *conceded*; but then that is *a work of virtue*.⁷⁵

74. *Epist.* 120: ML 22,1002.

75. See v.gr. Eusebius speaking about the martyr Aedesius, *Liber de marty. Palaest.* 5: MG 20, 1480f.

3. In pagan regions, in India, there were widows who, after the death of their husband, endured death by fire; or there were and recently have been nobles who, after the death of the emperor, voluntarily sought death; or there have been priests wounding themselves in honor of the gods (1 Kings 18:28).

Response. Consider the *infamy* which would have been given to these individuals coming from debased and insane opinions; or the human *praise* which they sought; and the *pressure* of public opinion for these barbarous and irrational customs. Finally, there are *not many* of these persons; they are not *from every state of life, nor were they tormented over a long period of time*, as the Christian martyrs were.⁷⁶

4. The hope of immortal life, even if just an opinion, explains naturally the fortitude of the martyrs; thus among the Mohammedans who die bravely in battle; thus among the Hebrews who, according to the words of Tacitus, “think that the souls of those killed in battle are eternal; hence they have a love for generating and contempt for dying.”⁷⁷

Response. Natural hope alone does not give the support and fortitude such as we see in the true martyrs. With regard to Mohammedans, note that they are not passive, but they conduct themselves in war aggressively and with passionate fury; hence there is a difference with the martyrs. But what is said about the Hebrews, if by an error of the historian the matter refers to Christians, who died in a truly patient manner, it can be accepted that they were motivated by hope, but in their case a *supernatural hope*; but the others either did not die so patiently, or together with hope some other natural motive moved them to endure suffering.

5. According to Dodwell the martyrdom of Christians is explained naturally: a) from the obstinate character of the Galileans which was handed on to the first Christians; b) from the austere discipline of the primitive Christianity which was practiced by Christians; c) from the desire of glory; d) from the hope of future glory.⁷⁸

Response. a) The martyrs were not only Galileans; and it is ridiculous to think that such a trait could be transmitted to so many others of diverse nations. b) The austere discipline and the primitive abstinence certainly strengthened character; but many Christians, a few days after their acceptance of the faith, had to give their witness immediately; hence there is no explanation why *so many* Christians developed for themselves such an eminent character. c) The desire for glory certainly was not present among most of them. d) The hope of glory was present, but naturally it does not confer such firm comfort, as it did for the martyrs.

6. Also the Christian martyrs were fanatics, like those who, during the persecution of Diocletian: “It is reported that with a certain divine and indescribable eagerness men and women rushed into the fire”⁷⁹; or also the virgins who in order to avoid injury “And after arranging their garments suitably, they went aside from the middle of the road, having requested of the guards a little time for retirement, and cast themselves into a river which was flowing by”; and others.⁸⁰

76. On these widows and priests, see Ottiger, 890-893; Wilmers, n.557.

77. *Hist.* 5,5.

78. See Müller, n.36.

79. Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 8,6: Kch 448.

80. Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 8,12: MG 20,769-772.

I distinguish the antecedent. True martyrs did such things foolishly, as v.gr., the Donatists who, after having made their confession, killed themselves, *denied*; they did it because of a motive of virtue based on divine inspiration, *conceded*.⁸¹

7. Also the Tribunal of the Inquisition made heretics martyrs. Therefore....

I distinguish the antecedent. It made them martyrs because of hatred of the faith, gratuitously and without cause, *denied*; it decreed that they should be killed because of a crime, which was a cause of disturbance in the nation and in the Church, *I subdistinguish*: and they suffered ordinarily in a quiet manner and inspired with patience, *denied*; they suffered protesting, *conceded*.

8. Jews were also killed by Christians out of hatred for the faith.

Response. They were killed in a much smaller number than the Christians; all did not suffer inspired by patience, but many killed themselves; and they were not killed because of hatred of the faith, but because of their avarice, at least assumed, and because of hatred of the *nation*.⁸²

9. The heretics also had their own martyrs.

Response. 1) Not many, as Irenaeus says: "the Church... sends forward throughout all time a multitude of martyrs to the Father; while all others not only have nothing of this kind to point to among themselves, but even maintain that such witness-bearing is not at all necessary."⁸³

2) They had *some* as particular heroic acts, *I bypass this*, because often they have been seen as signs not of gentleness, but of fanaticism and pride; or, if some Protestants were of good faith, as those in Uganda in 1885-1886 seem to have been, then it can be conceded that they endured a true martyrdom, not as Protestants but as *Christians*.

10. Therefore de facto heretics, as also schismatics, have their own martyrs.

I respond again. Formal heretics are martyrs, *denied*, since, with bad faith renouncing the authority of God and the authentic magisterium of the Church, they cannot give testimony for the faith. But material heretics, *I subdistinguish*: for a particular truth, *conceded*; for their own sect, *denied*.

11. Therefore there can be heretical and schismatic martyrs.

I respond again. In a reduplicative way as such, *denied*; in a specific case, *conceded* (see above n.734).

12. Heretics can have true martyrs even for their own specific errors. *Proof*: If the heretics are in good faith in their errors, God must give them the grace to suffer death in testimony of their own particular faith, because they must follow a conscience that is invincibly erroneous.

Response. It is repugnant to divine providence that *it greatly strengthen someone for an error*; the whole Church and the martyrs, because of this divine assistance, argue for the truth of the Catholic faith. And even granted, but not conceded, if there were such heretics strengthened by God to suffer death, certainly there were not many of them, lest other men be led into error. In such a profession of their faith, God rather would give

81. See St. Augustine, who about these things does not attempt to judge it rashly: "For what if they did this, not being deceived after the manner of men, but commanded by God?" (*De civitate Dei* I,26: ML 41,39.

82. See P. Browe, S.J., *Die Judenbekämpfung im Mittelalter*: ZkathTh 62(1938) 197-231, 349-384.

83. *Adversus haereses* 4,33,9; R 243; above n.742.

them the grace of enlightenment to acknowledge the true faith.

13. According to Origen there were not many Christian martyrs: “[God] on certain occasions has restrained those who rose up against them and desired to destroy them. For in order to remind others, that by seeing a few engaged in a struggle for their religion, they also might be better fitted to despise death, *some, on special occasions, and these individuals who can be easily numbered, have endured death for the sake of Christianity*,—God not permitting the whole nation to be exterminated....”⁸⁴

Response. Origen was writing in 248, before the fierce persecutions; but he is also speaking *relatively*, that is, to affirm that the Christians were never extinguished.

14. But it is not correct to believe that God permits so many torments and persecutions to the point of death, precisely of those who have embraced his truth. Therefore the martyrdom of so many Christians rather weakens the truth of the Christian religion.

I distinguish the antecedent. This is incorrect for those who judge naturally, and do not understand the things that are of the Spirit of God (see 1 Cor. 2:14), *conceded*; it is incorrect for those who recognize the Spirit of God redeeming us through the cross and by filling up those things that are lacking in the sufferings of Christ, *denied*. And consider this: *without the persecutions the proof of patience would be lacking*, and the constancy of martyrs would not shine like a precious gem in the crown of the Church.

15. But Christ promised: *And not a hair of your head will perish* (Luke 21:18).

Response. With these words he exhorts his disciples to trust in divine providence, in spite of the persecutions and death, which he had predicted (see Luke 21:16; Matt. 10:20-22...).

16. Contrary to the testimony of those who professed their faith in the face of death, there is the testimony of many who denied the faith.

Response. 1) To prove the thesis *the positive testimony of many* is sufficient, and this must be explained by arguing for the supernatural intervention of God.

2) Those who fell away from the faith did not give a contrary testimony, because with the threat of torments defection is normal enough for weak human nature when left to itself; hence then the sincerity of the testimony is not to be expected. And even then many, after their repentance, revoked their apostasy.

17. According to the opinion of the Fathers, the theological truth of martyrdom is made certain from the truth of the faith for which someone dies.⁸⁵ But we want to prove the truth of the faith the other way around.

I distinguish the major. The truth of a *particular martyrdom* sometimes becomes known from a consideration of the truth for which someone dies, *conceded*; but the truth of a *martyrdom as a sufficiently universal fact* becomes known from the consideration of the truth of Christian doctrine, *denied*. There is no vicious circle; for, independently of knowledge of the truth of Christian doctrine we argue correctly from the fact alone of the martyrdom of so many Christians.

84. *Contra celsum* 3,8: MG 11,929 C.

85. See above, note 7.

C O N C L U S I O N

762. At the conclusion of our treatise the very clear words of Pope Pius IX come to mind (Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*): "... how many, how wonderful, how splendid are the proofs at hand by which human reason ought to be entirely and most clearly convinced that the religion of Christ is divine, and that 'every principle of our dogmas has received its root from above, from the Lord of the heavens,'¹ and that, therefore, nothing is more certain than our faith, nothing more secure, nothing more holy, and nothing based on firmer principles... All of this certainly shines in every way with so great a glory of divine wisdom and power that the mind and intelligence of each one clearly understands that the Christian faith is the work of God" (D 2779).

Rightly, therefore, we can use the words of Richard of St. Victor: *Lord, if there is error, we have been deceived by you: for, these things have been confirmed for us by such great signs and miracles, which could be done only by you.*"²

We will also give other arguments in favor of the Catholic Church, the teacher and guardian of divine revelation. *In fact, it is to the Catholic Church alone that belong all those signs that are so numerous and so wonderfully arranged by God to make evident the credibility of the Christian faith* (D 3013); thus this certainly is true: *Thy decrees are very true* (Ps. 93:5).

For this reason, *giving thanks to the Father, who has qualified us to share in the inheritance of the saints in light* [Col. 1:12], only let us not neglect our salvation, but *looking to Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith* [Heb. 12:2] *let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering* [Heb. 10:23] (D 3013); *always prepared to make a defense to any one who calls us to account for the hope that is in us* (see 1 Pet. 3:15).

1. St. Chrysostom, *Interpretatio in Isaiam prophetam* c.1: MG 56,14.

2. *De Trinitate* 1,2: ML 196,891.

A P P E N D I X

On the historiography of Jesus of Nazareth

763. The treatise *On Jesus the Legate*, when taken as a whole, produces the history or biography of Jesus of Nazareth.

Now the book that immediately precedes this treatise, namely, the book *on the historical sources to prove the fact of revelation*, is a book treating the major parts of the gospels, which are *the main historical sources for writing the life of Jesus*. But we have also mentioned some other historical sources in order to establish historically the existence and life of Jesus, namely, the letters of St. Paul and other documents, whether of the Jews (especially Flavius Josephus) or of the Gentiles, which can refer to Jesus and give some information about him (th.25).

764. Concerning the life itself of Jesus, *we find it prefigured and foretold* (a unique fact in the life of any man) in an abundant series of prophecies which deal with the Messiah and which we have proved must be referred to a definite and individual person (th.35).

But these are *miracles performed for Jesus*, that is, in order to illuminate his image and in order by divine influence to describe the course of his life, like the wondrous facts involved *in his Annunciation and Birth (and afterwards in his public baptism and in his death)*, which gave total approval by God of his life (n.572).

