

Hallinan, Paul J.
Tools and techniques
ADQ 9054

TOOLS *and* TECHNIQUES

*For the teaching of the Catholic
Religion in Colleges and Universities*



PART I

FOUNDATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

TOOLS and TECHNIQUES

for the

TEACHING OF THE CATHOLIC RELIGION

in

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Part One

'Foundations of the Catholic Church'

by

Rev. Paul J. Hallinan

Newman Hall, Cleveland, Ohio

and

Rev. Robert J. Welch,

School of Religion, University of Iowa

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF NEWMAN CLUB CHAPLAINS

1956

NIHIL OBSTAT:

Patrick Gillespie,
Censor Liborum.
June 19, 1956

IMPRIMATUR:

✠ JOS. F. RUMMEL, Archiepiscopus
Novae Aureliae
Die XX Junii 1956

August 25, 1956

Printed for the National Association
of Newman Club Chaplains
by Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind.



Declassified



Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
--------------------	---

PART I—GOD

CORE OF CHAPTER

1. THE STARTING POINT	10
2. CURRENT CONCEPTS OF GOD	11
3. USE OF THE FIVE PROOFS	12
4. THE NATURE OF GOD	13
5. REALIZING THE MEANING	14
6. PARTICULAR PROBLEMS	14
7. RELIGION AND RELIGIONS	15
8. REVELATION	16
9. EVIDENTIAL MIRACLES AND COLLEGE MIND	16
10. CONCLUSION OF THIS SECTION	17
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	18

PART II—THE SOURCES OF CHRISTIANITY

CORE OF CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	21
2. APOLOGETICS AND THE GOSPELS	22
3. APPROACH AND METHOD	22
4. A POINT OF ORDER	23
5. SUGGESTED TECHNIQUES AND EMPHASES	23
6. THE GOSPELS AND MODERN SCHOLARSHIP	26
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	29

PART III—THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

CORE OF CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	32
2. PREPARING THE MIND	33
3. THE LINE OF PROOF	34

4. SUGGESTIONS AND SUGGESTED TECHNIQUES	35
5. CHRIST AND THE CRITICS	38
6. CONCLUSION	39
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	40

PART IV—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

CORE OF CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	42
2. THE LINE OF PROOF	45
3. PREPARING THE MIND	47
4. SUGGESTED TECHNIQUES	48
5. CONCLUDING THIS SECTION	49
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	50
CONCLUSION:—FAITH	53

INTRODUCTION

THIS is not a text-book in Apologetics, nor a source-book. Yet it is more than an outline. It is meant to be a *Companion* for the teacher of Apologetics. As its title indicates, it offers some Tools and some Techniques. The *tools* are some eighty books for reading, reference and assignment. The *techniques* are suggestions on the use of these books and the general arrangement of such a course.

* * *

There is great concern over the teaching of the Catholic religion to college people today. On the non-Catholic campus, a course about the Church is no longer a 7-day wonder; in at least a dozen institutions it is now a 3-hour credit. On the majority of campuses, priests are teaching thousands of students on a non-credit basis. As the dust of old controversies settles, the priest is finding that he has certain definite advantages in this relatively new apostolate of the campus:

There is the *novelty*. He is teaching Theology, and the campus may be amused, scornful, interested or hostile—it is difficult for the average student or professor to remain indifferent to this alien science.

Then, too, academic *freedom* leaves the door unlocked, if not actually opened. If all kinds of political, scientific, economic and philosophical systems are to be taught, why not (according to the contemporary conscience) the theological system of Catholicism?

Finally, the students are weary of diluted courses *about* Religion; so are college administrators. Biblical literature, religious art, and Engineering Ethics all have their place, but it is hardly in the Department of Religion. A course called "Great Religions of the World" is apt to leave the average student cold, especially when taught by a man whose own ideas of God, religion and church are (by any academic standard) quite vague.

A teacher willing to hang out a shingle for the teaching of Roman Catholicism (or Judaism or Protestantism) will likely get a hearing—if he is intellectually competent, factually equipped and absolutely honest. Against the forbidding back-drop of a crowded curriculum, shortage of chaplains, flood of students, occasional anti-Catholic hostility and frequent Catholic apathy, we simply have not appreciated our assets!

* * *

But not all the conflict is between Catholicism and the secular forces on the American campus. There is plenty within our own ranks. Should we teach Theology or Religion? And if Theology, should the college student's course differ from the seminarian's? For those who are interested in these questions, we suggest reading the views of Fathers Cyril Vollert, S.J., John Courtney Murray, S.J., Walter Farrell, O.P., W. H. Russell, Joseph Fenton, Roy J. Deferrari and others in the issues of *Theological Studies*, *American Ecclesiastical Review*, *Journal*

of *Religious Instruction*, *Catholic Educational Review* and the *Bulletin of the National Education Association* from 1943 on.

The Newman Club Chaplain may or may not be concerned with the pedagogical principles of this argument. But he does face certain more practical problems:

- (1) How much Religion can be taught—as to Hours and Content?
- (2) What should his basic course be?
- (3) If Apologetics, where should he start?
- (4) What text-books are most suited?

What Is the Basic Course?

Two recent surveys in Newman Club work may help decide. In 1953, the authors of *Tools and Techniques* surveyed 14 representative colleges and universities in a brochure called *The Newman Club and American Education*. In seven accredited and seven non-credit situations, some 80 religion courses were being taught by Catholic priests. In practically all these schools, Apologetics was the basic course. Moral Principles (including Ethics) and Catholic Doctrine were next.

That same year, in the Rev. Leonard Cowley's *Exploring Our Resources*, the students listed their "intellectual needs" in this order: Fundamentals of the Catholic Church, Catholic Doctrine, Catholic Social Principles, and Moral Theology.

"The Foundation of the Catholic Church" (or Apologetics) has been chosen for the first phase of *Tools and Techniques*. "Catholic Doctrine" and "Catholic Moral Principles" will follow. These seem to be the core of a student's religious education. Liturgy, Scripture, Philosophy, History and Sociology can be easily worked into an integrated program where time and facilities permit.

* * *

One hour a week would be the absolute minimum for any effective teaching of the Catholic faith. In the typical non-credit situation, it is well to allow for school examinations and vacations. If the course is designed for *one semester*, it can run from October to December or from February to May. It is better, of course, to make it *two semesters*; and proportionately better if it can be taught two or three hours a week instead of one.

Where Should Apologetics Begin?

"Foundations of the Catholic Church"—whether the old or the new Apologetics is used—deals with three elements: *God—Christ—Church*. The traditional technique begins with the Existence of God, proceeds to the Divinity of Christ, and concludes with the Catholic Church as the Voice and Power of God in the world, the Mystical Body of Christ. This arrangement is logical, forward-moving, and appeals to the student because it starts with no assumptions except the principle of causality. It runs the two major risks of tilting against already van-



No 1288

NATIONAL NEWMAN CLUB FEDERATION

UNIT OF YOUTH DEPARTMENT OF N. C. W. C.

1312 Massachusetts Ave., N. W. Washington 5, D. C.

DATE October 10, 1956

TO: Rev. Frank J. Crowley
St. Peter's Rectory
Peterborough, New Hampshire

PLEASE TO INSURE THE PROPER CREDIT OF YOUR REMITTANCE
DETACH AND RETURN THE ABOVE STUB.

1	Tools and Techniques	.35
	Mailing and Handling	<u>.06</u>
		.41

PLEASE MAKE CHECK TO:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NEWMAN CLUB
CHAPLAINS

Thank you,

Also sending you a publication
list.

PROMPT PAYMENT OF THIS INVOICE WILL BE APPRECIATED

1871 78

...

...

...

...

quished opponents (Deists, etc.) and appearing to be too "defensive."

The new technique has various forms, but generally it begins with the fact of the Church, traces its authority back to Christ Who is God. This treatment can be made more lively and pertinent, and it appears more "positive." Its disadvantage is that it has to assume, in the beginning, what the modern mind often denies: a Personal God and the necessity of religion.

A third technique is Christocentric. It begins with *Christ* and His teachings: about *God* the Father; the brotherhood of men in the Mystical Body of Christ; supernatural life; and comes to the living agency for the transmission of truth and grace—the *Church*.

The teacher presumably will make his own choice based on the needs and capacities of his students. *Tools and Techniques* follows the traditional approach. Much of the material could be rearranged for the other two methods.

What Text-Books?

Most Apologetics text-books are written to serve the *Traditional* Approach. A recent survey of Catholic colleges shows a decided preference for these three:

Joseph H. Cavanaugh, C.S.C., *Evidence for Our Faith*,
(University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana)

M. Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, Vol. I,
(Gill & Son, Dublin)

A. Patrick Madgett, S.J., *Christian Origins*, Vol. I and Vol. II,
(Xavier Press, Cincinnati, Ohio)

To these should be added:—

Anthony F. Alexander, *College Apologetics*, (Henry Regnery, Chicago, Illinois)

Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., *Textbook in Apologetics*, (Longman Green, New York)

A Primer of Theology, Book One, (just published by the Priory Press, Dubuque, Iowa), is the work of three Dominican priests, James W. Regan, O.P., John A. Henry, O.P., and Thomas C. Donlan, O.P. Following the *Summa's* general order, the authors nevertheless have adapted the first volume to Apologetics' use.

More popularly written are three studies by laymen:

Arnold Lunn, *Now I See*, Part II—"The Argument"
(Sheed and Ward, New York)

Thomas F. Woodlock, *The Catholic Pattern*, Chapters I-IV
(Simon and Schuster, Inc.)

John G. Brunini, *Whereon to Stand*, Chapters 1-4, 8-14
(Harper & Brothers, New York)

The following are designed more for the instruction of converts, but might be useful:

Francis J. Ripley, *This Is the Faith*, Chapters 1-6; 13-19
(Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland). Also avail-

able in paperbound volume from Catechetical Guild Educational Society, St. Paul, Minn.

John J. Keating, C.S.P., *Outlines of Catholic Teaching*, pp. 1-40 (Paulist Press, New York)

William J. Grace, S.J., *The Catholic Church and You*, Chapters 1-6; 9 and 10 (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin)

* * *

For the newer technique (starting with the fact of the Church), there is a wealth of material, but little of it is arranged for teaching. John M. Cooper's *Religion Outlines for Colleges* (Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C.) devotes Course III to Apologetics, starting with the Church and working back.

Probably the best presentation of the Church is in *The Spirit of Catholicism* by Karl Adam (now available in Image Books). Every page is aimed at a better understanding of its tenets, historical development and the role of the Church in world society. Adam points out briefly (in Chapter III) that the structure of Catholic faith may be summarized in a single sentence: I come to a living faith in the Triune God through Christ in His Church.

The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind, by Bakewell Morrison, S.J. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin) has an unusual approach. The Church is first discussed in its relation to the modern mind; then he gives the usual order: God—Christ—Church.

Not a text-book but an excellent teachers' guide is the *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*, edited by Frank Sheed and Maisie Ward (Sheed and Ward, New York). Written to help train outdoor apologists in England, this book has brief outlines that can easily parallel the "Church—Christ—God" method. Read especially Course I, Part 1, the sections 1-14 on the Church; then, Course II, Part 1, the sections 1-6 on Revelation, and the sections 12-21 on Christ; and finally, Part III on the Existence of God.

* * *

The Christocentric method has been used extensively in the writings of William H. Russell. Among these are his book, *Jesus the Divine Teacher* (P. J. Kennedy, New York), and several articles:

"The Nature and Function of Christocentrism," *Journal of Religious Instruction*, (June, 1942)

"Teaching the Life of Christ," *Catholic Educational Review*, (February, 1952)

The standard Lives and Theologies of Christ would all be used in this method: Grandmaison, Fouard, Guardini, Ricciotti, Arendzen, Adam and others.

* * *

The use of a text-book by the students is almost a necessity, especially where the teaching time is short. Mimeographed material or assigned outside reading can be a supplement to the text, not a substitute for it. The purchase of a text is a psychological asset; it is an investment, it parallels courses in other subjects, and it becomes a resource for the future.

One Word More

Teaching methods differ because teachers and students differ. A device like *Tools and Techniques* should be in constant revision as Chaplains add to it their own experiences. These experiences will be as varied as the campuses where the chaplains teach.

But the diversities in our work grow less important once we agree that the Newman Club or Foundation is not doing its job unless the Catholic students get their religious education on the college level. A full-time chaplain teaching three hours a week for credit at a large university approaches his subject in much the same manner as the har-rassed curate meeting his tiny student-flock in the church basement once a week. Backgrounds, content, methods and goals are roughly the same.

It would seem, in both cases, to be a question—not of Cephas, or Paul, or Apollo—but of One Lord, One Faith and One Baptism. That is the vantage point from which *Tools and Techniques* can best be used.

* * *

Part I. GOD

CORE OF CHAPTER

<i>Starting Point</i>	<i>Particular Problems</i>
<i>Current Concepts of God</i>	<i>Religion and Religions</i>
<i>Use of the Five Proofs</i>	<i>Revelation</i>
<i>The Nature of God</i>	<i>Miracles and the College Mind</i>
<i>Realizing the Meaning</i>	<i>Conclusion of this Section</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

* * *

Core Of Chapter

1. Man begins his search for God when he first asks: "Why?" In asking that question, he affirms a *First Fact* (Man can think as well as exist) and a *First Principle* (Whatever begins to be must have an efficient cause outside itself).
2. God exists as the Personal Supreme Being, infinitely perfect.
3. The universe (including man) is totally dependent upon Him. Religion is the necessary expression of man's total dependence. Man is *naturally* religious.
4. Although some individuals by human reason alone have known and worshipped the One Supreme Being, and lived accordingly, mankind has generally lacked the initiative, skill and time to work out an adequate and certain Natural Religion. Divine Revelation, even in this Natural Religion, is practically necessary.
5. If God has intended an end for man higher than his natural purpose, such supernatural facts would have to be revealed. In this case, Revelation would be absolutely necessary.
6. Religion, in any case, must be on God's terms, not man's. If God has revealed what religion must be, such revelation is definitive and final.
7. Man's best criterion, in examining any teachings said to be revealed by God, is some Divine Action verifying that teaching or that teacher.

