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The dogmatic Constitution Dei Verbum of Vatican II is the most recent comprehensive document of the Magisterium on the subject of sacred Scripture. It is another milestone in the development of the science of the Bible which has received a particular impetus over the past hundred years, starting from the publication of the encyclical Providentissimus Deus in 1893. Dei Verbum is a synthesis of much of the riches of this scriptural doctrine of Leo XIII and of that published is subsequent documents of the Magisterium. However, the approach of Dei Verbum is somewhat different in that it specifically avoids technical analysis and language and, like the rest of the documents of Vatican II, is written primarily from a pastoral point of view.

The purpose of this study is to examine the doctrine of Chapter III of the Constitution on Divine Revelation which deals with the fundamental ideas of the inspiration and the interpretation of sacred Scripture. A first reading of the conciliar text indicates without any doubt what the Church wished to say in this dogmatic Constitution. However, consequent to the recent publication of all the Acta Synodalia of Vatican II during the period 1971 to 1978, it is now known that the definitive text was the result of a considerable amount of work on the part of the Council Fathers and the Doctrinal Commission which gave a precise meaning to every word and every phrase of the Council document. Because of this, in order to determine and define the real meaning of the text, it is necessary to reflect on the background work done on the constitution Dei Verbum, if one is to avoid the danger of interpreting the text from a subjective point of view rather than according to the mind of the Council.

To accomplish this task we had recourse to the Acta Synodalia, studying with care the proposals which the Fathers
made at each stage of the editorial *iter* of the document to determine the effective influence which the Council Fathers had on the conciliar text. Although several studies of *Dei Verbum* have been made, it would seem that to date no one of these has taken full cognisance of the additional information which the recent publication of the *Acta Synodalia* has provided.

As will be seen, the Constitution on Divine Revelation went through five different drafts from the day it was first introduced to the Council Chamber (14 November 1962) until the definitive text was solemnly voted on 18 November 1965, just three years later. The editorial intinerary of *Dei Verbum* during this period gave rise, on the one hand, to a considerable volume of oral and written comment by the Council Fathers which, on the other hand, elicited a number of significant replies and doctrinal clarifications from the doctrinal Commission responsible for the redaction of the different drafts.

The nature of scriptural inspiration and the science of biblical hermeneutics are topics of exceptional interest for the study of theology today. Nevertheless, it is generally admitted that some of the ocurrent perceptions of these aspects of sacred Scripture can only with difficulty be reconciled with the teaching of the Magisterium on these topics. This is partly due to the fact that they are the result of a less than rigorous examination of the full implications of the doctrine contained in chapter III of the Constitution on Divine Revelation.

To carry out such a detailed study was the object of our doctoral dissertation. In this *excerptum*, however, we are only publishing those two chapters of the thesis which examine the nature of the divine charism of scriptural inspiration as expressed according to the mind of the Fathers of Vatican II. It is our opinion that only on the basis of a precise understanding of the concept of divine inspiration as articulated by the Magisterium of the Church, will it be possible to arrive at an accurate perception of the nature of scriptural inerrancy and of the principles which determine an orthodox approach to biblical hermeneutics.
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I. THE DOCTRINE OF BIBLICAL INSPIRATION

In this chapter we will consider the doctrine of the divine origin of Sacred Scripture as it is articulated in the constitution Dei Verbum. To establish a context in which to assess the affirmations of the Council Fathers on this point, we shall review briefly the previous teaching of the Magisterium. We shall also examine how Tradition and Sacred Scripture itself have lead to a clearer understanding and a more precise articulation of this doctrine.

We have already seen how the statement of the relationship between Sacred Scripture and Tradition was one of the topics of particular concern to the Council Fathers and the doctrinal Commission. The point at issue was whether all revealed truths are contained in Sacred Scripture, or whether some come to us from Tradition only. This concern was reflected in the discussion of the opening words of paragraph 11 of the conciliar text on biblical inspiration. We shall see how the Council arrived at a formula which left open the question of the relationship between Sacred Scripture and Tradition. Our analysis will follow the development of the text, and will note how the Council emphasised the scriptural basis for biblical inspiration and the apostolic origin of this teaching; how the doctrine of the universal extension of inspiration is articulated in the Constitution and confirmed by reference to previous documents of the Magisterium.

We will examine the continuity of doctrine in the conciliar text and see how closely the articulation of the teaching
in *Dei Verbum* resembles that of previous magisterial documents on this subject.

Finally we shall note the criteria which Pope Paul VI gave for the interpretation of conciliar text and, as a consequence, draw attention to various points which are implicit in this dogmatic Constitution.

1. **The traditional catholic notion of inspiration**

The word «inspiration» has its origin in the latin text of the Vulgate. When St. Paul refers to Sacred Scripture as being *theopnéustos*, the Vulgate translates it as «*divinitus in-spirata*»², divinely inspired. The divine origin of Scripture is a truth which has been affirmed from the very earliest period of the history of the Church³.

Since inspiration is a phenomenon of the supernatural order, we need the testimony of God to come to know of it. God has revealed the fact of inspiration and the existence of inspire books⁴. This divine revelation has been recorded and transmitted by the apostolic tradition, and this in its turn, has been transmitted by the ecclesiastical tradition which guarantees with infallible certainty the existence of the inspired books. The Church proposes this revealed truth to the faithful by means of its Magisterium at the ordinary or at the extraordinary level.

a) **The testimony of Sacred Scripture about Inspiration**

In the Old Testament there is no explicit testimony about inspiration. There are, however, a number of references which indicate clearly that the Israelites were persuaded of the divine origin of the Bible. Thus in several places in the Old Testament the hagiographer is said to have received an order from God to put his words in writing. For example, in Exodus 17,14 Moses by divine command makes a description of the victory over the Amelchites. The book of the law, composed by Moses,
contains the «words which Yahweh has said to you» and it is called by Josueh himself «the book of the law of God».

The prophets also receive from God the command to speak and to write in his name. Because of this they repeat frequently in the Old Testament the words «This is what the Lord says».