And we could not pass over what Jesus said and what he did; therefore we treated *the testimony that Jesus gave about himself, both about his messiahship* (th.26-29), and about his divinity (th.30). And, while we treated briefly the sense in which he himself understood his messiahship, it was necessary to say something concerning the opinions held about it at that time by the people and by the Rabbis and by the Jewish leaders: and with this it was necessary to highlight *the social and doctrinal atmosphere current at the time* (n.406-414). Moreover, a fuller knowledge and exposition of the teaching of Jesus will be given in the treatise on his kingdom and on his Church.

It also helps in reading biographies to have some knowledge of *the personal qualities or character* of the person whose life is being written. And we have tried to do that, when we pointed out that Jesus was not a deceiver, but truthful and upright, that he himself was not deceived but supremely wise and intelligent with every type of intelligence, not abnormal but sane to the highest degree; at the same time we noted that he radiated eminent holiness (th.31).

765. After a man is known, then his works should be examined. After explaining the personal qualities and character of Jesus, we next considered his works which bear witness to him, namely, *the miracles* (th.32) and *prophecies given by him* (th.33); these facts, since they clearly manifest the omnipotence of God and his infinite knowledge, are most certain signs of the divine revelation of Jesus' teaching and of his testimony.

But among the works and signs of Jesus there is the work that is to be admired before his other works, the greatest sign before all other signs, like the crown of all the signs given by him, of all the works done by him: *we mean the resurrection of Jesus from the dead*, which chronologically is the last sign; in its dignity and majesty it surpasses all the other signs; we treated this as the last and the supreme miracle performed by Jesus (th.34).

Thus simply, as is apparent, our whole treatment concerning Jesus the Legate was a consideration of his life and his history.

766. But with these points the consideration of Jesus is not completed. For, men are well known not only from the things they did while living, but also from other things that follow them after their death, or are done because of their influence. Hence the way becomes easy *to consider the teaching of Jesus in itself*, especially as it appears in historical evolution (th.36), and in order to detect in the world *the fruits of holiness produced by that teaching*, namely, fruits of light and virtue (th.37).

And all of these facts, *quickly, with incredible zeal and great fervor propagated in difficult circumstances*, clearly demonstrate the valid religious movement coming from Jesus and flowing back to Him; these facts also authenticate his legation and his person (th.38).

Indeed the *imperturbable preservation of this religious movement*, in the midst of troubles both internal and external, as Church history records, clearly confirms the internal power of this religion from Christ and its divine external assistance (th.39).

767. But especially *the martyrdom of many Christians*, in ancient and recent times, not only bears witness to the truth of Jesus' teaching (th.40), but also to the amiableness of his person, whom innumerable persons from every walk of life, condition and age have loved: boys, girls, the elderly, men, women, peasants, scholars—to the point of shedding their blood for him: *truly he is loved*.

768. Finally, even with these facts the consideration of the work started by Jesus is not closed. For, Christ loved the Church, which does not have a

stain or wrinkle, and he handed himself over for her, which he acquired by his blood. He is the Head of the Church, as will be shown in what follows; *and from this consideration of the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, Christ will be revealed and known with a brighter light and the fullness of his reality.*

769. On the “biographies” of Jesus of Nazareth. A general catalogue of the “lives” or *biographies of Jesus* has been composed, among others, though incompletely, by A. Michel,¹ R. Aigrain,² L. Koesters, S.J.³; F.M. Braun, O.P.⁴; A. Schweitzer.⁵ We will pass over others.⁶

The holy Fathers explained the life of Jesus while they commented on the holy gospels. And in the middle ages there was no lack of exegetical explanations, and selected quotes (*catenae aureae*) of the gospels; there were also *Mediations on the Life of Christ*. As a complete and integral life of Jesus, not a mere commentary on the gospels, the famous work of Ludolph of Saxony in the 14th century stands out (+ 1377), *The Life of Christ*,⁷ which in a special way promotes devotion and mediation on the mysteries of Christ.

770. Other lives of Jesus were published both in the 15th century and in the following centuries, which also had the purpose of promoting piety. Of these authors deserving of mention, one is Peter de Ribadeneira, S.J., 1527-1611), who wrote *Vida et misterios de Cristo Nuestro Señor*,⁸ where the ascetical and devout aspect with great unction is developed for preaching or mediation. Also worthy of mention is Fr. De Ligny, S.J. (1709-1788) who in Avignon in the year 1774 published *Histoire de la vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ depuis son incarnation jusque'à son ascension*.

771. Against the attacks of the rationalists (Reimarus, G. Paulus, Strauss, Renan...) there were not lacking Catholics (also Protestants) who composed lives of Christ; but the Catholic movement to write truly scholarly lives of Christ began in the 19th century, truly as a gift of God, especially as a powerful reaction in France against the work by Renan.

-
1. In the article, *Jésus-Christ* in DTC 8,1408-1411.
 2. *Quelques vies de Jésus* in the encyclopedia *Le Christ* (Bloud and Gay, Paris 1932) 1119-1149.
 3. *Christusbiographie* in his book *Unser Christuglaube* (Freiburg Br. 1939) 232ff.
 4. *L'evangile devant les temps présents* (Paris 1938); Spanish translation: *El evangelio y los tiempos actuales* (Barcelona 1943) 153.
 5. *Geschichte der Leben Jesu-Forschung*^A (Tübingen 1926); it goes up to the year 1912, from Reimarus to Wrede.
 6. Like M. Goguel*, *Histoire des vies de Jésus* in the work *La vie de Jésus* (1932) 17-48; likewise G. Pfanmüller* in *Jesus im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (1939) 363-442, but he has very little about biographies of Jesus written by Catholics; J.G. Hoffmann, *Les vies de Jésus et le Jésus de l'Histoire* (Uppsala 1947) on lives written in French by non-Catholics, from Renan to Ch. Guignebert (Paris 1933).
 7. Printed editions began to appear in 1474 and it was translated into various languages.
 8. It was taken from his *Flos sanctorum*; and this extract was published often after 1878; see Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* 6, 1741.

Ernestus Renan (1823-1892), formerly a seminarian and learned in Hebrew, after travels in the Orient published his *Life of Jesus* in 1863, as the first volume of his *Historia de originibus Christianismi*.⁹ This work, written in a pleasant style, was a literary work, not scientific, based on insinuations, subjectivism and weak scholarship; it was not developed with solid, objective and penetrating exegesis of the texts and the facts. But it had this good result, that it stimulated the work of Catholics, who wrote true and scientific histories of Jesus.¹⁰

Among others, L. Veuillot, M. Dupanloup, Pauvert, H. Waldon in France wrote other lives of Christ; A. Capececiatti in Italy; H.J. Coleridge in England; and P. Schegg, J. Grimm in Germany....

772. But the beginning of the best biographies of Jesus, in which the scholarly and pious spirits were joined together, was made by C. Fouard (+1903), who published an excellent life of Jesus in 1880,¹¹ which since then has often been reprinted. And that has been a good thing, since beautifully and carefully he describes in the true chronological and geographical context the words and deeds of Jesus, while he rejects the commentaries of the critics in the notes.

Shortly thereafter, in the year 1883, E-P. Le Camus published a scholarly life of Jesus, where he also considered minute points.¹²

The lives which Bougard (1884) and Didon (1890)¹³ wrote, were adapted to their time and taste.

In 1922 in Paris, the life written by L.Cl. Fillion (1843-1927) appeared; many editions and translations of this work were made.¹⁴ But this life with more abundance and modernity treats questions beyond what was done by the *lives* written by Didon, Le Camus, Fouard, and it achieves very well an exegetical and apologetic purpose; therefore it is not yet out of date, in spite of the other more recent *lives* that are full of erudition.

J.M. Lagrange, O.P., produced a compendium of his ample commentaries on the gospels; he published it in 1928 and wanted it to be simply *The Gospel of Our Lord*¹⁵; in it, while preserving the special nature of each gospel, he narrates the life of the Lord in a simple and penetrating style.

9. *Vie de Jésus in Histoire des origines du Christianisme*.

10. Thus we have the statement of Bersot about Renan's work: "Vous avez tué le sommeil"; and the books written in response to this "life" number no less than 85.

11. *La vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* 2 t. (Paris 1880); 21st edition (Paris 1911).

12. *La vie de N.S. Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1907). Spanish translation (Barcelona 1909).

13. *Jésus Christ* (Paris 1913).

14. *Vie de N.S. Jésus-Christ. Exposé historique, critique et apologetique* 3 t. (Paris 1922). The Spanish translation for the 9th French edition was made by P.V.M. de Larrainzar: *Vida de Nuestro Señor Jesu-cristo. Exposición histórico, crítica y apologetica* 4 t. (Madrid 1942).

15. *Evangile de Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1928). The Spanish translation is by E.G. Fierro, O.P., *El Evangelio de N.S. Jesucristo* (Barcelona 1933).

The life written by P. Julio Lebreton, S.J.,¹⁶ joins together the latest historical elements with the accounts of the evangelists, and it is outstanding in its penetration and exposition of both the moral and dogmatic values, which are strictly religious, and which are drawn from the teaching of Jesus. Therefore it can truly be said to be a “spiritual” life of the Lord, and in this sense it presents a certain analogy with the fourth gospel.

Ferdinand Prat, S.J., with great erudition and a simple style, places at the end of the book the more technical notes and speaks to his readers in a religious way and splendidly locates the deeds and words of the Lord in their historical and social milieu.¹⁷

F.M. William, certainly acquainted with the scientific tools but not clearly using them, from his study of the land and of the real customs of the Palestinians (which are not quickly changed) tried to get a psychological insight into the life of Jesus in his social surroundings.¹⁸

Vita di Gesù Christo by Giuseppe Ricciotti, written in 1941, appeared not so long ago in Italy. The philological aspect in the exegetical consideration of the narrations of the life of Jesus is exceptional in this beautiful and large book and it is presented in a calm and simple style. All things are illustrated with beautiful and expressive images which locate the places before one's eyes; and truly useful *introductions* are added concerning the historical time, the sources, etc.¹⁹

D.M. Almazán, familiar with the most recent discoveries and debates, though he does not explicitly mention them, carefully and densely presented the image of the Lord in a suitable way for the devout.²⁰

In the life recently written by A. Fernández Truyols, S.J., a topographical knowledge of the places in Palestine stands out, together with an accurate evaluation of the things narrated in a simple style with a spiritual emphasis.²¹

773. Among the simple and *popular lives*, directed especially to the understanding of the public, but not by omitting the internal scientific method, those works can be mentioned which were written by P. Berthe,²² R. Vilariño, S.J.,²³ truly solid and devotional, and

16. *La vie et l'enseignement de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1931; 1951¹⁹). The Spanish edition is by F. Cereceda, S.J., *La vida y doctrina de Jesucristo N. Señor*³ (Madrid 1952).

17. *Jésus Christ. Sa vie, sa doctrine, son oeuvre*² 2 v. (Paris 1933). The Spanish translation is by S. Abascal (Mexico 1944).