1. The Starting Point

There are many places for the study of religion to begin. Our Lord did not hesitate to start with a man's question asked in the dark; or with empty stomachs; or with lack of eyesight; or even discarded husbands, as St. John shows in his 3rd, 6th, 9th and 4th chapters. The exact point of departure is not as vital as the Content—and even this is less

urgent than the Objective. As Cardinal Newman remarks in the *Grammar of Assent*:

“. . . the Catholic religion is reached, as we see, by inquirers from all points of the compass, as if it mattered not where a man began, so that he had an eye and a heart for the truth.”

Wherever the course begins, the student must soon come to terms with the *fact of God*. He must clarify, organize and make real his knowledge of Him. A man can save his soul without knowing the Five Proofs of God's Existence, but we are not here directly engaged in saving souls. We are engaged in teaching minds. At the college level, the Catholic should be handed no substitute for the intellectual approach to God and religion. Several techniques suggest themselves:

a) *By Deepening*: One student may have a working notion of God, but because he has not examined it, he has little insight and no sure grasp. He needs to probe the old definition:

“The One Supreme and Infinite Personal Being,
Creator and Ruler of the Universe,
To Whom man owes obedience and worship.”

(*Catholic Encyclopedia*)

Each term can be analyzed: Personal Being—One—Supreme—Infinite, etc. Then traditional proofs are studied, and the nature of God explored by analogy. Two of Newman's extended definitions can be found in the *Idea of a University*, II, 7; and III, 7. This approach has the advantage of handling what is already familiar.

b) *By Contrasts*: Another student (more typical) is aware of the old definition, but more aware that many do not believe in this Personal God. It may be tactically wise to show how modern minds have defined God, then draw the student to realize how inadequate these concepts are, and finally move on to the study of His Existence and Nature.

Which technique should the teacher use? That which the class needs. Perhaps the teacher already knows or can learn by a few inquiries. A survey in the opening class might try these questions:

- (1) How would you define *God*?
- (2) Could you *explain* this definition in a class-room; in a bull session; in a letter to a Catholic friend who has written that he has become an atheist?

2. Current Concepts of God

Let us assume that *Contrasts* offers a good opening, that the Catholic student is aware of, and puzzled and even shaken by, the popular views about God. Msgr. Donald Cleary recently found, in a survey at Cornell, that most Protestant (and the Jewish) directors agreed on a definition of God which he had proposed. But two significant deviations were noted. The Quaker said: “Friends discuss very little the nature of God . . . if he is a spirit, he (or it) does not have intellect, memory, imagination, will, etc. The spirit is more likely to be an *all*

pervading function—call it creation or creativeness . . ." (Italics added). The Unitarian scoffed at the whole notion of defining God: "Any God you can put into a definition is at least no bigger than a man's mind." Regardless of labels, these two views seem to come much closer to the American campus idea of God than the traditional Judaeo-Christian definition does.

Excellent treatment of these present-day concepts can be found in Bishop Sheen's three studies of God: *God and Intelligence* (1925), *Religion Without God* (1928) and *The Philosophy of Religion* (1948). Chapters IV and V of the first book are recommended. In *Religion Without God*, he neatly summarizes three "explanations" of God:

- (1) the Philosophical—God is the budding-off of the evolving universe;
- (2) the Psychological—God is a mental projection;
- (3) the Sociological—God is society divinized.

Chapter VI ("The Philosophy of Value") has a fine chapter on Kant and his consequences in the field of religion.

Frank Sheed's chapter in *Theology and Sanity* on "He Who Is" is characteristically to the point. Dismissing the anthropomorphic god as "a venerable man with a beard, rather like the poet Tennyson, or perhaps Karl Marx," he then traces two modern tendencies:

- (1) to treat God as an equal;
- (2) to treat God as an extra.

This is not only authentic class-room language, but will remind the student of even more popular and persistent notions about the Supreme Being.

In a remarkable book, *God and the Supernatural* (now reprinted in abridged form) M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. has a penetrating essay on "The Idea of God." This contains a good refutation of both Pantheism and "watered-down pantheism." Sheen's Chapter VI in *God and Intelligence* is also appropriate on this topic; it is called "Is God organic with the world?" Walter Farrell, O.P. in *A Companion to the Summa* is always good. In a passage headed "Unspeakable modern gods," he lists:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) a subjective god; | (3) an undeveloped god; |
| (2) a finite god; | (4) a pantheistic god. |

Current Protestant concepts of God are outlined in a much-needed *Survey of Protestant Theology in Our Day* by Gustave Weigel, S.J.

3. Use of the Five Proofs

From the inadequacy of these pseudo-gods, the student comes to appreciate the facts and principles used in a disciplined study of the One God. The Five Proofs of St. Thomas give us a point of departure. If we avoid using them so that we reduce God, in the student's mind, to the final term in a syllogism, they will have a distinct value in the discipline of going from *Fact* through *Principle* to *Conclusion*. As against the non-intellectual approaches to God, the Five Proofs remind the thinking student that the Catholic Church, from Sts. Peter and Paul

down to Pius XII, has championed the use of human reason in man's quest for his Creator.

How to use the five proofs? Just what do they prove? These questions are well answered in Ronald Knox's *The Hidden Stream* ("Does Proof Matter?") and Farrell's *Companion* (I, 45-46). Knox emphasizes the usefulness of the proofs under "stress of sudden shock, or great disappointment, or unforeseen conflict." Farrell stresses more their profound personal significance—what can each proof mean to me? Sheed (in *Theology and Sanity*) holds that they are valuable not only to lead men to a "certainty that God is," but a "profounder understanding of what God is."

If there is time, it is good to take the proofs in St. Thomas' own words. The Modern Library's *Introduction to St. Thomas Aquinas* contains the famous Article Three of Part One, Question Two of the *Summa*—"Whether God Exists." Most of the standard apologetics' texts paraphrase the proofs.

If there is time for only one or two proofs, well-explained and well-understood, Pope Pius' XII's address on "Modern Science and the Existence of God" is very useful. In a brilliant summary (part of a pamphlet, *Church and Modern Science*), the Pope draws together modern scientific evidence for the Proof from Motion and the Proof from Design. For the student of physics, astronomy or biology, this will have strong appeal.

A wealth of material on the Proof from Design can be found in John O'Brien's *Truths Men Live By*; Frederick Houck's *Our Palace Wonderful*; Arnold Lunn's *Now I See* (Chapter III); and John Stoddard's *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* (Chapter IV). Hilaire Belloc examines and deals with the case against the Proofs from Motion and Cause in *The Question and the Answer* (Chapter II).

For one proof, briefly and intensively reasoned through, one can hardly find anything better than Sheed's treatment of the Proof from Contingency in *Theology and Sanity* (pp. 32-35). A very useful book by Maisie Ward and Sheed is the *Catholic Training Evidence Outlines*; the Proofs from Contingency and Design are well handled here.

The other proofs (Conscience, Universal Consent, St. Anselm's, etc.) are found in most text-books. Paschal's famous "wager-argument" is well analyzed in Leo Ward's *Catholic Church and the Appeal to Reason* (Part I). The relation between the Thomistic approach and that of Religious Experience is considered in Sheen's *God and Intelligence* (Chapter V).

4. The Nature of God

As Sheed notes, a study of the proofs that God is gives us much on what He is. In *Theology and Sanity*, he proceeds thus: the implications of Infinity and Perfection, a Personal God; then in the next chapter ("The Mind Works on Infinity"), he brings out clearly that God is free of all limitations: space, time, knowledge, power. In his pamphlet, *Are We Really Teaching Religion?* he has a fine chapter on "Spirit."

C. C. Martindale, S.J., has an excellent chapter on the Nature of God in his *Faith of the Roman Church*, and Knox in *The Hidden Stream*. Again, St. Thomas should be studied in his own words if there is time: Part I of the *Summa* (in the Modern Library edition), Question 3 (Simplicity of God) through to Question 25 (Power of God), pp. 28-232.

5. Realizing the Meaning

The Existence and the Nature of God must never remain mere words. As Newman puts it:

“Admit a God, and you introduce among the subjects of your knowledge, a fact encompassing, closing in upon, absorbing, every other fact conceivable.”

And again, still in the *Idea of a University*:

“The word “God” is a Theology in itself, indivisibly one, inexhaustibly various, from the vastness and simplicity of its meaning.”

Newman is valuable in getting the student to grasp the profound meaning of the *Fact of God*. Knox in his chapter on “The Average Man’s Doubts about God” (*The Hidden Stream*) and Sheed in “He Who Is” (*Theology and Sanity*) demonstrate how *personal* this knowledge must be. It is no classroom exercise to be memorized and filed. If left at this stage, as Sheed points out, it will seem “thin and remote and uncomfortable.” Our knowledge of God must live, and we live with it.

Part of the difficulty here is that in refuting Pantheism, we emphasize God’s Transcendence so much that we back over into Deism. Now Pantheism is very much a modern problem, but Deism can be too. The Immanence of God must again be affirmed; He is present in the universe in His Wisdom, Goodness and Power. Sheen’s Chapter VII in *The Philosophy of Religion* is useful here.

Autobiographies can be used in bringing this home to the student. Of special interest are Alfred Noyes’ *The Unknown God*; the old favorite, John L. Stoddard’s *Rebuilding a Lost Faith*, and of strong appeal to the college-age youth, Avery Dulles’ *Testimonial to Grace*.

6. Particular Problems

- (a) Why not an “infinite series of causes”? Aristotle first tackled that one. Madgett has it in his *Christian Origins*, I, 18; and Farrell in his *Companion to the Summa*, I, pp. 34-35.
- (b) Where was God before the Universe was created? Sheed not only answers this in *Theology and Sanity* (Chapter IV), but uses it as a frame for an excellent discussion on God’s limitless perfection.
- (c) Where does Evolution fit in? The pamphlet, *Church and Modern Science*, contains a fine essay on “The Evolution of the Human Body” by Cyril Vollert, S.J. There is considerable material also in Sheen’s three books, *Religion Without God*, *Philosophy of Religion*, and *God and Intelligence*—especially Chapter IV in the last-named, “Evolution and the First Principles of the Intelligence.”

Also in Farrell's Chapter VIII and Chapter XII of *A Companion*, I.

- (d) How can God, infinitely good, permit evil (and suffering)? An excellent pamphlet is *The Problem of Evil* by D'Arcy. The question is also treated in:
- Regan-Henry-Donlan, *Primer of Theology*, pp. 152-163;
 - Farrell, *A Companion*, I, Chapter VI (pp. 129-132);
 - Sheed, *A Map of Life* (under "Law and Suffering");
 - E. I. Watkin, (in *God and the Supernatural*) "The Problem of Evil"
 - Sheen, *The Philosophy of Religion* (under "Man as a Problem")
 - T. J. Walshe, *The Principles of Christian Apologetics*, (pp. 96-109);
 - St. Thomas, *God and His Creatures* (translated with notes by J. Rickaby, S.J.), pp. 186-196.
- (e) If God knows all, what does my freedom mean? Read *A Primer of Theology*, I, pp. 140-143 and Farrell in *A Companion*, chapters on "The Vision of God" and "The Will of God." Also Part IX of M. J. Scheeben's *The Mysteries of Christianity* to clarify the particular mystery of Predestination.

7. Religion and Religions

Comparative religion, as a term, has become so familiar to college students that it should be used as an asset, not shunned as a liability. Frazer's *Golden Bough* is largely withered now, despite its great popularity in the 19th Century. But memories of it still persist, and occasionally a department of Religion still advertises a course in "Devils, Magic and Witchcraft."

The old conclusions, however, have lost their impact in the flood of new facts. Many scholars today consider it naive to speak of a "cumulative Christianity," or to make the easy generalization that the primitives were polytheists first and monotheists much later.

If the existence and nature of God have been taught well, and a workable definition of man has been adapted from any good psychology text-book like Bittle's *Whole Man* or Harmon's *Principles of Psychology*, we now have the terminals. A definition of religion, then, is simply a statement of the *bond or relationship between God and Man*.

What has the History of Religions to teach about that bond?

- (1) that certain religious elements appear in all cultures —prayer, sacrifice, propitiation;
- (2) that these bear witness to Religion as the expression of man's dependency upon, and his duty to, his Creator.

Monotheism can then be traced from the beginning, with some attention to the many deviations from it: animism, idolatry, magic, mythology, and polytheism. It can be clearly shown that Religion, left to man's own devices, soon comes to be Religion on man's own terms

instead of God's. The basic meaning (bond between man and God) is lost.

A brief review of the present-day concepts of religion brings this home sharply to the student. Knox's chapter in *The Hidden Stream*, "What is Religion?", will help. Today we have religion as brotherhood, fellowship, service (all man-to-man) and we have religion as inner-glow, experience, satisfaction (all man-to-self). Considerable effort is needed to bring the student back to Religion as the *bond between man and God*.

8. Revelation

Having used Natural Science and Philosophy to clarify what man can know about God by reason, and Anthropology and History to show what man has made of religion we now face an old question: Can man, unaided by God, reach an *adequate* and *certain* religion?

It is interesting to show how some individuals, by human reason alone, knew and worshipped the One Supreme Being, and lived accordingly. Knox has a good chapter in his *Hidden Stream*, showing how pagan religions with their bits of truth prepared man for the coming Revelation; and how the Jews who had Divine Revelation preserved this heritage, half-consciously, for all. But both cases illustrate how necessary Revelation is.

The old thesis is abundantly proved: Mankind generally has lacked the (1) Time; (2) Skill; and (3) Initiative needed to work out a Natural Religion which was sure and adequate. For even this Natural Religion, revelation is morally (or practically) necessary.

The question must be raised here of the *Supernatural*. Since this permeates all that follows—it should be grasped as soon as possible. C. C. Martindale, S.J. treats "The Supernatural" in the first chapter of *God and the Supernatural*. So does Sheed in *Map of Life* (Chapters XI and XII) and *Theology and Sanity* (pp. 150-153). The point at this stage of the study is this: If God has intended for man an End higher than his natural purpose, such supernatural facts would have to be revealed. Man simply could not grasp them by reason. In this case, revelation is not only morally, but *absolutely* necessary.

9. Evidential Miracles and the College Mind

After the *necessity* of Revelation is shown, the *fact* of Revelation must be demonstrated. *Internal* Criteria (such as the apparent holiness of the teacher, and the apparent truth of the doctrine) are shown to be insufficient. *External* criteria should be shown as demonstrable and conclusive.