We have a clearer argument from the Jewish tradition attested to in the Bible. This recognised a collection of sacred books which were held in great honour; they were placed in the Ark of the Covenant and were called holy. Jewish extrabiblical writers such as Philo and Flavius Joseph admit and clearly express their belief in the sanctity and inspiration of the sacred books which is admitted unanimously by all the Israelite tradition.

The New Testament speaks about the inspiration of the books of the Old Testament both implicitly and explicitly. This doctrine is implicit in the absolute and indisputable authority which Jesus Christ and the apostles attribute to the Old Testament in such a way that everything contained in it has necessarily to be fulfilled. The reason why Jesus and the apostles attribute such authority to the Old Testament is because God is its author. This divine origin of scripture is expressed in different formulas in the New Testament: «what the Lord has announced through the prophet»; «the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophet Isaias»; «David himself, inspired by the Holy Spirit, said»; etc. In these expressions we can detect in a latent manner the doctrine which patristic theology, and later St. Thomas, was to develop: God is the principal author, the principal cause, in the composition of Scripture, and the human author is the instrumental cause.

In the New Testament there are two texts which explicitly affirm the divine inspiration of Scripture. One of these texts is from St. Paul’s second Letter to Timothy where he says «All Scripture is inspired by God and useful for teaching, for reproofing, for correcting, for instructing in justice; that the man of God may be perfect, equipped for every good work». The other is to be found in St. Peter’s second epistle: «This, then, you must understand first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture
is made by private interpretation, for not by will of man was prophecy brought at any time; but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit\textsuperscript{15}. Both refer to the divine inspiration of the Old Testament and mutually complement each other. The first formally affirms the inspiration of all the books of the Old Testament; the second is more general but it describes with significant precision the nature of inspiration itself. St. Paul exhorts his disciple, Timothy, to persevere in the doctrine which he has learned from himself, and to devote himself to the reading of Sacred Scripture, which will be of great use to him in the exercise of his pastoral office, because it is inspired by God an in it God makes his will known. St. Peter, speaking about the nature of the divine influence of inspiration, says, effectively, that the hagiographers were instruments in the hands of God, since the Holy Spirit impelled them and moved them to speak and to write on behalf of God those things which the Lord gave them to understand.

As far as inspiration of the New Testament is concerned, there are no explicit testimonies in Sacred Scripture. However there are some texts which seem to suppose the divine inspiration of the New Testament. In II Pet. 3,16\textsuperscript{16} the epistles of St. Paul are put on the same level as the other scriptures of the Old Testament, whose inspiration is expressly affirmed by St. Peter in the same epistle as we have seen above. Another text which seems to indicate the divine inspiration of the New Testament comes from St. Paul who in I Tim. 5,18\textsuperscript{17} cites the text of Deut. 25,4 and Lk. 10,7 under the same title: «For the Scripture says: 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treads out the grain' and 'The labourer is worthy of his wages'». From this it would appear that St. Paul is attributing the same authority to St. Luke as to Deuteronomy. St. John, in the Apocalypse, affirms that on a number of occasions he had received an order from God to write\textsuperscript{18}. In addition he refers to his book as prophecy and attributes to it the highest authority\textsuperscript{19}.

Apart from the scriptural indications, there is also a very strong reason of convenience for the inspiration of the New Testament. If, in effect, the Old Testament is inspired because the prophets speak in it, with all the more reason should the
New Testament be inspired because it is there that God himself speaks to men.

b) The Testimony of Tradition about Inspiration

All of Tradition, from the time of the apostolic Fathers, teaches unanimously that the books of the Bible contain the word of God. The apostolic Fathers affirm that the books, both of the Old and the New Testament are «oracles of God», «the word of the Holy Spirit» 20. St. Clement of Rome is even clearer in another passage where he says that the scriptures were «inspired by the Holy Spirit» 21. These expressions, which the apostolic Fathers received from the apostles themselves, clearly demonstrate the belief which they had in the divine inspiration of Scripture.

The apologetic Fathers speak even more precisely. They do not limit themselves, like their predecessors, to affirming their faith in the divine inspiration of the books of Scripture. They justify this faith, demonstrating it on the basis of two arguments (i) the remarkable concordance of the sacred writers in their doctrine, and (ii) the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. St. Justin, Martyr, affirms that the prophets and the hagiographers «spoke under the influence of the Holy Spirit» 22, and that «the prophets, being divinely inspired, did not relate anything except with a divine word» 23. St. Irenaeus expressly attributes the New Testament to the Holy Spirit 24.

The Fathers of the 3rd to the 5th century teach that the prophet is an instrument by means of which God manifests his will 25, that the sacred author writes under divine inspiration 26, and that the Old and the New Testament are equally inspired because both have God as their author. There are several references in Origen to the fact that each one of the books of both Testaments is divinely inspired 27. Among others, St. John Chrysostom 28, St. Jerome 29, and St. Augustine 30 give very clear testimony to the inspiration of Sacred Scripture. With particular interest we note that St. Gregory the Great says that «the Holy Spirit is the author of these books» 31, and that Clement
of Alexandria affirms that «God is the principal cause of the Old and the New Testament» 32.

All the Fathers, without having the theological precision which was to be developed later, take for granted that the Scriptures are a work of God ant that they are inspired by Him 33.

c) St. Thomas and Biblical Inspiration

A synthesis, however brief, of the traditional doctrine on divine inspiration cannot omit a reference to the contribution of St. Thomas Aquinas in this field.

Taking as his starting point the doctrine of the Church Fathers, the fundamental principle of the exegesis of St. Thomas was his faith in the divine origin of Sacred Scripture: «auctor sacrae Scripturae est Deus» 34. In saying that God is the author of Sacred Scripture, St. Thomas meant to say much more than what is understood by the general doctrine of the first causality of God over everything which exists and moves. The action of God is present in all things. He is the first Cause of any book which is written by human industry alone, since in the activity of the human writer, the divine causality is also present in a fundamental way. But god is author of Sacred Scripture in a different, in a higher way. In affirming the divine origin of the sacred books, what is meant is that it is a work which pertains properly only to God — ut opus proprium, as Aquinas says 35— and thus only to Him ought they be attributed primarily and principally.