18. *Das Leben Jesu im Lande und Volke Israel*⁸ (Freiburg 1949). The Spanish translation is by J. Sola, S.J., *Vida de Jesús en el país y pueblo de Israel*⁸ (Madrid 1940).

19. The Spanish version is by J.G. de Suances, *Vida de Jesucristo con introducción crítica e ilustraciones* (Barcelona 1948).

20. *Jesús de Nazaret* (Barcelona 1946).

21. *Vida de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo*²¹ (Madrid 1954).—The popular edition: Barcelona 1950.

22. *Jesucristo, su vida, su pasión, su triunfo*. Version by A. Vargas (Buenos Aires 1943).

23. *Vida de N. Señor Jesucristo*¹² (Bilbao 1951).

M. Meschler, S.J.²⁴; G. Papini,²⁵ full of poetry and exaltation, C.M. Abad, S.J.,²⁶ J. Pickl,²⁷ N.M. Buil, S.J.²⁸; J. Pérez de Urbel, O.S.B.²⁹; I. Iulius Martínez, S.J.³⁰; L. Cristiani,³¹ I. Beaufays³²; J. Alzin³³; R. Housse, C.S.S.R.³⁴; in Portuguese Plinius Salgado wrote a beautiful life for the educated³⁵; in German A. Riedmann.³⁶

774. M. Lepin wrote *apologetically* very effectively against the rationalists and modernists, and then he wrote a life of the Lord.³⁷

L. de Grandmaison, S.J. (1868-1927) in 1914 published an article entitled *Jésus Christ* in the *Dictionnaire apologetique de la foi catholique*; and with the same apologetic purpose he developed the previous article into a major work with great erudition; for this he used an excellent method that was both technical and scientific³⁸; thus he accurately refuted the adversaries, but in such a way also as to defeat them with courtesy and charity.

Likewise apologetically: H. Felder, O.F.M.Cap.³⁹; L. Koesters, S.J.⁴⁰; J. Leal, S.J.⁴¹; E. Guerrero, S.J.⁴²; M. Trullás, S.J.⁴³

775. The following treated the life of Jesus in an *oratorical way*: P. Leroy, S.J.⁴⁴; Alphonsus Torres, S.J.⁴⁵; H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J.⁴⁶...

But stressing the *ascetical aspects*, those who dealt with this matter were, among oth-

24. *Der göttliche Heiland. Ein Lebensbild der studierenden Jugend gewidmet*⁶ (Freiburg Br. 1922). Spanish translation² by V. Gómez-Bravo, S.J. (Friburg 1928).

25. *Storia di Cristo* (1921). Spanish translation, *Historia de Cristo*² (Madrid 1952).

26. *Vida de N.S. Jesucristo*⁵ (Santander 1953).

27. *Der Messias König Jesus in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen* (Munich 1935).

28. *Vida popular y apologética de N.S. Jesucristo* (Montevideo 1939).

29. *Vida de Cristo*² (Madrid 1945).

30. *El drama de Jesús*. There were many editions: a work truly adapted to ordinary people: 9th edition (Bilbao 1955).

31. The Spanish translation from the 4th French edition was made by J. Goenaga, S.J., *Jesucristo, Hijo de Dios, Salvador* (Bilbao 1944).

32. *Vida de Jesucristo. El hombre-Dios en su marco palestiniiano*. Translated from the French by S. Eiján, O.F.M. (Madrid 1940).

33. *Jésus-Christ* (Brugge 1941).

34. *Cristo Jesús. Su vida según los documentos más modernos* (Santiago de Chile 1943).

35. *Vida de Jesús*. Edit. Atica (Portugal) 1943. Spanish translation by J.L. Vázquez Doderó, *Vida de Jesús* (Madrid-Cádiz 1946).

36. *Wie Jesus lebte, litt und starb* (Freiburg 1953).

37. *Jésus Christ, sa vie et son oeuvre*³ (Paris 1912).

38. *Jésus Christ. Sa personne, son message, ses preuves* 2 v. (Paris 1928); afterwards a polemical, anti-modernist compendium was made of this work by P. Huby. The Spanish translation of the first work is by J. Sendra, *Jesucristo. Su persona, su mensaje, sus pruebas* (Barcelona 1932).

39. *Jesus von Nazareth. Ein Christusbuch*² (Paderborn 1939). Spanish translation by P. De Iráizoz, O.F.M.Cap., *Jesús de Nazaret* (Buenos Aires 1949).

40. *Unser Christusglaube* (Freiburg Br. 1939).

41. *Jesucristo Dios-Hombre* 2 t. (Granada 1942); 2nd edition: *Jesucristo y nuestra fe en El* (Granada 1949).

42. *Jesucristo la mejor prueba de la fe católica* (Bilbao 1947).

43. *La figura de Jesucristo* (Barcelona 1947).

44. *Jésus-Christ, sa vie, son temps* 18 v. (Paris 1912).

45. *Jesucristo, su persona y su doctrina* (Madrid 1918).

46. *Conferences de Notre-Dame du Paris (1929-1937)* 9 t. Spanish translation² by L.M. Jiménez Font, S.J. (Madrid 1941).

ers: M. Meschler, S.J.⁴⁷; A. Goodier, S.J.⁴⁸; Tihamér Tóth⁴⁹....

But from the theological point of view the life was treated extensively by, among others: J.M. Bover, S.J.⁵⁰; Karl Adam⁵¹; Cardinal I. Gomá⁵²; J. Múnera, S.J.⁵³; synthetically F.M. Braun, O.P.⁵⁴

We are omitting the lives written by non-Catholics⁵⁵; we omit also the lives that consider only the period of the life of the Lord.⁵⁶

776. Images of the life of Jesus. The life of Jesus has been written not just by words alone; it has also been expressed in images or pictures. And in this matter, while passing over the *Biblia pauperum*, which especially in the middle ages placed the gospel scenes before one's eyes,⁵⁷ in the 16th century the work of Jerome Nadal, S.J., is worth noting; the work was first published by the author in 1593, *Evangelicae historiae imagines*⁵⁸; it contained ample and selected graphic descriptions of the life of Jesus numbering 153; it has been reprinted again and again even up to our own times.⁵⁹

Recently W. Hole, paying attention to the archeology and character of the region of Palestine, portrayed the life of Jesus in 80 images.⁶⁰ But other painters also wanted to give expression to this life (Hoffmann, Fugel...); and I will pass over in silence those who have put together collections of the life of Jesus from the more famous artistic paintings.⁶¹

47. *Das Leben unseres Herrn Jesu Christi... in Betrachtungen* 2 v. (Freiburg Br).

48. *The Public Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ* (London 1930).

49. *El joven y Cristo...; Cristo Rey o Jesucristo y nuestro siglo...* Spanish versions (Madrid), in several editions of the works of the author.

50. *Jesús. Estudios cristológicos de vulgarización* (Barcelona 1916). There you will find an adapted study concerning the beauty and love of Jesus.

51. *Jesus Christus*⁸ (Düsseldorf 1949). The Spanish translation is by B. Avila, O.S.B. (Buenos Aires 1940); likewise Barcelona 1945.

52. *Jesucristo Redentor* (Barcelona 1944).

53. *Jesucristo. Estudio histórico, apologético, teológico* (Bilbao 1945).

54. *Jésus. Histoire et critique* (Tournai-Paris 1947).

55. But here are the names of the main ones...: M. Goguel, *La vie de Jésus* (Paris 1932); J. Ninck, *Jesus als Charakter*³ (Leipzig 1925); G. Pfannmüller, *Jesus im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (Berlin 1939); J. Klausner, *Jésus de Nazareth. Son temps, sa vie, sa doctrine*. Translated from the Hebrew (Paris 1933).

56. Among these one that deserves mention is L. de la Palma, S.J., *Historia de la Sagrada Pasión*, published again and again.

57. See G. Sanner, *La vie de Jésus-Christ racontée par les images du moyen âge sur les portes d'églises* (Lille 1908).

58. *Evangelicae historiae imagines ex ordine evangeliorum, quae toto anno in missae sacrificio recitantur, in ordinem temporis vitae Christi digestae* (Antwerp 1593).

59. On the origin and history of these images, and also on their influence, see M. Nicolau, S.J., *Jerónimo Nadal. Sus obras y doctrinas espirituales* (Madrid 1949) p.114-132, 166-188. On their influence on early Chinese Christian art, see P. D'Elia, *Le origini dell'arte cristiana cinese (1583-1640)* (Rome 1939). Recently an elegant, but not complete, new edition of these images was prepared by His Eminence, D. Celso Costantini, *Gesù Cristo. Via. Verità, Vita*. Riproduzione de cento stampe antiche con commenti sui vangeli (Rome 1943).

60. *The Life of Jesus of Nazareth* (London); J.M. Bover, S.J., illustrated these images with notes in the Spanish edition (Madrid).

61. As, for example, Dr. F. Camprubí, who collected 55 images published in the life by A.M. Almazán, *Jesús de Nazaret* (Barcelona 1946). And also from the collection "*Los grandes temas del arte cristiano en España*": F.J. Sánchez Cantón in *Nacimiento e infancia de Cristo* (Madrid 1948), and also by the same author, *Cristo en el Evangelio* (Madrid 1950); J. Camón Aznar, *La Pasión de Cristo en el arte español* (Madrid 1949).

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic the *marginal* numbers.

Gen	3,14f	II 582	Isa	2,1-4	II 611
	12,2f	II 584		2,2f	II 38
	17,6	II 584		2,3	II 420
	17,16	II 584		4,2	II 612
	18,18	II 584		7,14-16	II 623
	18,18f	II 591-593		9,1.5-7	II 614
	22,16-18	II 584		11,1.2.10	II 615
	28,14	II 584		11,12	II 646
	49,8-12	II 585-587		28,16	II 616
Exod	4,22	II 446		35,4-6	II 617
	7,1	II 176		40,1.3.5	II 618
	29,7	II 384		42,1-4	II 619
Lev	10,7	II 384		49,1-13	II 620
Num	24,15-24	II 589f		50,4-11	II 621
1 Sam	2,10	II 594		52,13-15	II 622
	9,16	II 384		53,1-9	II 623
2 Sam	1,21	II 384		53,10-12	II 624
	7,12-15	II 595f		55,5	II 625
	7,14	II 446		60,3	II 625
1 Kings	19,16	II 384		61,1.2.9	II 625
2 Kings	4,81	II 472		63,1	II 625
Ps	2	II 597f	Jer	23,5f	II 629
	15,8	II 599		30,9	II 629
	21	II 601		31,22	II 629
	36,35f	II 720	Ezek	21,27	II 631
	44	II 602f		34,11-12	II 631
	68,2-5,9f-			37,24f	II 631
	21.23,26f	II 605	Dan	7,13f	II 396f; II 48
	68,22-24	II 538		61	
	92,5	II 762		9,24-27	II 632-637
	108,8	II 608	Hos	3,4f	II 520
	109	II 609f	Amos	9,12-15	II 646
Wis	13,2-10	II 83	Mic	4,1-3	II 48 61 1138
	14,15.16-			5,2f	II 628
	20,23	II 83	Hag	2,7f.10	II 638
Sir	51,5	II 446	Zech	2,4.10-12	II 639

