

Novice Class Module III

The Specific Purpose – Preaching

Readings (All included in this document)

Mt. 28:18-20; Acts 4:33; Mk 16:15

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia* 3-40-1 to 3-42-1 and 2. (Note: It is recommended that you obtain a copy of the *Summa Theologia*. It is available online and in ebook format. (<http://www.newadvent.org/summa/>) There are very good apps for smart phones and tablets as well. If you are new to reading the Summa, you may wish to review the document, *How to read the Summa*, included in Module 6.)

R. Koch, *Preaching*, in *Vol 1 of Sacramentum Verbi – An Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*; pages 686-693

And Jesus came and said to them, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. ¹⁹Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, ²⁰and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age." *Mt 28: 18-20*

With great power the apostles bore witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great favor was accorded them all. Acts 4:33

He said to them, "Go into the whole world and proclaim the gospel to every creature. Mk 16:15

Read St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia* 3-40-1 to 3-42-1 and 2. (Note: It is recommended that you obtain a copy of the *Summa Theologia*. It is available online and in ebook format. (<http://www.newadvent.org/summa/>) There are very good apps for smart phones and tablets as well. If you are new to reading the Summa, you may wish to review the document, *How to read the Summa*, included in Module 6.)

Read R. Koch, *Preaching*, in *Vol 1 of Sacramentum Verbi – An Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*; pages 686-693

ST Part III

Question 40. Christ's manner of life

1. [Should Christ have led a solitary life, or should he have associated with men?](#)
2. [Should He have led an austere life as regards food, drink, and clothing? Or should He have conformed Himself to others in these respects?](#)
3. [Should He have adopted a lowly state of life, or one of wealth and honor?](#)
4. [Should He have lived in conformity with the Law?](#)

Article 1. Whether Christ should have associated with men, or led a solitary life?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should not have associated with men, but should have led a solitary life. For it behooved [Christ](#) to show by His manner of life not only that He was [man](#), but also that He was [God](#). But it is not becoming that [God](#) should associate with men, for it is written ([Daniel 2:11](#)): "Except the gods, whose conversation is not with men"; and the [Philosophers](#) says (Polit. i) that he who lives alone is "either a beast"--that is, if he do this from being wild--"or a god," if his motive be the [contemplation](#) of [truth](#). Therefore it seems that it was not becoming for [Christ](#) to associate with men.

Objection 2. Further, while He lived in mortal flesh, it behooved [Christ](#) to lead a most perfect life. But the most perfect is the contemplative life, as we have stated in the II-II, 182, 1, 2. Now, solitude is most suitable to the contemplative life; according to [Hosea 2:14](#): "I will lead her into the wilderness, and I will speak to her heart." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) should have led a solitary life.

Objection 3. Further, [Christ's](#) manner of life should have been uniform: because it should always have given evidence of that which is best. But at times [Christ](#) avoided the crowd and sought lonely places: hence [Remigius](#) [Cf. Catena Aurea, Matth. 5:1], commenting on Matthew, says: "We read that [our Lord](#) had three places of refuge: the ship, the mountain, the desert; to one or other of

which He betook Himself whenever he was harassed by the crowd." Therefore He ought always to have led a solitary life.

On the contrary, It is written ([Baruch 3:38](#)): "Afterwards He was seen upon earth and conversed with [men](#)."

I answer that, [Christ's](#) manner of life had to be in keeping with the end of His [Incarnation](#), by reason of which He came into the world. Now He came into the world, first, that He might publish the [truth](#). thus He says Himself ([John 18:37](#)): "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony to the [truth](#)." Hence it was fitting not that He should hide Himself by leading a solitary life, but that He should appear openly and preach in public. Wherefore ([Luke 4:42-43](#)) He says to those who wished to stay Him: "To other cities also I must preach the [kingdom of God](#): for therefore am I sent."

Secondly, He came in order to free men from [sin](#); according to [1 Timothy 1:15](#): "[Christ Jesus](#) came into this world to save sinners." And hence, as [Chrysostom](#) says, "although [Christ](#) might, while staying in the same place, have drawn all [men](#) to Himself, to hear His preaching, yet He did not do so; thus giving us the example to go about and seek those who perish, like the shepherd in his search of the lost sheep, and the physician in his attendance on the sick."

Thirdly, He came that by Him "we might have access to [God](#)," as it is written ([Romans 5:2](#)). And thus it was fitting that He should give men confidence in approaching Him by associating familiarly with them. Wherefore it is written ([Matthew 9:10](#)): "It came to pass as He was sitting . . . in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came, and sat down with [Jesus](#) and His [disciples](#)." On which [Jerome](#) comments as follows: "They had seen the publican who had been converted from a [sinful](#) to a better life: and consequently they did not [despair](#) of their own [salvation](#)."

Reply to Objection 1. [Christ](#) wished to make His Godhead [known](#) through His [human nature](#). And therefore, since it is proper to [man](#) to do so, He associated with men, at the same time manifesting His Godhead to all, by preaching and working [miracles](#), and by leading among men a blameless and righteous life.

Reply to Objection 2. As stated in the II-II, 182, 1; SS, 188, 6, the contemplative life is, absolutely speaking, more perfect than the active life, because the latter is taken up with bodily actions: yet

that form of active life in which a man, by preaching and teaching, delivers to others the fruits of his [contemplation](#), is more perfect than the life that stops at [contemplation](#), because such a life is built on an abundance of [contemplation](#), and consequently such was the life chosen by [Christ](#).

Reply to Objection 3. [Christ's](#) action is our instruction. And therefore, in order to teach preachers that they ought not to be for ever before the public, [our Lord](#) withdrew Himself sometimes from the crowd. We are told of three reasons for His doing this. First, for the rest of the body: hence ([Mark 6:31](#)) it is stated that [our Lord](#) said to His [disciples](#): "Come apart into a desert place, and rest a little. For there were many coming and going: and they had not so much as time to eat." But sometimes it was for the sake of [prayer](#); thus it is written ([Luke 6:12](#)): "It came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to [pray](#); and He passed the whole night in the [prayer](#) of [God](#)." On this [Ambrose](#) remarks that "by His example He instructs us in the precepts of [virtue](#)." And sometimes He did so in order to teach us to avoid the favor of [men](#).

Wherefore [Chrysostom](#), [commenting](#) on [Matthew 5:1](#), [Jesus](#), "seeing the multitude, went up into a mountain," says: "By sitting not in the city and in the market-place, but on a mountain and in a place of solitude, He taught us to do nothing for show, and to withdraw from the crowd, especially when we have to discourse of needful things."

Article 2. Whether it was becoming that Christ should lead an austere life in this world?

Objection 1. It would seem that it was becoming that [Christ](#) should lead an austere life in this world. For [Christ](#) preached the perfection of life much more than John did. But John led an austere life in order that he might persuade men by his example to embrace a perfect life; for it is written ([Matthew 3:4](#)) that "the same John had his garment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins: and his meat was locusts and wild honey"; on which [Chrysostom](#) comments as follows (Hom. x): "It was a marvelous and strange thing to behold such austerity in a [human](#) frame: which thing also particularly attracted the [Jews](#)." Therefore it seems that an austere life was much more becoming to [Christ](#).

Objection 2. Further, abstinence is ordained to [continency](#); for it is written ([Hosea 4:10](#)): "They shall eat and shall not be filled; they have committed fornication, and have not ceased." But [Christ](#) both observed [continency](#) in Himself and proposed it to be observed by

others when He said ([Matthew 19:12](#)): "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the [kingdom of heaven](#): he that can take it let him take it." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) should have observed an austere life both in Himself and in His [disciples](#).

Objection 3. Further, it seems absurd for a man to begin a stricter form of life and to return to an easier life: for one might quote to his discredit that which is written, [Luke 14:30](#): "This [man](#) began to build, and was not able to finish." Now [Christ](#) began a very strict life after His [baptism](#), remaining in the desert and [fasting](#) for "forty days and forty nights." Therefore it seems unbecoming that, after leading such a strict life, He should return to the common manner of living.

On the contrary, It is written ([Matthew 11:19](#)): "The [Son of Man](#) came eating and drinking."

I answer that, As stated above ([Article 1](#)), it was in keeping with the end of [Incarnation](#) that [Christ](#) should not lead a solitary life, but should associate with men. Now it is most fitting that he who associates with others should conform to their manner of living; according to the words of the [Apostle](#) ([1 Corinthians 9:22](#)): "I became all things to all [men](#)." And therefore it was most fitting that [Christ](#) should conform to others in the [matter](#) of eating and drinking. Hence [Augustine](#) says (*Contra Faust.* xvi) that "John is described as 'neither eating nor drinking,' because he did not take the same food as the [Jews](#). Therefore, unless [our Lord](#) had taken it, it would not be said of Him, in contrast, 'eating and drinking.'"

Reply to Objection 1. In His manner of living [our Lord](#) gave an example of perfection as to all those things which of themselves relate to [salvation](#). Now abstinence in eating and drinking does not of itself relate to [salvation](#), according to [Romans 14:17](#): "The [kingdom of God](#) is not meat and drink." And [Augustine](#) (*De Qq. Evang.* ii, qu. 11) explains [Matthew 11:19](#), "Wisdom is justified by her children," saying that this is because the [holy apostles](#) "understood that the [kingdom of God](#) does not consist in eating and drinking, but in suffering indigence with equanimity," for they are neither uplifted by affluence, nor distressed by want. Again (*De Doctr. Christ.* iii), he says that in all such things "it is not making use of them, but the wantonness of the user, that is [sinful](#)." Now both these lives are lawful and praiseworthy--namely, that a man withdraw from the society of other men and observe abstinence; and that he associate with

other men and live like them. And therefore [our Lord](#) wished to give men an example of either kind of life.

As to John, according to [Chrysostom](#) (Hom. xxxvii super Matth.), "he exhibited no more than his life and righteous conduct . . . but [Christ](#) had the testimony also of [miracles](#). Leaving, therefore, John to be illustrious by his [fasting](#), He Himself came the opposite way, both coming unto publicans' tables and eating and drinking."

Reply to Objection 2. Just as by abstinence other men acquire the power of self-restraint, so also [Christ](#), in Himself and in those that are His, subdued the flesh by the power of His Godhead. Wherefore, as we read [Matthew 9:14](#), the Pharisees and the [disciples](#) of John fasted, but not the [disciples](#) of [Christ](#). On which [Bede](#) comments, saying that "John drank neither wine nor strong drink: because abstinence is [meritorious](#) where the [nature](#) is weak. But why should [our Lord](#), whose right by [nature](#) it is to forgive [sins](#), avoid those whom He could make [holier](#) than such as abstain?"