An observable action, above the powers of all created nature, attributable to God alone as its cause, and performed in testimony to the truth of a particular revelation—such an act is an adequate criterion. It must be made clear to the student that only such an action is properly termed an evidential "miracle."

The college mind is not tuned to miracles in this strict sense, pos-

sibly because it is so accustomed to them in the popular sense—the marvels of scientific discovery. Two questions may clarify at this point:

- (1) First, a purely philosophic question must be posed: Is a miracle in the strict sense *possible*? Here the definition of God must be kept firmly in mind. If a miracle is *impossible*, that definition would have to be changed—A Being infinitely perfect *except that He cannot intervene in His own laws!*
- (2) Which mind is more *open* and *objective*, in the presence of a phenomenon—that which rejects the possibility of Divine Intervention, or the mind that admits it? The first is restricted to natural causes, and must dismiss or change evidence to the contrary. The second is open to both natural and supernatural causation, and may examine the facts accordingly.

Two other problems can arise—what about non-Christian “miracles” in the ancient religions? And what about current “miracles” of faith-healing, etc. Knox treats this in a chapter in his pamphlet on *Miracles*. Sheen’s chapter on “Comparative Religion and Philosophy” in *The Philosophy of Religion* is worth re-reading. At the end of Book V of Grandmaison’s *Jesus Christ*, there is a series of excellent notes on Divine Kings and Healing Kings, the Miraculous in primitive Buddhism and Islam, Faith-Healing, Over-powering Suggestion, Resurrections from the Dead in Greek and Rabbinic literature, and gods who died and came to life.

10. Conclusion of this Section

We are now at a turning point in the course—we are about to study Christianity, the religion revealed by Jesus Christ. It is good to review what we know about God, not only His Existence and Nature, but *especially what this knowledge means to man*. The Fact of God has profound and far-reaching effects in our life. If He has spoken in Revelation, His word is final—there is no room for debate.

If the student, at this point, still thinks he can consider God’s words with the same attention as he would any religious leader’s—that there is a *sort of option* here—there is need for review and re-study. At what point does he bog down—and what are the consequences of his stopping at this point? What else follows? Exceptional time cannot be spent in class on the student who is having difficulties, but every effort must be made by the teacher to clear the air so that the student can think the problem through, step-by-step:

- (1) God exists as the Personal Supreme Being, infinitely perfect;
- (2) The universe (including man) is totally dependent upon Him;
- (3) This dependence is expressed in man’s case by Religion;
- (4) Religion must be on God’s terms, not man’s;
- (5) If God has revealed what Religion must be, that is final;

- (6) Man's best criterion for Divine Revelation is a miracle.

* * *

Bibliographical Notes

In addition to the sources already noted in the Chapter, the following may prove useful. They are well-known to those teaching. Their particular value here will be collateral reading for the student.

In labelling them under the heading of general concepts, it is not intended to treat them as "chunks" of material about God, Religion, etc. Each assignment should be related to the over-all context. But within this framework, it should surely be of value to assign readings in these "chunks."

The classics in studying about God are *God, His Existence and His Nature*, by Garrigou-LaGrange, O.P. (condensed in a smaller work, *Providence*) and *Principles of Natural Theology* by G. H. Joyce, S.J. To the students' general reaction that these are abstract, there may be placed the more significant point,—that they are detailed in content and scientific in approach. That the largest subject of our knowledge can be studied by the highest power man has, his intellect, frequently strikes the collegiate mind as startling, good, and even exciting.

Sheen has a chapter on "The Transcendence of God" in his *Philosophy of Religion*. Farrell's Vol. I *Companion to the Summa* gives the proofs on pp. 32-44, and continues through Chapters III, IV and V on the attributes of God. "The Idea of God" in *God and the Supernatural* is by D'Arcy. St. Thomas is paraphrased and well-explained in Vol. I of the *Primer of Theology* (Regan-Henry-Donlan), pp. 111-166.

The material on *Religion* is, of course, growing rapidly. These are definitely worth-while:

Otto Karrer, *Religions of Mankind* (note the summary on pp. 80-83); P. W. Schmidt, S.V.D., *Origin and Growth of Religion*; Christopher Dawson, *The Age of the Gods*; and *Progress and Religion* (especially Chapters IV, V, VI); G. K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man*; Wilhelm Koppers, *Primitive Man and his World Picture*; Sheen, *Philosophy of Religion* (especially Chapter IX).

One of the handiest references in this field is *Studies in Comparative Religion* (five small volumes published by the Catholic Truth Society): especially—Schmidt, "Religion of Pre-historic Man," and "Religion of Present Primitives" (vol. I); E. C. Messenger, "An Introduction to Comparative Religion" Messenger's "A Philosophy of Comparative Religion" published separately as a pamphlet.

In treating *Revelation*, our sources continue with excellent material. Note especially: Knox, *Hidden Stream* (Chapter on "The Necessity of Revelation"); Sheed, *Map of Life*, (pp. 13-19); *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Revelation."

There are good summaries of the steps in this part of the argument in Karl Adam's *Spirit of Catholicism* (pp. 47-50) and *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines* (pp. 164-166).

Newman, as usual, has clear, well-phrased thoughts on Revelation. They have been summarized by Erich Przywara, S.J. in his *Newman Synthesis* under the heading "Preparations for Christianity": the readiness to believe, the consciousness of sin, and surrender (pp. 15-41).

There are good summaries on the importance of *Miracles* in the following:

L. De Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ*, Vol. III, Bk. V ("Introduction to the Study of the Gospel Miracles"); *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Miracles;" Farrell, *A Companion*, I, pp. 381-382; *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*, pp. 212-215; Lunn, *Now I See*, pp. 138-143; *The Third Day*, Chapters I, XII and XIII; Chesterton, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 232-236; 275-282; Newman, *Two Essays on Miracles*; Knox, *Hidden Stream*, Chapter on "Miracles" (also his pamphlet of the same name.)

Part II. SOURCES OF CHRISTIANITY

CORE OF CHAPTER

Introductory Remarks
Apologetics Concentrates on the Gospels
Approach and Method
A Point of Order
Suggested Techniques and Emphases
The Gospels and Modern Scholarship

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Core Of Chapter

1. In the records of monotheistic revelation (Judaeo-Christian, Moslem and others), Christianity maintains a unique position. Since it claims to be the Complete Fulfillment of the Divine Promises its relation to the others must be clearly grasped.
2. If it is the *Fulfillment*, then modern Judaism is false. If it is *Complete*, then Islam (which rejected Christ as a Divine Person) is superfluous as well as false.
3. The chief Christian source is the "Gospel," the good news of salvation announced by Jesus Christ. His actions and words were preserved in an *oral* synthesis by the Apostles, called "Catechesis." Certain summaries of this were *written* (during the generation of these Apostles). Historical tradition refers to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as the authors of these written "gospels."
4. The Gospels are authentic historical records. Their *integrity* is evidenced by the striking mass of complete Gospels (going back to the 4th and 5th centuries), and partial texts, translations and some 20,000 quotations (going clear back to the beginning). A comparison of this evidence with our Gospels today shows variations in less than 1/1000th of the text.
5. This wealth of evidence unanimously names Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as the authors; the years from 45 A.D. to 90/100 A.D. as the outside dates. Thus *genuinity* as well as integrity is clearly established.
6. The *truthfulness* of the authors is attested by internal evidence, by the lack of any reason for untruthfulness, and by the acceptance of the Gospels by Jewish eye-witnesses to the events, and by thousands of Greek and Roman converts.
7. The Gospel records, along with the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, plus some help from Judaic and Roman writers, give us the details of the Life of Jesus Christ. Once they are clearly seen as historical records, each detail in His Life can be carefully studied: the events, His teachings, His identification of Himself, His miracles, His plan for the future centuries, His death.

1. Introductory Remarks

In the previous section, in treating of Revelation, the point has been made that by reason alone the most man can reach is the impressive conclusion that it would be wonderful if God did indeed speak to His created human race. The race needs that Revelation badly and is more or less conscious of that need. Newman has said of Revelation:

“It comes to you recommended and urged upon you by the most favorable anticipations of reason. The very difficulties of nature make it likely that a Revelation should be made; the very mysteries of creation call for some act on the part of the Creator by which those mysteries shall be alleviated to you or compensated . . . You cannot help expecting it from the hands of the All-Merciful, unworthy as you feel yourselves of it. It is not that you can claim it but that He inspires the hope of it . . . the fact that there is a Creator, and a hidden One, powerfully bears you on and sets you down at the very threshold of Revelation and leaves you there, looking up earnestly for divine tokens that a Revelation has been made.” (*Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, pp. 276, 278)

The question of its *possibility*—whether or not God could reveal truth to man—should scarcely detain one a moment in the study of Apologetics. There is simply no problem worth the time we might give to it, no problem either from the point of view of God or the point of view of man. *Whether or not God has spoken is not a philosophical question; it is simply a question of history.*

To a degree the question of Revelation is made more difficult because there are so *many people who claim or have claimed that God has spoken to them*. Further, there are so many people who claim that the sayings of others, usually in the remote past, are of such quality that they must be considered a Revelation of God. One cannot in a course of Apologetics pursue each and every claim to Revelation, although something should be said on the matter. There crops up a somewhat subtle attempt to take Christianity down from its claim of *uniqueness* by suggesting that others have religious doctrines which are like those of Christianity or even better. Confucius, Mohammed and Buddha are the favorite examples. Knox in chapter 12 of *The Hidden Stream* makes some telling points on this matter, especially that nobody ever compares Christianity right down the line with some non-Christian religion but compares only a part with a similar part in Christianity. And Alexander in his *College Apologetics* remarks:

“The key to the correct appraisal of the different religions is not in showing how they are alike but in *how they are not alike*. Christianity is different from other religions in that it is built around a Person who proved He is God . . . Since Buddha, Confucius and Mohammed were never able to prove that they possessed a divine mandate to found a religion, it follows that the religions which they did establish are stripped of all authority. Any truth that they do possess is a borrowed truth, or one which can be attained by the use of reason.” (p. 131).

In practice we should perhaps simply emphasize that the Christian claim to a Revelation is *unique*. Our point of approach is that this Revelation is not only *true* but *uniquely true* in such fashion as to exclude all other claims by the validity of its claims. If it can be shown to be reliable—if it is what it claims to be—its uniqueness will rule out all other possibilities to true public Revelation. If it cannot stand the test of proof, Apologetics ends right there!

2. Apologetics and the Gospels

The Church maintains that not all of Christian Revelation is written down or contained in the Bible. But for practical purposes in Apologetics, we may state these points:

- a) While the New Testament presumes the Old Testament, *the Old Testament, for apologetic purposes, does not stand alone.*
- b) From the viewpoint of historical criticism, it is sensible to start with the Gospels. *There are outside "controls" for judging the Gospels and their contents which do not exist for Genesis or Exodus or Isaias.* By this we mean that the Gospels and their content are cast in a context of geography, history, and a social, political and religious milieu which is well known from other sources outside the New Testament. This collateral evidence can then serve as a criterion for judging the historical worth of the New Testament.
- c) *The key figure in Apologetics is Jesus Christ.* In the Gospels (that part of the New Testament on which Apologetics concentrates principally) He is shown to have a common ground with His listeners, the Jews. That common ground is the Old Testament. If the Gospels show Him to be what Apologetics claims, we have authority for the conclusion that the Old Testament is also Revelation. The student should know that the reason why we begin with the Gospels is not that *the Old Testament is shaky and insupportable.* If he is not told why we direct our attention to the Gospels first and almost exclusively, he may think we hold a less enthusiastic view of the Old Testament than we do.

3. Approach and Method

This is not the place to deal with the question of "the Bible as the sole rule of faith," nor is it the place to deal with the question of *Inspiration*, except to say that the Gospels will not be considered here as Inspiration or the Revelation of God but as ordinary *documents which claim to be history.* To these documents men must apply the same criteria they apply to other documents which claim to be history.

The burden of apologetic argument is the familiar one of demonstrating the historical value of the Gospels in terms of

- 1) authority
- 2) integrity
- 3) historicity or truthfulness

The *method* pursued is that of presenting and evaluating evidence, both *internal* and *external*, to show that the Gospels are authentic and can be trusted and used as good history, faithfully portraying reality. The evidence is from within the documents themselves (*internal evidence*) or from Catholic and non-Catholic sources outside the Gospels (*external evidence*). The mode of procedure is quite standardized and can be found in almost all the standard apologetics books.

4. A Point of Order

Generally, in presenting the arguments for the historical value of the sources of Christianity, the factors considered are in this order: (1) *authorship*, (2) *trustworthiness*, and (3) *integrity*. There is something to be said for putting the treatment of integrity *first* on the list, as Alexander (*College Apologetics*) and Cavanaugh (*Evidence For Our Faith*) have done.

The student may find much more difficulty in the proposition that the Gospels have come down, intact and unchanged, through all the evident vicissitudes of the centuries (particularly the earliest centuries) than in the proposition that they were written by the authors claimed and were *originally trustworthy*. It is best to remove this natural suspicion at the very beginning lest it weaken the force of the other two demonstrations.

Again, there is a tendency in Apologetics to go at length on the authorship and trustworthiness of the Gospels and then give only passing attention to the question of *integrity*. But integrity may be the biggest question in the student's mind.

5. Suggested Techniques and Emphases

(a) Show, in referring to the method and line of argument, that this is not something devised especially for Apologetics but is a *standard procedure* for establishing the historical value of any documents. E.g. if half a dozen letters were to come to light and it was claimed for them that they were Columbus' letters, historians and others interested in their truthfulness or falsity would go through the same procedure of internal and external evidence used in Apologetics in testing the Gospels.

(b) One gets the impression that much is lost in many works on Apologetics by *understressing the internal evidence*. It is a good technique to have each student read any one of the Gospels through *at a single sitting*, asking him to be sensitive to the impression of knowledge of the subject, sincerity, familiarity with persons and events which such

a reading creates. He may never have read one of the Gospels in its entirety and the Gospels are still the best argument for their own validity. The lack of pretense, the absence of the gimmicks and artifices of the writer of fiction should be pointed out. There is a tone to the Gospels which can create a lasting impression of *a story that simply rings true*.

(c) It is important to create *a right mentality toward the entire Bible*. This should be preliminary to taking up the consideration of the Gospels. The student lives in a world where reckless and vicious and uninformed criticism of the Bible has created a popular suspicion against the reliability of the Scriptures generally. "The student who reads will encounter blanket denials of the Gospels and blanket charges of their untrustworthiness." (Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind*, p. 274). The statement can be made of the student and the *entire Bible*, not just the Gospels.