	3,8	II 639		22,45	II 458
	6,12f	II 639		22,46	II 458
	9,9f	II 639		23,10	II 391
	12,9f	II 640		23,37-39	II 539
	13,1-7	II 640		24,14	II 267
Mal	1,10f	II 641		24,15	II 506
	2,7	I 26		24,19-21	II 506
	3,1	II 642		24,23f	II 391
	4,5f	II 642		24,46	II 277
Matt	3,14f	II 404		26,13	II 247
	3,16f	II 472		26,62-66	II 442f
	4,23	II 247		27,8	II 277
	6,7	II 277		27,33	II 277
	9,13	II 275		28,18-20	II 438
	10,5	II 276		28,20	II 722
	11,25f	II 114	Mark	1,14	II 247
	11,25-30	II 437f 458		3,5	II 349
	11,27	II 48		3,17	II 284
	11,28	II 661		3,20f	II 472
	12,6	II 434		5,41	II 284
	12,8	II 434		7,11	II 284
	12,26	II 472		7,34	II 284
	12,28	II 493		8,27	II 439
	12,38-40	II 548		8,28	II 446
	12,40	II 571		8,33	II 284
	12,41	II 439		8,35	II 247
	12,42	II 434		8,38	II 427
	15,24	II 276		9,10	II 550
	16,13-20	II 439f		9,22	II 499
	16,17	II 48		9,32	II 932 550
	16,18	II 722		9,41	II 391
	16,20	II 399		12,42	II 284
	19,12	II 472		13,10	II 505
	21,33-46	II 441		13,31	II 459
	21,41	II 277		14,30	II 534
	21,43	II 505		14,36	II 284
	21,44	II 536		14,60-64	II 442
	22,21	II 458		15,16	II 284
	22,30	II 458		15,22	II 284
	22,41-46	II 441		15,34	II 284

	15,44f	II 552	3,19	I 49
	16,15	II 247	4,6	II 316
Luke	1,35	II 295	4,24	II 28 41
	4,18	II 247	4,25-27	II 391
	4,23	II 293	4,27	II 316
	4,38	II 293	5,17f	II 444
	4,43	II 405	5,18	II 446
	9,18	II 439	5,19	II 446
	9,20	II 446	5,27	II 394
	10,21f	II 437f	5,36	II 473
	13,29	II 505	5,39	II 574
	13,35	II 506	6,44	II 319
	16,10-12	II 295	7,8-11	II 471
	18,22-25	II 296	7,16	II 423 665
	18,27	II 296	7,17	II 137
	18,34	II 550	7,40	II 592
	19,43	II 304 512	7,46	II 460
	19,43f	II 506	8,28f	II 548
	19,44	II 305	8,46	II 466
	21,18	II 761	8,57	II 321
	21,20	II 506	10,17	II 548
	21,20-24	II 304	10,21	II 472
	21,21f	II 506	10,4	II 361
	21,24	II 506	10,30	II 444 446
	22,19	II 295	10,38	II 473
	22,66-71	II 442	11,4	II 471
	23,2	II 446	11,41	II 446
	23,34	II 538	11,51	II 176
	24,25	II 574	12,33	II 399
	24,27	II 574	12,49f	II 423
	24,39	II 564 566	13,13	Preface
	24,44f	II 574	13,19	II 530
	24,46-47	II 505	13,30	II 361
	24,47	II 427	13,38	II 534
John	1,18	II 114	14,28	II 548
	1,41	II 391	14,29	II 530
	2,15-18	II 361	16,4	II 530
	2,24f	II 460	16,22	II 548
	3,13	II 398	17,20	II 505
	3,18	II 427	19,7	II 446

	19,26	II 315		15,53	II 571
	19,35	II 315 359	2 Cor	3,6	Preface
	20,27	II 436		4,6	II 571
	20,31	II 360 444		5,6	II 114
	21,2-13	II 316		8,9	II 371
	21,20	II 315		8,18f	II 302
	21,24f	II 315 359		12,1f	II 571
Acts	1,1f	II 302	Gal	1,15-16	II 571
	1,8	II 505		2,8	II 356
	2,5	II 288		2,11	II 253
	3,15	II 551 556		2,14	II 253
	3,18	I 66		3,16	II 371
	10,10-17	II 58		4,4	II 371
	10,40	II 571	Eph	2,20	I 563
	10,41	II 565	Phil	2,5-7	II 445
	10,43	II 574		2,5-11	II 374
	13,27-29	I 66		4,22	II 697
	13,32f	I 66	Col	1,12	II 762
	15,7	II 253		1,23	II 511
	20,5-15	II 302		1,26	II 54
	21,20	II 694		4,14	II 302
	28,23	II 574	1 Thess	2,13	II 137
Rom	1,8	II 694	1 Tim	4,6	Preface
	1,18.21-32	II 84 88		4,16	I 26
	2,14	II 88	Philem	23f	II 302
	9,3-5	II 371	Heb	1,1	II 65
	9,4f	II 539		4,13	II 533
	9,5	II 445		10,5-7	II 402
	11,25f	II 520		10,23	II 762
	11,29	II 539		11,1	II 114
	11,33f	II 89		12,2	II 762
	15,19	II 604	Jas	1,17	II 722
1 Cor	1,23	II 699		2,19	II 185
	2,7f	II 114	1 Pet	1,1	II 694
	2,8	II 374		3,15	I..50
	2,10	II 48		5,13	II 283
	4,1	Preface	2 Pet	1,16	I 31
	12,6	II 137		1,19	II 574
	15,1-11	II 557 561		1,21	II 48
	15,44-48	II 571	1 John	1,1-3	I 1-31

	1,1-3	II 316
	2,20	II 137
	2,23	II 426
	4,1	II 120
Rev	1,4-11	II 694
	20,4	II 740

INDEX OF NAMES

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic the *marginal* numbers.

- A**bad, C.M. II 771
 Acilius Glabrio II 697
 Adam, K. II 464 648 775
 Aedesius, martyr II 761
 Aesculapius II 483 487
 Agnes (St.) II 724
 Aguiló, Th. I 83
 Alcuin, eboracensis II 208
 Alexander of Hales I 34
 Alfaric II 366
 Alfonso de Zamora I 73
 Aliberch, S. I 62
 Allard, P. II 685 697 729 734 740
 744 746 754
 Allo, E.B. II 537
 Almazán, D.M. II 772 776
Alogoi II 307
 Alvarez de Linera, A. I 82; II 116
 Alzin, J. II 773
 Amann, E. I 37; II 7
 Ambrose (St.) II 519 751
 Ammianus Marcellinus II 519
 Amort, E. II 116
Anomoei II 113
 Anselm (St.) I 9 72
 Antoninus Pius II 381
 Apollonius Tyanensis II 483 486
Apologists I 67-85
 Aquila II 613
 Arias Montano II 238
 Aristides I 67; II 697
 Aristotle II 680 683
 Arriaga, R. de II 48
 Athanasius (St.) II 736
 Athenagoras I 67; II 676 679 697
 Aubert, R. II 37 116 184
 Aufhauser, I.B. II 381
 Augustine (St.) I 9-45 70 77; II 5 19
 33 163 178 227f 263 309 347
 483 485 496 532 537f 570 674
 676 678 702 714 734f 749 761
 Avila, B. II 775
 Ayuso Marazuela, T. I 63; II 206 228
 233 329
- B**acht, H. II 175
 Bacon, W. II 307
 Bainvel, J.V. II 1
 Baisi, C. I 35
 Balmes, J. I 20 83; II 648
 Balthasar, N. I 72
 Bannwart, Cl. I 36
 Báñez, D. I 34 53 76
 Bar-Cochba II 520 569 590
 Bareille, G. I 64
 Bartmann, B. I 35
 Basilides II 295 319
 Basmagius II 519
 Battifol, P. II 257 678 682 699
 Bauer, A. II 363
 Bauer, Br. II 254 307 365 387
 Baumann, J. II 451
 Baur, F.Ch. II 253 307 357 690
 Bautain, L. II 116f 172 184 479 547
 Bayo, M.J. II 744
 Bea, A. II 582
 Beaufays, L. II 773
 Becqué, M. I 85
 Bellamy, J. I 33
 Bellarmine, R. (St.) I 34 75
 Benedict XIV II 160 162 173 731
 734
 Benedict XV II 326
 Beni, A. I 62
 Berendts, A. II 376
 Bersot II 771
 Berthe, P. II 773
 Bertholet, A. II 12

- Beza, Th. II 225 237
 Bickermann, E. II 545
 Billerbeck, P. II 341 443
 Billuart, F.C.R., I 35
 Bilz, J. I 1
 Binet-Sanglé II 450
 Bligh, J.F. II 271
 Blondel, M. II 138
 Boissier, G. II 737
 Bolley, A. II 19
 Bona, Io II 56
 Bonaventure (St.) I 3 18 29f 34
 Bonnetty, A. I 8; II 116f
 Bonsirven, J. II 385
 Borgongini Duca, F. II 632 635
 Bossuet, J.J. I 80
 Bougaud II 772
 Bougnicourt, P. II 13
 Boulenger, A. I 63
 Bousset, W. II 401 430
 Bouvier, F. II 13
 Bover, J.M. I 25; II 206 219 223
 228f 234 240f 242 345 352 399
 437 459 539 554 775f
 Boyer, Ch. I 1
 Brandariz, F. I 1
 Branscheid, F. II 240
 Brassac, A. II 345
 Braun, F.M. II 363f 366 369f 769
 775
 Bretschneider, S. II 307
 Bricout, J. II 12
 Briggs II 307
 Brillant, M. II 12
 Brinktrine, J. I 62
 Brou, A. II 689
 Broussole, Ch. II 464
 Browe, P. II 761
 Brunner, A. I 1
 Brunsmann, J. I 62' II 3 218f 428
 Buchberger, Mich. I 37
 Budda, *buddism* II 469 489 497 704
 Buil, N.M. II 773
- Bulst, W. II 464
 Bultmann, R. II 258 387 430 581
 Butler, C.B. II 345
- C**aballero Sánchez, P. II 632 635
 Caecilia (St.) II 724
 Cajetan, Thomas de Vio I 34
 Calcagno, F.X. I 62
 Calès, J. II 597
 Callistus (St.) II 685 697
 Calmes II 357
 Calvin II 134
 Camón Aznar, J. II 776
 Camprubí, F. II 776
 Cantera, F. I 73
 Capreolus, I. I 34
 Carpophorus II 697
 Carreras Artau, J. And T. II 94
 Cartagena, A. de I 73
 Casanovas, Ig. I 62 83
 Castiello, J. II 464
 Cavallera, F. I 6 8 36; II 205
 Celsus II 319 331 337 474 483 543
 571 697
 Cereceda, F. II 772
 Cerinthus II 307 309 320f
 Cerruti, P. 63
 Ceuppens, F. II 574 633
 Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D. II 12
 Chapman, J. II 271
 Charnes, Th. I 35
 Chateaubriand, F.R. I 81; II 648 736
 Chaterinet, F.M. II 498
 Chiappini, F. II 775
 Cicero, M.T II 3 178 182 680 699
 Cipriani, S. I 62
 Cladder, H.J. II 444
 Clamer, A. II 627
 Clemen, C. 363
 Clement VIII II 213
 Clement of Alexandria I 69; II 235
 264 273 277 279f 288 301 310
 314 320 337 742