Reply to Objection 3. As [Chrysostom](#) says (Hom. xiii super Matth.), "that thou mightest learn how great a [good](#) is [fasting](#), and how it is a shield against the [devil](#), and that after [baptism](#) thou shouldst give thyself up, not to luxury, but to [fasting](#)--for this [cause](#) did He fast, not as needing it Himself, but as teaching us . . . And for this did He proceed no further than [Moses](#) and Elias, lest His assumption of our flesh might seem incredible." The mystical meaning, as [Gregory](#) says (Hom. xvi in Evang.), is that by [Christ's](#) example the number "forty" is observed in His fast, because the power of the "[decatalogue](#)" is fulfilled throughout the four books of the Holy Gospel: since ten multiplied by four amounts to forty." Or, because "we live in this mortal body composed of the four elements, and by its lusts we transgress the commandments of the Lord, which are expressed in the [decatalogue](#)." Or, according to [Augustine](#) (QQ. lxxxiii, qu. 81): "To [know](#) the [Creator](#) and the creature is the entire teaching of wisdom. The Creator is the [Trinity](#), the Father, the Son, and the [Holy Ghost](#). Now the creature is partly invisible, as the [soul](#), to which the number three may be ascribed, for we are commanded to love [God](#) in three ways, 'with our whole heart, our whole [soul](#), and our whole mind'; and partly visible, as the body, to which the number four is applicable on account of its being subject to heat, moisture, cold, and dryness. Hence if we multiply ten, which may be referred to the entire moral code, by four, which number may be applied to the body, because it is the body that executes the [law](#), the product is the

number forty: in which," consequently, "the time during which we sigh and grieve is shown forth." And yet there was no inconsistency in [Christ's](#) returning to the common manner of living, after [fasting](#) and (retiring into the) desert. For it is becoming to that kind of life, which we hold [Christ](#) to have embraced, wherein a man delivers to others the fruits of his [contemplation](#), that he devote himself first of all to [contemplation](#), and that he afterwards come down to the publicity of active life by associating with other men. Hence [Bede](#) says on [Mark 2:18](#): "[Christ](#) fasted, that thou mightest not disobey the commandment; He ate with sinners, that thou mightest discern His sanctity and acknowledge His power."

Article 3. Whether Christ should have led a life of poverty in this world?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should not have led a life of [poverty](#) in this world. Because [Christ](#) should have embraced the most eligible form of life. But the most eligible form of life is that which is a mean between [riches](#) and [poverty](#); for it is written ([Proverbs 30:8](#)): "Give me neither beggary nor [riches](#); give me only the necessities of life." Therefore [Christ](#) should have led a life, not of [poverty](#), but of moderation.

Objection 2. Further, external [wealth](#) is ordained to bodily use as to food and raiment. But [Christ](#) conformed His manner of life to those among whom He lived, in the [matter](#) of food and raiment. Therefore it seems that He should have observed the ordinary manner of life as to [riches](#) and [poverty](#), and have avoided extreme [poverty](#).

Objection 3. Further, [Christ](#) specially invited men to imitate His example of [humility](#), according to [Matthew 11:29](#): "Learn of Me, because I am meek and [humble](#) of heart." But [humility](#) is most commendable in the rich; thus it is written ([1 Timothy 6:11](#)): "Charge the rich of this world not to be high-minded." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) should not have chosen a life of [poverty](#).

On the contrary, It is written ([Matthew 8:20](#)): "The [Son of Man](#) hath not where to lay His head": as though He were to say as [Jerome](#) observes: "Why desirest thou to follow Me for the sake of [riches](#) and worldly gain, since I am so poor that I have not even the smallest dwelling-place, and I am sheltered by a roof that is not Mine?" And on [Matthew 17:26](#): "That we may not [scandalize](#) them, go to the sea," [Jerome](#) says: "This incident, taken literally, affords edification to those who hear it when they are told that [our Lord](#) was

so poor that He had not the wherewithal to pay the tax for Himself and His [apostles](#)."

I answer that, It was fitting for [Christ](#) to lead a life of [poverty](#) in this world. First, because this was in keeping with the [duty](#) of preaching, for which purpose He says that He came ([Mark 1:38](#)): "Let us go into the neighboring towns and cities, that I may preach there also: for to this purpose am I come." Now in order that the preachers of [God's](#) word may be able to give all their time to preaching, they must be wholly free from care of worldly matters: which is impossible for those who are possessed of [wealth](#). Wherefore the Lord Himself, when sending the [apostles](#) to preach, said to them ([Matthew 10:9](#)): "Do not possess gold nor silver." And the [apostles](#) ([Acts 6:2](#)) say: "It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of [God](#) and serve tables."

Secondly, because just as He took upon Himself the death of the body in order to bestow [spiritual](#) life on us, so did He bear bodily [poverty](#), in order to enrich us spiritually, according to [2 Corinthians 8:9](#): "You [know](#) the [grace](#) of [our Lord Jesus Christ](#): that . . . He became poor for our [[Vulgate](#): 'your'] sakes that through His [poverty](#) we [[Vulgate](#): 'you'] might be rich."

Thirdly, lest if He were rich His preaching might be ascribed to cupidity. Wherefore [Jerome](#) says on [Matthew 10:9](#), that if the [disciples](#) had been possessed of [wealth](#), "they had seemed to preach for gain, not for the [salvation](#) of [mankind](#)." And the same reason applies to [Christ](#).

Fourthly, that the more lowly He seemed by reason of His [poverty](#), the greater might the power of His Godhead be shown to be. Hence in a sermon of the Council of Ephesus (P. iii, c. ix) we read: "He chose all that was poor and despicable, all that was of small account and hidden from the majority, that we might recognize His Godhead to have transformed the terrestrial sphere. For this reason did He choose a poor [maid](#) for His Mother, a poorer birthplace; for this reason did He live in want. Learn this from the manger."

Reply to Objection 1. Those who wish to live virtuously need to avoid abundance of [riches](#) and beggary, in as far as these are occasions of [sin](#): since abundance of [riches](#) is an occasion for being proud; and beggary is an occasion of thieving and lying, or even of perjury. But forasmuch as [Christ](#) was incapable of [sin](#), He had not the same motive as Solomon for avoiding these things. Yet neither is

every kind of beggary an occasion of [theft](#) and perjury, as Solomon seems to add ([Proverbs 30:8](#)); but only that which is involuntary, in order to avoid which, a man is guilty of [theft](#) and perjury. But [voluntary poverty](#) is not open to this danger: and such was the [poverty](#) chosen by [Christ](#).

Reply to Objection 2. A [man](#) may feed and clothe himself in conformity with others, not only by possessing [riches](#), but also by receiving the necessities of life from those who are rich. This is what happened in regard to [Christ](#): for it is written ([Luke 8:2-3](#)) that certain [women](#) followed [Christ](#) and "ministered unto Him of their [substance](#)." For, as [Jerome](#) says on [Matthew 27:55](#), "It was a Jewish custom, nor was it thought wrong for [women](#), following the ancient tradition of their nation, out of their private means to provide their instructors with food and clothing. But as this might give [scandal](#) to the [heathens](#), [Paul](#) says that he gave it up": thus it was possible for them to be fed out of a common fund, but not to possess [wealth](#), without their [duty](#) of preaching being hindered by anxiety.

Reply to Objection 3. Humility is not much to be praised in one who is poor of [necessity](#). But in one who, like [Christ](#), is poor willingly, [poverty](#) itself is a sign of very great [humility](#).

Article 4. Whether Christ conformed His conduct to the Law?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) did not conform His conduct to the [Law](#). For the [Law](#) forbade any work whatsoever to be done on the Sabbath, since [God](#) "rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done." But He healed a man on the Sabbath, and commanded him to take up his bed. Therefore it seems that He did not conform His conduct to the [Law](#).

Objection 2. Further, what [Christ](#) taught, that He also did, according to [Acts 1:1](#): "[Jesus](#) began to do and to teach." But He taught ([Matthew 15:11](#)) that "not" all "that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man": and this is contrary to the precept of the [Law](#), which declared that a man was made [unclean](#) by eating and touching certain animals, as stated [Leviticus 11](#). Therefore it seems that He did not conform His conduct to the [Law](#).

Objection 3. Further, he who consents to anything is of the same mind as he who does it, according to [Romans 1:32](#): "Not only

they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them." But [Christ](#), by excusing His [disciples](#), consented to their breaking the [Law](#) by plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath; as is related [Matthew 12:1-8](#). Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) did not conform His conduct to the [Law](#).

On the contrary, It is written ([Matthew 5:17](#)): "Do not think that I am come to destroy the [Law](#) or the Prophets." Commenting on these words, [Chrysostom](#) says: "He fulfilled the [Law](#) . . . in one way, by transgressing none of the precepts of the [Law](#); secondly, by justifying us through [faith](#), which the [Law](#), in the letter, was unable to do."

I answer that, [Christ](#) conformed His conduct in all things to the precepts of the [Law](#). In token of this He wished even to be [circumcised](#); for the [circumcision](#) is a kind of protestation of a man's purpose of keeping the [Law](#), according to [Galatians 5:3](#): "I testify to every [man](#) circumcising himself, that he is a debtor to do the whole [Law](#)."

And [Christ](#), indeed, wished to conform His conduct to the [Law](#), first, to show His approval of the [Old Law](#). Secondly, that by obeying the [Law](#) He might perfect it and bring it to an end in His own self, so as to show that it was ordained to Him. Thirdly, to deprive the [Jews](#) of an excuse for slandering Him. Fourthly, in order to deliver men from subjection to the [Law](#), according to [Galatians 4:4-5](#): "[God](#) sent His Son . . . made under the [Law](#) that He might redeem them who were under the [Law](#)."

Reply to Objection 1. [Our Lord](#) excuses Himself from any transgression of the [Law](#) in this matter, for three reasons. First, the precept of the hallowing of the Sabbath forbids not Divine work, but [human](#) work: for though [God](#) ceased on the seventh day from the creation of new creatures, yet He ever works by keeping and governing His creatures. Now that [Christ](#) wrought [miracles](#) was a Divine work: hence He says ([John 5:17](#)): "My Father worketh until now; and I work."

Secondly, He excuses Himself on the ground that this precept does not forbid works which are needful for bodily health. Wherefore He says ([Luke 13:15](#)): "Doth not every one of you on the Sabbath-day loose his ox or his ass from the manger, and lead them to water?" And farther on ([Luke 14:5](#)): "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fall into a pit, and will not immediately draw him out on

the [Sabbath-day](#)?" Now it is manifest that the [miraculous](#) works done by [Christ](#) related to health of body and [soul](#).

Thirdly, because this precept does not forbid works pertaining to the worship of [God](#). Wherefore He says ([Matthew 12:5](#)): "Have ye not read in the [Law](#) that on the Sabbath-days the [priests](#) in the Temple break the Sabbath, and are without blame?" And ([John 7:23](#)) it is written that a man receives [circumcision](#) on the [Sabbath-day](#). Now when [Christ](#) commanded the paralytic to carry his bed on the [Sabbath-day](#), this pertained to the worship of [God](#), i.e. to the praise of [God's](#) power. And thus it is clear that He did not break the Sabbath: although the [Jews](#) threw this [false](#) accusation in His face, saying ([John 9:16](#)): "This [man](#) is not of [God](#), who keepeth not the Sabbath."

Reply to Objection 2. By those words [Christ](#) wished to show that [man](#) is made [unclean](#) as to his [soul](#), by the use of any sort of foods considered not in their [nature](#), but only in some signification. And that certain foods are in the [Law](#) called "[unclean](#)" is due to some signification; whence [Augustine](#) says (Contra Faust. vi): "If a question be raised about swine and lambs, both are clean by [nature](#), since 'all [God's](#) creatures are [good](#)'; but by a certain signification lambs are clean and swine [unclean](#)."

Reply to Objection 3. The [disciples](#) also, when, being hungry, they plucked the ears of corn on the Sabbath, are to be excused from transgressing the [Law](#), since they were pressed by hunger: just as David did not transgress the [Law](#) when, through being compelled by hunger, he ate the loaves which it was not lawful for him to eat.

Question 41. Christ's temptation

1. [Was it becoming that Christ should be tempted?](#)
2. [The place](#)
3. [The time](#)
4. [The mode and order of the temptation](#)

Article 1. Whether it was becoming that Christ should be tempted?