To indicate clearly the singular action of God in the composition of the inspired books, St. Thomas equates it to another supernatural action of God —the working of miracles: works which are above the ordinary laws of nature and which are only possible to the author of that nature 36. The composition of Sacred Scripture, like miracles, is an effect of God which surpasses the powers and efforts of any kind of creature. In a way which is analogous to that by which Christ, who is God and man, worked miracles through his human nature, God, through the hagiographers, produced a work which is divine. In Sacred Scripture the divine action is very superior. God works in an
immediate way above the ordinary course of secondary causes as when he works a miracle, and though a creature intervenes in its execution, the effect is due principally to the surpassing effectiveness of the divine omnipotence. Sacred Scripture is a divine supernatural action which it is impossible to reduce to the operation of the hagiographer, an action of God which no creature can appropriate.

d) *The Magisterium of the Church as regards the divine inspiration of the Bible*

The Church has always taught the divine inspiration of Scripture. This firm belief was expressed in different documents ranging from simple professions of faith to solemn dogmatic definitions. There is a gradual development in the Church's teaching as evidenced by the documents of the different periods.

In the first four centuries we find catalogues of «canonical» books established as a reaction against heretics, particularly the Marcionists, and against some apocryphal books which had begun to circulate among the Christians. The oldest canon in existence is the Muratorian Fragment which dates from the second century and contains a catalogue of the books of the New Testament. The inclusion of particular books in the conciliar canons of the first centuries testifies to the implicit belief in the inspiration of these books.

During the period from the fifth to the thirteenth century, the Church insisted particularly on the idea of the one and the same God as author of both the Old and the New Testaments. The reason for this affirmation was to oppose the erroneous doctrines of the Marcionists and the Manicheans which had infiltrated Christian belief. According to this doctrine the God of the Old Testament was different from the God of the New Testament and thus they rejected all the books of the Old Testament. One of the most important documents of this period is the *Antiqua regula Fidei*, dating from the middle of the fifth century, which condemns the distinction between the God of the Old Law and the God of the Gospels.
and anathematises anyone who accepts books of Scripture other than those received by the Catholic Church. The letter of Pope St. Leo in the year 1053, the profession of faith prescribed by Innocent III for the Waldensians (1208), and the second council of Lyons (1274) in the profession of faith for Michael Paleologus, all confirm that the one God is the author of the New and the Old Testaments, of the law, the prophets and the apostles.

A third period followed which saw a great evolution and new advances in the concept of inspiration and in the definition of the canon of Scripture. This period included the councils of Florence (1441), the Council of Trent (1546), and Vatican I (1870). The Council of Florence repeated the proposition of the one God as author of the New and the Old Testaments, because both were written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It also condemned manichean dualism. In the decree «De Canonicis Scripturis», the Council of Trent solemnly defined the canonicity of all the sacred books, together with all their parts. The canonicity of these books is based on the fact that «God is their author», i.e. because they are inspired. Thus while the decree does not define the concept of inspiration, it assumes it as the basis of the canonicity of the books of the Bible.

Vatican I is the supreme authority on the existence of divine inspiration because it defined inspiration as a dogma of faith. None of the previous councils had to deal with the question of inspiration since it was only with the advent of the rationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that the matter of the inspiration of the Bible was put in doubt. In the dogmatic constitution Dei Filius, after firstly recalling the doctrine of Trent about the canonicity of the books of the Bible, it goes on to say: «The Church regards them as sacred and canonical... because having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their author, and as such have been given to the Church». Then in canon 4 of De Revelatione, Vatican I goes on to define as a dogma of faith the supernatural inspiration of the Bible in the following words: «If anyone were not to receive as sacred and canonical the books of Sacred Scripture, integral with all their parts as enumerated...»
by the holy Council of Trent, or if he were to deny that they were divinely inspired, let him be anathema 47.

The most recent period comprehends all the major pontifical documents subsequent to Vatican I, which emphasise particularly the inerrancy and the extension of biblical inspiration. In the period after Vatican I, faced with the new discoveries of the auxiliary biblical sciences, catholic exegetes were at a disadvantage by comparison with Protestants who were much more involved in these sciences. Many catholic scholars didn’t know how to reconcile the inspiration of Scripture with these discoveries of the positive sciences and arrived at the simplistic solution of limiting biblical inspiration to matters of faith and morals which these discoveries did not affect. Leo XIII, in the encyclical Providentissimus Deus, rejected this limitation which was proposed by some authors and went on to repeat the doctrine of Vatican I on this point 48.

St. Pius X, in the decree Lamentabili (1907), rejected the proposition of the modernists which said «Those who believe that God is truly the author of Sacred Scripture manifest an excessive simplicity or ignorance» 49. Benedict XV in his encyclical Spiritus Paraclitus (1920) expounds the doctrine of St. Jerome in the following terms: «You will not find a single page of the writings of the Doctor Maximus where he does not support firmly and constantly with the universal Catholic Church the following proposition: that the books of Sacred Scripture, written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have God for their author and as such have been given to the Church. He affirms in effects that the books of Sacred Scripture were composed under the inspiration, at the suggestion of, or indeed at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. He goes even further by saying that they were written and edited by the Holy Spirit, without, on the other hand, putting in doubt the fact that each one of the authors had collaborated with the inspiration of God, according to the nature and the intellectual capacity of each one» 50.

Pius XII, in his encyclical Divino afflante Spiritu to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Providentissimus Deus, not only reiterates all the doctrine of the Magisterium about divine
inspiration since the Council of Trent, but he teaches this truth in the very first paragraph of his encyclical as a basis for all the subsequent doctrine which is to follow: «By the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the Sacred Writers wrote these books which God in accordance with his paternal love for the human race, wished, out of his generosity, to bestow (on his Church) for teaching, confirming, correcting and guiding in justice, with the objective that the man of God would be perfect and made ready for every good work» ⁵¹.

e) The Extension of Inspiration

The Magisterium of the Church teaches that inspiration extends to all the content of Sacred Scripture irrespective of whether it is dealing with religious or profane topics, with subjects of great doctrinal importance or with matters which are of no real significance.