- Clement of Rome (St.) II 275 285
 303 340 676 694 697 742
 Closen, G.E. II 629
 Coleridge, H.J. II 771
 Coll Pérez, A. I 63
 Collomb, M. II 193 270
 Colunga, A. II 539 582
 Comte, A. II 14 16
COUNCILS:
 —*Trent* 426
 Condamin, A. II 205 611 629
 Confucius II 469
 Congar, M.J. I 1 33
Contingentists II 165
 Coppens, J. II 646
 Corluy, J. II 297
 Cornelius II 697
 Cornely, R. II 193 196 202 205 219
 292 322 345 353 357 361
 Corssen, P. II 280 291 312
 Cotter, A.C. I 62; II 66 102 428
 Couchoud, P.L. II 366 369 f 374
 Coué, E. (*coueismus*) II 492
 Criado, R. II 639
 Crispus II 697
 Cristiani, L. II 773
 Cuadrado, J.M. I 83
 Cumont, M. II 567
 Cureton, W. II 226
 Cyprian (St.) II 227 328 674 676
 734 751 756
 Cyril of Jerusalem (St.) II 263
- D**affara, P.M. I 1
 D'Ales, A. I 37; II 704
 D'Angers, J.E. I 80
 Dalman, G. II 395
 Damasus (St.) II 228 697
 Dausch, P. II 437 439
 De Abázuza, F.X. I 35
 De Bonriot, J. II 486
 De Castro Alonso, Em. I 35
 De Elizalde, M. I 79
- De Ghellinck, J. II 91
 De Granada, L. I 76; II 668 720 740
 De Grandmaison, L. II 1 41 270 363
 366 381 384 446 474 486 488ff
 500f 540f 543ff 571 646 665
 690 774
 De Haes, P. II 541
 D'Herbigny, M. I 1
 De Heredia, C.M. II 182
 De Iráizoz, P. II 774
 De Iriarte, M. II 464
Deism II 64 70
 De Jerphanion, G. II 464
 De Labriolle, P. II 382
 De La Palma, L. II 775
 De la Vallée Poussin, L. II 469
 De Leon, L. II 639 646 700 724
 D'Elia, P. II 776
 De Ligny, F. II 770
 De Loosten, Dr. (G. Lomer) II 450
 Del Páramo, S. II 597
 De Moreau, E. II 737 741
 Denzinger, H. I 6 36
 De Regla II 544
 De Ribadeneira, P. II 770
 De Rossi, I. II 199
 Deschamps, V.A. I 74 85; II 671
 Descoqs, P. II 3 14f
 De Suances, J.G. II 772
Determinists II 165
 De Tonquédec, J. II 138 160
 De Ulloa, J. II 183
 De Val, H. I 35
 De Wolf, J. II 183
Diatessaron Tatiani II 226
 Díaz, J. I 36
 Dibelius, M. II 258-430
 Diderot, D. II 250
 Didiot, J. I 62
 Didon, H. II 772
 Dieckmann, H. I 1 38 56 64 86; II
 1 3 18 22ff 34 45f 57 62 76 83
 90f 94 99 109f 129 132 134

- 138 142 160 162 248 363 376
 384 387 394f 401 406 415 421
 428 430 437 439 444 446 449f
 464f 472 474-478 485f 488 497
 540 543 546 567 572 574 651
 689 711
- Diekamp, F. I 35
 Di Favio, G. I 33
 Dillmann, A. II 578
 Dio Cassius II 697 741
 Dionysius of Alexandria II 270f
 Dionysius the Areopagite (St.) II 697
 Dionysius (St.), Corinth. II 331
 Dodwell, H. II 737 761
 Döllinger, Jo.Ig. I 84; II 674
 Domitilla II 697
 Donoso Cortés I 83; II 648
 Dorado, G.G. II 194 259 307 357
 361
 Dorsch, Ac. I 62; II 127 175 186
 500 648 651 668 689 711 724
 Drews, A. II 366
 Due, A. II 169 474
 Dupanloup, M. II 771
 Dupuis, Ch.F. II 364
 Durand, A. II 205 219 307 361 437
 439 458
 Durrwell, F. II 642
- E**ckermann II 307
 Ehrhard, A. II 668
 Eiján, S. II 773
 Enciso, I. II 175 539
 Ephraem (St.) II 225f 263 483
 Epiphanius (St.) II 263 279 290 307
 309 314 367 483 512 534
Epistola ad Diognetum I 67; II 675
 695
 Erasmus, D. II 237
 Espasa Signes, J. I 77
 Estienne (Stephanus) R., II 211 237
 Estrix, G. II 116
Eudaemonists II 26
- Eunomius, *eunomiani* II 113
 Eusebius Caesariensis I 69; II 217
 233 236 263f 266-271 277 279f
 288 290f 301 309ff 321 328 331
 375 378 483 486 509 512 534
 590 674 694 696f 643 745 747
 750 756f 761
 Evanson II 307
- F**abro, C. I 19
 Falcon, I. I 62
 Felder, H. I 62; II 428 446 540 774
 Felicitas (St.) II 758
 Felix, J. I 81; II 648
 Fénelon, F. I 45
 Fernández Fernández, P. I 35
 Fernández Truyola, A. II 772
 Fernáñez Valbuena, R. II 12
Fetishism II 13 16 83
Fideism II 116
 Fierro, E.G. II 772
 Fillion, Cl. II 248 363 474 772
 Fischer, J. II 611
 Flavius Clemens II 697
 Flavius Josephus II 197 217 341
 376ff 381f 483 507 509-518 527
 637 763
 Florit, E. II 258
 Fonck, L. II 474 486 489 496
 Fonsegrive, G. I 86
 Fouard, C. II 772
 Fournier, R. I 62
Fragmentum Muratorianum II 292
 301 311
 Franca, L. I 49
 Francis of Assisi (St.) II 256
 Francis de Sales (St.) I 75
 Frassen, Cl. I 34
 Frey, I.B. II 192
 Fridericus II II 250 704
 Fridericus Barbarossa II 718
 Froebes, J. II 718
 Frövig, D.A. II 401 430

Frohschammer II 94 112f
 Fugel II 776
 Funk, F.X. II 275 285 295 303 756

Gächter, P. II 194 219 259 268 271
 274 277ff 283f 289 297 303 307
 318 320 332 351 353 356f 361
 370 557

Gagnebet, M.R. I 1

Galdos, R. II 206 213 610

Gallicanum Psalterium II 206

Galonio, D. II 747

Gante, E. De I 1

García de Santa María, A. I 73

García y G. De Castro, R. I 83

Gardette, L. II 13

Garrigou-Lagrange, R. I 62 72; II 45
 62 90 99 101 127 164 428 689

Gartner, P. II 307

Gasser, Ep. II 82

Gerhardus, Io. II 134

Gibbon, E. II 690 737

Girens, M. I 25

Gil Ulecia, A. II 193

Girgensohn, K. II 19

Gisler, A. II 60

Goebel, B. I 62

Goenaga, J. II 773

Goettesberger, J. II 632

Goetz, K.G. II 546

Goguel, M. II 363 541 769 775

Gomá Tomás, I II 775

Gómez-Bravo, V. II 773

Gonet, Io.B. I 34

González-Blanco, E. II 484

González Ruiz, J.M. II 539 623

Goodier, A. II 775

Gormaz, J.B. II 183

Gottlob Paulus, H.E. II 251 475 501
 534 544 771

Goupil, A.-A. I 35

Grabmann, M. I 33

Graf, P. I 74

Grass (Berendts-Grass) II 376

Grausem, J.P. II 138

Grégoire, H. II 737

Gregory XVI I 46

Gregory Nazianzen (St.) II 529 721

Gregory of Nyssa (St.) II 483

Gregory, C.R. II 223

Gresham Machen, J. II 183

Griesbach, Io.Iac. II 239

Griffe, E. II 737

Grimm, J. II 771

Groot, Hugo de (Grotius) I 79; II 347
 535

Gruechn, W. II 19

Guenther I 8; II 94

Guerrero, E. II 774

Guignebert, Ch. II 363 769

Guillén, J. II 744

Gummersbach, J. I 35

Gunkel, H. II 546

Gut, B. II 193f 322

Gutberlet, G. I 62 84

Gutiérrez, D. I 33

Gutwenger, E. II 269

Hadrianus, Imp. II 381

Haeckel, E. II 449

Hardon, J.A. II 163 572

Harent, S. I 46; II 115

Havet, E. II 737

Hedde, R. II 731

Hegesippus II 375

Heinisch, P. II 582 588 631

Heisenberg, W. II 169

Hellín, I. II 48

Henry IV II 718

Henze, Cl.M. II 394

Heraclea, Th. ab II 226

Heracleon II 319

Heras, H. II 89 469

Herbert, E. I 76

Herder II 544

Herkenne, H. II 597

Hermes, G. I 46; II 94
Hermesiani II 37 117 122f
 Hermias I 67
 Herrmann, J. I 35
 Hertling, L. II 341 694 740
 Hervé, J.M. I 35
 Herzog, G. II 487
 Hesichius II 232 236
 Hettinger, F. I 62; II 500f 534
 Hetzenhauer, M. II 240
 Heyse, Th. II 214
 Hierocles II 483 486
 Hilary (St.) II 721 745 749
 Hilgenfeld II 253
 Hillaire, A. I 63
 Hippolytus (St.) II 697 714
 Hirsch, W. II 450
 Hitos, F.A. II 754
 Hocedez, E. I 33; II 730
 Höpfl, H. 193f 322 357
 Hofbauer, J. II 582
 Hoffmann, J.G.H. II 769
 Hoffmann, pictor II 776
 Hoffmann, R.A. II 546
 Hoffmann, K. I 37
 Hole, W. II 776
 Holsten II 253
 Holzclau, Th. I 35
 Holzmann, H.I. II 256 307 357 452
 Holzmann, O. II 401 451 476 543
 Holzmeister, U. II 369
 Horatius, Fl.Q. II 86
 Hort, F.J.A. II 240 242 292 329
 Housse, R. II 773
 Huby, J. II 12 194 270 278 469 774
 Huck, A. II 345
 Huet, P.D. I 80
 Hugo a S. Caro II 210
 Hugon, E. I 35
 Hume, D. II 171
 Hummel, E.L. II 730
 Hurtado, G. II 48
 Hurter, H. I 35 37 39; II 668 688

711 724

Iacobus ben Chaiim II 199
 Ignatius of Antioch (St.) II 247 285
 295 319 340 724
 Ignatius Loyola (St.) II 19 86 156
 709
Indifferentists II 36
 Irenaeus (St.) I 67; II 265f 271 273
 277 281 288 292 295f 301 311
 314 320f 325 328 337 350 483
 695 697 742 745 761
 Iriarte, J. II 653
 Isidore of Spain (St.) I 71; II 206