Objection 1. It would seem that it was not becoming for [Christ](#) to be tempted. For to [tempt](#) is to make an experiment, which is not

done save in regard to something unknown. But the power of [Christ](#) was [known](#) even to the [demons](#); for it is written ([Luke 4:41](#)) that "He suffered them not to speak, for they [knew](#) that He was [Christ](#)." Therefore it seems that it was unbecoming for [Christ](#) to be tempted.

Objection 2. Further, [Christ](#) was come in order to destroy the works of the [devil](#), according to [1 John 3:8](#): "For this purpose the [Son of God](#) appeared, that He might destroy the works of the [devil](#)." But it is not for the same to destroy the works of a certain one and to suffer them. Therefore it seems unbecoming that [Christ](#) should suffer Himself to be tempted by the [devil](#).

Objection 3. Further, [temptation](#) is from a threefold source--the flesh, the world, and the [devil](#). But [Christ](#) was not tempted either by the flesh or by the world. Therefore neither should He have been tempted by the [devil](#).

On the contrary, It is written ([Matthew 4:1](#)): "[Jesus](#) was led by the [Spirit](#) into the desert to be tempted by the [devil](#)."

I answer that, [Christ](#) wished to be tempted; first that He might strengthen us against [temptations](#). Hence [Gregory](#) says in a [homily](#) (xvi in Evang.): "It was not unworthy of our Redeemer to wish to be tempted, who came also to be slain; in order that by His [temptations](#) He might conquer our [temptations](#), just as by His death He overcame our death."

Secondly, that we might be warned, so that none, however [holy](#), may think himself safe or free from [temptation](#). Wherefore also He wished to be tempted after His [baptism](#), because, as [Hilary](#) says (Super Matth., cap. iii.): "The [temptations](#) of the [devil](#) assail those principally who are sanctified, for he desires, above all, to overcome the [holy](#). Hence also it is written ([Sirach 2](#)): Son, when thou comest to the service of [God](#), stand in [justice](#) and in fear, and prepare thy [soul](#) for [temptation](#)."

Thirdly, in order to give us an example: to teach us, to wit, how to overcome the [temptations](#) of the [devil](#). Hence [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. iv) that [Christ](#) "allowed Himself to be tempted" by the [devil](#), "that He might be our Mediator in overcoming [temptations](#), not only by helping us, but also by giving us an example."

Fourthly, in order to fill us with confidence in His mercy. Hence it is written ([Hebrews 4:15](#)): "We have not a [high-priest](#), who cannot have compassion on our infirmities, but one tempted in all things like as we are, without [sin](#)."

Reply to Objection 1. As [Augustine](#) says (De Civ. Dei ix):

"[Christ](#) was [known](#) to the [demons](#) only so far as He willed; not as the Author of [eternal life](#), but as the [cause](#) of certain temporal effects," from which they formed a certain conjecture that [Christ](#) was the [Son of God](#). But since they also observed in Him certain signs of [human](#) frailty, they did not [know](#) for certain that He was the [Son of God](#): wherefore (the [devil](#)) wished to [tempt](#) Him. This is implied by the words of [Matthew 4:2-3](#), saying that, after "He was hungry, the tempter" came "to Him," because, as [Hilary](#) says (Super Matth., cap. iii), "Had not [Christ's](#) weakness in hungering betrayed His [human nature](#), the [devil](#) would not have dared to [tempt](#) Him." Moreover, this appears from the very manner of the [temptation](#), when he said: "If Thou be the [Son of God](#)." Which words [Ambrose](#) explains as follows (In Luc. iv): "What means this way of addressing Him, save that, though he [knew](#) that the [Son of God](#) was to come, yet he did not think that He had come in the weakness of the flesh?"

Reply to Objection 2. [Christ](#) came to destroy the works of the [devil](#), not by powerful [deeds](#), but rather by suffering from him and his members, so as to conquer the [devil](#) by righteousness, not by power; thus [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. xiii) that "the [devil](#) was to be overcome, not by the power of [God](#), but by righteousness." And therefore in regard to [Christ's temptation](#) we must consider what He did of His own will and what He suffered from the [devil](#). For that He allowed Himself to be tempted was due to His own will. Wherefore it is written ([Matthew 4:1](#)): "[Jesus](#) was led by the [Spirit](#) into the desert, to be tempted by the [devil](#)"; and [Gregory](#) (Hom. xvi in Evang.) says this is to be understood of the [Holy Ghost](#), to wit, that "thither did His Spirit lead Him, where the [wicked](#) spirit would find Him and [tempt](#) Him." But He suffered from the [devil](#) in being "taken up" on to "the pinnacle of the Temple" and again "into a very high mountain." Nor is it strange, as [Gregory](#) observes, "that He allowed Himself to be taken by him on to a mountain, who allowed Himself to be crucified by His members." And we understand Him to have been taken up by the [devil](#), not, as it were, by force, but because, as [Origen](#) says (Hom. xxi super Luc.), "He followed Him in the course of His [temptation](#) like a wrestler advancing of his own accord."

Reply to Objection 3. As the [Apostle](#) says ([Hebrews 4:15](#)), [Christ](#) wished to be "tempted in all things, without [sin](#)." Now [temptation](#) which comes from an enemy can be without [sin](#): because it comes about by merely outward suggestion. But [temptation](#) which comes from the flesh cannot be without [sin](#), because such a [temptation](#) is [caused](#) by pleasure and [concupiscence](#); and, as [Augustine](#) says (De Civ. Dei xix), "it is not without [sin](#) that 'the flesh desireth against the spirit.'" And hence [Christ](#) wished to be tempted by an enemy, but not by the flesh.

Article 2. Whether Christ should have been tempted in the desert?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should not have been tempted in the desert. Because [Christ](#) wished to be tempted in order to give us an example, as stated above ([Article 1](#)). But an example should be set openly before those who are to follow it. Therefore He should not have been tempted in the desert.

Objection 2. Further, [Chrysostom](#) says (Hom. xii in Matth.): "Then most especially does the [devil](#) assail by [tempting](#) us, when he sees us alone. Thus did he [tempt](#) the [woman](#) in the beginning when he found her apart from her husband." Hence it seems that, by going into the desert to be tempted, He exposed Himself to [temptation](#). Since, therefore, His [temptation](#) is an example to us, it seems that others too should take such steps as will lead them into [temptation](#). And yet this seems a dangerous thing to do, since rather should we avoid the occasion of being tempted.

Objection 3. Further, [Matthew 4:5](#), [Christ's](#) second [temptation](#) is set down, in which "the [devil](#) took" [Christ](#) up "into the Holy City, and set Him upon the pinnacle of the Temple": which is certainly not in the desert. Therefore He was not tempted in the desert only.

On the contrary, It is written ([Mark 1:13](#)) that [Jesus](#) "was in the desert forty days and forty nights, and was tempted by Satan."

I answer that, As stated above (1, ad 2), [Christ](#) of His own [free-will](#) exposed Himself to be tempted by the [devil](#), just as by His own [free-will](#) He submitted to be killed by His members; else the [devil](#) would not have dared to approach Him. Now the [devil](#) prefers to assail a man who is alone, for, as it is written ([Ecclesiastes 4:12](#)), "if a man prevail against one, two shall withstand him." And so it was that [Christ](#) went out into the desert, as to a field of battle, to

be tempted there by the [devil](#). Hence [Ambrose](#) says on [Luke 4:1](#), that "[Christ](#) was led into the desert for the purpose of provoking the [devil](#). For had he," i.e. the [devil](#), "not fought, He," i.e. [Christ](#), "would not have conquered." He adds other reasons, saying that "[Christ](#) in doing this set forth the [mystery](#) of [Adam's](#) delivery from exile," who had been expelled from paradise into the desert, and "set an example to us, by showing that the [devil](#) envies those who strive for better things."

Reply to Objection 1. [Christ](#) is set as an example to all through [faith](#), according to [Hebrews 12:2](#): "Looking on [Jesus](#), the author and finisher of [faith](#)." Now [faith](#), as it is written ([Romans 10:17](#)), "cometh by hearing," but not by seeing: nay, it is even said ([John 20:29](#)): "Blessed are they that have not seen and have [believed](#)." And therefore, in order that [Christ's temptation](#) might be an example to us, it behooved that men should not see it, and it was enough that they should hear it related.

Reply to Objection 2. The occasions of [temptation](#) are twofold. one is on the part of [man](#)--for instance, when a man [causes](#) himself to be near to [sin](#) by not avoiding the occasion of [sinning](#). And such occasions of [temptation](#) should be avoided, as it is written of Lot ([Genesis 19:17](#)): "Neither stay thou in all the country about" Sodom.

Another occasion of [temptation](#) is on the part of the [devil](#), who always "envies those who strive for better things," as [Ambrose](#) says (In Luc. iv, 1). And such occasions of [temptation](#) are not to be avoided. Hence [Chrysostom](#) says (Hom. v in Matth. [From the supposititious Opus Imperfectum]): "Not only [Christ](#) was led into the desert by the [Spirit](#), but all [God's](#) children that have the [Holy Ghost](#). For it is not enough for them to sit idle; the [Holy Ghost](#) urges them to endeavor to do something great: which is for them to be in the desert from the [devil's](#) standpoint, for no unrighteousness, in which the [devil](#) delights, is there. Again, every [good](#) work, compared to the flesh and the world, is the desert; because it is not according to the [will](#) of the flesh and of the world." Now, there is no danger in giving the [devil](#) such an occasion of [temptation](#); since the help of the [Holy Ghost](#), who is the Author of the perfect [deed](#), is more powerful* than the assault of the [envious devil](#). [All the codices read 'majus.' One of the earliest printed editions has 'magis,' which has much to commend it, since [St. Thomas](#) is commenting the text quoted from [St. Chrysostom](#). The translation would run thus: 'since rather is it (the [temptation](#)) a help from the [Holy Ghost](#), who,' etc.].

Reply to Objection 3. Some say that all the [temptations](#) took place in the desert. Of these some say that [Christ](#) was led into the Holy City, not really, but in an [imaginary](#) vision; while others say that the Holy City itself, i.e. Jerusalem, is called "a desert," because it was deserted by [God](#). But there is no need for this explanation. For Mark says that He was tempted in the desert by the [devil](#), but not that He was tempted in the desert only.

Article 3. Whether Christ's temptation should have taken place after His fast?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ's temptation](#) should not have taken place after His fast. For it has been said above (Question 40, Article 2) that an austere mode of life was not becoming to [Christ](#). But it savors of extreme austerity that He should have eaten nothing for forty days and forty nights, for [Gregory](#) (Hom. xvi inn Evang.) explains the fact that "He fasted forty days and forty nights," saying that "during that time He partook of no food whatever." It seems, therefore, that He should not thus have fasted before His [temptation](#).

Objection 2. Further, it is written ([Mark 1:13](#)) that "He was in the desert forty days and forty nights; and was tempted by Satan." Now, He fasted forty days and forty nights. Therefore it seems that He was tempted by the [devil](#), not after, but during, His fast.

Objection 3. Further, we read that [Christ](#) fasted but once. But He was tempted by the [devil](#), not only once, for it is written ([Luke 4:13](#)) "that all the [temptation](#) being ended, the [devil](#) departed from Him for a time." As, therefore, He did not fast before the second [temptation](#), so neither should He have fasted before the first.

On the contrary, It is written ([Matthew 4:2-3](#)): "When He had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards He was hungry": and then "the tempter came to Him."