The Fathers of the Church always affirm that everything in Scripture is the work of the Holy Spirit, even those points which seem to be of no real importance. Hence they held that in all the words of the Bible a deep meaning can be found ⁵². Leo XIII in his encyclical Providentissimis Deus summarises the judgement of Christian tradition on the extension of divine inspiration as follows: «All the Fathers and Doctors are unanimous in affirming that the books of Scripture in their totality and in each one of their parts enjoy the same divine inspiration» ⁵³.

St. Pius X confirmed the same doctrine in the decree Lamentabili ⁵⁴, and a few years later, the mind of Benedict XV was expressed very clearly in a reply of the Pontifical Biblical Commission dated 18 June 1915 ⁵⁵. According to this reply, everything which the hagiographer affirms, enunciates or insinuates is equally affirmed, enuntiated or insinuated by the Holy Spirit. Pius XII confirmed this teaching of his predecessors in this encyclicals Divino afflante Spiritu ⁵⁶ and Humani generis ⁵⁷.

2. The inspiration of the Bible in No. 11 of «Dei Verbum»

In the light of the traditional doctrine about the divine origin of Sacred Scripture and the extension of Biblical inspira-
tion, we will now consider the doctrine of the dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum* on this point. The teaching of *Dei Verbum* on the divine origin of Sacred Scripture is affirmed at the beginning of paragraph 11 as follows:


This is a straightforward statement of the traditional doctrine on the divine inspiration of the Bible, which is confirmed by the content of the references in note 1 59. However, with the help of the *Acta Synodalia* it will be instructive to examine the genesis of this affirmation in the different stages of the Council debate. Thus we will be able to assess more precisely the exact meaning and emphasis which the Council Fathers intended to give to the definitive text on the doctrine of divine inspiration.

a) *Revelation and inspiration*

The exposition of the doctrine on biblical inspiration in *Dei Verbum* is considered in the context of revelation. We can perhaps detect here a slight change of emphasis by comparison with previous documents of the Magisterium. Since the time of Leo XIII, because of historical and doctrinal requirements, much of the teaching on inspiration was presented in function of the defence of the truth of Scripture. However, it is of interest to note that in Vatican Council I the topic of inspiration was dealt with in the chapter on revelation, and that the definition of the dogma of inspiration is included in the canons about revelation. In a sense there is thus in Vatican II a return to the focus of Vatican I.
Although we shall see that the exposition of the concept of divine inspiration is very much along traditional lines, this conciliar text is not without its own particular insights. *Dei Verbum* clarifies more explicitly that the inspirational action is ordained to putting revelation into writing. So it is affirmed in the central passage of paragraph no. 11: «ut ... ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, ut veri auctores, scripto traderent» and in other parts of the Constitution. The Constitution presents revelation as the divine word through which God manifests himself. To transmit revelation God used a double way—the oral preaching of the apostles, and the putting of revelation in writing. According to the conciliar text, the object of inspiration is this putting in writing, by means of which revelation becomes Sacred Scripture.

b) *The Formula «Divinitus Revelata»*

Paragraph 11 of schema II begins with the words «Divina Revelatio». However a number of Council Fathers requested that this wording be changed for various reasons. One of the Fathers said that, at first sight, the words «Divina Revelatio» could give the impression that all of revelation was contained in Sacred Scripture. He points out that the Council did not intend, nor was it yet in a position to solve the disputed question of whether all revealed truths are contained in Sacred Scripture, or whether some come to us from Tradition only. A revised phraseology «Divinitus revelata», was proposed by another Council Father for the reason that the act of Revelation itself is distinguished from those things which are revealed. The German speaking bishops also suggested the phraseology «Divinitus revelata», giving as their reason the fact that the term «revelatio» primarily signified the act of revealing. Another one of the Council Fathers commented that the ambiguity of the phrase «Divina Revelatio» could also lead to the conclusion—that all the hagiographers were necessarily conscious of the fact that they were writing under the influence of the Holy Spirit.
The doctrinal Commission, however, although it refers to the Council Fathers mentioned above in support of its decision to change the opening words of paragraph 11, indicates that «this change was made so as to leave open the question of the relationship between Sacred Scripture and Tradition» i.e. the use of the words «Divina Revelatio» could imply that all of Revelation was contained in Sacred Scripture, and the Council did not wish to become involved in this issue.

There was another slight change in this first phrase of paragraph 11; instead of «Divino Spiritu» in schema II, the words «Spiritu Sancto» were used by the Commission in schema III (cfr. Appendix 3, p. 299) and subsequently, to avoid repetition of the word «Divinum» in the same line.

This first sentence of paragraph 11 of schema III was accepted in schema IV (cfr. Appendix 4, p. 304) without any further change. However, in schema V, as a result of various suggestions by the Council Fathers, the order of the phrases in the first sentence was inverted by the Commission to provide greater clarity. Thus the definitive opening sentence of paragraph 11 in schema V read:

«Divinitus revelata, quae in Sacra Scriptura litteris continentur et prostant, Spiritu Sancto afflante consignata sunt».

By comparison the text in schema IV read:

«Divinitus revelata, quae afflante Spiritu Sancto litteris consignata sunt, in Sacra Scriptura continentur et pro­stant».

c) The Doctrine of the Divine Origin of Sacred Scripture as developed during the Council

To complete the conciliar text on the divine origin of Sacred Scripture, the following sentence was added to the text which we have seen above:
«Libros enim integros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum omnibus eorum partibus, sancta Mater Ecclesia ex apostolica fide pro sacris et canonicis habet, propterea quod, Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti (cfr. Io. 20. 21; II Tim. 3, 16: II Pt. 1, 19-21; 3, 15-16), Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt» 72.

When this idea was first articulated in schema II it read as follows:

«Quae Scriptura, ex apostolica fide, ‘divinitus inspirata’ (II Tim. 3, 16) creditur, quia nimirum Deum habet principalem auctorem» 73.

A number of Fathers were dissatisfied with this statement on biblical inspiration and submitted various proposals for improving it. As a consequence, the doctrinal Commission took the following text 74, proposed by one of the Fathers, as a basis for the text of schema III, saying that it satisfied the desires of many Fathers 75.