(d) There are some things which the student needs to appreciate before he reads the Bible or any part of it:

(1) The books of the Bible were not written primarily for us at all! Therefore, we cannot apply to them all the criteria of modern writing and modern scholarship. People sometimes act as if somehow Matthew or John should have written in the form and fashion of a 20th Century historian, with all the apparatus of modern scientific history-writing. The student needs to appreciate that none of the writers of the Gospels had even one semester of a seminar in "Historical Method" but that *this does not militate* against their having written good and sound history. This is an old point, like the case of the modern mind expecting that the author of Genesis should (and could) have written in the language of the 20th Century text in geology or anthropology.

(2) There is a wonderful little book called *Unless Some Man Show Me* that might well be required reading for any class that deals with the Bible, especially for a class in Apologetics. It is by a Catholic exegete in England, Father Alexander Jones, and can be a healthy brain-wash to rid the student of much of the nonsense that clutters his mind about the interpretation of Scripture. Samples of this fine and scholarly work, in sprightly language, passed on to a class, can do much for that needed *perspective*. Often the student simply needs confidence that the Bible does make sense. He can get it from Father Jones in a palatable way.

(3) The student needs to appreciate, also, that the *language of Scripture* is oriental, ancient, semitic and that fact is not taken care of merely by translating the language into our English. The thinking itself is different from our own. The student needs to know that, too.

(4) Strangely, people seldom give the Bible the same "break" they give other written works. The student needs to grasp that there are not only "literary forms" which come in for consideration in his "Lit" courses; there are "literary forms" in the Bible as well. It is not all as *literal* as a bill of lading but utilizes a wide variety of these forms. The failure to understand that simple fact about the Bible has led those who love the Bible to speak and write as much nonsense as those who despise the Book.

(e) Certain apparently minor points in demonstrating the histori-

ty of the Gospels have considerable effect, psychologically, and need stressing.

(1) The fact that the Gospels were written within the lifetime of numerous persons who would also have been witnesses to the alleged events, and could denounce them as false—if false. Yet, early Christian literature is utterly empty of either the literature of protest or the suggestion that there was such protest. The events of the Gospels are not described as having happened over the hill and five hundred miles away, at some indeterminate time in the past. Names are named and places are identified and the people are real people. Christ lived “in the full glare of history.”

“Names that all the world knows are encountered in the pages of the Gospels. We meet Tiberius there; we meet Herod. We meet Lysanias, tetarch of Abilena, we meet John the Baptist, Caiphas, Annas. We meet Pontius Pilate. And, of course we encounter the whole galaxy of Christian leaders, the Apostles, Mary, Elizabeth. And the period in which He was born is not shrouded in mists of mystery. It was the age of Augustus.” (Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind*, p. 287)

(2) The fact that the Gospels are not in existence at the very beginning of Christianity but only come later. Protestant dependence on the Scripture as the sole source of Christian truth has tended to obscure the fact that there already was a *Gospel, the oral one*, the *catechesis* of the early Church, pre-existing as a source. It is a commonplace of biblical knowledge that a “a living teaching authority is prior to every single book of the Bible,” and this is true not only of the Gospels but the books of the Old Testament as well. This oral Gospel existed as a *criterion and control* for all subsequent writing that pretended to be historical.

So, the Gospels, to get a hearing at all, would have to pass the rigid test of that total criterion. It is nonsense to think of the early Christians as lacking a critical sense. The Apocrypha didn't make it past this criterion; the Gospels did. The Apocrypha were modeled after the Gospels and, superficially, seemed genuine. *Yet they were rejected on the basis of authorship and content.*

(3) If the teacher can obtain some of the Apocryphal Gospels, or parts of them, reading them can be an impressive demonstration of the difference between the historical and pseudo-historical, as well as a testimony to the critical sense of the early Church which rejected the Apocrypha. (cf. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, and Charles, *The Apocryphal New Testament*.)

(4) Much is made by critics of the fact that *Jewish and pagan sources* (external evidence) say so little about Jesus Christ. It is forgotten that the same pagan writers ignore the Jews just as completely, and what little they do say of the Jews is as garbled as what they say about Christ. As for the scarcity of Jewish references in the enormous compilation called the *Talmud*, there is reason for that also. There was evidently a *conspiracy of silence*. St. Justin and Origen both make the point that there was much Jewish campaigning against the

followers of Christ in their day but the Jewish sources of that age, abundant as they are, are practically silent. Again, one should not be too surprised at their omissions. From the *Talmud* you wouldn't know there had been a Herod, or Judas Machabeus, and others who were, to say the least, prominent in Jewish affairs. And it would be futile to try to reconstruct a picture of Palestinian life at the time of Jesus from the *Talmud*. (cf. Prat, *Jesus Christ*, I, p. 7)

It is important, too, to stress that the Jews did not deny the principal facts and works of Christ when they did criticize Him. They did, however, give these facts their own interpretation. (Cf. Samuel Krauss' comments in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (1904 edition) Vol. VII, 170 on the motives from which the Jews interpreted the Gospel story the way they did.)

6. The Gospels and Modern Scholarship

There is a danger that Apologetics may fall behind the times from ignorance of the main lines of modern biblical scholarship.

The approach to any good treatment of this question in Apologetics is, first of all the *positive approach*. It is nothing more than the old technique, used by Papias and Origen and Eusebius. It is still the fundamental technique of any effective 20th Century treatment. That approach is simply to marshal the internal and external evidence and to evaluate them, to show that the Gospels are the sort of dependable history the Church has always maintained. The evidence is impressive and conclusive, if not coercive, and modern biblical scholarship patiently adds new items to the evidence year after year. No modern Apologist for the Gospels should fail to employ to the fullest what it has to offer in abundance. This perhaps takes more work but it also bears more fruit. *Both the failures and the successes of biblical scholarship have their value.*

a) *Negative aspect*

'To speak first of the failures, it may seem that so negative a thing could offer little to the study of Apologetics and the support of the Gospels. But here the Apologist has what, at the present time, may be (subjectively speaking) his most potent point. For over a hundred years unfriendly critics of the Gospels have worked a furious attack against the veracity of the story found in the Gospels. They have used every tool which modern critical and historical method has placed at their disposal. Their aim was evident—they intended to demolish Christianity by destroying the validity of its sources. For a long time they held the field almost uncontested, except for Catholic scholars and some others. Their leaders' names have bulked large in the story of biblical criticism for a century.

Now, after a century, it is clear that they have lost *because they were wrong*. One after another, they offered theories to offset the traditional Christian view of Christ and the Gospels. One after another these views were exploded as untenable, as often as not by other unfriendly critics anxious to propose their own latest theory.

The history of this so-called "higher criticism" is proof enough of the hopelessness and falsity of the attack on the Gospels. As long ago as the turn of the century men like Harnack, himself a Rationalist opponent of the traditional views, could see that the attack was doomed to fail and was, in fact, defeating itself. *Today these extremist views are almost passe* and there has been a general return all along the line to the orthodox Catholic position which these have sought to destroy. Father Gutwenger, S.J., has pointed out some reasons why the attack has failed of its objective.

"... The radical brand of higher criticism has failed to be guided by sound principles of investigation. It draws its life from the obsolete speculation of the rationalist era, and *clings desperately to its dogma of the impossibility of miracles*. Proceeding from such a philosophical bias its historical method is of necessity vitiated. External evidence is often neglected altogether if it is seen to lead to conclusions contrary to the tenets of rationalism. Or, if some obscure and questionable evidence can be turned to the support of radical views, it is chosen in preference to the clear testimony of trustworthy and venerable writers... Higher criticism set out to destroy confidence in the gospels, but in a balanced view of the evidence it has only succeeded in destroying confidence in itself." ("The Gospels and Non-Catholic Higher Criticism," in *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, p. 759).

All this failure of the Rationalist critics suggests some points for the use of this failure:

- 1) The Rationalist debacle is known well enough in scholarly circles but it is doubtful that it is known to the average student who, perhaps, doesn't even know that there was a Rationalist attack. What he may know is that people, even professors, often enough speak as if *modern scholarship had destroyed the credibility of the Gospels*.

It is not uncommon even this late in the history of biblical criticism to hear supposedly learned men, inside and outside the classroom, peddling the nonsense of critics who were utterly discredited half a century ago! There is normally a lag of a generation or more between the findings of sound scholarship and popular impressions and convictions. The popular mind on these matters (which at times is the mind of a professor or writer who seems otherwise reasonably educated) often is right straight out of the 19th Century when it comes to views of what biblical scholarship now maintains.

- 2) It must be stressed that *this is not an attack on biblical scholarship*. The Church is in no way opposed to a full-scale scientific investigation of the Christian sources—in fact she welcomes it if honest and unbiased. While most of the noise in biblical scholarship in the past century has been made by the Rationalists, there have been numerous others, scholars and lovers of the Gospels, who have quietly used the tools of

the modern scholar to deepen our grasp of biblical literature. Catholic scholars might even be said to be *grateful for the Rationalists* for their works have been indirectly a blessing on biblical scholarship. Attack and counter-attack have unearthed much new fact; *it has also helped to put the Gospels in an unassailable position*. This is said while recognizing that (a) the Rationalists never intended it that way, and (b) great numbers of souls were led away from belief in the Scriptures by the Rationalists and never returned.

- 3) There is a tremendous vindication of the traditional view of the Gospels in the rise and fall of the Rationalist campaign. The teacher of Apologetics will find that the case against them is easily documented, and a proper use of it helps to strengthen the traditional positive approach. In itself it is a powerful apologetic. It has a real appeal for the Catholic student, bedeviled as he may be by the suggestions he gets elsewhere that his Christian sources are almost worthless.

b) *Positive Aspect*

The *successes of modern biblical scholarship* are not less important. Out from under the unhealthy influence of the Rationalist criticism and linked favorably with biblical archeology, linguistics, historical studies—even chemistry—contemporary biblical studies supply the teacher of Apologetics with much new support in his task of showing the credibility of the Gospels. There is something of poetic justice in the fact that science and progress, in whose names the Rationalists confidently expected to destroy the Christian Sources, are now the fruitful tools which support these Gospels.

The desirability of employing these latest discoveries of biblical and allied sciences cannot be stressed too much. The case for the historical value of the Gospels is sound enough as it has been presented traditionally in the Apologetic texts but the modern student is the child of a scientific age, with a deep respect for what science can do. He cannot help but be impressed with the amazing support given the Gospels, and all of Scripture, by modern scientific study.

Especially should *biblical archeology* hold a place in today's Apologetics. The discoveries of the last few decades, little known or appreciated by the rank and file, have been described (perhaps justly) as "revolutionary." In recent years leadership in archeological studies has shifted to American scholars, notably those associated with the American Schools for Oriental Studies. Their leading light is W. F. Albright. Typical of the impact of archeology and kindred studies on biblical criticism is the current state of scholarly opinion about the date of writing and trustworthiness of St. John's Gospel. For so long pushed deep into second century, safe from any connection with Christ, by the Rationalist critics, modern scholarship has not only brought it back to its traditional place in the first century but pushed the suggested date of writing as far back as 70 A.D. This is the con-

clusion of Albright, Goodenough, Olmstead and others on the basis of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Egyptian papyri on the Gnostics, and other finds. (cf. W. F. Albright, "The Bible after Twenty Years of Archeology, 1932-1952," in *Religion and Life*, XXI, Aug., 1952, pp. 537-550; and the same author, "Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The American Scholar*, XXII, Winter, 1952-53, pp. 77-85).

As a result of these recent discoveries, many scholars insist on the strong Aramaic influence in the Greek of John's Gospel, reflecting conditions before the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and representing a thought content that is now said to reflect, not a Gnostic second century, but the time of John the Baptist and Jesus.

There is an abundance of material from all these sources for an up-to-date Apologetic presentation of the Sources of Christianity.

* * *

Bibliographical Notes

There is certainly no lack of literature on the *Sources of Christianity*. The man who has to prepare his notes and his lectures may feel that there is entirely too much on the subject. There is truth in that impression, if one considers the works which are worthless as well as those which can be used.

It is obvious that the *first bibliographical item* should be the *New Testament*. It would be rash to recommend one translation above the others. Some will prefer the Confraternity edition because they have it, or the Douay because their parents had it. They may lean toward the Knox translation for its newness of expression. There is a newcomer among the versions which recommends itself very highly as scholarly and most readable, *The New Testament* by Fathers Kleist and Lilly. It is presumed that few (if any) college students in Apologetics will wander into the Greek versions—or even the Vulgate.

Almost all the scholarly "Lives of Christ" have included material at some length on the Sources and some are among the finest treatments available. Leonce de Grandmaison has a three-volume work, *Jesus Christ*, the first volume of which is a real gold mine for anyone handling this question, with lengthy consideration of the sources, criticism, the evidence, etc. There are few better chapters than the one on "The Documents" which opens Volume One of Fillion's three-volume *Life of Jesus Christ*. Ferdinand Prat, *Jesus Christ* (two volumes) has an excellent "Introduction" in the first volume which is particularly good on rules for developing a sympathetic understanding of biblical writing.

That most scholarly single volume *Life of Christ* by Giuseppe Ricciotti has no superior among extant works on Christ and the Gospels. Two long chapters on "The Sources" (X) and "The Rationalist Interpretations of the Life of Christ" (XIII) are unsurpassed for scholarship and clarity of presentation.

The priest whose task it is to teach Apologetics probably has somewhere among his possessions *seminary texts* which he may find

useful, and notes from seminary courses in the Scripture and Fundamental Dogma. There are many works specifically on the New Testament or all of the Bible. A few are deserving of special mention. A. Robert and A. Tricot have edited a *Guide to the Bible*, the two volumes of which have been translated into English. It is a cooperative work which engaged the talents of over a score of French scripture scholars (Catholic). It is full of the best in contemporary scholarship.

Another work of outstanding scholarship is the recent large single volume, *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, the cooperative work of over forty of the best biblical scholars in England. It can only be described as a "monumental work" and is simply invaluable to anyone who wishes to pursue a serious interest in the Bible. Samples of its articles bearing on this part of Apologetics are the following: D. J. Leahy, "The Literary Characteristics of the Bible"; R. C. Fuller, "The Interpretation of Holy Scripture"; Dyson and Mackenzie, "Higher Criticism"; E. Power, "Archeology and the Bible"; R. J. Foster, "The Apocrypha"; E. Gutwenger, "The Gospels and Non-Catholic Higher Criticism".