I answer that, It was becoming that [Christ](#) should wish to fast before His temptation. First, in order to give us an example. For since we are all in urgent need of strengthening ourselves against [temptation](#), as stated above ([Article 1](#)), by [fasting](#) before being tempted, He teaches us the need of [fasting](#) in order to equip ourselves against [temptation](#). Hence the [Apostle](#) ([2 Corinthians 6:5-7](#)) reckons "fastings" together with the "armor of [justice](#)."

Secondly, in order to show that the [devil](#) assails with [temptations](#) even those who fast, as likewise those who are given to other [good](#) works. And so Christ's [temptation](#) took place after His fast, as also after His [baptism](#). Hence since rather [Chrysostom](#) says (Hom. xiii super Matth.): "To instruct thee how great a [good](#) is [fasting](#), and how it is a most powerful shield against the [devil](#); and that after [baptism](#) thou shouldst give thyself up, not to luxury, but to [fasting](#); for this [cause](#) Christ fasted, not as needing it Himself, but as teaching us."

Thirdly, because after the fast, hunger followed, which made the [devil](#) dare to approach Him, as already stated (1, ad 1). Now, when "[our Lord](#) was hungry," says [Hilary](#) (Super Matth. iii), "it was not because He was overcome by want of food, but because He abandoned His manhood to its [nature](#). For the [devil](#) was to be conquered, not by [God](#), but by the flesh." Wherefore [Chrysostom](#) too says: "He proceeded no farther than [Moses](#) and Elias, lest His assumption of our flesh might seem incredible."

Reply to Objection 1. It was becoming for [Christ](#) not to adopt an extreme form of austere life in order to show Himself outwardly in conformity with those to whom He preached. Now, no one should take up the office of preacher unless he be already cleansed and perfect in [virtue](#), according to what is said of [Christ](#), that "[Jesus](#) began to do and to teach" ([Acts 1:1](#)). Consequently, immediately after His [baptism](#) Christ adopted an austere form of life, in order to teach us the need of taming the flesh before passing on to the office of preaching, according to the [Apostle](#) ([1 Corinthians 9:27](#)): "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway."

Reply to Objection 2. These words of Mark may be understood as meaning that "He was in the desert forty days and forty nights," and that He fasted during that time: and the words, "and He was tempted by Satan," may be taken as referring, not to the time during which He fasted, but to the time that followed: since Matthew says that "after He had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards He was hungry," thus affording the [devil](#) a pretext for approaching Him. And so the words that follow, and the [angels](#) ministered to Him, are to be taken in sequence, which is clear from the words of Matthew ([4:11](#)): "Then the [devil](#) left Him," i.e. after the [temptation](#), "and behold [angels](#) came and ministered to Him." And as to the words inserted by Mark, "and He was with the beasts," according to [Chrysostom](#) (Hom. xiii in Matth.), they are set down in

order to describe the desert as being impassable to [man](#) and full of beasts.

On the other hand, according to [Bede's](#) exposition of [Mark 1:12-13](#), [our Lord](#) was tempted forty days and forty nights. But this is not to be understood of the visible [temptations](#) which are related by Matthew and Luke, and occurred after the fast, but of certain other assaults which perhaps [Christ](#) suffered from the [devil](#) during that time of His fast.

Reply to Objection 3. As [Ambrose](#) says on [Luke 4:13](#), the [devil](#) departed from [Christ](#) "for a time, because, later on, he returned, not to [tempt](#) Him, but to assail Him openly"--namely, at the time of His Passion. Nevertheless, He seemed in this later assault to [tempt Christ](#) to dejection and [hatred](#) of His neighbor; just as in the desert he had tempted Him to gluttonous pleasure and idolatrous contempt of [God](#).

Article 4. Whether the mode and order of the temptation were becoming?

Objection 1. It would seem that the mode and order of the [temptation](#) were unbecoming. For the [devil](#) tempts in order to induce us to [sin](#). But if [Christ](#) had assuaged His bodily hunger by changing the stones into bread, He would not have [sinned](#); just as neither did He [sin](#) when He multiplied the loaves, which was no less a [miracle](#), in order to succor the hungry crowd. Therefore it seems that this was nowise a [temptation](#).

Objection 2. Further, a counselor is inconsistent if he persuades the contrary to what he intends. But when the [devil](#) set [Christ](#) on a pinnacle of the Temple, he purposed to [tempt](#) Him to [pride](#) or vainglory. Therefore it was inconsistent to urge Him to cast Himself thence: for this would be contrary to [pride](#) or vainglory, which always seeks to rise.

Objection 3. Further, one [temptation](#) should lead to one [sin](#). But in the [temptation](#) on the mountain he counseled two [sins](#)--namely, [covetousness](#) and [idolatry](#). Therefore the mode of the [temptation](#) was unfitting.

Objection 4. Further, [temptations](#) are ordained to [sin](#). But there are seven deadly [sins](#), as we have stated in I-II, 84, 4. But the tempter only deals with three, viz. [gluttony](#), vainglory,

and [covetousness](#). Therefore the [temptation](#) seems to have been incomplete.

Objection 5. Further, after overcoming all the [vices](#), [man](#) is still tempted to [pride](#) or vainglory: since [pride](#) "worms itself in stealthily, and destroys even [good](#) works," as [Augustine](#) says (Ep. ccxi). Therefore Matthew unfittingly gives the last place to the [temptation](#) to [covetousness](#) on the mountain, and the second place to the [temptation](#) to vainglory in the Temple, especially since Luke puts them in the reverse order.

Objection 6. Further, [Jerome](#) says on [Matthew 4:4](#) that "[Christ](#) purposed to overcome the [devil](#) by [humility](#), not by might." Therefore He should not have repulsed him with a haughty rebuke, saying: "Begone, Satan."

Objection 7. Further, the gospel narrative seems to be [false](#). For it seems impossible that [Christ](#) could have been set on a pinnacle of the Temple without being seen by others. Nor is there to be found a mountain so high that all the world can be seen from it, so that all the kingdoms of the earth could be shown to [Christ](#) from its summit. It seems, therefore, that [Christ's temptation](#) is unfittingly described.

On the contrary is the authority of [Scripture](#).

I answer that, The [temptation](#) which comes from the enemy takes the form of a suggestion, as [Gregory](#) says (Hom. xvi in Evang.). Now a suggestion cannot be made to everybody in the same way; it must arise from those things towards which each one has an inclination. Consequently the [devil](#) does not straight away [tempt](#) the [spiritual man](#) to grave [sins](#), but he begins with lighter [sins](#), so as gradually to lead him to those of greater magnitude. Wherefore [Gregory](#) (Moral. xxxi), expounding [Job 39:25](#), "He smelleth the battle afar off, the encouraging of the captains and the shouting of the army," says: "The captains are fittingly described as encouraging, and the army as shouting. Because [vices](#) begin by insinuating themselves into the [mind](#) under some specious pretext: then they come on the [mind](#) in such numbers as to drag it into all sorts of folly, deafening it with their bestial clamor."

Thus, too, did the [devil](#) set about the [temptation](#) of the first [man](#). For at first he enticed his mind to consent to the eating of the forbidden fruit, saying ([Genesis 3:1](#)): "Why hath [God](#) commanded you that you should not eat of every tree of paradise?" Secondly [he tempted him]

to vainglory by saying: "Your eyes shall be opened." Thirdly, he led the [temptation](#) to the extreme height of [pride](#), saying: "You shall be as gods, [knowing good](#) and [evil](#)." This same order did he observe in [tempting Christ](#). For at first he tempted Him to that which men desire, however [spiritual](#) they may be--namely, the support of the corporeal [nature](#) by food. Secondly, he advanced to that [matter](#) in which [spiritual](#) men are sometimes found wanting, inasmuch as they do certain things for show, which pertains to vainglory. Thirdly, he led the [temptation](#) on to that in which no [spiritual](#) men, but only carnalmen, have a part--namely, to desire worldly [riches](#) and fame, to the extent of holding [God](#) in contempt. And so in the first two [temptations](#) he said: "If Thou be the [Son of God](#)"; but not in the third, which is inapplicable to [spiritual](#) men, who are sons of [God](#) by adoption, whereas it does apply to the two preceding [temptations](#).

And [Christ](#) resisted these [temptations](#) by quoting the authority of the [Law](#), not by enforcing His power, "so as to give more [honor](#) to His [human nature](#) and a greater punishment to His adversary, since the foe of the [human race](#) was vanquished, not as by [God](#), but as by [man](#)"; as Pope Leo says (Serm. 1, De Quadrag. 3).

Reply to Objection 1. To make use of what is needful for self-support is not the [sin](#) of [gluttony](#); but if a man do anything inordinate out of the desire for such support, it can pertain to the [sin](#) of [gluttony](#). Now it is inordinate for a man who has [human](#) assistance at his command to seek to obtain food [miraculously](#) for mere bodily support. Hence the Lord [miraculously](#) provided the children of [Israel](#) with manna in the desert, where there was no means of obtaining food otherwise. And in like fashion Christ [miraculously](#) provided the crowds with food in the desert, when there was no other means of getting food. But in order to assuage His hunger, He could have done otherwise than work a [miracle](#), as did [John the Baptist](#), according to Matthew (3:4); or He could have hastened to the neighboring country. Consequently the [devil](#) esteemed that if [Christ](#) was a mere [man](#), He would fall into [sin](#) by attempting to assuage His hunger by a [miracle](#).

Reply to Objection 2. It often happens that a man seeks to derive [glory](#) from external humiliation, whereby he is exalted by reason of [spiritual good](#). Hence [Augustine](#) says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 12): "It must be noted that it is possible to boast not only of the beauty and splendor of material things, but even of filthy squalor." And this is signified by the [devil](#) urging [Christ](#) to seek [spiritual glory](#) by casting His body down.

Reply to Objection 3. It is a [sin](#) to desire worldly [riches](#) and honors in an inordinate fashion. And the principal sign of this is when a man does something wrong in order to acquire such things. And so the [devil](#) was not satisfied with instigating to a desire for [riches](#) and honors, but he went so far as to [tempt Christ](#), for the sake of gaining possession of these things, to fall down and [adore](#) him, which is a very great crime, and against [God](#). Nor does he say merely, "if Thou wilt [adore](#) me," but he adds, "if, falling down"; because, as [Ambrose](#) says on [Luke 4:5](#): "Ambition harbors yet another danger within itself: for, while seeking to rule, it will serve; it will bow in submission that it may be crowned with [honor](#); and the higher it aims, the lower it abases itself."

In like manner [the [devil](#)] in the preceding [temptations](#) tried to lead [Christ] from the desire of one [sin](#) to the commission of another; thus from the desire of food he tried to lead Him to the vanity of the needless working of a [miracle](#); and from the desire of [glory](#) to [tempt God](#) by casting Himself headlong.

Reply to Objection 4. As [Ambrose](#) says on [Luke 4:13](#), [Scripture](#) would not have said that "'all the [temptation](#) being ended, the [devil](#) departed from Him,' unless the [matter](#) of all [sins](#) were included in the three [temptations](#) already related. For the [causes](#) of [temptations](#) are the [causes](#) of desires"--namely, "[lust](#) of the flesh, hope of [glory](#), eagerness for power."

Reply to Objection 5. As [Augustine](#) says (De Consensu Evang. ii): "It is not certain which happened first; whether the kingdoms of the earth were first shown to Him, and afterwards He was set on the pinnacle of the Temple; or the latter first, and the former afterwards. However, it matters not, provided it be made clear that all these things did take place." It may be that the Evangelists set these things in different orders, because sometimes cupidity arises from vainglory, sometimes the reverse happens.

