

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

APRIL 1900.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

CHRISTOLOGY.

(Continued.)

In and for the work of redemption, and in the manner and measure requisite for such work, Christ the God-man humiliated himself. The verb, ταπεινώω, means *to lower, to humble*, the contrary being ὑψόω, *to raise, to elevate, to exalt.*¹⁾ With the reflex pronoun, ταπεινοῦν signifies *to humble one's self*, to forego honor or high stations or prerogatives which one might rightfully claim or enjoy. Thus Paul says that he had "abased himself,"²⁾ when he had "preached the gospel of God freely," earning his livelihood with his own hands, and taking what other churches gave him, instead of taking and enjoying what he might have rightfully claimed at the hands of the Corinthians.³⁾ And such was the self-humiliation of Christ, *that, though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;*⁴⁾ *that he, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being in fashion as a man, he humbled*

1) Matt. 23, 12. Luke 14, 11; 18, 14. Phil. 2, 8. 9.

2) ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν, 2 Cor. 11, 7.

3) 2 Cor. 11, 5 ff.

4) 2 Cor. 8, 9.

upon the matter, saying:—"In Hesse I know of one Landgravine, and none other will be able to bear and nurse young Landgraves; I mean the Duchess, Duke George's, of Saxony, daughter."¹⁾

From all this it appears beyond a shadow of doubt that Luther did not advocate or recommend, but emphatically discountenanced and condemned bigamy; that he did not advise the Landgrave to take a second wife, but earnestly and repeatedly dissuaded that measure; that he never defended the Landgrave's second marriage when, against his advice, it had been contracted and given a measure of publicity; that Luther's opinion as to the admissibility of the second marriage in the Landgrave's case was based upon peculiar circumstances confided to him and never made public either by him or by the Landgrave, and that this opinion was never intended to cover more than the individual case for and in consideration of which it was asked; that Luther never uttered a doubt as to the correctness of that opinion while, at the same time, he rejected and strenuously denied the right of bigamous or polygamous marriage; and that it is preposterous and due either to ignorance, or to malice, or to both, to stamp Martin Luther the father of Mormonism.

A. G.

AN ABUSED DICTUM OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

A correspondent writes to us: "St. Augustine is quoted by Cardinal Vaughan as saying: *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholice Ecclesie commoveret auctoritas*. A translation is given, which seems to be by the cardinal, thus: 'I should not believe in the truth of Scripture unless the authority of the Catholic Church so bade me.' (Literary Digest, Feb. 17, p. 217.) Would you please, if

1) Luther's Works, Erl. ed., vol. 26, p. 60.

convenient to you, through the columns of the QUARTERLY, or otherwise, state whether this quotation is true, and give necessary comment."

Of course, we cheerfully comply with our correspondent's request. And, in the first place, we would say that the Latin quotation is correct, and the English translation, by whomsoever it may be, is incorrect; for *Evangelio* is not "the truth of Scripture," but simply "the Gospel," and in what sense the word is used in the text quoted from St. Augustine, we shall presently see.

The words of St. Augustine are taken from the fifth chapter of his book *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant Fundamenti*. Augustine cites the opening words of that "Epistle," thus: "Manichaeus, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father. These are wholesome words from the perennial and living fountain." Then he argues, "I do not believe that man to be an apostle of Christ. Pray, do not grow angry and begin to revile me; for you know I have stated that I do not rashly believe anything you say. Hence, I ask, who is that man Manichaeus? You will answer, An apostle of Christ. I don't believe it. Now, you have nothing to say or to do; for you promised me knowledge of truth, and now you would force me to believe what I do not know. Perhaps you will read the Gospel to me and try therefrom to assert the person of Manichaeus. Hence, if you found a man who not yet believed the Gospel, what would you do if he said to you, I do not believe? But I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the catholic church prompted me."¹⁾

1) Certe sic incipit: Manichaeus apostolus Jesu Christi providentia Dei Patris. Haec sunt salubria verba de perenni ac vivo fonte. Jam cum bona patientia si placet attendite quid quaeram. Non credo istum esse apostolum Christi; quaeso ne succenseatis et maledicere incipiatis. Nostis enim me statuisse nihil a vobis prolatum temere credere. Quaero ergo, quis sit ille Manichaeus? Respondebitis, apostolus Christi. Non credo. Jam quid dicas aut facias non habebis; promittebas enim scientiam veritatis,