Jacquemet, G. I 37
 Jacquier, E. II 270 296 353 556
 Jensen, P. II 366
 Jeremias, A. II 363
 Jerome (St.) II 203 205f 227f 263
 270 273 279 290 301 311 313
 320 331 474 520 535 629 697f
 704 760
 Jiménez de Cisneros, F. II 211 237
 Jiménez Font, L.M. II 775
 John of the Cross (St.) II 181
 John of St. Thomas I 34
 John Chrysostom (St.) II 263 272 279
 500 519 535 569 689 714 762
 John Damascene (St.) I 72
 John of Avila (Bl.) I 51
 John Nepomuscene (St.) II 734
 Joseph II II 718
 Journet, Ch. I 1
 Jousse, M. II 351
 Jülicher, A. II 256 307 357 363 401
 Junker, H. II 591 638
 Jüssen, K. I 35

Kalt, Ed. II 384
 Kalthoff, A II 365
 Kant, E. II 20f 26 59
 Kappler, E. I 19

- Keim, Th. II 253 270 307 321
 Kempf, C. II 682
 Kennicot, B. II 199
 Kilber, H. I 35
 King, J.H. II 16
 Kirsch, C. I 36
 Kittel, G. II 46 91 199 247
 Klausner, J. II 379 449 483 775
 Kleutgen, I. I 35
 Klostermann, E. II 363
 Knabenbauer, I. II 259 278 289 297
 307 427 439 471f 520 597 611
 627 629 631 638 646
 Kneib, Ph. I 62
 Kneller, C.A. II 737
 König, F. II 12
 Kösters, L. I 1; II 428 446 540 769
 774
 Kopler, L. II 437
 Korff, Th. II 546
 Kuhaupt, W. II 546
 Kunicic, P.J. I 19
- L**aberthonnière, L. II 138 141
 Lachman, Car. II 240
 Lacordaire, J. I 81; II 648
 Lactantius I 69; II 5 496 676 745f
 748 750
 Lagrange, M.J. II 60 219 248 270
 278 307 318f 341 357 385 427
 437 439 471f 633 772
 Lahousse, G. II 1 186
 Lakner, F. I 19
 Lamennais, F. I 3
 Lamping, S. II 659
 Lang, A. I 62 76
 Lang, A. (1844-1912) II 17
 Langton, Steph. II 210
 Larrainzar, V.M. II 772
 Laurentius, S. II 751 753
 Laurin, J.-R. I 69
 Leal, Io. II 194 270 345 554 774
 Le Bachelet, X.M. I 38 64
- Lebreton, J. II 567 772
 Le Camus, E.P. II 772
 Lecky II 690
 Leclercq, H. II 487 694 747
 Lehmann, E. II 12
 Leibnitz, G. I 47
 Leimbach, K.A. II 594
 Leo XIII I 7 23; II 187 195 262
 660f 685f
 Leon-Dufour, X. II 194
 Lépicier, A.M. II 160
 Lepin, M. II 307 357 363 384 774
 Lercher, L. I 35 86; II 14 22 24 34
 90 99 105 127 422 428 446
 451f 459 463 567 644 648 651
 657 668
 Le Roy, E. II 60 543
 Leroy, P. II 775
 Lesêtre, H. II 379
 Lessing, G.E. II 59 250 348 475 543
 Levie, J. II 345
 Lhermitte, J. II 564
 Linder, J. II 394 396 585 632f
 Llamas, J. II 369
 Lodulphus a Saxonia II 769
 Loisy, A. II 60 256 307 357 361 363
 446 545
 Lombard, P. I 34
 Lomer, G. II 450
 Longpré, E. II 94
 Lossiada, L. De II 48
 Lottini, Io. I 35
 Lubbock, J. II 16
 Lucanus, hereric II 331
 Lucas Brugensis II 214
 Lucianus, antioch II 236
 Lucianus, ethnicus II 677
 Lukyn Williams, A. II 576
 Lull (Lullius), R. (Bl) 94
 Lupanus II 489
 Lusseau, H. II 193 270
 Lyonnet, S. II 239

- M**acaulay, Th.B. II 721
Machiavellists II 26
 Madariaga, B. I 30
 Madox, J. II 680 724
 Magdalena de Pazzis (St.) II 724
Magic II 13 16
 Magnin, E. II 3
 Magrini, Ae. I 1 53
 Mahomet II 489 497
 Maillet, G. II 464
 Maimonides II 644
 Mainage, L. 40; II 659 707
 Maisoneuve, L. I 38 64
 Maldonado, I. I 1 25; II 37
 Malevez, L. I 20
 Mangenot, E. I 37; II 205 259 278
 289 332 540 545 571
 Maniacornia, N. II 209
Manism II 13 16 83
 Manning, H. I 82
 Manzoni, A. I 84
 Marcion, II 235 280 291 295 310
 331 340 374
 Marcotte, E. I 76
 Margaret Mary de Alacoque (St.) II 56
 724
 Maria Goretti (St.) II 734 754
 Marin Negueruela, N. I 63; II 12 486
 Marinus, centurian II 697 751
 Marius Maximus II 489
 Marranzini, A. I 25
 Marti, R. I 73; II 574 633
 Martin, Con. II 502
 Martínínez, J.J. II 773
 Martinus Legionensis (St.) I 73
 Marxauch, F. de P. I 62; II 48
 Mazzella, C. I 35 62 84
 McGinley, L. J. II 258
 Méchineau, L. II 259 278 289 345
 Medina, B. I 76
 Melito Sardensis (St.) II 483
 Mendive, I. I 35 83
 Menéndez Pelayo, M. I 83
 Menzel, A. II 704
 Merk, A. II 193 196 202 205 219
 223 241 322 345 350 357 361
 387
 Meschler, M. II 773 775
 Metzinger, A. II 357
 Meyer, A. II 545f
 Michel, A. II 90 175 464 769
 Migne, J.P. I 36
 Mill, Io. II 239
 Millás, J.M. I 73f
 Minges, P. I 39
 Minucius Felix I 67; II 674 676
 Mir, Io. I 83; II 12
 Miralles Sbert, J. II 94
Modernists II passim
 Moehler, A. I 84
Mohammedism II 704 761
 Molina, L.de I 53; II 48
 Molinos, M. De I 27
 Mommsen, Th. II 737
 Monsabré, J.M. L. II 648
 Montini, I.B. II 138
 Moreno Cebada, E. II 12
 Mors, I. I 35
 Mucius Scaevola II 735
 Müller, I. II 1 500 519f 535 540 544
 668 686 703f 711 724 726f 729
 756 761
 Muncunill, Io. II 1 69 102 574 648
 650f 689 698 711 729
 Múnera, J. II 775
 Munier, U. I 35
 Muñiz, F.P. I 1
 Muñoz, José de Jesús II 364
 Muñoz, P. II 169
 Muñoz Iglesias, S. II 175
 Muratón, L. II 292
 Murillo, L. II 345 574 578

Nácar, E. II 609
 Nadal, Hier. II 658 776
 Napoleon I II 718

- Nereus and Achilleus II 697
 Nestle, E II 240
 Neubauer, Ig. I 35
 Newman, John H. I 82; II 116
 Nicolas, Aug. I 81
 Nicolau, M. I 1 11 17 19 21 25 49
 51 76; II 659 705 710 776
 Ninck, J. II 775
 Norden, E. II 353
 Nötscher, F. II 629
- O**gara, F. II 632
 Ollé-Laprune, L. I 86
Ontologists II 94
 Origen I 69; II 204 205 233 264
 268 273 277 280 291 295 301
 310 331 337 375 474 483 543
 571 687 696ff 761
 Orland, J. II 169
 Otten, B. I 35
 Ottiger, Ig. I 62 84; II 76 186 428
 550f 574 648 651 665 668 689
 729 739 751 758 761
 Otto, K. II 544
 Otto, R. II 451 478 546
 Ovidius, Publius N. II 687 704
- P**almés, F.M. II 182
 Palmieri, D. II 634
 Pamphilus (St.) II 236
 Pantaenus Alexandrinus II 274 273
 277
 Papias II 266-271 277 282 288 296
 313 320f 342 349
 Papini, G. II 773
 Parente, P. I 35
 Pascal, B. I 80
 Patritius, F.X. II 345
 Paulsen, Fr. II 14
 Pauvert II 771
 Penido, L. I 49; II 91 705
 Pérès, J.L. II 364
 Pérez Castro, F. I 73
- Pérez de Urbel, J. II 773
 Pérez del pulgar, J.A. II 169
 Perrella, G.M. II 193
 Perrone, I. I 35 84; II 711 718
 Pesch, Ch. I 35; II 127 134 489 574
 Pfanmüller, G. II 769 775
 Pfister, O. II 490
 Pfeleiderer, O. II 104 452 501
 Philostratus II 486
 Pickl, J. II 773
Pilati Acta li 380 551
 Pinard de la Boullaye, H. I 1 4 12
 22 160 363f 384 500 540 546
 568 574 648 665 689 665 689
 704 775
 Pinto, M. I 17
 Pirot, L. I 37
 Pius I II 292
 Pius IV II 213
 Pius V (St.) II 213
 Pius VI II 613
 Pius IX II 37 112ff 155 184 367
 453f 502 579 650 671 691 713
 738 762
 Pius X (St.) I 7f; II 139 194 214
 Pius XI I 23 27 29; II 56 661 685
 Pius XII I 7f 21 23 26; II 73 169
 245 661
 Planck, M. II 169
 Plantin, Christ. II 238
 Platzeck, E. I 1
 Plinius II 221
 Plinius Secundus Minor II 380f 505
 695 732 741
 Plotinus II 85
 Pohl, W. II 1
 Pohle, J. I 35
 Polycarp (St.) II 265f 275 295 311
 319 321 340 756 758
 Polycarp, Chorepisc. Philoxeni II 226
 Pomponia Graecina II 359
 Ponce de Leon, J.M. II 1 428
 Porphyry II 337 474 697

Prado, J. II 193 345 597
 Prat, F. II 464 557 772
Progressionists II 81
Protestant, liberal II 178
 Prudentius II 744
 Prüm, K. II 12 181 704
 Ptolomaeus, heretic II 314 319
 Ptolomaeus Philadelphus II 202
 Puig, N. I 35
 Puigrefagut, R. II 169
 Puzo, F. II 193 351

Quadratus (St.) I 67; II 375 483
 697
 Quentin, H. II 205

Rabeau, G. I 1
 Rahner, H. I 19
 Rahner, K. I 35; II 680ff 736
 Raitz v. Frenz, E. II 19
 Rasnussen, E. II 450
Rationalism I 3; II 64 70 81 99 105
 248 260 and passim
 Reimarus, H.S. II 59 250 449 475
 543 771
 Reinach, Th. II 363
 Renan, E. II 171 251 256 401 476
 546 551 690 569 771
 Resch, A. II 348
 Réville, Io II 307
 Revill, G. II 48
 Rhodes, G. II 48
 Riaza, J.M. II 169
 Ricciotti, G. II 772
 Richard, P. II 24 34
 Richard of St. Victor I 77 762
 Riedmann, A. II 773
 Ritschl, A. II 22
 Rivière, J. II 60 689
 Robert, A. II 193
 Roberts, C.H. II 224 320
 Robertson, J.M. II 366
 Robles Dégano, Ph. II 678