«Libris enim Veteris quam Novi Testamenti sancta Mater Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet propterea quod, Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt».

The doctrinal Commission modified this proposed text as follows:

(i) the phrase «ex apostolica fide» from schema II was introduced into the text proposed for schema III in order that the apostolic origin of the doctrine of biblical inspiration should be explicitated 76.

(ii) two references —Jn. 20.31 77 and II Pet. 3,15-16 78— were added to the biblical reference already given in schema II, i.e. II Tim. 3,16 79. II Tim. 3,16, as we have already seen, is one of the classic texts in which the doctrine of the divine origin of Sacred Scripture is taught explicitly. II Pet. 3,15-16 puts the epistles of St. Paul on the same level as the writings
of the Old Testament, where as Jn. 20,31 is a statement of the supernatural end of scripture—belief in the central message of revelation, that Jesus Christ is God through whom comes supernatural life.

Thus the text of this second sentence of schema III on the divine origin of Scripture reads as follows:

«Libros enim tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti sanit Mater Ecclesia, ex apostolica fide (cfr. Io. 20,31; II Tim. 3,16; II Pet. 3,15-16), pro sacram et canonici habet propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt».

(iii) In schema IV a reference to II Pet. 1,19-20 was added by the doctrinal Commission. In schema V, the definitive text, this reference to II Pet. 1,19-20 was extended to include verse 21 as follows: «non enim voluntate humana allata est aliquando prophetia: sed Spiritu Sancto inspirati, locuti sunt sancti Dei homines». This latter verse is the scriptural reference which most clearly manifests that biblical inspiration is a supernatural motion, a divine impulse, which the Holy Spirit exercises over the hagiographer. Thus in schema V we have four biblical texts which either confirm the divine origin of Scripture or indicate the supernatural nature of this charism.

(iv) It is to be noted that the use of the scholastic term «auctorem principalem» in schema II was discontinued in the third and subsequent schemas. The definitive text reads simple «Deum habent auctorem». In our study of the collaboration of God and man in the writing of the Bible in chapter III, we shall be discussing in detail the significance of this change.

d) The Extension of Inspiration

In schema V the doctrine of the conciliar text is completed by the affirmation of the universal extension of this divine charisms. In the definitive text the word «integros» is included in the phrase «Libros enim tam Veteris...» and the phrase «cum
omnibus eorum partibus" is also added. This affirmation of the universal extension of divine inspiration is confirmed by the content of the references in note 1 appended to this part of the text:

(i) by reference to a text of Vatican I which contains the phrase «Qui quidem Veteris et Novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus... pro sacris et canonicos suscepiendi sunt».

(ii) by the reply of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 18 June 1915, which refers to «the catholic dogma of the inspiration and inerrancy of Sacred Scripture in virtue of which everything which the hagiographer affirms, enunciates and insinuates ought to be taken as affirmed, enuntiated or insinuated by the Holy Spirit».

(iii) by reference to part of a letter of the Sacred Congregation for the Holy Office dated 23 December 1923. This letter quotes from three magisterial documents which confirm the universality of biblical inspiration:

— Providentissimus Deus: which says «All of the books which the Church recognises as sacred and canonical have been written integrally with all their parts under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit».

— Lamentabili: which condemns the proposition that denied that inspiration extends to all and every part of Scripture.

— Letter of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 18 June 1915: whose content we have seen in (ii) above and which is repeated in the letter of 23 December 1923.

Another reference to the universality of biblical inspiration is made further on in the text of paragraph 11, in the introduction to the part which deals with the veracity of Scripture. It begins with the phrase: «Cum ergo omne id, quod auctores inspirati seu hagiographi asserunt, retineri debeat assertum a Spiritu Sancto...», words which are very similar to those used in the reply of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 1915 about the extension of biblical inspiration which we have noted in (ii) above.
Thus we see that the Conciliar text explicitly teaches the universal extension of biblical inspiration and confirms this assertion by several references to the Magisterium of the Church, including the reference to the letter of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (1915) which affirms "the Catholic dogma of the... inerrancy of Sacred Scripture".

e) Interpretation of the Conciliar text

After the addition of the word "integros" and the phrase "cum omnibus eorum partibus" the definitive text has a wording which is effectively the same as the classical text on inspiration in the decree on Revelation of Vatican I. The conciliar text in Dei Verbum reads as follows:

"Libros enim integros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum omnibus eorum partibus, sancta Mater Ecclesia ex apostolica fide pro sacris et canonicis habet, propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti (c. Io. 20, 31; II Tim. 3, 16; II Pet. 1, 19-21; 3, 15-16), Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt".

The parallel text in the decree on Revelation in Vatican I affirms:

"Veteris et Novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus... pro sacris et canonicis suscepiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet... propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt" 90.

In the above text from the decree on Revelation, the references (i) to the Vulgate and (ii) to erroneous interpretations of inspiration are omitted in order to see more clearly the extent of the parallelism between the Dei Verbum text and that of Vatican I. Apart from this similarity it is of interest to note that the text of Dei Verbum emphasises two additional elements:
(i) the apostolic origin of the notion of inspiration («ex apostolica fidei»), and
(ii) the scriptural confirmation of the doctrine of biblical inspiration.

In addition, the references in note 1 give us a perspective on how this part of the next of Dei Verbum should be interpreted. The first reference is to the central text of Vatican I about inspiration 91. We have already seen above the similarity between part of this text and the text of Dei Verbum which we are discussing. The Vatican I text also refers to the following elements:

— the faith of the universal Church, as declared by the Council of Trent, in the canon of Scripture as found in the ancient Vulgate edition;

— the rejection of two erroneous interpretations of the doctrine of biblical inspiration: i) the theory of «subsequent approval» by the Church and (ii) the theory that the inspiration of the Bible consists in the fact that the books of Scripture do not contain error.