And later on in the same chapter, Augustine says:—
 “But far be it from me not to believe the Gospel. For believing it, I do not see how I might believe you also. For the names of the apostles which we read there do not contain among them the name of Manichaeus. But who was the successor of him who betrayed Christ, we read in the acts of the Apostles which book I must needs believe if I believe the Gospel, since both scriptures alike catholic authority commends to me.”¹⁾

Here we have very plainly the sense in which Augustine in this text and context speaks of the Gospel. It is not the gospel as the doctrine of our salvation, nor the entire Scriptures, nor “the truth of Scripture,” nor the entire New Testament; but when Augustine refers to the Gospel and the Acts as *utraque scriptura*, he evidently follows an *usus loquendi* common among the early Fathers, according to which *Evangelium* stood for the four Gospels and *Apostolus* for the rest of the canonical books of the New Testament. We have the same *usus loquendi* when Augustine says:—
 “I have undertaken to show forth the error or recklessness of those who think they are preferring very cunning charges against the four books of the Gospel which the four evangelists have severally written.”²⁾ And again: “Hence,

et nunc quod nescio cogis ut credam. Evangelium forte mihi lecturus es et inde Manichaei personam tentabis asserere. Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui Evangelio nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, non credo? Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas. Augustini Opera, ed. Froben., Tom. VI, col. 118.

1) Sed absit ut ego evangelio non credam. Illi enim credens non invenio quomodo possim etiam tibi credere. Apostolorum enim nomina, quae ibi leguntur, non inter se continent nomen Manichaei. In locum autem traditoris Christi qui successerit, in apostolorum Actibus legimus: cui libro necesse est me credere, si credo evangelio: quoniam utramque scripturam similiter mihi catholica commendat auctoritas. Ibid. col. 119.

2) Demonstrare suscepimus errorem vel temeritatem eorum, qui contra Evangelii quatuor libros, quos evangelistae quatuor singulos scripserunt, satis argutas criminationes se proferre arbitrantur. De consensu evangelist., Lib. 1, cap. 7. Opp. Tom. IV, col. 375.

when they wrote what he pointed out and said, it can by no means be said that he did not write it, since the members performed that which they knew as the head dictated. For whatever he would have us read concerning his deeds and words, he ordered them, as his hands, to write. Whoever has understood this bond of unity and this ministry of concordant members under one head in various offices, will look upon the narratives of the disciples of Christ which he reads in the *Gospel* precisely as if he had seen the very hand of the Lord, which he bore upon his own body, writing them." 1)

The context of the quotation from Augustine given in the *Digest* furthermore very clearly shows in what sense the author says that he is prompted by the authority of the catholic church to give credence to these books of the New Testament canon. The purported epistle of Manichaeus claimed the dignity of apostolic authorship. This claim Augustine rejects. He denies the authenticity of a work which lacks the testimony whereby its authenticity might be established. On the contrary, he gives credence to the *Evangelium*, the canonical Gospels, their authenticity being fully established by the testimony of the ancient church throughout the world, just as the authenticity of the Acts, which Augustine accepts on the same authority.

This plain sense, as it appears from the context, is also corroborated by parallel passages from other writings of

1) Itaque cum illi scripserunt quae ille ostendit et dixit, nequaquam dicendum est quod ipse non scripserit: quandoquidem membra eius id operata sunt, quod dictante capite cognoverunt. Quicquid enim ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. Hoc unitatis consortium et in diversis officiis concordium membrorum sub uno capite ministerium quisquis intellexerit, non aliter accipiet quod narrantibus discipulis Christi in Evangelio legerit, quam si ipsam manum domini, quam in proprio corpore gestabat, scribentem conspexerit. — Ibid. cap. 35. Col. 395. We call attention to Augustine's view of the inspiration of Scripture as exhibited in this passage. The holy penmen are the hands of the divine Head, whose thoughts and words, known to them as by *dictation*, they reduced to writing.

Augustine. Thus, in the XV Book of his great work *De civitate Dei* he says:—"Let us therefore pass by the fabulous stories of those writings which are called Apocrypha, for the reason that their occult origin was not clear to the Fathers, from whom the authority of the true Scriptures came down to us by most certain and well known succession."¹⁾

Again, in the XXVIII Book of his work *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, our author says:—"Thus also you should believe that book to be of St. Matthew which from the time when Matthew himself lived in the flesh the church in an uninterrupted course of time and with securely connected succession brought down to these times."²⁾ And later:—"If certain letters had been brought forth, which, while no one else made mention of them, were said to be letters of Christ himself: how could it have been that, if they were his, they were not read, not received, did not excel by the very highest authority in his church, which extends from Christ himself to the present time, propagated by the apostles and the bishops succeeding them, the church in which much of what has been predicted has already been fulfilled, and what remains, will to the end doubtless come in the future. For if those letters were brought forth, it would be proper by all means to consider by whom they were brought forth. If they came from him, it was doubtless most likely that they should be brought first of all to those who were then his adherents, and that through them they should also come to others. If this had been the case, they would shine with confirmative authority by the above said successions

1) Omittamus igitur earum scripturarum fabulas quae apocryphae nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos autoritas veracium scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. Aug. Opp. Tom. V, col. 852.