Since this question of *Sources* for Christianity is a part of the general field of Apologetics, the specifically Apologetic works mentioned in the Introduction to *Tools and Techniques* offer material in varying degrees of worth and length. Madgett, *Christian Origins*, Vol. 1; Cavanaugh, *Evidence for Our Faith*; Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*; Alexander, *College Apologetics*; and Blackwell Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind* offer the best treatments of the Sources among the Textbooks. Madgett is particularly good on the kinds and the value of evidence, and his Chapter VI, "Anti-Intellectualism" is excellent background for the understanding of the motives of the Rationalist attack.

Cavanaugh is orderly and thoroughly packed with usable material, with a considerable amount of quotation from other authors, particularly those which would not be readily available in every library. He has an abundance of quotes from non-Catholic sources. Alexander excels in the clarity with which he pursues the line of argument. His chapter on "The Integrity of the Gospels" is the best on this neglected subject. Sheehan is an old standard but still very usable. Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind* has a fine grasp of the modern mind toward the Gospels and a good appreciation of the modern attack on the Gospels. It is one of the better works for this area of Apologetics.

John O'Brien, *Truths Men Live By*, is valuable if only for Chapter XXIX, "The Historical Character of the Gospels," good for its simplicity and readability, and sound in its scholarship. Joseph Fenton, *We Stand With Christ*, has many fine pages on external evidence.

There are many books which need little more than a mention, although each has something to contribute. Graham, *Where We Got The Bible*; Stoddard, *Rebuilding a Lost Faith*; Arendzen, *The Gospels-Fact, Myth or Legend* (old but very useful); Ripley, *This is the Faith*; Lunn, *Now I See*, particularly Chapters IV and V; also Lunn, *The Third Day* whose chapter on "Gospel Sceptics" should be read; Hugh

Pope, *The Catholic Church and the Bible*; Schmidt and Perkins, *Faith and Reason*; Stienmuller, *Companion to Scripture Studies*, Volume III; Stienmuller and Sullivan, *A Companion to the New Testament*, notably Chapter II, "The Four Gospels;" Batiffol, *The Credibility of the Gospels*, although fifty years old, still a usable refutation of the rationalist critics; Dom John Chapman, *The Four Gospels*; Joseph Huby, *The Church and the Gospels*, and a few chapters in Knox, *The Hidden Stream*, and *Belief of Catholics*.

There are numerous works, from non-Catholic sources, like those of Lightfoot, Goodenough, and others which are valuable. A number of works bearing on the testimony of biblical archeology, are helpful: Sir W. M. Ramsey, *The Bearing of Recent Discoveries on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*; Arthur Barnes, *The Early Church in the Light of the Monuments*. W. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, and *The Archeology of Palestine and the Bible*; Jack Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past*.

There is an endless stream of information on the findings of biblical archeology in such publications as *Biblical Archeologist*, published by the American Schools of Oriental Research with which the current leadership in this field seems to rest.

No bibliography on this subject would be complete without mention of Hilarin Felder's *Christ and the Critics* in two volumes. Now out of print, this work of great scholarship by the German Capuchin not only deals with the evidence for the Gospels in superb manner but it stands as a final and complete indictment of the Rationalist critics, out of their own mouths.

There is, finally, a vast mountain of books which need not be named. The libraries of the world are filled with them. In a way they have served the cause of Apologetics but today the interest in them is little more than antiquarian. They are the works of the Rationalist critics.

Part III. THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

CORE OF CHAPTER

Introductory Remarks

Preparing the Mind

The Line of Proof

Suggestions and Suggested Techniques

Christ and the Critics

Conclusion

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Core Of Chapter

1. It is impossible in the Gospels to divorce the *message* of Christ from the *Person* of Christ. He is speaking in the name of God, Whom He calls His Father.
2. Gradually, he reveals that He is the Messiah expected by the Jews, that He is, in truth, the Son of God, equal to His Father in all things. By word and by act, this claim is brought out and climaxed in the two great formal statements of His Divinity.
3. Christ offered His Miracles as proof of His Divine Nature and His Divine Revelation. The Miracles are an integral part of the Gospels, and cannot be removed from the context without destroying the context.
4. The historical evidence for the miracles is clear; they can be explained, not by natural causes, but by Divine intervention.
5. His Resurrection from death remains, after centuries of critical examination, the most outstanding fact about Christ, and about Christianity.
6. Either He is God or He is not. If He is not, then He either lied about His identity or was Himself deluded about it. There is no other alternative.
7. Christ never taught a religion (either doctrinal or moral) apart from His own Divinity. He is unlike all other religious leaders in that His religion centers in Himself.

1. Introductory Remarks

Once the soundness of the sources of Christianity has been established (cf. Part II of *Tools and Techniques*) the student is invited to look into those sources to search out the revelation which they are alleged to contain and to evaluate it. The search, unlike the search in other claimed revelations, is actually *a search for a person*. That person is Jesus Christ. Apologetics puts to the student a question which Jesus Himself first asked: "*What do you think of the Christ? Whose Son is He?*".

It is no ordinary question and the answer of Apologetics is in-

comparably the most staggering answer that any question has ever received. From the beginning of Christianity it has been the peculiar mark of the Christian that he has answered the question with the firm conviction that *Jesus Christ is the God-Man*, that entirely unique person who is at one and the same time entirely and literally God, and entirely and completely man.

Dostoevsky says: "Faith in the divinity of Christ is the Christian faith pure and simple." Karl Adam opens his work, *The Son of God*, with the information that this same Dostoevsky, "in the draft for his novel *The Possessed* makes his hero declare that the most pressing question in the problem of faith is 'whether a man, as a civilized being, . . . can believe at all, believe, that is, in the divinity of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, for therein rests, strictly speaking the whole faith.'"

This is, indeed the key question of Christianity, the *key question of our Apologetics*. "All life turns upon the question of who and what He was . . ." (Arendzen, *Whom Do You Say?*, iii).

That Jesus was a man seems so obvious as to need no demonstration. It is true that only rarely have people who called themselves "Christians" seemed to deny the reality of His humanity, as in the case of the Docetists, although the notions of that humanity have varied and do vary today. Apologetics must pay appropriate attention to the humanity of Jesus Christ. Otherwise it will imperfectly represent Him.

" . . . the mystery of Christ does not lie in the fact that He is God, but that He is God-Man . . . hence it is just as important to establish that Christ is full and complete man as it is to establish the other proposition, namely that this man is God." (Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 2).

Apologetics then must not neglect the humanity of Christ. In the long range view of what the whole course of Apologetics is supposed to do for the student, to concentrate on that humanity will serve many purposes, not the least of which is to help to head off a Docetism in Catholic piety and devotion. This is not something openly affirmed but is evident in the neglect of that humanity in the life of prayer.

But clearly the principal burden of Apologetics in relation to Jesus is the question of *proving that He is also God*, without forgetting the full Christ—the Word that was made flesh.

2. Preparing the Mind

Some preliminary preparation of the student for so profound and important a task as exploring the question of the divinity of Jesus is necessary. It must be emphasized to the student that *this is no ordinary concept he is asked to consider*. It is extraordinary and mysterious in the extreme. It cannot be approached or studied as if it were something prosaic and ordinary.

In itself the question of Jesus Christ is, of course, "the question of questions." This is not the same as saying that in fact it is the question

which today agitates the human mind the most. What has been said about the modern man's attitude toward God as "an extra" (in Part I) can be said with equal truth about the modern man's attitude toward Jesus Christ. Whose Son He is does not torture the average modern mind because the average man does not think the question either important or intriguing enough. It is the job of the teacher to emphasize that the question has lost none of its value even though men have lost much of their interest.

The modern man, be he Catholic or not, doesn't have much of an eye for the supernatural or a taste for it. His world is too much a "world of phenomena behind which he seldom looks." He is a stranger not just to the idea of God becoming man (and what that could mean) but to the whole supernatural world.

"The real need above all others is for a new orientation towards the superterrestrial and the supernatural. We must again take the certainty seriously that the possibilities of the modern man do not exhaust God's possibilities, and that our thought is conditioned or bounded in time and therefore in no sense the absolute thought of God. *We must again become little before God.* It must be our first concern to cleanse ourselves from the time-conditioned prejudices of the Western mind, from the spirit of arrogant autonomy and autocracy, from narrow-minded rationalism, . . . from the purely materialistic habit of thought." (Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 21).

Again, what we discover from investigating the sources is bound to be strange to our minds. We are not the first to have that experience. It was first of all *strange for the Apostles*.

"They saw Him acting and speaking as a man; they saw Him acting and speaking as a man has no right to act and speak, as only God rightly could. But they had no concept born of experience of one person with two natures, for there never had been such a person any more than there ever would be such another." (Sheed, *Theology and Sanity*, p. 213).

The student needs to appreciate that even *the possibility of the Incarnation* "has for man something so rousing, so compelling, so awful, that if he would not sin against the very foundations of his being, he can never simply dismiss it with a shrug of his shoulders." (Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 24).

If God has wedded Himself to our nature in Jesus Christ, *the consequences* of that fact are simply enormous for the race and the individual. The question of the divinity of Christ *can never be merely academic*. It is unlike any other question as Christ is unlike any other person. The question means too much.

3. The Line of Proof

While the *proof* is presented to those who are *already Catholic*, the teacher will proceed almost as if the students did not already believe that Jesus is God. The reasons for this are:

- 1) the student needs the fulness of the proofs from Apologetics for his own possible use as an apologist;
- 2) while he believes, as a Catholic, that Christ is God, that belief may be undeveloped and be detached from any personal conviction of how unique the Incarnation is and how far reaching its consequences are, not only for the race but for the student himself.

How does Apologetics proceed to demonstrate that Jesus Christ is God? The method is practically that which Christ Himself used, which the Apostles used after Him, which Christians have used ever since.

We know that we cannot hope to demonstrate the divinity of Christ as one demonstrates a mathematical theorem.

“It is obvious that a direct proof in the sense of a demonstration from cause to effect, or effect to cause, is impossible in the case of the divinity of Christ. The union of two natures in one person is clearly in itself incapable of demonstration, as it cannot be the object of human experience. It is plain that all that can be done is to prove that *Christ claimed to be God* and that *right reason leads us to accept that claim.*” (Arendzen, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-77).

The general line of the proof is familiar. The Gospels (and other pertinent parts of the New Testament) are examined in order to study what Jesus said and did. The study will show that He claimed:

- 1) that His doctrine was actually a revelation, a teaching from God;
- 2) that He was the Messiah expected by the Jews;
- 3) that He was the true and natural Son of God.

This is His general claim. But claims without proofs are rather worthless. Anyone can make such claims. (Father Divine does). Christ could not expect men to accept his startling claims without proof. He gave proof aplenty by public acts (miracles and prophecy) which could be done only by one who has God’s support.

The *general line of proof* can be found in a variety of treatments in the following works: Alexander, *College Apologetics*, chapters VIII-XII; Adam, *The Son of God*, chapters VI and VII; Arendzen, *Whom Do You Say?*, Part II, chapters I-III.; Madgett, *Christian Origins*, I, Chapters VII and VIII; Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind*, Ch. XI; Cavanaugh, *Evidence For Our Faith*, Chapters VII-VIII; Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, chapters VI-VII, to mention a few of those works most readily available.

* * *

4. Suggestions and Suggested Techniques

- 1) *Don’t isolate the proof* into one of just proving the divinity of Christ. A progressive procedure (which follows the technique Our Lord used) of first presenting Him as claiming to speak in the name of God, then of claiming to be the Messiah, then claiming to be God,

is more effective. Fenton, *op. cit.*, Ch. XI, is particularly valuable here.

2) As suggested in Part II (on the Sources) begin by having the student read one of the Gospels all the way through at one sitting. "Ignorance of the Scripture is ignorance of Christ" (St. Jerome). The best and indispensable source for knowing Jesus is the Gospels. The student should not be initiated to the study of Christ and His claims by reading or hearing isolated and single quotations.

It will condition the student to *keep two things together* in his mind—the teaching of Jesus and his miracles. "Our Lord's teaching and his miracles are interlocked because his miracles are teaching miracles." (Knox, *The Hidden Stream*, p. 116)

Which one of the Gospels should be selected? It makes little difference. Perhaps St. John is the most impressive. If it could be done, the student might read St. Matthew at the beginning, St. John when the treatment is finished.

3) Much of the impact of the Gospel story is lost in the reading because the story seems to the reader far away and long ago. An important technique is for the student to make a conscious effort to localize the claims of Jesus in the here and now, to make the acts and words seem more real. Localize them and make them more real by imagining that these claims and words of Jesus were being said today on the street-corner of one's own home town. What would the impact on the mind of the student be if *today* he were to hear someone say, e.g. "The Father and I are One . . . all power is given to me in heaven and on earth . . . before Abraham began to be I am . . . , etc."

This technique will emphasize the arrogance and blasphemy of Jesus—if He is not in fact God but only a creature. A dozen or more of the most striking statements of Jesus, read to the class which has been cued to think of these remarks as made *in their presence*, is quite effective.

4) Stress is needed on the fact that *Jesus gradually unfolded* His divinity—and that from *a set and necessary* plan. It was not a question of his inability to reveal Himself (the nonsense of the "development of Messianic consciousness"). Show that in all revelation *God respects those to whom the revelation is given*. There are good reasons for Our Lord's reticence about Himself, maddening as that reticence was to both his friends and his enemies. An understanding of the *why* helps to make good sense of the Gospel story.

Cavanaugh (*op. cit.*, p. 120) does well by this question, but no one has done it so well and so understandingly as Sheed in *Theology and Sanity*, pp. 55-57. The passage should be read. It shows that Jesus had to proceed that way if He were ever to get his work done, because He was talking to Jews and not to moderns who lack the Jews' terrible awe of the Divinity.

5) Quite evidently the Gospels set men up for an "either-or" reaction to his claims. Either his claims are correct and He *is God*, or He is *not God* (but must be crazy, or a faker, or horribly deluded). Those who heard Him had just those two alternatives. Historically that is the way they *did react*. Modern liberal Christians and some

men who are not Christians at all today profess that there is a *third* (and softer) *alternative*. It runs something like this: no, He is not God, nor is He crazy or a faker; He's just a nice good man, the best ever.