Rocca, A. II 213
 Rodriguez, I. II 744
 Roberius, Bac II 210
 Roig Gironella, I. II 138
 Romeyer, B. II 138
 Rosadini, S. II 194 253 259 268
 270f 275 288f 296 307 319
 321f 325 332 345 439 554
 Rosenmüller, G. II 578
 Rosmini, A. de II 94
 Rouët de Journel, M.J. I 36; II 292
 Rousselot, P. II 171 183
 Rubio y Ors, J. I 83
 Ruinart, Th. II 737 740 747 756
 Ruiz Bueno, D. I 35; II 730 740

Sabatier II 256 307
 Salgado, P. II 773
Salmanticenses I 34
 Salvatorelli, L. II 363
 Sánchez Cantón, F. II 776
 Sanoner, G. II 77
 Santamaría, P. De I 73
 Sasse, I.B. II 89
 Sauras, E. I 18
 Savonarola, H. I 74
 Schanz, P. I 84
 Scheeben, M.I. I 35; II 90
 Schegg, P. II 771
 Schell, H. II 142
 Schiffini, S. I 62
 Schlagenhafen, F. I 64 71; II 99
 121 127 129 148 153 175 182f
 376 647 651 703 724 727
 Schlatter, A. II 430
 Schleiermacher, F.E.D. II 22 134
 Schmaus, M. I 35
 Schmidt, G. II 12 17
 Schmidt, K.L. II 258
 Schmiedel, P.W. II 401 545
 Scholz, I.M. II 239
 Schoupe, F.X. I 35
 Schröder, Ch.M. II 32

- Schulemann, G. II 469
 Schumacher, H. II 437
 Schweitzer, A. II 769
 Scotus, I. Duns I 1 34 53
Semi-Fideism II 116
Semi-Rationalists II 94
 Seneca II 674 683
 Sergius Paulus II 697
 Serrano, L. I 73
 Simón, H. II 193f 259 307 357 361
 582
 Simonet, A. I 72
 Sixtus V II 213
 Skrinjar, A. II 639f 642
 Slavicek, J. II 134
 Smeets, U. I 82
 Smit, I. II 498
 Smith, W.B. II 366
Socinians II 430
 Socrates, historian II 519
 Sohler, A. II 116
 Soiron, Th. I 1
 Sola, J. II 772
 Sota n II 307
 Sommervogel, C. II 770
 Souben, I. II 648
 Sozomenos II 328 519 677
 Spartianus II 489
 Spencer, H. II 16f
 Sinoza, B. I 78; II 171 249
 Spiridon, S. II 328
Spiritism II 165 182 498
 Spitta, F. II 544
 Stefini, A. II 345
 Steinmüller, J.E. II 193f
 Stentrup, F.A. II 727
 Steuernagel, C. II 578
 Stolz, A. I 1; II 183
 Strack, H. II 341 379 443
 Strauss, F. II 171 252 307 357 370
 387 475 501 534 544f 771
 Streffe II 544
 Stuart Mill II 165
- Suarez, F. I 3 34 53 77; II 45 48
 102 115f 121 127 474 656 734
 Suetonius Tranquil, C. II 380 486
 488 505 509 511 697 752
 Surbled, J. II 182
 Sureda Blanes, F. II 94
- T**acchi Venturi, P. II 12
 Tacitus, C. II 341f 380 486 488f
 505 508-511 674 697 699 741
 747 761
 Tanquerey, Ad. I 35 64; II 574 674
 683 690 744
 Tatianus I 67; II 226 235 285 295
 Tauchnitz, B. II 721
 Taymans d'Eypernon II 134 138
 Tellechea, J.I. I 1
 Teppe, G.B. I 35
 Teresia (St.) II 19
 Teresia a Iesu Infante (St.) II 724
 Tertullian I 697f; II 141 146 227
 264 273 280 291 301 310 328
 380 483 505 567 674 676 678
 681 688 695ff 699 749 752
 Theis, J. II 627
 Theodas II 569
 Theodoretus II 519 744
 Theodotus II 319
 Theodulphus II 209
 Theophilus Antiochenus (St.) I 67; II
 319
 Theudas II 507
 Thils, G. I 20
 Thoma II 307
 Thomas Aquinas (St.) I 3 10f 18 23f
 30 34 72 77; II 4 29 41 45 66
 86 102 160ff 164 176f 183 186
 490 499 704 744f 755f
 Thucydides II 342
 Tihamer Tóth II 775
 Tillmann, F. II 394
 Tischendorf, C. II 214 225 240 242
 Titus Livius II 342

- Tobac-Coppens II 646
 Toledo, F. de II 213
 Torres, A. II 775
Totemism II 12
Traditionalism II 81
 Traianus II 380f
 Tricot, A. II 193
 Tromp, S. II 1 62 68 110 127 129
 183 185 415 490 500 540f 544f
 574 576 648 651 659 689 703f
 719 737 739
 Trullás, M. II 774
 Tual, M. I 65f
 Turchi, N. II 12
 Tusquets, J. I 63
 Tylor, E.T. II 16f
- U**eding, L. I 36
 Ugarte de Ercilla, E. II 474
 Umberg, I.B. I 36
 Ungarelli, Al. II 214
 Urráburu, I.I. II 48
- V**acant, A. I 37; II 65 76 90
 Vaccari, A. II 196 202 205 213 219
 227 229 322 329 597 613 615
 Vaganay, L. II 345 474
 Valencia, G. De I 34 77
 Valensin, A. II 138
 Valentinus II 295 319 331 340
 Van der Heeren, A. II 597
 Van der hooght, E. II 199
 Van Hoonacker, A. II 571 627 638
 Van Hove, A. II 160
 Van Laak, H. I 62; II 69 174 428
 534
 Van Noort, G. I 35; II 1 711
 Vargas, A. II 773
 Vázquez, G. I 34
 Vázquez Dodero, J.L. II 773
 Venntura, J. I 84
 Venturini, K.H. II 544
 Vercellone, C. II 214
- Verhaar, J.P. I 35
 Veuillot, L. II 771
 Vigouroux, F. I 37
 Vilariño, R. II 773
 Viller, M. II 680ff 736
 Villion, A. II 754
 Viñayo, A. I 73
 Virgilius Maro (Publius) II 181
 Viva, D. II 37
 Vives, L. I 74
 Vizmanos, F. De B. I 63 77; II 116
 681 688
 Vogels, H.J. II 229 241
 Volkmar, G. II 253 387
 Volney, C.F. II 364
 Voltaire, F.M. II 171 250 364
 Von Dobschütz, E. II 546
 Von Gall, A. II 387
 Von Harnack, Ad. II 171 256 270f
 307 321 357 401 418 422 425
 437 452 477 545 678 690 696
 712 737
 Von Hummelauer, F. II 582 588 591
 599
 Von Soden, H. II 223 232 241 307
 363
 Vosté, I. II 205
- W**achsmann, A.M. II 19
 Waet, A. II 490
 Walgrave, J.H. I 82
 Wallon, G. II 771
 Walton, B. II 238
 Weber, S. I 62
 Weiss, A.M. I 84; II 648
 Weiss, B. II 240 256 452 578
 Weiss, J. II 363 401 452
 Weisse, H. II 307
 Weizsäcker, K. II 307
 Wellhausen, I. II 256 387
 Wendt, H. II 307
 Werner, K. I 64
 Westcott, B.F. II 240 242 292 329

Wettstein, J. II 223 239
Weymouth, Fr. R. II 240
Whitaker, W. II 134
White, J. II 214 313
Wieger, L. II 469
Wikenhauser, A. II 194 345
Willam, F.M. II 772
Wilmers, G. II 1 127 186 428 500f
534 689f 699 711 729 752 761
Windisch, H. II 363
Winternitz, M. II 351
Wirceburgensis I 35
Wiseman, N. I 82
Wordsworth, I. II 214 313
Wrede, W. II 256 387 500
Wunderle, G. II 19
Wundt, W. II 22

Xarrié, F. I 35
Xiberta, D.M. I 1
Xystus (St.) II 751

Yehuda Ha-Levi I 73
Yelle, G. I 62

Zahn, Th. II 292 303 311
Zameza, J. II 740
Zaragüeta, J. II 648
Zeller, E. II 171
Zigliara, Th. M. I 62 84; II 186
Zorell, F. II 46 91 160 247 395 421
472 597 611

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic. the *marginal* numbers.

Action of God ad extra II 48

Acts of the Apostles author 297-306; time of composition 303; history of 353-356.

Analogy what it is II 92; function in theology 91.

Apologetic adaptation II 138.

Apologetics its nature and relation to fundamental theology I 39f; its object 41-44; presupposed truths 45; initial state of min 46; certitude to be obtained 47; utility 50f; relations with theology 52-56; theological function 53; distinction from fundamental theology 57; two apologetic ways 59f; division and treatise 61; practical and pastoral apologetics 48f; in the 16th and 17th centuries the treatise on faith 77; apologetics of immanence 81 132; taken exclusively it cannot be admitted 138-141 149.

Apparitions of Jesus resurrected II 554.

Aquila its version of the O.T. 203f.

Argument of Scripture and Tradition differs from the work of biblical and patristic theology I 16.

Atheists their kinds II 15; no peoples without religion 18; they deny the possibility of revelation 64.

Authority what it is and its many forms II 55.

Authenticity of the books of the O.T II 215-219; of the Vulgate II 331.

Authentic what it is II 215. See **Magisterium**.

Books, canonical II 191.

Cantus galli II 534.

Cardiognosia in Jesus II 533.

Certitude what it is and its kinds I 50, II 115; before faith it is pre-required concerning the fact of revelation II 116-119; object of certitude before faith 120f; moral suffices, even common 122-125; and respective certitude 126ss; certitude of one's own religion 43.

Chapters in Trent and Vatican I are definitions II 65.

Character of Jesus II 464

Christ Son of God II 36; Messiah 26 47 61; King 36 39 44; Legislator 44.

Concept immediate and mediated, proper from properties and proper from other sources, analogous II 96.

Congruous knowledge of natural religion II 69.

Conversion its preparation I 49; history of conversions II 659; apologetic argument of conversions 705-710.

Correctoria biblica II 210.

Criterion of inspiration II 43-55.