The second reference in note 1—the reply of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 18 June 1915—we have already seen in connection with the doctrine of the extension of inspiration 92. The third element in note 1—EB 499—is a reference to part of a letter of the Sacred Congregation for the Holy Office which contains references to three different magisterial documents. We have already considered how each of these three documents refers to the extension of inspiration. However, the first of these documents, which is a quotation from Providentissimus Deus 93, also draws attention to the following:

— the absolute inerrancy of Scripture as a consequence of inspiration extending to all parts of the Bible;

— the constant faith of the Church about inspiration as confirmed by the councils of Florence, Trent and Vatican I;

— the nature of inspiration as a supernatural power by which God influences the intellect, the will and the executive faculties of the hagiographer;
— that those who think that the books of Scripture could contain any error destroy the catholic notion of divine inspiration.

Thus we see that note I refers to five different declarations of the Magisterium on the divine origin of Scripture which confirm the Church's teaching from the time of the council of Florence. We must therefore assume that what is said in Dei Verbum about the divine origin of the Bible has to be interpreted in the light of these previous statements of the Magisterium on this topic, particularly if we bear in mind what Pope Paul VI said nexo cohaerent cum Magisterio ecclesiastico superioris aetatis, cuius continuatio, explicatio atque incrementum sunt dicenda.\(^9^4\)

Thus in Dei Verbum, while there is a more explicit emphasis on the scriptural basis for the doctrine of biblical inspiration, the teaching of this consiliar text is a very clear and explicit exposition of the traditional doctrine on this topic, even to the point of articulating it with formulas taken from previous documents of the Magisterium.

f) **Erroneous theories of Inspiration**

The reference to Vatican I, which we have seen above, contains the following affirmation: «Qui quidem Veteris et Novi Testamenti libri cum omnibus suis partibus... pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria cincinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat quod revelationem sine errore continet; sed propterea, quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem»\(^9^5\).

It is thus to be noted that this reference to Vatican I condemns two particular errors with regard to the nature of divine inspiration: (i) the theory of «subsequent approval» by the Church, and (ii) the theory of «negative assistance» according to which the inspiration of the Bible consists simply in the fact that the books of Scripture do not contain any error.

According to the theory of subsequent approval, a book written by human effort alone would be regarded as being in-
spired by the simple fact of being included by the Church in the canon of Scripture after it had been written. As a consequence the composition of the book is attributed totally to the hagiographer. The Church in effect guarantees the contents of the book, but does not in any way change the nature of the book which remains a human work and is in no way the result of the extraordinary providence of God.

According to the other theory of «negative assistance» condemned by Vatican I, inspiration consists in the supernatural and particular «assistance» of God which preserves the hagiographer from error; God does not influence the sacred writer in a positive manner. The assistance of God to the hagiographer is not causal, that is to say by the interaction of God as «principal cause» with the hagiographer as «instrumental cause», but is of such a kind that it has as its only objective to ensure that the hagiographer does not fall into error or omit anything which God wishes him to say. As regards its origin, Sacred Scripture according to this theory is in no way different from other books. However, it is not sufficient that for a book to be inspired it should be free from error. Inspiration presupposes the positive action of God who produces a work in which he is the principal cause of its content. Inerrancy, as we shall see later, is a consequence of inspiration, not its essence.

Although the doctrinal Commission was requested by some Council Fathers to condemn modern errors with regard to the nature of inspiration, there is no explicit reference in this part of the council document to these errors. However we have seen that Dei Verbum, in its reference to Vatican I in note 1, indirectly condemns the theory of «subsequent approval» and the theory that the books of Scripture are human work without error.

In the discussion on schema IV two erroneous proposals were made with regard to the nature of inspiration different, however, from the two erroneous theories which we have seen above. One Council Father explained inspiration as the evolution of religious knowledge which the authors and the primitive Church wrote under God's providence. The doctrinal Commis-
sion replied that it could not be admitted that inspiration could be reduced solely to divine providence.\footnote{96}

Another Council Father suggested that in line 12 of paragraph 11 of schema IV, the phrase «modo singulari vel sociali» should be added after the words «Deus homines elegit»\footnote{97}. This was effectively a proposal affirming that the charism of inspiration was not only a personal one but that it was also a communal or social charism. This erroneous proposal, which corresponds to some of the current errors regarding the notion of inspiration, was rejected by the doctrinal Commission.

Thus we see that the Council, while not condemning directly errors in relation to the divine origin of the Bible, has indirectly rejected four erroneous interpretations of the inspiration of Sacred Scripture.

g) Conclusions

Our analysis of the history of the treatment of the nature of divine inspiration in Chapter III of the dogmatic Constitution \textit{Dei Verbum} leads us to the following conclusions:

1. Although the exposition of the concept of divine inspiration is very much along traditional lines, this conciliar text is not without its own particular insights. While it is implicit in previous magisterial statements, \textit{Dei Verbum} clarifies explicitly that the inspirational action is ordained to putting revelation into writing.

2. The Council document restates the traditional doctrine of the Church with regard to the divine origin of the Bible. In almost identical words as that used by Vatican I, and subsequently quoted by \textit{Providentissimus Deus}, the Constitution reiterates the divine origin of all the books of the Old and the New Testaments, integrally with all their parts. In support of this assertion \textit{Dei Verbum} refers to five different declarations of the Magisterium on the divine origin of the Bible, from the time of the council of Florence.

3. The Council text explicitly teaches the universal extension of biblical inspiration and confirms this assertion by
several references to the previous magisterium of the Church which include Vatican I, the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, the decree *Lamentabili* of St. Pius X, and two replies of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 1915 and 1923.

4. The doctrinal Commission explicitly affirmed the apostolic origin of the doctrine of divine inspiration.

5. *Dei Verbum*, in comparison with previous magisterial documents, gives a particular emphasis to the scriptural basis for the doctrine of divine inspiration by including four scriptural references in this part of the conciliar text. These include the two classic text of II Tim. 3,16 and II Pet. 1,19-21.

6. Although the doctrinal Commission was requested by some Council Fathers to condemn modern errors with regard to the nature of inspiration there is no explicit reference in this part of the Council document to these errors. However, *Dei Verbum* in its reference to Vatican I in note 1, indirectly condemns the theory of «subsequent approval» and the theory that the books of scripture are a human work without error.

The doctrinal Commission also rejected two erroneous proposals by Council Fathers which reflect some of the current errors about the nature of inspiration: (i) the proposal which explained inspiration as the evolution of religious knowledge written under God's providence, and (ii) the idea that the charism of inspiration was not only a personal one, but that it was also a communal or social one. Both of these errors reflect the Modernist theory of inspiration.