It is not particularly difficult to show that this third alternative does not in fact exist. Either He is God or He is not. If not, then He is totally unacceptable as one revealing God. That would certainly be the reaction of a man today who listened to such claims and statements from a man on a street-corner in his own town. The *logical man is the one who, having failed to conclude that Jesus is God, has nothing whatsoever to do with Him.*

"If Christ was not God, how can we escape the conclusion that He was mad? If He was not God, His madness took the form of conceit so overpowering in its absurdity that even the records of lunacy provide no parallel." (Lunn, *Now I See*, p. 194).

"Until they (i.e. the Apostles) realized that He was God they must have been uncertain even of His virtue as a man. This is a truth which a great deal of modern talk quite incredibly overlooks. The phrase '*Christ was not God but He was the perfect man!*' can surely only be the product of a long and heroic abstinence from Gospel reading. If He was not God He was not a perfect man: He was a totally intolerable man." (Sheed, *Theology and Sanity*, p. 213)

"No, there are two alternatives, and no more. Jesus' own ideas about Himself are clear; and either He was right, or else He was a tragically misguided visionary. We must see which of the two alternatives is the more likely in the light of his personality." (Vann, *Awake In Heaven*, p. 55).

6) It cannot be emphasized too much that Apologetics, in treating the proofs for the divinity of Christ, often pays *scant attention* to St. Paul, if not ignoring him altogether. His Epistles, and not just the Gospels, should be utilized. He is simply full of the statement of that divinity, in multiple ways and modes of expression.

Chronologically, St. Paul is the first to state this conviction of the early Christians in writing, before the Gospels appear. He labels his own belief as "received." It is the belief of the Apostles. His letters are loaded, even more than the Gospels. (cf. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, particularly the chapter on "The Pre-Existent Christ" in Volume II; also, Chapter X in Knox, *The Hidden Stream*, and Knox, *St. Paul's Gospel*, the chapter on "St. Paul and Christ's Divinity," pp. 25-26; and Morrison, *op. cit.*, pp. 324-326.)

It is to be remembered that even those still reluctant, despite the evidence of scholarship, to accept the Gospels as authentic generally accept the Epistles of St. Paul.

7) What choice of *miracles of Jesus* should be made for apologetic purposes? He did not grade them "Super," "Grade A," etc. While the cumulative value of all the miracles is great, certain miracles are, for purposes of strong proof, more powerful than others, e.g. the raising of Lazarus from the dead; *Jesus' own Resurrection.*

Traditionally the *Resurrection* has claimed the greatest attention,

and with good reason. Christ made so much of it Himself. So did the Apostles. So do the opponents of His divinity who concentrate most heavily on discrediting the account of the Resurrection.

Cavanaugh (*op. cit.*, p. 140) makes the interesting observation that if one looks at the history of Jews and Greeks both in the five hundred years before Christ he will note that the histories of these people mention very few alleged miracles. Jewish writers record hardly any and Josephus says there were none. The statement, if true, is important for showing that the Jews of Jesus' time *were not miracle-happy*. The critic of the miracles of Jesus is perhaps in danger of projecting later Christian tendencies to see miracles everywhere back into an age that was not so inclined.

All the miracles of Christ were *signs*. Yet, when asked for a *sign*, He pointed prophetically to His own Resurrection. "However gifted a man may be, once he dies he can do no more in this world. It was precisely after Our Lord died that He became successful" (Heenan, *The Faith Makes Sense*, pp. 177-178).

8) *Prophecy* should be given a more prominent place in the proofs for the divinity of Christ. Not just His own prophecies but especially the prophecies from the Old Testament referring to Him. That was his technique; it is the technique of the Gospels, e.g. St. Matthew.

"This unique person is not an isolated fact. There has been a preparation itself unique." (Ward and Sheed, *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*, p. 208, who suggest "use prophecy massively.")

Jesus Christ is the one person in all history who casts his shadow before Him down through the centuries.

9) Apologetics has too often taken its cue from the *Higher critics* and treated the Synoptic Gospels as a unit, then appended St. John, in lining up the proofs for the divinity of Christ. *Perhaps this is bad, psychologically* (cf. Sheehan, *op. cit.*, I., chapter VI, and Morrison, *op. cit.*, chapter XI, for examples of this arrangement).

It suggests, without meaning to, a lesser status for St. John's Gospel. We have never held this lesser stature. Modern scholarship does not require any such divided allegiance to the Gospels. If St. John is not acceptable, neither are the others. The apologetic argument is in any and all of the Gospels.

5. Christ and the Critics

As in the case of the sources, so also here, some attention should be devoted to the matter of the rationalist and liberal attack upon Jesus Christ. Nothing can detail this attack and evaluate it for what it really is better than Felder's two volumes of *Christ and the Critics*.

The student lives in the spell of these critics—in the sense that writers and teachers often parrot their dechristianizing of Christ as if it were the last word of modern learning. In the library of his college or university he will find numerous works (many written by Protestants, even ministers) in which Christ is portrayed merely as a human. Usually in such portrayals He is praised highly as a man.

Pierre Von Paassen's *Why Jesus Died* and/or Harry Emerson Fosdick's *The Man From Nazareth* would be good books to use in class as examples of how rationalists operate in denying the divinity. They literally *make over the Gospels* to suit themselves, ignoring what they cannot use, distorting what they cannot avoid. They begin with a pre-conceived conclusion that miracles (the entire supernatural) cannot exist. They are finished before they begin because they are trying the impossible.

"The evidences that Jesus worked miracles is just as strong, and is of precisely the same quality and texture as that He taught that God is Father and that His disciples should forgive one another. We cannot on historical grounds alone accept the evidence for the one and reject that for the other. The evidence that Jesus healed a dropsical man on the Sabbath day is just as good as the evidence that He told the story of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son." (Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, p. 170. This is not a Catholic work).

Rationalism tried to separate the Christ of the Gospels from the Christ of history. But "the whole corpus of primitive Christian literature knows of and confesses no other Christ figure but that of the God-Man. From the beginning men knew only the one Christ of the Resurrection and the miracles." (Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 16).

6. Conclusion of this Section

Unless the treatment of the question of the divinity of Christ has been a mere dialectic it should produce in the students some fruit other than a firmer grasp of the massive proof for that divinity. In studying the sources *they found a Person Whom*, all things being equal, their study must have made more attractive.

Christ is unlike all other religious leaders who have moved across the stage of our history in that *His religion centers in Himself* and is tied up entirely with personal devotion to Him. The person and the teaching cannot be sundered without destroying the doctrine. To know even the *digest* that the Gospels gives is but the beginning of man's knowledge of Him. "This growth in the knowledge of Our Lord is not simply a matter of learning texts and seeing the detail of this or that episode of His life. *We must get to know Him, as we know a person.*" (Sheed, *Theology and Sanity*, p. 209).

In Christ God is showing Himself to us. The student therefore should emerge from this study having *learned more about God by knowing Christ*. The study is important for what it tells the student of Christ; it is important also for what it tells him of God.

"Quite clearly we cannot grow to our capacity in the knowledge either of God or of man if we do not grow in the knowledge of Christ. *He is our best approach to the knowledge of God because . . . here God is to be studied not simply in His own nature, infinitely glorious but remote from our experience, but in our nature finitely glorious and thronging with experiences that we have*

shared. *He is our best approach to the knowledge of man, because man, like everything else, is best studied in its most perfect specimen . . .*" (*id.*, 208-209)

That study does not end here. For Christ continues on in His Church which is His Body. The study of it continues the study of Him through history.

Many lives of Christ have been written. Many more will be written. Not just scholarship but *belief* separates the wheat from the chaff. "It should be needless to say that the life of Christ can be written only by a believer . . . *What is needed is a Newman, with science and adequate knowledge.*" (Sanday, *Outline of the Life of Christ*, p. 240). We might add that belief and love are also necessary. Newman had both.

Bibliographical Notes

It is a commonplace of our knowledge that more has been written about Jesus Christ than about any other person in the history of the race. This vast bulk of written things shares the fate of vast bulks—some is excellent, some is fair, some should not have been written at all.

Of the standard Apologetics works mentioned in previous sections (and in this section) some are especially worthy. Alexander, *College Apologetics* is remarkably clear and orderly all the way through. His two chapters on "The Probative Force of Miracles" (X) and "The Probative Force of Prophecies" (XII) are recommended. Madgett, *Christian Origins*, I, is high class in all respects, particularly strong on Miracles and the Resurrection in chapter VIII. He also deals with objections and difficulties.

Cavanaugh, *Evidence for Our Faith*, is perhaps unsurpassed for text-book treatment on the topic of the divinity. Fenton, *We Stand With Christ*, is very lengthy and complete in his treatment and very sound, of course. He includes much that is theological along with the apologetic material. His chapter IX on "The Claims of Jesus" is by far the most complete of all the texts, and the order and content of his treatment differ from the ordinary text in many things. Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind* is uniformly good throughout. Ward and Sheed, *Outlines* provide much help for the teacher. Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine* is still valuable.

Sheed's *Theology and Sanity*, while not professedly an apologetic work does fill that role admirably in many parts. His Chapter V, "God Tells Man" and chapter XVII on "The Redeemer" are presentations in a manner which always characterizes the lucid and penetrating works of Sheed. Ripley, *This is the Faith*, compresses his treatment into a very satisfactory single chapter, "Belief in Jesus Christ" (XIII).

There are two solidly packed, relatively small classics which are a "must" in any listing of works for this topic. These are Karl Adam's *The Son of God*, and J. P. Arendzen's *Whom Do You Say?* They are not the newest but they have not been equalled or surpassed.

The various lives of Christ listed in the Bibliographical Notes for

Part II are all highly recommended. *The Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture* has many pertinent articles such as McKenzie, "The Jewish World in New Testament Times," pp. 728-741; Graham, "The Person and Teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ," pp. 765-781.

Lunn, *Now I See*, and *The Third Day* by the same author are valuable, the latter especially being a full scale treatment of the question of the Resurrection. Heenan, *The Faith Makes Sense*, has numerous passages on the subject in popular style. Other recommended works are Knox, *The Hidden Stream*, and *St. Paul's Gospel*; Karrer, *Religions of Mankind*, with special attention to Chapters IX-XI which treat the question of the uniqueness of Christ and Christianity in relation to other religious leaders and other religions; Fehner, "The Problem of Christ," in *God, Man and the Universe*; Koesters, *The Believer's Christ*; Lagrange, *Christ and Renan*; Vann, *Awake in Heaven*; Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*.

The storehouse of material on this subject, written at the level of the highest scholarship, is the two-volume *Christ and the Critics* by Felder, the subtitle of which is "A Defence of the Divinity of Jesus Against the Attacks of Modern Sceptical Criticism." There is no argument for or against that has not been treated exhaustively by Felder.

Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, although not up-to-date, provides a bibliography of non-Catholic works on Christ.

Part IV. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

CORE OF CHAPTER

Introductory Remarks

The Line of Proof

Preparing the Mind

Suggested Techniques

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Concluding This Section

* * *

Core Of Chapter

1. Jesus Christ became Man to do for men what they could not do for themselves—to save them from their sins, to make it possible for them to reach the Heaven for which God had made them, to teach them the truths of God they needed to know.
2. Redemption provided the means (the Life) for men but did not thus give it to every man. Salvation is not precisely the same as Redemption. His teaching gave Truth to the world but not Truth to each man. Each man would have to receive that in his own lifetime. But how?
3. The Catholic answer is the same from Apostolic days until today—Jesus, while on earth, fashioned a society, a Kingdom, the Church, which He empowered and commissioned to carry on His work until the end of time, to dispense His Truth and Life to men.
4. That Church is human because it is built on and in the midst of men. Men are its members; men are the instruments of Christ. Thus it is visible, and its outward organization fundamentally is set by Jesus Himself. But it is also divine, with a divine Life of its own, for it is Christ's Church and His Body.
5. The Constitution of that society, the Church, is set by Jesus and found in the New Testament. The development of that society is the story of the Catholic Church in history. The marks of that society fit no other Church. It is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. It is infallible and indestructible.
6. The Catholic Church is unique. It alone claims that Jesus is its direct and immediate founder. It alone claims to speak with His authority and His freedom from error. It alone has been there "all days," even as He promised to be with it "all days."

* * *

1. Introductory Remarks:

The question of the *divinity* of Jesus Christ will always be the primary question in Christianity. It is not, however, the final question in our consideration of the "Foundations of the Catholic Church." There still remains the matter of the Church itself. That question is at

once the most complicated and, in a sense, the most crucial in Apologetics.

It is *complicated* by reason of the confusion and ambiguity which accompanies and surrounds the very use of the word "Church" in our society. The term is applied to literally hundreds of bodies currently existing in the world and calling themselves "Christian Churches," yet contradicting one another at every turn, differing on almost everything that Christ said and everything that could be said about Christ. The picture is further complicated when men designate this chaos *collectively* as "the Church."

The question of the Church is *crucial* because it is the point at which the Catholic parts company with the non-Catholic—or vice versa—if, perchance they have gone along this far, more or less in agreement. It is true that many non-Catholics will *already* have left our company in the statement that Jesus Christ is indeed and literally God.

"When we have come so far upon our journey, we have already parted company with a great portion of mankind: with the atheists, who deny God's existence, and with the pagans and pantheists who misconceive His Nature; with the Jews, and the Mohammedans and Unitarians who refuse divine honours to Jesus Christ. It is, if I may pursue my metaphor, at the very next turn that we have to take leave of our Protestant friends. For *the next step is one they never take* . . . we proceed immediately to the proof that Our Lord Jesus Christ founded, before He left us, a *single, visible and indivisible Church.*" (Knox, *The Belief of Catholics*, p. 130).

Back of the question of the Church is, obviously, the *basic question* of how God intends to deal with men from the Ascension of Christ into Heaven until the end of time. The question might be put another way: "What did Our Lord leave behind Him at His Ascension?" (Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 145) One's answer to that question is one's notion of what is meant by "the Church of Christ."