Reply to Objection 6. When [Christ](#) had suffered the wrong of being tempted by the [devil](#) saying, "If Thou be the [Son of God](#) cast Thyself down," He was not troubled, nor did He upbraid the [devil](#). But when the [devil](#) usurped to himself the [honor](#) due to [God](#), saying, "All these things will I give Thee, if, falling down, Thou wilt [adore](#) me," He was exasperated, and repulsed him, saying, "Begone, Satan": that we might learn from His example to bear bravely insults leveled at ourselves, but not to allow ourselves so much as to listen to those which are aimed at [God](#).

Reply to Objection 7. As [Chrysostom](#) says (Hom. v in Matth.): "The [devil](#) set Him" (on a pinnacle of the Temple) "that He might be seen by all, whereas, unawares to the [devil](#), He acted in such sort that He was seen by none."

In regard to the words, "'He showed Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the [glory](#) of them,' we are not to understand that He saw the very kingdoms, with the cities and inhabitants, their gold and silver: but that the [devil](#) pointed out the quarters in which each kingdom or city lay, and set forth to Him in words their [glory](#) and estate." Or, again, as [Origen](#) says (Hom. xxx in Luc.), "he showed Him how, by means of the various [vices](#), he was the lord of the world."

Question 42. Christ's doctrine

1. [Should Christ have preached to the Jews only, or to the Gentiles also?](#)
2. [In preaching, should He have avoided the opposition of the Jews?](#)
3. [Should He have preached in an open or in a hidden manner?](#)
4. [Should He have preached by word only, or also by writing?](#)

Article 1. Whether Christ should have preached not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should have preached not only to the [Jews](#), but also to the [Gentiles](#). For it is written ([Isaiah 49:6](#)): "It is a small thing that thou shouldst be My servant to raise up the tribes of [Israel](#) [[Vulgate](#): '[Jacob](#)'] and to convert the dregs of [Jacob](#) [[Vulgate](#): '[Israel](#)']: behold, I have given thee to be the light of the [Gentiles](#), that thou mayest be my [salvation](#) even to the farthest part of the earth." But [Christ](#) gave light and [salvation](#) through His doctrine. Therefore it seems that it was "a small thing" that He preached to [Jews](#) alone, and not to the [Gentiles](#).

Objection 2. Further, as it is written ([Matthew 7:29](#)): "He was teaching them as one having power." Now the power of doctrine is made more manifest in the instruction of those who, like the [Gentiles](#), have received no tidings whatever; hence the [Apostle](#) says ([Romans 15:20](#)): "I have so preached the [[Vulgate](#): 'this'] gospel, not where [Christ](#) was named, lest I should build upon

another [man's](#) foundation." Therefore much rather should [Christ](#) have preached to the [Gentiles](#) than to the [Jews](#).

Objection 3. Further, it is more useful to instruct many than one. But [Christ](#) instructed some [individual Gentiles](#), such as the Samaritan [woman](#) ([John 4](#)) and the Chananæan [woman](#) ([Matthew 15](#)). Much more reason, therefore, was there for [Christ](#) to preach to the [Gentiles](#) in general.

On the contrary, [our Lord](#) said ([Matthew 15:24](#)): "I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of [Israel](#)." And ([Romans 10:15](#)) it is written: "How shall they preach unless they be sent?" Therefore [Christ](#) should not have preached to the [Gentiles](#).

I answer that, It was fitting that [Christ's](#) preaching, whether through Himself or through His [apostles](#), should be directed at first to the [Jews](#) alone. First, in order to show that by His coming the promises were fulfilled which had been made to the [Jews](#) of old, and not to the [Gentiles](#). Thus the [Apostle](#) says ([Romans 15:8](#)): "I say that [Christ](#) . . . was minister of the [circumcision](#)," i.e. the [apostle](#) and preacher of the [Jews](#), "for the [truth](#) of [God](#), to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

Secondly, in order to show that His coming was of [God](#); because, as is written [Romans 13:1](#): "Those things which are of [God](#) are well ordered [[Vulgate](#): 'those that are, are ordained of [God](#)']" [See Scriptural Index on this passage]. Now the right order demanded that the doctrine of [Christ](#) should be made [known](#) first to the [Jews](#), who, by [believing](#) in and worshiping one [God](#), were nearer to [God](#), and that it should be transmitted through them to the [Gentiles](#): just as in the heavenly [hierarchy](#) the Divine enlightenment comes to the lower [angels](#) through the higher. Hence on [Matthew 15:24](#), "I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost in the house of [Israel](#)," [Jerome](#) says: "He does not mean by this that He was not sent to the [Gentiles](#), but that He was sent to the [Jews](#) first." And so we read ([Isaiah 66:19](#)): "I will send of them that shall be saved," i.e. of the [Jews](#), "to the [Gentiles](#). . . and they shall declare My [glory](#) unto the [Gentiles](#)."

Thirdly, in order to deprive the [Jews](#) of ground for quibbling. Hence on [Matthew 10:5](#), "Go ye not into the way of the [Gentiles](#)." [Jerome](#) says: "It behooved [Christ's](#) coming to be announced to the [Jews](#) first, lest they should have a valid excuse, and

say that they had rejected [our Lord](#) because He had sent His [apostles](#) to the [Gentiles](#) and Samaritans."

Fourthly, because it was through the triumph of the cross that [Christ merited](#) power and lordship over the [Gentiles](#). Hence it is written ([Apocalypse 2:26-28](#)): "He that shall overcome . . . I will give him power over the nations . . . as I also have received of My Father"; and that because He became "obedient unto the death of the cross, [God](#) hath exalted Him . . . that in the [name of Jesus](#) every knee should bow . . ." and that "every tongue should confess Him" ([Philippians 2:8-11](#)). Consequently He did not wish His doctrine to be preached to the [Gentiles](#) before His [Passion](#): it was after His [Passion](#) that He said to His [disciples](#) ([Matthew 28:19](#)): "Going, teach ye all [nations](#)." For this reason it was that when, shortly before His [Passion](#), certain [Gentiles](#) wished to see [Jesus](#), He said: "Unless the grain of wheat falling into the ground dieth, itself remaineth alone: but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit" ([John 12:20-25](#)); and as [Augustine](#) says, commenting on this passage: "He called Himself the grain of wheat that must be mortified by the unbelief of the [Jews](#), multiplied by the [faith](#) of the [nations](#)."

Reply to Objection 1. [Christ](#) was given to be the light and [salvation](#) of the [Gentiles](#) through His [disciples](#), whom He sent to preach to them.

Reply to Objection 2. It is a sign, not of lesser, but of greater power to do something by means of others rather than by oneself. And thus the Divine power of [Christ](#) was specially shown in this, that He bestowed on the teaching of His [disciples](#) such a power that they converted the [Gentiles](#) to [Christ](#), although these had heard nothing of Him.

Now the power of [Christ's](#) teaching is to be considered in the [miracles](#) by which He confirmed His doctrine, in the efficacy of His persuasion, and in the authority of His words, for He spoke as being Himself above the [Law](#) when He said: "But I say to you" ([Matthew 5:22-44](#)); and, again, in the force of His righteousness shown in His sinless manner of life.

Reply to Objection 3. Just as it was unfitting that [Christ](#) should at the outset make His doctrine [known](#) to the [Gentiles](#) equally with the [Jews](#), in order that He might appear as being sent to the [Jews](#), as to the [first-born](#) people; so neither was it fitting for Him to neglect the [Gentiles](#) altogether, lest they should be deprived of

the hope of [salvation](#). For this reason certain [individualGentiles](#) were admitted, on account of the excellence of their [faith](#) and devotedness.

Article 2. Whether Christ should have preached to the Jews without offending them?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should have preached to the [Jews](#) without offending them. For, as [Augustine](#) says (De Agone Christ. xi): "In the Man [Jesus Christ](#), a model of life is given us by the [Son of God](#)." But we should avoid offending not only the [faithful](#), but even unbelievers, according to [1 Corinthians 10:32](#): "Be without offense to the [Jews](#), and to the [Gentiles](#), and to the [Church of God](#)." Therefore it seems that, in His teaching, [Christ](#) should also have avoided giving offense to the [Jews](#).

Objection 2. Further, no wise [man](#) should do anything that will hinder the result of his labor. Now through the disturbance which His teaching occasioned among the [Jews](#), it was deprived of its results; for it is written ([Luke 11:53-54](#)) that when [our Lord](#) reproved the Pharisees and Scribes, they "began vehemently to urge Him, and to oppress His mouth about many things; lying in wait for Him, and seeking to catch something from His mouth, that they might accuse Him." It seems therefore unfitting that He should have given them offense by His teaching.

Objection 3. Further, the [Apostle](#) says ([1 Timothy 5:1](#)): "An ancient [man](#) rebuke not; but entreat him as a father." But the [priests](#) and princes of the [Jews](#) were the elders of that people. Therefore it seems that they should not have been rebuked with severity.

On the contrary, It was foretold ([Isaiah 8:14](#)) that [Christ](#) would be "for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to the two houses of [Israel](#)."

I answer that, The [salvation](#) of the multitude is to be preferred to the peace of any [individuals](#) whatsoever. Consequently, when certain ones, by their perverseness, hinder the [salvation](#) of the multitude, the preacher and the teacher should not fear to offend those men, in order that he may insure the [salvation](#) of the multitude. Now the Scribes and Pharisees and the princes of the [Jews](#) were by their [malice](#) a considerable hindrance to the [salvation](#) of the people, both because they opposed themselves to [Christ's](#) doctrine, which was the only way to [salvation](#), and because

their [evil](#) ways corrupted the morals of the people. For which reason [our Lord](#), undeterred by their taking offense, publicly taught the [truth](#) which they [hated](#), and condemned their [vices](#). Hence we read ([Matthew 15:12,14](#)) that when the [disciples](#) of [our Lord](#) said: "Dost Thou [know](#) that the [Pharisees](#), when they heard this word, were [scandalized](#)?" He answered: "Let them alone: they are blind and leaders of the blind; and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit."

Reply to Objection 1. A [man](#) ought so to avoid giving offense, as neither by wrong [deed](#) or word to be the occasion of anyone's downfall. "But if [scandal](#) arise from [truth](#), the [scandal](#) should be borne rather than the [truth](#) be set aside," as [Gregory](#) says (Hom. vii in Ezech.).

Reply to Objection 2. By publicly reproving the Scribes and [Pharisees](#), [Christ](#) promoted rather than hindered the effect of His teaching. Because when the people came to [know](#) the [vices](#) of those men, they were less inclined to be prejudiced against [Christ](#) by hearing what was said of Him by the Scribes and [Pharisees](#), who were ever withstanding His doctrine.

Reply to Objection 3. This saying of the [Apostle](#) is to be understood of those elders whose years are reckoned not only in age and authority, but also in probity; according to [Numbers 11:16](#): "Gather unto Me seventy men of the ancients of [Israel](#), whom thou [knowest](#) to be ancients . . . of the people." But if by [sinning](#) openly they turn the authority of their years into an instrument of [wickedness](#), they should be rebuked openly and severely, as also [Daniel](#) says ([Daniel 13:52](#)): "O thou that art grown old in [evil](#) days," etc.

Article 3. Whether Christ should have taught all things openly?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should not have taught all things openly. For we read that He taught many things to His [disciples](#) apart: as is seen clearly in the sermon at the Supper. Wherefore He said: "That which you heard in the ear in the chambers shall be preached on the housetops" [[St. Thomas](#), probably quoting from [memory](#), combines [Matthew 10:27](#) with [Luke 12:3](#)]. Therefore He did not teach all things openly.