Criterion of revelation what it is, its species and divisions II 130-133; subjective criteria are not primary 134-137; immanentistic are not sufficient 138-141; internal of doctrine are not primary 142-146; except per accidens 146; the ultimate is always some divine sign 147f; primary is a miracle 149-152; a miracle is a criterion also for immediate revelation 153; subjective

- and internal criteria have utility 154-159.
- Criticism, textual** logical norms II 243f; utility 245.
- Cult** obligation of external and social II 28-32.
- Demon** revelation from him is per se null and void II 47.
- Deuterocanonical** books II 217.
- Discernment** of private revelations II 560.
- Divinity of Christ** affirmed by Jesus in a proper and natural sense II 428 446; why it is treated in fundamental Theology 428.
- Doctrine of Jesus** internal excellence as an apologetic argument II 678-688.
- Doubt of faith** not permitted for those who accept faith under the magisterium of the Church II 43.
- Eschatologism** in expectation of the messianic kingdom II 409.
- Exercises, scholastic** I 24f.
- Faith** definition of Vatican I I 5; faith in theology 3-6; its proximate rule 6; how it is assent above all things firm II 125; practical leading to faith I 49; faith and will 51.
- Fathers of the Church** their citations of the N.T. II 230; apologetics of the Apostolic Fathers I 66.
- Founts, historical** to prove the fact of revelation II 187-192; Christian founts 191; profane 192; general bibliography 193f.
- Genuine** what it is II 215; genuineness of author and time 15; literary of Matt. 16:16-19 181-185 207; genuineness of John 21 212ff 246.
- Gospels** notion II 247; theories and adversaries on their historicity 248-258; author of the first gospel 259-277; time of composition 252; author of the second 278-288; time of composition 285ff; author of third 289-296; time of composition 215 304f; author of the fourth 307-321; time of composition 319f; integrity of the gospels 322-331; historicity 332-344 357-361; synoptic gospels and the "question" they raise 345-352.
- Heart of Jesus** its cult is destined for the whole human race II 56; revelations made to St. Margaret 56.
- Hebrew text of the O.T.** II 196-201.
- Henotheism** II 13.
- History** of Apologetics I 64-86.
- Historicity** of the books of the O.T. II 215-219.
- Historical** what it is II 215 333.
- History of Jesus** II 763-776.
- "Humani generis" Encyclical**, passages cited I 6ff 21 26 47; II 82 84.
- Illumination**, supernatural per se is not required to know for certain the fact of revelation II 183ff.
- Image of Christ** in the prophecies of the O.T. II 573-646.
- Immanence** as an apologetic method I 81; II 81 132 138-141 149.
- Indifferentism** I 3; II 26 36 425.
- Inquiry into religion** its obligation II 35-43.
- Inspiration** differs from revelation II 58.
- Integral** what it is II 215; integrity of the Gospels 322-331.
- Intelligence** what it is and how many forms II 457; in Jesus 458-462.

Introduction to the Bible relation to the historical sources of revelation II 187ff; its importance 195; a general bibliography 193f.

James, Apostle, brother of John, his martyrdom II 377.

Jerusalem prophecies about its destruction II 363.

Jesus of Nazareth His historical existence II 363-382; testimony about his messiahship 383-399; from the beginning of his public life 400-405; in what sense he wished to be recognized as Messiah 406-414; testimonies about his doctrinal mission 415-427; he affirmed his divinity 428-446; the personal character of Jesus is proof of His testimony 447-472; proof from miracles 473-499; from prophecies given by him 500-534; how he is loved in an admirable way 724ff; he is hated in a singular way 727f; how his life is contained in the treatise on Jesus the Legate 763-768; the history of Jesus 769-776.

Jewish people its fate as an apologetic argument II 520 535-539.

John, Apostle author of the fourth Gospel II 307-321; his knowledge and veracity in narrating 360.

Judgments of credibility and the obligation to believe are de facto supernatural II 183.

Kantianism false idea about religion II 20f 26; about revelation 59.

Kerê ketib II 198.

Kerygmatic theology I 11 19.

Knowledge of God ignorance of his for a long time cannot be blameless II 15 41.

Language of the O.T. II 196.

Laws of nature notion II 162 168; necessity 167f; statistical concept of some 169; we do not know how far the laws extend, but we know how far they do not reach in some circumstances 173.

Legate what it is and how many forms II 416ff how legation differs from a mission 416; Jesus said that he is the Legate of God 416-423; to all men 424-427.

Legio fulminatrix II 697.

Liberalism, religious II 28 36.

Locution what it is and its conditions II 53; teaching and attesting 54.

Love in Jesus its properties II 724ff.

Luke, doctor, author of the third Gospel II 289-296; and the book of Acts 297-306.

Man his autonomy of reason and vitality II 66.

Mark disciple of Peter, author of the second Gospel II 278-288;

Martyrdom what it is and its conditions II 730-735; the martyrdom of so many Christians is an apologetic argument 729-761.

Mary, Virgin consecration of studies to her I 31; extreme opposites in Christian doctrine about her II 658; her prophecy in the canticle "Magnificat" II 572.

Masora masoretic text II 199f.

Matthew, apostle, author of the first Gospel II 259-277;

Messiah: meaning of the word II 384; other names of the Messiah 385; properties of his kingdom 386.

Method of learning in theology I 22-25; scholastic 24f; positive 24; method of immanence in apologet-

- ics II 81 132; taken exclusively it cannot be admitted 138-141 149;
- Miracle** what and how many kinds II 160-164; its possibility 160-169; knowable as a criterion of revelation 170-174; it is a natural sign of revelation 131; criterion of immediate revelation 103; primary of public revelation 149-152; miracles are offered by Jesus, by the Apostles by apologists for proof I 65 70; miracles whereby Jesus proved his testimony II 473-499.
- Mishna** II 379.
- Mission** what it is in the divine persons II 416.
- Mode, physical** of revelation II 68.
- Monotheism** II 13 18.
- Moses** author of the Pentateuch II 218.
- Muratorium Fragment** II 292 298 301 303 310 314.
- Mutation** extrinsic of God by revelation II 68.
- Mysteries:** notion and divisions II 90ff; no repugnance 90-98; whether a priori their existence can be proved 99-102; their revelation is not repugnant 103-108; this proof is negative 110; their revelation is simply supernatural 101; they are contained de facto in revelation 111-114; they are connection harmoniously in one system 655.
- Mysteries, oriental** II 83.
- Necessity, moral** concept, conditions, examples II 78.
- New Testament** texts and manuscripts II 220-225; language and scripture 221f; principle papyruses 224; principal codices 225; versions 226-234; history of the text 231-234; editions 237-243; incorruption of the text 322-331.
- Obelo** II 204.
- Obligation** what it is II 25; obligation of religion 24-43.
- Origen** his hexapla II 204f.
- Pantheism** is not a form of religion II 12.
- Papias** his testimony about the Gospel of Matthew II 266-271 273 277; about the Gospel of Mark 267 282; about the Gospel of John 313.
- Parisian Bible** II 210.
- Paul, Apostle** his knowledge and veracity II 373; conversion and apparition of Jesus 556 560; he acknowledged he primacy of Peter 560.
- Pentateuch, Samaritan** II 201.
- Perfection, Christian** II 658.
- Peshitta** version II 226.
- Polyglots** II 211 237f.
- Polytheism** II 13 16.
- Possibility** its species II 62; moral possibility 63.
- Praxis, apologetic** I 49; II 159.
- "Presbyter John"** more probably is the Apostle John II 270f 321.
- Probabilism** when it is allowed and not allowed to use it II 42.
- Prologs, monarchian** II 280 291 312.
- Propagation** of the Christian religion as an apologetic argument II 689-710.
- Prophecis in the O.T.** to prove the legation of Jesus II 572-646.
- Prophecy** what it is and how many forms II 175ff; possibility and knowability as a criterion of revelation 175-182; its relation to

revelation 58; why there is no mention of prophecy in Vatican I 502; prophecies of Jesus to prove his testimony 500-534.

Qualifications, theological their pedagogical value II 37; explanation of some 37.

Religion etymological notion II 3f; philosophical notion 5; division 6ff; essential elements 10f; religion as a virtue 6; natural and positive 7 9; historical notion 12-18; conclusions from historical, comparative study 18; explanations of the religious fact 17; study of religion by way of psychology 19; false notions of religion 20-23; necessity and obligation of religion 24-43; obligation of positive religion 34; the Catholic religion easily appears to be true 35.

Resurrection what it is and how many forms II 553; resurrection of Jesus as an apologetic argument 540-571.

Revelation what it is and how many forms 45-49 51-58; false notions 59ff; efficient cause 48; possibility 62-68; fittingness and utility 69-75; moral necessity 76-89; how it agrees with other truths 89; public and private revelation 56; three stages of public revelation 186; the extent to which private revelations are approved and can be believed 56.

Revision Alcuin II 208; Theodulphus 209.

Sacrament of nature II 89.

Sanctity how it is esta

bled positively and negatively II 465-468; why it is a moral miracle in Jesus 465-470/

School, liberal concerning the Gospels II 255 260.

Science human perfected by revelation II 73ff; threefold knowledge in Christ 43.

Sentiment in the modernist notion of religion II 60f.

Servant of Yahweh prophecies about him 619-625.

Sin, original how its concept is established II 89

Suggestion inasmuch as it is helpful for healing II 492 498.

Supernatural what it is and how many forms II 50f; supernaturalness of revelation 52 56f.

Syllogistic form I 24.

Symbolism in John's Gospel II 361.

Synoptic question II 345-352.

Talmud, talmudists II 379 449 474 483 644.

Testimony a) of Jesus of Nazareth is proved also by other criteria: from the internal excellence of doctrine II 647-668; from the fruits of holiness flowing from it 669-688; from the amazing spread of the teaching 689-710; from the stability of Catholic unity 711-728; from the martyrdom of so many Christians 729-761; b) the Holy Spirit is not a primary criterion of revelation 134-137.

Theodotius his version of the O.T II 203f.

Theology a) general introduction I 1-37; theology as science 1; object of theology 1f; theology and faith 3-6; its objective principles and a

subjective principle 3f; theology and progress 20; and newness 21; and priestly life 26031; and contemplation 27; right intention in its study 28;

b) function of positive theology I 7 9; excellence of scholastic 7-10; defense against attackers 8; practical I 18.

c) introduction to fundamental theology I 38-61; proportion to the rest of theology 58; special bibliography 62f;

d) function of dogmatic theology I 18; principles from faith 55; division and treatise 61.

Theologically certain. II 123.

Theory of fraud regarding the Gospels II 250; naturalistic (Gottlob Paulus) 251; mythical (Strauss) 252;

Truth historical, philosophical and relative of miracles II 170.

St. Thomas commendations of his teaching I 23; his apologetics 72.

Titles of the Gospels for their genuineness II 272.

Tübingen critical school II 253.

Versions of Holy Scripture Latin versions II 272f; see **Vulgate**; Syrian versions of the N.T 226; other versions 229.

Vespasian: miracles attributed to him II 688.

Virginity among Christians II 681 687f.

Virtues special of Christians II 678-682.

Vision, intuitive is the measure of something simply supernatural II 51; distinct from revelation 58.

Vulgate version II 205-214; Vulgate

of the N.T 228; its authenticity 212f 331.

Will of God, salvific II 89.

Wisdom I 18; it is Theology 29f.