II. THE COLLABORATION OF MAN WITH GOD IN THE COMPOSITION OF SACRED SCRIPTURE

In our consideration of the divine origin of Sacred Scripture in Chapter I, we have touched on some aspects of the nature of biblical inspiration. In this present chapter we propose to analyse the charism of inspiration from the point of view of the collaboration of the hagiographer with God in the composition of Sacred Scripture as articulated in the conciliar text.
To provide a context for our study of the relevant section of the constitution, we shall firstly consider the development of the Church’s teaching on the authorship of Sacred Scripture. This will be followed by an analysis of the Acta Synodalia in order to define the development of the conciliar text as it progressed through the five different schemas. We shall see that in the text of Dei Verbum there is first of all a statement of the divine choice of the hagiographers which destines these men to be qualified transmitters of revelation. We will analyse the full implications of the phrase «ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente» as a description of the actuation of the divine influence on the human author in the composition of Sacred Scripture, and see how the Council linked it with the doctrine of Vatican I.

We shall note the comments of the Council Fathers with regard to the use of traditional terminology to explain the nature of divine inspiration and indicate why the doctrinal Commission did not use the word «instrumentum» in the conciliar text. We shall see how the concept of «author» has lead to a deeper understanding of the nature of inspiration both in Tradition and in the Magisterium, and note how by means of the phrase «ut veri auctores» the active part played by the hagiographer in the authorship of Sacred Scripture is emphasised more strongly than in previous magisterial documents.

We will analyse the implications of the phrase «quae Ipse iuberet» and see how its substitution by the phrase «quae Ipse vellet» avoids interpretations which would seem to imply that inspiration was a «mechanical» concept as affirmed by some sixteenth century Protestants, or that the inspiration of the Bible was limited to the things which were commanded by God to be written down.

Finally we shall note that the description of the divine influence on the faculties of the sacred writer is less specific than it is, for example, in Providentissimus Deus and Spiritus Paraclitus, an suggest a possible reason why this might be so.

1. The nature of divine inspiration

Having seen the fact of biblical inspiration as affirmed
Dei Verbum, we shall now go on to examine the nature of this charism as understood by the conciliar text. Since inspiration is the effect of a supernatural action on the hagiographer, the intimate nature of this action surpasses natural perception and can only be made known by God himself through Scripture or Tradition or by the teaching of the Church through its Magisterium. Before going on to study the relevant part of the Constitution we shall firstly examine briefly the teaching of Scripture, Tradition and the Magisterium on this topic and the contribution which theological reflection has made to a deeper understanding of the nature of divine inspiration.

The question of the nature of inspiration is a relatively modern one in that Catholics did not concern themselves with it until after the Protestant reformation when Luther and Calvin advocated the principles of sola Scriptura and private interpretation of the Bible. Luther denied the divine institution of the hierarchy of the Church. For him there was no intermediary between God and the individual. Tradition had only a human historical value. The only source of divine revelation was Sacred Scripture, by means of which God speaks to men (principle of sola Scriptura). Without the Magisterium and Tradition, Scripture ought to be interpreted individually by means of a direct illumination from God for each of the faithful (principle of private interpretation). The reformers had fallen into the error of taking the Bible out of its context and had compounded this error by adding to it the principle of subjectivism. The logical consequence was a progressive fractionation of the Protestant community which is clearly attested to by subsequent events.

The founders of Protestantism had maintained, in general lines, the notion of divine inspiration of the Bible which they had received from the common doctrine of the Church. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Protestantism expounded a concept of inspiration in the most rigid and material sense of the word. Everything in the Bible according to early Protestantism, had been dictated mechanically by the Holy Spirit to the human author.
However, when Luther reached the point where he said that he was not interested in what Christ was in himself, but rather in what Christ meant for me, he had sown the seeds of a theology which was later to find its intellectual expression in the subjective philosophy of Kant. This in turn gave rise to the liberal protestantism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries under whose influence the concept of divine inspiration disappeared from lutheran theology. Schleiermacher, the most representative protestant theologian of the nineteenth century, reduced biblical inspiration to the common spirit which reigned in the primitive church and in the preceeding stages of the history of the people of Israel. For Schleiermacher, all of revelation is given in Christ, and from Christ it passed on to the primitive community by means of a certain influence, which he called inspiration. From his time, protestantism became more and more inclined towards rationalism. Schleiermacher presented a totally erroneous conception of biblical inspiration because he confused inspiration with the revelation made in Christ. Scripture, according to him, had been written by human effort alone and, as a consequence, it was not free from error.98 The concept which modern protestantism has of inspiration is thus totally incompatible with the catholic concept.

a) The nature of Inspiration as understood by Sacred Scripture

The testimony of II Pet. 1,21: «but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit» is that which manifests most clearly that biblical inspiration is a supernatural motion, a divine impulse which the Holy Spirit exercises on the hagiographer. But Scripture also tells us that the hagiographers are authentic instruments and authors of the inspired books. We see this from two points of view:

(i) where scripture testifies that God the Holy Spirit, speaks through the mouth of the prophets, or of the sacred authors. For example, in the Acts of the Apostles, when St Peter is speaking to the assembly on the occasion of the election of St. Matthias: «Brethren, the Scripture must be fulfilled, which
the Holy Spirit declared before by the mouth of David...» (Acts 1,16). Another example is where St Paul proclaims in the epistle to the Romans that he has been chosen: «to preach the Gospel of God, which he had promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures» (Rom 1,2).

(ii) where the words of the hagiographer testify to his own work of preparation and composition. In this context there are two classic examples: the second book of the Maccabees and the prologue to the Gospel of St Luke. Both these texts demonstrate how the hagiographer puts all his human industry and activity at the disposal of divine inspiration in the composition of Sacred Scripture. In the second book of the Maccabees, the author proposes to make a resume of the five volumes which Jason of Cyrene had written about the Maccabees. He says that this work cost him a lot of toil and sweat. On the other hand it is a matter of faith that this book of the Bible is inspired. So the conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the hagiographer puts his full personal human activity at the service of divine inspiration. In no way is he a passive instrument in the process.