Objection 2. Further, the depths of wisdom should not be expounded save to the perfect, according to [1 Corinthians 2:6](#): "We

speak wisdom among the perfect." Now Christ's doctrine contained the most profound wisdom. Therefore it should not have been made [known](#) to the imperfect crowd.

Objection 3. Further, it comes to the same, to hide the [truth](#), whether by saying nothing or by making use of a language that is difficult to understand. Now [Christ](#), by speaking to the multitudes a language they would not understand, hid from them the [truth](#) that He preached; since "without parables He did not speak to them" ([Matthew 13:34](#)). In the same way, therefore, He could have hidden it from them by saying nothing at all.

On the contrary, He says Himself ([John 18:20](#)): "In secret I have spoken nothing."

I answer that, Anyone's doctrine may be hidden in three ways. First, on the part of the [intention](#) of the teacher, who does not wish to make his doctrine [known](#) to many, but rather to hide it. And this may happen in two ways--sometimes through [envy](#) on the part of the teacher, who desires to excel in his [knowledge](#), wherefore he is unwilling to communicate it to others. But this was not the case with [Christ](#), in whose [person](#) the following words are spoken ([Wisdom 7:13](#)): "Which I have learned without guile, and communicate without [envy](#), and her [riches](#) I hide not." But sometimes this happens through the vileness of the things taught; thus [Augustine](#) says on [John 16:12](#): "There are some things so bad that no sort of [human](#) modesty can bear them." Wherefore of [heretical](#) doctrine it is written ([Proverbs 9:17](#)): "Stolen waters are sweeter." Now, Christ's doctrine is "not of [error](#) nor of [uncleanness](#)" ([1 Thessalonians 2:3](#)). Wherefore [our Lord](#) says ([Mark 4:21](#)): "Doth a candle," i.e. [true](#) and pure doctrine, "come in to be put under a bushel?"

Secondly, doctrine is hidden because it is put before few. And thus, again, did [Christ](#) teach nothing in secret: for He propounded His entire doctrine either to the whole crowd or to His [disciples](#) gathered together. Hence [Augustine](#) says on [John 18:20](#): "How can it be said that He speaks in secret when He speaks before so many men? . . . especially if what He says to few He wishes through them to be made [known](#) to many?"

Thirdly, doctrine is hidden, as to the manner in which it is propounded. And thus [Christ](#) spoke certain things in secret to the crowds, by employing parables in teaching them [spiritual](#) mysteries which they were either unable or unworthy to grasp: and yet it was better for

them to be instructed in the [knowledge](#) of [spiritual](#) things, albeit hidden under the garb of parables, than to be deprived of it altogether. Nevertheless [our Lord](#) expounded the open and unveiled [truth](#) of these parables to His [disciples](#), so that they might hand it down to others worthy of it; according to [2 Timothy 2:2](#): "The things which thou hast heard of me by many [witnesses](#), the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others." This is foreshadowed, [Numbers 4](#), where the sons of [Aaron](#) are commanded to wrap up the sacred vessels that were to be carried by the Levites.

Reply to Objection 1. As [Hilary](#) says, commenting on the passage quoted, "we do not read that [our Lord](#) was wont to preach at night, and expound His doctrine in the dark: but He says this because His speech is darkness to the carnal-minded, and His words are night to the unbeliever. His meaning, therefore, is that whatever He said we also should say in the midst of unbelievers, by openly [believing](#) and professing it."

Or, according to [Jerome](#), He speaks comparatively--that is to say, because He was instructing them in Judea, which was a small place compared with the whole world, where Christ's doctrine was to be published by the preaching of the [apostles](#).

Reply to Objection 2. By His doctrine our Lord did not make [known](#) all the depths of His wisdom, neither to the multitudes, nor, indeed, to His [disciples](#), to whom He said ([John 16:12](#)): "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now." Yet whatever things out of His wisdom He judged it right to make [known](#) to others, He expounded, not in secret, but openly; although He was not understood by all. Hence [Augustine](#) says on [John 18:20](#): "We must understand this, 'I have spoken openly to the world,' as though [our Lord](#) had said, 'Many have heard Me' . . . and, again, it was not 'openly,' because they did not understand."

Reply to Objection 3. As stated above, [our Lord](#) spoke to the multitudes in parables, because they were neither able nor worthy to receive the naked [truth](#), which He revealed to His [disciples](#).

And when it is said that "without parables He did not speak to them," according to [Chrysostom](#) (Hom. xlvii in Matth.), we are to understand this of that particular sermon, since on other occasions He said many things to the multitude without parables. Or, as [Augustine](#) says (De Qq. Evang., qu. xvii), this means, "not that He spoke nothing literally,

but that He scarcely ever spoke without introducing a parable, although He also spoke some things in the literal sense."

Article 4. Whether Christ should have committed His doctrine to writing?

Objection 1. It would seem that [Christ](#) should have committed His doctrine to writing. For the purpose of writing is to hand down doctrine to posterity. Now Christ's doctrine was destined to endure for ever, according to [Luke 21:33](#): "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) should have committed His doctrine to writing.

Objection 2. Further, the [Old Law](#) was a foreshadowing of [Christ](#), according to [Hebrews 10:1](#): "The [Law](#) has [[Vulgate](#): 'having'] a shadow of the [good](#) things to come." Now the [Old Law](#) was put into writing by [God](#), according to [Exodus 24:12](#): "I will give thee" two "tables of stone and the [law](#), and the commandments which I have written." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) also should have put His doctrine into writing.

Objection 3. Further, to [Christ](#), who came to enlighten them that sit in darkness ([Luke 1:79](#)), it belonged to remove occasions of [error](#), and to open out the road to [faith](#). Now He would have done this by putting His teaching into writing: for [Augustine](#) says (De Consensu Evang. i) that "some there are who wonder why [our Lord](#) wrote nothing, so that we have to [believe](#) what others have written about Him. Especially do those [pagans](#) ask this question who dare not blame or [blaspheme Christ](#), and who ascribe to Him most excellent, but merely [human](#), wisdom. These say that the [disciples](#) made out the [Master](#) to be more than He really was when they said that He was the [Son of God](#) and the [Word of God](#), by whom all things were made." And farther on he adds: "It seems as though they were prepared to [believe](#) whatever He might have written of Himself, but not what others at their discretion published about Him." Therefore it seems that [Christ](#) should have Himself committed His doctrine to writing.

On the contrary, No books written by Him were to be found in the canon of [Scripture](#).

I answer that, It was fitting that [Christ](#) should not commit His doctrine to writing. First, on account of His dignity: for the more excellent the teacher, the more excellent should be his manner of teaching. Consequently it was fitting that [Christ](#), as the most excellent

of teachers, should adopt that manner of teaching whereby His doctrine is imprinted on the hearts of His hearers; wherefore it is written ([Matthew 7:29](#)) that "He was teaching them as one having power." And so it was that among the [Gentiles](#), [Pythagoras](#) and [Socrates](#), who were teachers of great excellence, were unwilling to write anything. For writings are ordained, as to an end, unto the imprinting of doctrine in the hearts of the hearers.

Secondly, on account of the excellence of [Christ's](#) doctrine, which cannot be expressed in writing; according to [John 21:25](#): "There are also many other things which [Jesus](#) did: which, if they were written everyone, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." Which [Augustine](#) explains by saying: "We are not to [believe](#) that in respect of space the world could not contain them . . . but that by the capacity of the readers they could not be comprehended." And if [Christ](#) had committed His doctrine to writing, men would have had no deeper thought of His doctrine than that which appears on the surface of the writing.

Thirdly, that His doctrine might reach all in an orderly manner: Himself teaching His [disciples](#) immediately, and they subsequently teaching others, by preaching and writing: whereas if He Himself had written, His doctrine would have reached all immediately.

Hence it is said of Wisdom ([Proverbs 9:3](#)) that "she hath sent her maids to invite to the tower." It is to be observed, however, that, as [Augustine](#) says (De Consensu Evang. i), some of the [Gentiles](#) thought that [Christ](#) wrote certain books treating of the magic art whereby He worked [miracles](#): which art is condemned by the [Christian](#) learning. "And yet they who claim to have read those books of [Christ](#) do none of those things which they marvel at His doing according to those same books. Moreover, it is by a [Divine judgment](#) that they [err](#) so far as to assert that these books were, as it were, entitled as letters to Peter and [Paul](#), for that they found them in several places depicted in company with [Christ](#). No wonder that the inventors were deceived by the painters: for as long as [Christ](#) lived in the mortal flesh with His [disciples](#), [Paul](#) was no disciple of His."

Reply to Objection 1. As [Augustine](#) says in the same book: "[Christ](#) is the head of all His [disciples](#) who are members of His body. Consequently, when they put into writing what He showed forth and said to them, by no means must we say that He wrote nothing: since His members put forth that which they [knew](#) under His dictation. For

at His command they, being His hands, as it were, wrote whatever He wished us to read concerning His [deeds](#) and words."

Reply to Objection 2. Since the [old Law](#) was given under the form of sensible signs, therefore also was it fittingly written with sensible signs. But [Christ's](#) doctrine, which is "the [law](#) of the spirit of life" ([Romans 8:2](#)), had to be "written not with ink, but with the [Spirit](#) of the living [God](#); not in tables of stone, but in the fleshly tables of the heart," as the [Apostle](#) says ([2 Corinthians 3:3](#)).

Reply to Objection 3. Those who were unwilling to [believe](#) what the [apostles](#) wrote of [Christ](#) would have refused to [believe](#) the writings of [Christ](#), whom they deemed to work [miracles](#) by the magic art.

[BIBELTHEOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH]

SACRAMENTUM VERBI

An Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology

Edited by

Johannes B. Bauer, 1927-

Volume 2

Humility – Righteousness

*Dominican College Library
187 Michigan Ave., N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20017*

HERDER AND HERDER

Sacramentum Verbi

Preaching

up especially the basic demands of morality, and from *didaskalia*, which is a higher form of religious instruction aiming at providing a basis for the christian faith and going into it more deeply. A careful examination of the texts referred to above shows that *kērugma* may be used to designate the earliest form of the proclamation of the christian mystery. It denotes a preaching of the necessity of conversion and decision, a missionary preaching, a preaching of renewal in the context of the church.

The word *kērux* (=herald) occurs only three times in the New Testament: 1 Tim 2:7 and 2 Tim 1:11 with reference to Paul, 2 Pet 2:5 with reference to Noah. It is used only four times in LXX: Gen 41:43; Sir 20:15; Dan 3:4; 4 Macc 6:4. Why, we may ask, does the New Testament hardly ever speak of the human 'herald', an expression which would fit the christian preacher so well? It is never used of the person of the preacher who proclaims the message since the only bearer of the proclaimed word is either God himself or Christ. The human preacher must remain in the background behind Christ who alone is the true 'proclaimer'.

The frequent use of the verb *kērussēin* (=proclaim) supports this conclusion. It occurs sixty-one times in the New Testament: nine times in Matthew, fourteen times in Mark, nine times in Luke, eight in Acts, nineteen in Paul (Romans four, 1 Corinthians four, 2 Corinthians four, Galatians two, Philippians two, Colossians one, 1 Thessalonians one, 1 Timothy one, 2 Timothy one), once in 1 Peter, and once in Revelation. This verb does

Preaching

Usually 'proclamation' or 'preaching' are used to translate the Greek word *kērugma*. This word occurs eight times in the New Testament if we omit the brief Markan conclusion, ie, in Mt 12:41 = Lk 11:32; Rom 16:25; 1 Cor 1:21; 2:4; 15:14; 2 Tim 4:17; Tit 1:3. It is absent in the johannine writings, and is found only four times in LXX: 2 Chron 30:5; Prov 9:3; Jn 3:2. *Kērugma* is distinct from *katekkēsis* and *didakhē*, which expound at length christian doctrinal and moral teaching, from *parainēsis*, which points

Sacramentum Verbi

Preaching

not occur at all in the johannine writings, but is substituted by *marturein* (=bear witness). By using this verb so often while neglecting the corresponding noun, the New Testament writers may well be indicating the enormous importance of the *kērugma* since it is, in the last analysis, God or Christ who speaks by means of the herald. LXX uses the verb thirty times, generally as a translation-word for the Hebrew *qara'*.