The *Catholic answer* to that question has been the same through all the centuries from the time of the Apostles to the present and will continue the same: having entered history by way of the Incarnation, Christ brought to the human race the all-important gifts of *Truth* and *Life*. To dispense these gifts to men until the end of time, he fashioned an instrument, a vehicle, which is a living, teaching, sanctifying society, *visible, human and divine*. Of this society He is the Head; through it He continues to teach men and make them holy; for these ends He uses men, for the society is built not only *among* men but *on men*. That society is the Church, more specifically that which is known to all history as the Catholic Church.

The Catholic claim is *unique*. No denomination claims that Christ is the head of that denomination. Catholics profess that Christ immediately and directly founded *their Church* and no other.

Until the 16th century all Christians, with rare exceptions, thought of the Church in these terms. When the new Protestants left the Catholic Church in which both this theory and its reality had been enshrined, a new concept of "the Church" had to be fashioned to fit the

facts of Protestant existence outside that existing visible Catholic Church. From such need sprang the notion of the Church founded by Christ as "the invisible community of all those who profess Christ."

Most people who reject the Catholic Church reject it, not because they believe in *some other visible church*, but because they do not believe in a visible church at all.

"It is not true to say that whereas Catholics think Christ founded one Church, Protestants think He founded many. The members of a Protestant Church do not regard it as the Church founded by Christ. Their view is that Christ founded *one church*: but it is not a visible society at all, with one body of officials ruling the whole. All true believers belong to it, and it has no earthly organization. Groups of members of this one Church may form individual churches, if they find it spiritually helpful to do so: but these are not essential: they are rather like clubs within a city. The Catholic believes that Christ founded the Catholic Church as immediately and directly as General Booth founded the Salvation Army. No non-Catholic body believes this about itself. (Ward and Sheed, *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*, p. 40).

In such a view of the Church as arose in the 16th century and persists in one form or another today, what place is left for the obvious fact that in the New Testament and ever since the Church has been *visible*? It is important for the Catholic treating the question of the Church in Apologetics to understand that non-Catholics *do not deny a visible character to the Church through history*. The point is that they do not consider that Christ gave it any specific visible form which is *essential*.

There is a helpful use of analogy by an Anglican theologian, Oliver Chase Quick, in his *Doctrines of the Creed*, which explains the difference between the Catholic and Protestant views admirably. He sees that the doctrine of the nature of the Church depends upon the answer to the question: what is the essential relation between the outward structure which makes the Church an organized and visible society in the world's view (the visible Church) and the spiritual reality (the invisible Church)? "Or, more particularly, do any outward unity and continuity of organization in any way constitute the unity of the Church, or are they *outward* even in the sense of being external to that unity?" (p. 330).

He narrows the various answers to two which are quite in opposition. (1) The first answer conceives the relation of the Church to its external order or organization to be somewhat analogous to *the relation of a man to his clothes*. This is the point of view almost universal in Protestantism, and Quick has labeled it "the utilitarian view." (2) The second answer conceives the relation to be like that of *a man and his body*. This would be the Catholic view, and Quick labels it "the organic view."

In *the first view* it would be admitted that some outward form or organization would always be necessary for the Church (man always needs clothing of some kind). But there is no form or external con-

tinuity which has to be present in the Church everywhere (some styles in clothes more fitted for this occasion or this climate—and styles do change). Change may be expedient. The form found in the first centuries may have been fine for that time but it does not follow that the same organization is best today.

In the second view, the spiritual in man may be higher in its value than the material but both are essential to man as man. The body develops and grows with the man. But “the man’s very life is bound up with the body, and his unity with its unity.” (p. 331). To break the unity and continuity of that living body is a maiming and mutilating of the body. So with the Church and its outward structure.

Mr. Quick does not come to a Catholic conclusion but this analysis and analogy are excellent. The Catholic Church maintains that the Church was originally founded personally by Christ himself as an organic unity on the government of the Apostles. To preserve its outward unity of order in unbroken continuity as Christ intended it should be is essential to the Church’s very being.

* * *

2. The Line of Proof

The proof is fashioned for those who are *already Catholic*, but it is equally usable for those who are not Catholic.

The presentation in Apologetics will be somewhat unsatisfactory if the section on “the divinity of Christ” is followed immediately by the proofs for the Church. What is missing and what is needed is a brief explanation of the *mission of Christ*. Why did God become Man? It is difficult to see how the Church can be made real and logical until one has considered Christ’s purpose. The Church is related to that purpose as its prolongation in time until the end of the world.

There are good treatments of the Mission of Christ in Alexander, *College Apologetics*, Ch. XII: “The Purpose of Christ in Coming to Earth”; Ripley, *This is the Faith*, Ch. XIV: “Redemption”; and Sheed, *Theology and Sanity*, Ch. XVI: “The Mission of Christ” and Ch. XVIII: “The Redeeming Sacrifice.”

By what line (or lines) of proof does the Catholic teacher of Apologetics arrive at the conclusion that Jesus Christ established the Catholic Church?

Each “apologist” will pursue lines that suit his purposes and persuasions best, but even so there are three generally accepted approaches. One is of ancient vintage, little used today; the other two are of current use although also very old.

A. *The historical method.* This approach takes the texts of scripture which establish the foundation of the Church as the work of Christ, indicating also the nature of the Church, and then traces the successors of the Apostles through the years to identify the Church here and now. This method, rarely used today, was common in the early centuries of the Church, used, for example, against the Gnostics and the Arians. As time went by the demonstration got too complicated

and we find St. Irenaeus short-cutting the process by simply tracing the descent of the successors of St. Peter at Rome and St. Polycarp at Smyrna. (cf. Madgett, *Christian Origins*, II, pp. 57-58; Cavanaugh, *Evidence for Our Faith*, p. 227).

B. *The historical-deductive method*: This is the best-known method. It starts with Christ's preaching of the Kingdom of God, an external Kingdom in this world to procure internal holiness, the truths of revelation, the means to salvation. Then, concentrating on the Apostles, it shows them selected, trained, commissioned and empowered to teach, rule, sanctify, with promises of divine assistance, infallibility, under the primacy of Peter and his successors. This is the Church as Christ founded it and it has certain *marks* (Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolicity) which are its hallmark, by which it can be identified in every age. The application of these marks to existing churches in the world reveals that only the Catholic Church is in possession of them.

"With hundreds of churches claiming to give the Christian message, it is necessary that a church should be ready to show its credentials; otherwise no one can know whether it is the true church or not. The credentials which the Catholic Church has to show are her four Marks." (Ward and Sheed, *op.cit.*, p. 57).

In this line of proof, other characteristics of the Church (such as infallibility and indefectibility) are dealt with but they are not classified as "marks" because they are not *visible*. They are however *essential properties* of the Church, always present.

C. *The empiric method*: There is a third line of proof, popular today, which Madgett calls "the empiric method." By this method the Church is examined and described just as it is found in the world today. "We point out the Church as a fact and her marks as facts . . . these marks are so extraordinary that they cannot be accounted for by natural causes." (Cavanaugh, *op. cit.*, p. 206).

This method demands graphic description to be effective—and abundant well-chosen examples. It has certain features which recommend it. It requires less intellectual effort; it avoids much involved discussion of scripture texts; it is easily understood; appeals to *the whole man*—is "a psychological approach" as distinguished from "a rational approach." Over against its advantages is the danger of too much subjectivity in the attitude toward the Church. Yet, for the convinced Catholic, this approach can be very helpful in impressing the Church upon his mind as a living reality. The method, it should be added, does not ignore scripture, history and the "marks" but uses them in somewhat different fashion.

The historical-deductive method is explained and demonstrated in Madgett, *op.cit.*, chapters I-IV; demonstrated in Alexander, *op.cit.*, chapters XV-XX; Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, I, chapters VIII-XII; and Ripley, *op.cit.*, chapters XV-XIX.

Cavanaugh is an excellent example of the use of the empiric method (*op.cit.*, chapters IX-XII). Ward and Sheed, (*op.cit.* pp. 39-84) show themselves decidedly partial to that method.

3. Preparing the Mind

It would be unwise to start the treatment of the Church in terms of "a line of proof" without preparing the minds of the students for so difficult and complex a question. There is always the danger that the reasonableness and logic of the Church's view have been obscured by the current prevailing views of "Church."

1) There is a *pattern* in God's dealings with the human race, discernible in everything. The pattern is one of *dependence*, which is a sort of ground-rule of our existence, and *instrumentality*, which reveals God working through others as instruments. In the natural order of things, He has made us dependent on others in our coming into existence, in our care, in our acquisition of food, knowledge, etc. The pattern never ceases through life—although theoretically He might have directly supplied us with all we need without the instrumentality of others. *Why should He act in a radically different manner when it comes to establishing the means for dispensing Truth and Life.* The Church, it will be noted, fits the consistent pattern of God's relations with us. (Sheed, *op.cit.*, Ch. 21)

2) It is wise to *emphasize the Jews* and the manner of God's dealing with them before Christ establishes the Church. "The Church of the Jews was a visible Church" (Lunn, *Now I See*, p. 206). God dealt with the Jews in the matter of their religious and spiritual life in the pattern which later will be perfect in the Church—but not in the *individualist style* which non-Catholics suggest is the New Dispensation. Judaism is a "religion of authority," an organized visible society, with priesthood, external rites, laws that bind, etc. This was God's revealed religion *before* Christ. There was no abandonment of the Jews to their own devices—hence the repeated sending of *the prophets*. They needed voices sent from God to keep them straight on the meaning of Revelation. All this indicates a relationship that comes from man's need, and that need has not changed with the coming of Christ.

3) It is a good practice to talk about "the Development of Doctrine" before taking up the line of proof. When one gets to the proofs, the whole question is rather dominated by the idea of development, especially when the topic turns to the question of papal primacy and infallibility. There is a good treatment of the question in Conway, *The Question Box*, edition of 1929, pp. 111-114; Algermissen, *Christian Denominations*, chapter XXV: "The Development of Catholic Doctrine"; and, of course, in Newman's *An Essay on Development*.

4) It should be pointed out in advance that the Protestant Reformation is not, as such, a part of Catholic Apologetics. It is wise to develop the apologetic treatment of the Church with a minimum of reference to Protestantism, except where it is necessary to mention the many conflicting views of "Church" or to answer questions which may come up.

5) As in the proof for the Divinity of Christ, recommend that the students take one of the Gospels and read it through, if possible, *at one sitting*. Suggest, as before, attempting to visualize the matter of the Gospel as happening in the *here and now*. Which Gospel? Perhaps

Matthew or John—or better, to read Luke's Gospel followed by the Acts, an order which makes both the Gospel of Luke and the Acts more relevant.

4. Suggested Techniques

1) Concentrate *heavily on the Apostles* because they are the key to the question of Christ having established a Church which is visible as a human society. Note that they are generally by-passed in discussions of Our Lord's life. "We have observed the modern tendency to ignore the Devil," says Sheed; "there is a tendency almost as great to ignore the Apostles." (*op.cit.*, p. 238). The result is to "badly falsify Our Lord's plan for the continuation of His work upon earth."

Note how much was said to them that was not said to anyone else—things of the greatest importance in Christianity. Our Lord paid too much attention to them to dismiss them as lightly as some Christians do. They are not with Him three years just as companions (did He need Twelve?), or stage props, asking foolish questions as foils to Our Lord's wisdom. They are not with Him three years just to find out He was God. The Apostles had nothing to do with Redemption—except for the part Judas unwittingly played—the emphasis on them was all orientated toward the future. The cumulative picture of Our Lord's attention to them should be drawn. The 21st chapter of Sheed's *Theology and Sanity* is the best we have for this.

2) If Christ founded no Church that, as an organization, was to carry on His work, then the Gospels are the story of an immense build-up and an equally immense let-down.

3) Emphasize that the question of whether or not Jesus established a Church fitting the Catholic idea of "Church" was *no question at all for the first Christians*—nor for anyone who called himself a Christian for nearly fifteen centuries. "There is no hint in the Gospels of that modern figment, of the theory that the Church is an invisible institution consisting of the sum total of all Christians." (Lunn, *op.cit.*, p. 209)

4) It is easy enough to become accustomed to the *de facto* situation of hundreds of churches, all calling themselves "Christian," teaching the most contradictory things about everything Christ said and did. If Our Lord were to step back into our community today and walk down the streets, noting the confusion of churches (which one Protestant has referred to as "an ecclesiastical zoo") how would He react? One thing seems certain: He would not say to them, "good, that's exactly what I wanted you to do."

5) If one were to grant (for the sake of argument) that Jesus Christ *did* not establish a Church such as Catholics claim, and if He had wanted to establish such a Church, *what could He have done that the Gospels do not show He already did?*

6) In dealing with the question of the Primacy of Peter and his successors, point out that this was reasonable and natural for Christ to have arranged it this way, providing His Church with a head. The al-

ternative is, of course, *a headless society*. Even we would not be guilty of neglecting so fundamental a need. Why, then, should it seem odd that Christ should have provided His Church with a head?

7) Don't neglect the early testimonies, such as the *early liturgies* and creeds, all of which show a view of the Church which never changes and is the Catholic view. (c.f. Bullough, *The Church in the New Testament*, p. 1).

8) It is bad psychology to begin consideration of the Church as a ruling authority with *papal primacy* (or supremacy). It is even worse to begin the treatment of *infallibility* with papal infallibility rather than with the "infallibility of the Church." Neither logically nor psychologically is it the best way to present the subject. (a) Show first that Jesus gave the Apostles authority to rule, then proceed to the natural apex of the structure—a chief ruler in which unity will naturally center. (b) Show that the *Church is infallible*. Something of a shock is induced by jumping ahead of the story and saying that "the Pope is infallible." Having shown that Christ meant the Church to be infallible, the practical question is "who has it?" Gradually work to papal infallibility, again as the apex.

9). In dealing with the role of Peter as head of the Church, it is very impressive to point out that the New Testament refers to Our Lord as *Rock*, *Key-bearer*, and *Shepherd* (I Cor. 3/11; Apoc. 3/7; John 10/11). He confers these three titles on Peter (Matt. 16/18; Luke 22/31; John 21/16-17). That is what the Church means by "Vicar of Christ."

10) *Use St. Paul* on the Church as much as possible. There still lingers in some corners the notion that St. Paul was somehow opposed to the Catholic concept of the Church. Quite to the contrary, the Church gets much of its notion of the Church from St. Paul. His mind was simply pre-occupied with the thought of the Church. This is shown in a fine short chapter on "St. Paul on the Mystical Body" in Knox, *St. Paul's Gospel*, and in extensive fashion in Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*.