2) Sic et istum librum crede esse Matthaei, quem ex illo tempore, quo Matthaeus ipse in carne vixit, non interrupta serie temporum Ecclesia certa connexionis successione usque ad tempora ista perduxit. Contra Faust. Man. Lib. XXVIII, cap. 2. Aug. Opp. Tom. VI, col. 467.

of bishops and congregations. Hence who is so void of reason as to believe to-day that a work set forth by Manichaeus were an Epistle of Christ, and not to believe what Matthew wrote to be the works and words of Christ?"¹⁾

And again:—"What writings shall ever have any weight of authority, if those of the evangelists and apostles have not? Concerning what book will it be certain whose it is, if it is uncertain whether the letters which the church says and holds to be of the apostles, and which were handed down from the apostles themselves and declared so loudly through all nations, be really letters of the apostles?"²⁾

From all these and other passages which might be quoted³⁾ it is evident that it is a familiar argument with St. Augustine to maintain the authenticity of the canonical Scriptures as established by the testimony of the primitive church, and that in this sense he claims the authority of the church in behalf of the canonical Scriptures as compared with the spurious sacred books of his day which claimed credence and apostolic dignity or divine authority while

1) Si enim prolatae fuerint aliquae literae, quae nullo alio narrante ipsius proprie Christi esse dicantur: unde fieri potuerat, ut si vere ipsius essent non legerentur, non acciperentur, non praecipuo culmine auctoritatis eminent in eius ecclesia, quae ab ipso per Apostolos succedentibus sibi-
met Episcopis usque ad haec tempora propagata dilatatur, multis in ea jam completis, quae ante praedicta sunt, et usque in finem quae restant sine dubio futuris atque venturis: quia et illae literae si proferrentur, utique considerandum erat a quibus proferrentur. Si ab ipso, illis primitus sine dubio proferri potuerunt, qui tunc eidem cohaerebant, et per illos etiam ad alios pervenire. Quod si factum esset, per illas quas commemoravi praepositorum et populorum successiones confirmativa auctoritate clarescerent. Quis est ergo tam demens, qui hodie credat esse Epistolam Christi, quam protulerit Manichaeus, et non credat facta vel dicta esse Christi quae scripsit Matthaeus. Ibid. cap. 4. Opp. VI, 468.

2) Quae unquam literae ullum habebunt pondus auctoritatis, si evangelicae, si apostolicae non habebunt? De quo libro certum erit cuius sit, si literae quas apostolorum dicit et tenet ecclesia, ab ipsis apostolis propagata et per omnes gentes tanta eminentia declarata, utrum apostolorum sint incertum est. Ibid. Lib. XXXIII, cap. 6. Opp. Tom. VI, col. 493.

3) E. g. Contra Faustum Manichaeum, Lib. XI, cap. 2. Lib. 32, 21. De Cons. Evang. Lib. 1.

they failed to establish their authenticity and their canonical recognition by the same church which recognized the canonical Scriptures as the inspired writings of Moses and the Prophets, the Apostles and Evangelists.

We have not seen the article in the *Digest* from which our esteemed correspondent has quoted Cardinal Vaughan, and we do not know what deductions are there made from the much abused words of Augustine. But we know that the Romanists were rebuked five centuries ago by one of their most learned and influential men of his day, Jean Charlier de Gerson, the great Chancellor of the university of Paris, for their abuse of this saying of Augustine,¹⁾ whose doctrine of the divine authority of the Scriptures is not based upon the authority of the Church, but upon his doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, which might also be exhibited by many passages from his works. Augustine holds the Scriptures to be the word of God;²⁾ and the word of God cannot receive its authority from the church, as the Creator cannot receive his power from the creature he has made.

A. G.

1) Gerson, de Vita Spirituali, lect. 2, coroll. 7.

2) See the passage quoted above, De consensu evangelistar. Lib. 1, cap. 35.