In addition to this verb the New Testament also makes use of *euangelizesthai* which has much the same meaning, as also other synonyms.

A. '*Kērugma*' in the Old Testament. In the Greek milieu the verb brings to mind the herald who, in the name of and fully authorised by the king or lord, proclaims some decisive event of the reign with a loud voice in the public square.

In the Greek Old Testament *kērussō* occurs thirty-three times corresponding to a whole series of Hebrew verbs and expressions: eighteen times to *qārā'* (Gen 41:43; Ex 32:5; 2 Kings 10:20; 2 Chron 20:3; Esther 6:9, 11; Prov 1:21; 8:1; Mic 3:5; Joel 1:14; 2:15; 3:9; Jn 1:2; 3:2, 4, 5; Is 61:1; Dan 3:4—in Jer 7:2 and Ps 105:1 only Symmachus translates *qārā'* [to cry or call out] with this verb); four times to *rāa'* (= 'to make a noise', 'raise the alarm': Hos 5:8; Joel 2:1; 'to break out into a cry of joy': Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9); twice to *he'ebir qōl* (Ex 36:6; 2 Chron 36:22 = 'to let out a cry', 'fecit ire seu resonare per regionem' vocem = proclamavit': F. Zorell, *Lexicon* 568); once for *zā'ag* (= 'give forth a cry of lamentation', Jn 3:7); once for *karaz* (= 'cry out publicly', Jer 5:29

Theod), once for *nāthan qōl* (= 'lift up the voice', 2 Chron 25:9), and once for *dāḥar* (= 'cry out', Jer 20:8 Symm). It also occurs in 1 Macc 5:49; 10:63, 64. It follows from the multiplicity of Hebrew correspondents that this verb is not a fixed expression for one particular kind of proclamation, but that for the most part it has the sense of crying or calling out.

In the political life of the city and the state it refers to the activity of the herald who proclaims festively and publicly some decisive event which is imminent, eg the proximate arrival of some one high up in the kingdom (Gen 41:43; Esther 6:9, 11; 1 Macc 10:63, 64; Dan 3:29) or of any enemy (Joel 3:9; Hos 5:8). This profane 'proclamation' has three characteristics: its official character, reference to an important occurrence, and the proximity of this occurrence.

The prophetic proclamation is usually in the form of an arresting and disturbing appeal (Joel 1:14; 2:15; Jn 1:2; 3:2, 4, 5, 7; Jer 7:2; cf 2 Chron 20:3) which rings out in the name and by the power of God and announces a coming festival, (Joel 2:1 cf Ex 32:5; 2 Kings 10:20) or the day of the Lord and/or the 'day of judgement' (Joel 2:1; Is 61:1 cf Jer 20:8; Mic 3:5; Hos 5:8). 'Blow the trumpet in Zion; sound the alarm on my holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble, for the day of the Lord is coming, it is near' (Joel 2:1). Hence the demand which is made: 'return to me with all your heart, with fasting, with weeping and with mourning; rend your hearts and not your garments. Return to the Lord your God' (2:12-13). When the voice of the herald is heard speaking out in

Preaching

the name of Yahweh (see Prov 1:21; 8:1 referring to Wisdom) it is always a proclamation of the day of judgement which is imminent. Hence the sinful people is thereby recalled to penance and conversion.

B. 'Kērugma' in the New Testament.

The prophetic preaching is the seedbed from which the New Testament kerygma emerges and develops. Our rather eviscerated term 'preaching' does not by any means exhaust the full meaning of the verb *kērussein*. It is not a case of an artistically arranged and impressively delivered sermon which aims at instruction, admonition or edification. What this verb implies is rather the solemn and official announcement of an event made in the name of God or Christ, an idea which is best conveyed in the word 'proclamation'. A study of the relevant vocabulary in the New Testament reveals that the emphasis is not on the *kērux* (herald; three times), not even on the *kērugma* (proclamation; eight times) but on the act of proclaiming (*kērussein*; sixty-one times). In other words, what turns the scales is not the messenger, and basically not even his message, but the act of proclaiming, which is effected by the Spirit. It is brought about by the Spirit of God in the same way that the word is in the Old Testament. It is therefore a charismatic operation. Since the prophets were filled with the divine Spirit (see Hos 9:7; Mic 3:8; Is 8:11; 30:1-2; 61:1; Ezek 2:2; 3:24; etc) they received not only the instructions of God but also the task and the ability to proclaim them without fear. Much the same can be said of the bearers of the *kērugma* in the New Testament. Having received the gift of the divine

Spirit (Jn 7:37-9; Acts 2:4, 33; 5:39; 11:21; 1 Cor 12:8; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:14; 3:16; 1 Pet 1:1-2), the apostles announce the 'gospel of God', God's message of salvation brought about in Christ.

This raises a whole series of questions: *who* preaches or proclaims? *what* is to be proclaimed and *how?* *to whom* is the proclamation addressed? *where* is the proclamation to take place?

I. *Who preaches or proclaims?* The New Testament refers to a considerable number to whom the *kērugma* is entrusted whose situation is different with regard either to the whole economy of salvation or to the church's mission. In the last analysis, however, the real bearer of the message is the exalted Christ himself; it is he who speaks through the human instruments.

1. In the first place, Christ is himself mysteriously present in christian preaching since it is a task commissioned by God (or by Christ) and since the object of preaching is the glorified Lord himself.

a. In much the same way as the prophets Joel and Jonah, *John the Baptist* was commissioned by God (Mk 11:30-33) to raise the sound of alarm in order to rouse his contemporaries from sleep and tell them of *the kingdom of God* (Mt 3:1-2) which was breaking in on them and the imminent coming of the king-messiah (Mk 1:7-8). For this reason he announced with a clear voice a 'baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins' (Mk 1:4 = Lk 3:3; Acts 10:37 cf 13:24). In this way John associates himself with the *kērugma* of the prophets who announced the advent of the kingdom of God, the coming of

John the Baptist

The Prophets

the Messiah and the forgiveness of sins.

Jesus

b. With *Jesus* the time of the *kērugma* was fully present (Acts 13:24 speaks of the pre-kerygmatic stage of the Baptist's ministry). As with John, Jesus proclaimed the message in virtue of a divine mission (Lk 4:18, 43): 'the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel' (Mk 1:14-15; see also Mt 4:17-23; 9:35). At the same time, the *kērugma* of Jesus is basically different from that of the Baptist. Jesus does not speak just as a prophet who announces the kingdom of God. By the very act of proclaiming or preaching (Mk 1:38, 45; 1:39 = Mt 4:23; Lk 4:44; Mt 11:1) he realises the good news (Mk 1:14) of the kingdom of God (Mt 4:17; see also 4:23 = 9:35; 24:14) and calls men to repentance (Mk 1:14 = Mt 4:17). The kerygma of Jesus brings about what it proclaims. It comes about by the Spirit of God and therefore is charged with power. This conviction is expressed by Jesus himself: 'today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing' (Lk 4:21). 'Today'—that means here and now—the salvation promised in Is 61:1 is *proclaimed*, that is, fulfilled and realised in the release of captives and the acceptable year of the Lord. '[Jesus] does not announce that something will happen. His proclamation is itself event. What he declares takes place in the moment of its proclamation' (G. Friedrich, *TDNT* III, 706). Following on this, Paul is sent 'to preach in its fullness' 'the gospel of Christ' (Rom 15:19) or 'the word of God' (Col 1:25). In both cases the verb *plēroō* is used. The Lord stood by him and gave him strength (*endunamoō*) so that through him the

kērugma might be 'fully proclaimed' (*plērophoreō*, 2 Tim 4:17). These expressions do not mean that Paul has preached the gospel or the word of God or the *kērugma* completely, without leaving anything out, or that he has preached it in every place. According to the context it signifies that he has brought it to its full development, that, in other words, he has actualised or realised it; for in all three texts Paul attributes the success of his preaching to 'the power' which he has received (Col 1:29; 2 Tim 4:17) or to 'the Holy Spirit' (Rom 15:19).

c. In the time before the resurrection Jesus sent out his *disciples* to 'proclaim' publicly on the streets and from the rooftops (Mt 10:27 = Lk 12:3) the proximate coming of the kingdom of God (Mk 3:14 = Mt 10:7 = Lk 9:2) and to call the hearers to conversion (Mk 6:12). Unlike the *kērugma* of the Baptist, that of the apostles is accompanied by the healing of the sick. After the resurrection the disciples are to carry on until the end the *kērugma* of Jesus in virtue of their divine mission (Mt 24:14; 26:13 = Mk 14:9; 13:10; 16:15, 20; Lk 24:47-8; Acts 10:42).

Apostles

d. The apostle Paul is conscious of preaching the same *kērugma* as that of the first apostles, as can be seen from the frequency with which he speaks in the plural: we preach, our preaching (Rom 10:8, 1 Cor 1:23; 15:11; 2 Cor 1:19; 4:5; 11:4; 1 Thess 2:9). This also emerges from the fact that he attributes his *mission* to God or to Christ rather than to the Twelve, but not to Christ of the earthly ministry but to the exalted Lord (see Gal 1:16; 1 Cor 1:17; 2 Cor 5:18; Eph 3:7). But he distinguishes his *kērugma* from

Paul

Preaching

that of the first apostles by appealing not just to an immediate revelation but also to the apostolic tradition (compare 1 Cor 15:11–12, 14 with 15:1, 3; see also Col. 1:23; Gal 2:2).

e. In the post-apostolic age the *kērugma* becomes the preaching of the church. The preaching of the word takes on more and more the form of *didakhē* and *didaskalia*, that is, the exposition of faith and moral conduct together with a more elaborated kind of religious instruction. Phrases such as 'sound teaching' (*didaskalia*; 1 Tim 1:10; 2 Tim 4:3; Tit 1:9; 2:1), 'sound words' (*hugiainontes logoi*; 1 Tim 6:3; 2 Tim 1:13), 'sound speech' (*logos hugiōs*; Tit 2:8), 'sound in the faith': Tit 1:13; 2:2) occur only in the

storals and refer to solid exposition and interpretation based on the fixed tradition of the gospel, 'in accordance with the glorious gospel of the blessed God' (1 Tim 1:11). This sound doctrine in keeping with the tradition must be distinguished from the preaching of the basic events of salvation. This is 'a distinction which the modern kerygmatic theology—and not only the modern kerygmatic theology—ignores and thereby loses the saving events, abandoning the saving history to the here and now of a proclamation aimed at arousing faith' (H. Schürmann, *LTK* vi², 123).