11) Our Lord did not disguise the fact that He was establishing a *visible Church*. Certain tremendous grants by Christ to the Apostles should not be underplayed: "I dispose to you, as My Father has disposed to Me, a kingdom"; "As the Father has sent Me, I also send you"; "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in Heaven;"—and the implication in the preliminary phrase which preceded one of those grants: "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth, going therefore, etc." There is a danger that these will be lost, or at least their effectiveness will be missed.

* * *

5. Concluding this Part

Apologetics, of its very nature, is not equipped to give one a full view of the Church as the Church sees herself. In a sense it is only the beginning of that reality which we glimpse through Apologetics.

“What we have now seen is the Church at the first level of our understanding — the Kingdom, a society of men to which we come to receive God’s gifts of truth and life through the Holy Spirit, a society in which we are in the company of Christ since He is with it. If the Church were no more than that it would still be glorious; but it is in fact more than that, and we should come to a deeper level of understanding, for it would be a shame for a Catholic to live in the Church without the fullest realization of the magnificence that is his.” (Sheed, *op.cit.*, p. 266)

Apologetics bring us to the Church as the living, teaching, and sanctifying society which Jesus Christ has fashioned for our most vital needs. But presentation should not aim (any more than the consideration of the divinity of Christ) at being a *mere dialectic*.

It is true that the Catholic needs to be equipped to explain and defend the Church’s position on what the Church is and why. Yet, much will have been lost unless the Catholic develops, along with his arguments, a love and appreciation for the Church. It is not a question of increasing his faith in the Church but his knowledge of the Church. But the very reasonableness of the Church’s position should inspire greater confidence in the Church as a living force in the world.

Inevitably the study of the Church in Apologetics will draw the non-Catholic into the thinking of the Catholic student, even though little may be said formally about Protestantism. He cannot avoid seeing the chaos which has come about (as it logically had to come about) when Protestantism rejected the Church and that doctrine concerning the Church which had been the possession of Christians from the days of the Apostles.

There is a temptation for the Catholic to be smug and superior. The mere fact that he stands looking down the centuries along the unbroken line of his Church’s life right back to the Apostles and Christ may tempt him to some sort of self-exaltation. The superior air will not wear well with the apostolic zeal which the study of the Church in Apologetics might reasonably be expected to kindle. The road to “one fold and one shepherd” will not be built on smugness and superiority.

The temptation could not endure a moment in the light of understanding what the Faith and the Church really are—gifts which only God can give.

Bibliographical Notes

If it is true that too much has been written about Jesus Christ (considering the inanity and worthlessness of so much that has been written), it is also true that too little has been written about the Church (considering the need for good material on so critical a question). Still, there is an adequate amount.

Of the standard *Apologetic Works* already mentioned a few deserve special praise. The second volume of Madgett’s *Christian Origins* is devoted entirely to this subject. It is unexcelled in arrangement and treatment and has good bibliographies. The teacher of Apologetics will

appreciate especially the lengthy discussion of the various methods of presenting the evidence for the Church, with an evaluation of each method.

Of equal value is Cavanaugh, *Evidence for Our Faith*, who demonstrates how to handle the empirical method without sacrificing all the valuable material of the older method. There is an abundance of quotation in Cavanaugh, much of it from non-Catholic sources. Alexander, *College Apologetics*, has a clear and orderly presentation of the historical-deductive method which he considers "will always remain the best way to prove the divine origin of Christ's Church for this was the way given by Christ Himself." (p. 207). But he adds a fine chapter on "The Church as a Moral Miracle." Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, Volume I, is an old standard, with tightly packed material in traditional fashion, and objections and answers featured after the formal presentation. Ripley, *This is the Faith*, ranks with the best, and is especially helpful with patristic quotations.

The teacher of Apologetics will find Ward and Sheed, *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*, a source of much good advice on how to present and not present arguments for the Church. Several chapters in Noll and Fallon, *Father Smith Instructs Jackson* present the proof in conversational style. Frank Sheed's *Theology and Sanity* would not be classed as a book of Apologetics but nothing excels it for lucidity and persuasiveness. The teacher who would thoroughly absorb the presentation of his chapters 21-23 would find a freshness of presentation that is thoroughly effective. Algermissen, *Christian Denominations* is a most helpful large resource-book and the beginning chapters of volume II of Canon George Smith's *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* are very solid.

Long a classic argument for the Church, Karl Adam's *The Spirit of Catholicism* is now available in paper-bound, and is still a classic. Chapter III: "The Church the Body of Christ"; Chapter V: "The Foundation of the Church in the Light of the Teaching of Jesus"; and Chapter VI: "The Church and Peter" are of unusual merit.

For a picture of the Church in action in apostolic and post-apostolic times, Lebreton and Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, in two volumes; and Bollough, *The Church in the New Testament*, are recommended, along with Philip Hughes' *History of the Church*, Volume I.

There are usable individual chapters in Stoddard, *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* (Ch. IX: "The Church of Christ"); Knox, *The Belief of Catholics* (Ch. XI: "The Foundation of the Church"); Knox, *The Hidden Stream* (Ch. 13: "The Four Marks of the Church," as well as the previously mentioned chapter in Knox's, *St. Paul's Gospel*; the first three chapters of Van Doornik, Jelsma, and Van de Lisdonk, *The Triptych of the Kingdom*.

Henry De Lubac, *Catholicism* in Chapter II on "The Church" shows how the mark of *Catholicity* was understood by the great apologists of the early centuries; Lunn, *Now I See*, has a short but effective chapter (IX) on "The Foundation of the Church"; Sylvester Berry, *The*

Church of Christ, is a Latin text translated, but is very full and attends to a great number of objections to the Catholic notion of the Church; Bakewell Morrison, *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind*, although not up to the standard set in dealing with earlier sections of Apologetics, particularly the question of the divinity of Christ, has two good chapters on the Church.

Paul Simon, *The Human Element in the Church of Christ*, gives a realistic presentation of a fact about the Church which needs strong emphasis in Apologetics—that its humanity is as real as its divinity and was willed by Christ. Two excellent small books deal with the question of Peter and the Church's infallibility and offer much helpful information. Charles Journet's *The Primacy of Peter*, is a critique of Cullman's *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, and distinguishes the Protestant and Catholic views of Primacy very clearly. The other work is B. C. Butler, *The Church and Infallibility*, which is a reply to the 1952 publication of an abridged version of Salmon's influential book on *The Infallibility of the Church*, giving not only the Catholic arguments for infallibility but also an insight into the Protestant mind on the subject.

Some additional works worth mentioning are: Congar, *Divided Christendom*, a somewhat controversial book which has two chapters containing many fine observations for this study—Chapter II on "The Oneness of the Church" and Chapter III on "The Catholicity of the Church"; *The Church Teaches: Documents of the Church*, edited by J. F. Clarkson and others, which has a section on the Church (pp. 67-121), giving the solemn teaching through the centuries, including the lengthy Vatican Council statement; Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question Box*, a mine of answers to objections against the teaching of the Church with abundant bibliographical references: John Brunini, *Whereon to Stand*, a popularly written apologetic with three good chapters on the Church.

The encyclical letter of Pius XII on "The Mystical Body of Christ" should be used, both to explain this doctrine, and to show a modern Pope developing an ancient theme.

If the teacher of Apologetics is going to bring the necessary understanding to his task, he must know something of the Protestant mind on the question of the Church. Recommended for this purpose are the following: H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Nature of the Church and Its Ministry*, a representative of the Neo-Orthodox view; Gustaf Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, a liberal Lutheran work; Oliver Chase Quick, *Doctrines of the Creed*, an Anglican work; Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking*; and R. Newton Flew, *The Nature of the Church*, presenting twenty-five views of the Church, including a Catholic view written by the editor, Mr. Flew, because he says he could not find a Catholic to write it!

Conclusion: FAITH

If the course thus far has remained only an Argument, the student has missed not only the *flavor* of learning about Christ and His Church. He has missed the whole point. The syllogism ending "Therefore, God exists . . ." is no *mere* exercise in Logic. Gospel records are not *only* reliable documents. The "Historical Christ" is not *only* the historical Christ; He is the Son of God. The Church is not *only* His work; it is His Voice, His Power, His Mystical Body. If Apologetics is only a skeleton, the class has been in some way defrauded.

The final chapter, on Faith, gives an opportunity of measuring how far the Divine Message has penetrated. It is crucial, in this section, to teach the student that

- (1) Faith is God's gift to us;
- (2) Our intellect and will are supernaturalized in the act of accepting it.

In the preamble of faith (God-Christ-Church) the method is strictly rational; we examine the evidence. But the student must be readied to move on now to higher ground, to use gratefully and effectively this virtue of Faith in knowing more about God and ourselves. This should have been foreshadowed all the way, as it grew evident how little we can know of the True God by reason alone, how incomplete the historical view of Christ, how unsatisfactory the rational view of the Church.

The post-Luther view of Faith as an affective state is still very much with us. It is considered, by its proponents, as "Reason grown courageous"; by its opponents as a prop, a substitute, a crutch. The distinction between the *supporting* view of Faith, and St. Paul's *substantive* definition of it must be made clear:

"The substance of things to be hoped for,
The evidence of things that appear not." (Heb. 11, 1)

For current concepts of Faith, see Sheen's *God and Intelligence* (27-30 and 192-217) and Madgett's *Christian Origins*, I, 164-169. The key here is Faith *as a source of knowledge*.

The explanation of Faith can be built around the definition given by the Vatican Council:

"A Supernatural power, by which God's grace inspiring and assisting, we believe to be true all that He has revealed, not because of the intrinsic truth of things seen by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself Who is revealing to us, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived."

For discussion of this definition, item by item, Sheed (*Theology and Sanity*, 350-355) and Madgett (*Christian Origins*, I, 169-175) are good. The Act of Faith can then be related to the Virtue of Faith.

After the nature of Faith is understood, its properties, its necessity and its value should be explained. The Chapter XVI of Knox' *Hidden Stream* is quite penetrating. It concludes with this distinction—faith

is "not something which you have got hold of, but something which has got hold of you." It should be read with the preceding Chapter on the Development of Doctrine, and the succeeding one on the Nature of Mystery.

* * *

Does the student now have a "reason for the hope that is in him?" Can he answer the question, "Why am I a Catholic?" Is he ready to accept the intellectual and moral responsibility of his religion? Does he find in the Act of Faith the highest exercise of his intellectual powers? Is he ready to study now the Doctrine of the Church, ready to make good practical moral judgments?

These questions will always be in the teacher's mind, with the silent prayer that they are being answered in the minds of the students. Prayer should always accompany this course, not just as a formula for beginning and ending class, but as a constantly pervading spirit. If one studies chemistry with a certain respect for the elements, is it less binding to study about God with a far greater respect for Him?

Much depends upon the attitude that both teacher and pupil bring to class, and maintain throughout the course. If the teacher is cocksure, intolerant, less than objective in dealing with facts,—or if the pupil is hostile, cynical or unwilling to move from truth to truth,—there can hardly be the meeting of minds which is requisite to all true education.

From Cardinal Newman's *Meditations and Devotions* comes a Prayer for the Light of Truth:

"O my God, I confess that Thou canst enlighten my darkness. I confess that Thou alone canst. I wish my darkness to be enlightened. I do not know whether Thou wilt; but that Thou canst and that I wish, are sufficient reasons for me to ask, that Thou at least has not forbidden my asking. I hereby promise that by Thy grace which I am asking, I will embrace whatever I at last feel certain is the truth, if ever I come to be certain. And by Thy grace I will guard against all self-deceit which may lead me to take what nature would have, rather than what reason approves."

H. W. HILLIARD CO., INC.

Home of

Easy-Open

Envelopes

THE ONLY ENVELOPE USING A THREAD FOR AN OPENER

OPEN 6 to 8 AT A TIME

1958

JANUARY

- 1—Circumcision
- 5—Feast of the Holy Name
- 6—Epiphany
- 12—Feast of the Holy Family
- 19—2nd Sunday after Epiphany
- 26—3rd Sunday after Epiphany

FEBRUARY

- 2—Septuagesima
- 9—Sexagesima
- 16—Quinquagesima
- 19—Ash Wednesday
- 23—1st Sunday of Lent

MARCH

- 2—2nd Sunday of Lent
- 9—3rd Sunday of Lent
- 16—4th Sunday of Lent
- 23—Passion Sunday
- 30—Palm Sunday

APRIL

- 6—Easter Sunday
- 13—1st Sunday after Easter
- 20—2nd Sunday after Easter
- 27—3rd Sunday after Easter

MAY

- 4—4th Sunday after Easter
- 11—5th Sunday after Easter
- 15—Ascension Day
- 18—Sunday after Ascension
- 25—Pentecost

JUNE

- 1—Trinity Sunday
- 5—Feast of Corpus Christi
- 8—2nd Sunday after Pentecost
- 13—Feast of the Sacred Heart
- 15—3rd Sunday after Pentecost
- 22—4th Sunday after Pentecost
- 29—5th Sunday after Pentecost

JULY

- 6—6th Sunday after Pentecost
- 13—7th Sunday after Pentecost
- 20—8th Sunday after Pentecost
- 27—9th Sunday after Pentecost

AUGUST

- 3—10th Sunday after Pentecost
- 10—11th Sunday after Pentecost
- 15—Feast of the Assumption
- 17—12th Sunday after Pentecost
- 24—13th Sunday after Pentecost
- 31—14th Sunday after Pentecost

SEPTEMBER

- 7—15th Sunday after Pentecost
- 14—16th Sunday after Pentecost
- 21—17th Sunday after Pentecost
- 28—18th Sunday after Pentecost

OCTOBER

- 5—19th Sunday after Pentecost
- 12—20th Sunday after Pentecost
- 19—21st Sunday after Pentecost
- 26—Feast of Christ the King

NOVEMBER

- 1—All Saints' Day
- 2—23rd Sunday after Pentecost
- 3—All Souls' Day
- 9—24th Sunday after Pentecost
- 16—25th Sunday after Pentecost
- 23—Last Sunday after Pentecost
- 30—1st Sunday of Advent

DECEMBER

- 7—2nd Sunday of Advent
- 8—Immaculate Conception
- 14—3rd Sunday of Advent
- 21—4th Sunday of Advent
- 25—Christmas
- 28—Sunday between Christmas and New Year