2. Christian preaching is carried out by a divine commission and has Christ as its centre. But the exalted Lord also speaks directly by the mouth of the apostle. Paul sees himself as 'sent on behalf of Christ' (2 Cor 5:20) to do 'the work of the Lord' (1 Cor 16:10)

preaching 'the gospel of Christ' (1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12; 9:13;

2 Thess 1:8; etc). In Rom 10:14 it is probably the exalted Lord himself to whom one must belong in order to attain to faith. In Rom 16:25: 'according to my gospel and the *kērugma* of Jesus Christ', 'Jesus Christ' should not be taken as objective genitive, namely, as the object or content of the preaching (as H. Ott), but rather as subjective genitive in keeping with the parallel 'according to my gospel'. In other words, it is here a question of the message which Jesus Christ himself proclaims, but not Christ in his life on earth (as G. Friedrich) but rather the exalted Lord. As Augustine put it, Jesus Christ preaches from his heavenly throne.

As the glorified Christ justifies men through the Holy Spirit (compare Gal 2:16 with 1 Cor 6:11), sanctifies them (compare 1 Cor 1:2 with 6:11) and seals them (compare Eph 1:13 with 4:30), so does he himself speak by the Spirit of God bestowed on the one who preaches. Paul says expressly that Christ with power watches over the word of the one sent by him (2 Tim 4:17; see also Lk 24:47–9; Mk 16:20) so that the apostolic preaching may sound forth 'in the manifestation of spirit and power' (1 Cor 2:4; see also 1 Cor 15:10–11), 'full of life and power' (Heb 4:12). Christian preaching is therefore integrally part of the charismatic gifts.

If, however, Christ speaks through the Holy Spirit (2 Cor 3:17) in the one commissioned by him it must follow that he has not just spoken 'then' but continues to speak here and now to those who listen today. 'In preaching, Christ himself continues to appear before men, offering himself to them as

lord and redeemer and calling them to decision. It is by means of the word that the church comes into existence and is established' (V. Schurr, 236).

II. *What is to be preached and how?*—these two questions are intimately related to each other.

1. In the first place, what is preached is not a truth or a precept but a *person*: the exalted and glorified lord, Jesus Christ. The person of Jesus Christ constitutes the heart and soul of the *kērugma*. Without him the *kērugma* would be like a watercourse without water, a body without soul, a husk without grain, a sky without sun.

By proclaiming the imminent coming of the kingdom of God and an urgent call to conversion Jesus not only presented himself as the bearer of the *kērugma* but became its very centre, as is clear from his interpretation of Is 61:1-2 in the synagogue of Capharnaum: 'today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing' (Lk 4:18-19, 21). Jesus therefore did not become the centre of the *kērugma* only after his resurrection. What happened after the resurrection was a shift of emphasis: the primitive christian *kērugma* was permanently centred on the figure of the dying Saviour, even more so on the risen and exalted Lord. It was grounded in the resurrection of Christ. From that point until his glorious return the exalted Lord was to be the heart and soul of the christian proclamation (see Acts 8:5; 9:20; 19:13; 1 Cor 1:23; 15:12; 2 Cor 1:19; 4:5; 11:4; Phil 1:15; 1 Tim 3:16). The *kērugma* takes in the whole mystery of Christ: the cross (1 Cor 1:23), the resurrection (Rom 10:8-9) and the return of Christ in glory as universal judge (Acts 10:42).

Since God and his decisive act in Christ form the centre of the *kērugma*, it can be described as the proclamation of the kingdom of God (Mt 13:19; Lk 9:2; Acts 28:31) and the preaching of Christ (Acts 8:5; 9:20; 1 Cor 1:23; 2 Cor 4:5). Seen in its effects it may be paraphrased as 'the word of salvation' (Acts 13:26), 'the word of grace' (Acts 14:3; 20:32), 'the word of faith' (Rom 10:8), 'the word of truth' (Col 1:5; Eph 1:13; 2 Tim 2:15), 'the atoning word' (*logos tēs katallagēs*, 2 Cor. 5:19), 'the word of the glory of Christ' (2 Cor 4:4) or simply as 'the word' (2 Tim 4:2; Acts 17:15D).

Since this word is effected by the Spirit of God it brings about and realizes what it expresses: salvation, grace, faith, truth, atonement, and life.

2. Since the exalted Lord speaks and acts through the proclamation of his messengers who are filled with the Spirit, it follows that the personality of the preacher must fall into the background, leaving room for the Lord who is mysteriously present through the word. The decisive factor is the presence of Christ and his Spirit. The personality of the preacher who proclaims the word is of no consequence since the true preacher is God, or God speaking through Christ. Hence in the New Testament little attention is paid to the *kērux*, the herald, seen in the fact that this word occurs there only three times. This explains the peculiar and unique function of the christian preacher such as we find it described in Paul's letters. More than any of the other apostles he set himself to fathom the mystery latent in the christian proclamation.

What?

The exalted Lord!

How

It follows from all this that the power of Christ comes through most clearly in the *weakness* of the one who proclaims the message (2 Cor 12:9). Paul admits to the Corinthians that he came to them 'in weakness, in fear and with much trembling' and preached to them 'not in lofty words of wisdom' but in 'the demonstration of the Spirit and power' so that their faith should not be grounded on 'human wisdom' but on 'the power of God' (1 Cor 2:2-5). Since the apostle of the Gentiles was deeply conscious of the fact that when he preached his own role was a secondary one, he did not put much store by 'earthly wisdom' (2 Cor 1:12) or by skill in speaking (11:6). The treasure of the word of God is borne for the apostle 'in earthly vessels' so that 'the transcendent power may belong to God and not to us' (4:7).

The mystery of the christian proclamation and preaching is founded in belief in the power of God's Spirit and in knowledge of the weakness of the human instrument. Here we have the key to its irresistible progress and power. Despite all his setbacks the apostle continued to boast of his weakness (2 Cor 11:30) and enjoy the consoling presence of God (1:3-4).

Whether free or in chains, the bearer of the message continues his mission—'the word of God is not fettered' (2 Tim 2:9). His voice is silenced by death but the word of the Lord continues to resound throughout the centuries (see 2 Thess 3:1).

III. *To whom is the proclamation addressed?* If we study the texts we shall see that the apostolic *kērugma* was not addressed exclusively to the gentiles or heathen. The New Testament *kērugma*

does not refer exclusively to the first proclamation of the mystery of Christ in terms of a call to conversion and decision, but takes in also, even primarily, the preaching of the renewal of life within the christian community.

In preaching to the Jews, who were always on the lookout for signs, Jesus compares his mission to that of the prophet Jonah (Mt 12:40=Lk 11:32). According to Rom 16:25 Paul addressed the *kērugma* of Jesus Christ to the christian community of Rome by means of which the exalted Lord himself strengthened by his word the christians of that city. The *kērugma*, therefore, was not just addressed to pagans. Paul reminded his christians in Corinth that by means of the *kērugma* God had saved all of them *who had believed in it* (1 Cor 1:21). This implies that in what was already a believing community the word of God continued to be present as a power of salvation 'for those who believe' (cf 2 Tim 4:17). According to 1 Cor 15:14 the apostle's *kērugma* is also a preaching of the resurrection which is addressed to christians. Without the risen and exalted Lord his preaching would be 'void' and the faith of the community vain. This too, therefore, must be considered as a preaching not of conversion but renewal (see also Tit 1:3; 1 Tim 3:16).

In writing to the Corinthians, 'My speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom but in demonstration of the Spirit and power' (1 Cor 2:4), Paul was certainly referring to his first preaching among them. But the whole context shows that he was not concerned with who had first preached the gospel but *how* it had been preached. Since they are filled

To whom?

with spirit and power the words of his preaching are superior to discourses inspired by gnostic wisdom. Since he is referring in 1 Cor 2:4 to a generally valid characteristic of his preaching, it can be concluded, especially in view of what he says in 1:18-31 and 2:6-16, that the reference throughout is in the present tense. Right from the beginning and throughout, the preached word of the apostle is full of the power of God's Spirit.

The texts we have adduced should not lead us to suppose that the *kerygma* refers exclusively to the first preaching of the gospel. It must continue to resound in the church even after the apostolic age. The faithful take their place at 'the table of the word of God' in order to be continually renewed in the Holy Spirit and strengthened in their resolve to live a christian life in accordance with the will of God.

IV. *Where does the proclamation take place?* The apostolic preaching always takes place in public: 1. in an assembly of non-christian listeners whom the preacher wishes to win over to faith in the risen and exalted Lord as, for example, on the first Pentecost (Acts 2:14-36), in the household of the Roman centurion Cornelius (Acts 10:34-8), or on the Areopagus at Athens (17:19-31); 2. Within the assembly of a believing community (Acts 14:27; 15); 3. Above all, during the divine service, where the divine host himself proclaims anew in a mysterious way the message of salvation through the mouth of his herald who is filled with the Holy Spirit. This proclamation has the purpose of recalling the christian hearer to conversion and to a renewal of life. Throughout the centuries the

christian church continues to preach the *kerygma* to bring into the hearts and lives of both christian and non-christian alike 'the word of Christ' (Col 3:16).

Bibliography: C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, London 1956; J. Gewiss, *Die Ur-apostolische Heilsverkündigung nach der Apostelgeschichte*, Breslau 1939; R. Asting, *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum*, Stuttgart 1939; A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament*, London 1944; H. Schürmann, *Aufbau und Struktur der ntl. Verkündigung*, Paderborn 1949; A. Rétif, 'Qu'est-ce que le kerygme?', *NRT* 81 (1949), 910-22; A. Rétif, 'Témoignage et prédication missionnaire dans les Actes des Apôtres', *NRT* 83 (1951), 152-65; A. Rétif, *Foi au Christ et mission d'après les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1952; J. R. Geiselmann, *Jesus der Christus*, Stuttgart 1951; K. Stendhal, 'Kerygma und kerygmatisch', *TLZ* 77 (1952), 715-20; P. Hitz, *L'Annonce missionnaire de l'Evangile*, Paris 1954; L. Cerfaux, 'Témoins du Christ d'après le livre des Actes', *Recueil L. Cerfaux* II, Paris-Gembloux 1954, 157-74; H. Schlier, *Kerygma und Sophia*, Freiburg 1956, 206-32; C. F. Evans, 'The Kerygma', *JTS* 7 (1956), 25-41; J. D. Vincent, 'Didactic Kerygma in the Synoptic Gospels', *SJT* 10 (1957), 272-3; W. Baird, 'What is the Kerygma?', *JBL* 76 (1957), 181-91; E. L. Allen, 'The Lost Kerygma', *NTS* 3 (1957), 349-53; K. Goldammer, 'Der Kerygma-Begriff in der ältesten christlichen Literatur', *ZNW* 48 (1957), 77-101; U. Wilken, 'Kerygma und Evangelium bei Lukas', *ZNW* 49 (1958), 223-37; H. Ott, 'Kerygma', *RGGM*, 1250-54; K. E. Logstrup, 'Verkündigung', *RGGM* VI, 1358-60; G. Friedrich, *TDNT* III, 683-718 (with bibliography); G. Friedrich, *TDNT* II, 707-37; D. Grasso, 'Il kerygma e la predicazione', *Gregorianum* 41 (1960), 424-50; H. Schürmann, 'Kerygma', *LTK* VI, 122-5; Bultmann 63-92 and 306-14; H. Schlier, *Wort Gottes*, Würzburg 1962; J. Audrissau, *DBT* 838-43; A. Regan, 'The Word of God and the Ministry of preaching', *Studia Moralia* 1 (1963), 389-449; I. Hermann, 'Kerygma und Kirche', *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Festschrift J. Schmid), Regensburg 1963, 110-14; K. Rahner, 'Die missionarische Predigt', *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie* I, Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1964, 220-29; V. Schurr, 'Die Gemeinde predigt', *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie* I, 230-65; D. Grasso, *L'annuncio della Salvezza*, Naples 1965 (with bibliography).

Robert Koch