The inspired gospel written by St Luke required a detailed preparation and an orderly composition. St Luke was thus a human instrument of the inspirational action.

b) Christian Tradition and the nature of Biblical Inspiration

Christian tradition, which has always professed that the Scriptures are sacred because they are the work of the Holy Spirit, has also left us some testimonies as to how the nature of this divine charism was understood by the early christian authors.

The apostolic Fathers speak of the principal author, i.e. the Holy Spirit, and of the effect of the action of the Holy Spirit, that is to say of Sacred Scripture. Thus St Clement of Rome in various passages of his letter to the Corinthians refers to Sacred Scripture as the word of the Holy Spirit or the word of God.
The apologetic Fathers compare the hagiographer to a musical instrument which God uses in order to make us hear and know the marvellous melody of heavenly things. This is how St. Justin describes inspiration. Clement of Alexandria writes: «But nobody is surprised that the prophets of the omnipotent God were instruments of the divine voice». It is in the same sense that the Nicean Creed speaks of the Holy Spirit «qui locutus est per prophetas». St Augustine, in a well known text, in which he speaks of Christ and the evangelists, says: «In this way, when they wrote the things which He manifested and told them, it cannot be said that he did not write them, because this is what his members did, having come to know them by means of the dictation of the head. All that he wished to leave us of his deeds and sayings, he commanded them to write as if they were his hands».

Tradition thus indicates that the sacred author is an instrument in the hands of God for his work of communication to men. And since the hagiographer is also a cause in the work of writing, tradition implicitly presents the sacred author as an intrumental cause in this biblical work.

c) The contribution of St Thomas to our understanding of the charism of Inspiration

St. Thomas in order to explain more fully the process of the divine action in the psychological faculties of the hagiographer, following the thinking of the early Fathers, uses the theory of instrumental causality. The classic enunciation of this principle is to be found in «De Sensibus Sacrae Scripturae» incorporated in the Quodlibetum VII: «The principal author of Sacred Scripture is the Holy Spirit; the instrumental author is the man, that is, the hagiographer».

St Thomas distinguishes a double type of efficient causality: the principal cause which functions by means of its own capacity, and the instrumental cause, which produces its effect thanks to the motion of the principal agent. The application of the principles of instrumental causality to the process of inspiration has necessarily to take two factors into account: the
plenitude of perfection of God, the principal cause, and the rational and free nature of man, the instrumental agent 107.

Inspiration is thus, for St Thomas, a divine light which is given to the hagiographer so that he is able to judge with the certainty of divine truth, things which are known by natural reason 108.

d) Magisterium and the doctrine of instrumentality

Historically speaking the thomist explanation of the mechanism of inspiration was gaining ground in the last century from the time of Leo XIII.

In his encyclical Providentissimus Deus he makes reference to the contribution of the scholastics to the progress of biblical studies, and in pointing out that their theological works and biblical commentaries manifest the abundance of doctrine which they have drawn out of Sacred Scripture, he says that, in this context, St Thomas excelled in a particular way 109. Later, in the same encyclical, he says that those who cultivate in depth the study of philosophy and theology under the direction of St Thomas, will be perfectly prepared to undertake biblical studies 110.

Benedict XV, in describing the doctrine of St Jerome in Spiritus Paraclitus, gives is further insights into the nature of the relationship between the divine and human authors in the composition of the books of the Bible when he describes God as the principal cause of Sacred Scripture 111.

The thomistic principle of instrumental causality as a way of explaining the nature of biblical inspiration is effectively canonised by Pius XII in his encyclical Divino afflante Spiritu when he says: «Catholic theologians, following the teaching of the holy Fathers and especially of the Angelic and Common Doctor, have investigated and explained the nature and effects of divine inspiration better and more fully than was the custom in past centuries. Starting from the principle that the sacred writer is the organon or instrument of the Holy Spirit, and a living and instrument, they rightly observe that under the in-
fluence of the divine motion he uses his own faculties and powers in such a way that from the book, which is the fruit of his labour, all may easily learn the distinctive genius and individual characteristics and features of each author. 112.

e) The Divine-Human conflux in the authorship of Scripture

The notion of efficient causality, principal and instrumental, as used to explain the collaboration of God and man in the composition of the sacred books, has to be understood in an analogous way and not in a strict and univocal manner. In the case of the divine-human conflux in inspiration, the instrument is not something dead and material, but is rather something live and free.

The image of the instrument is a very useful and fruitful analogy to explain the problem of inspiration. On the one hand it respects the transcendence and omnipotence of God who has a His disposal all the secondary causes, both natural and supernatural, and on the other hand it respects the full freedom of the sacred authors whom the divine motion impels to write but always respecting the human nature of the instrument. This analogy explains how, at the same time, the one had the same effect can pertain to two subordinated causes which concur, according to their proper natures, in the production of one effect 113.

From this is deduced that in the composition of a sacred book, all of the book’s argument and literary form, ideas and words, are an effect of the divine-human action: God working as principal cause, the hagiographer as instrument subordinate to the first cause. Because of this the influence of inspiration extends to all parts of the sacred book.

The supernatural influence of biblical inspiration, understood according to the doctrine of St Thomas, fully justifies the title of author of Sacred Scripture which christian tradition gives to God. Both in the conception of the book and in its execution, God is present by means of the light of in-
spiration, in which light the human author judges everything. God is, in consequence, author of all the book, but in a totally original way which can only be applied to Him: by His intimate and omnipotent actuation of a live and intelligent instrument. Because of this the sacred book has to be attributed in its totality to God and also in its totality to the hagiographer.

f) *The Divine influence on the faculties of the Hagiographer*

God moves the hagiographer in such a way that he functions according to his human nature, that is freely, in an intelligent and voluntary way. The divine light of inspiration is added to the natural light of reason and sublimates it, but does not substitute it. The charism of inspiration doesn’t suppress the normal activity of the intellect but it elevates it and strengthens it. In biblical inspiration, the Holy Spirit permits the sacred author to work with the fullest freedom; a freedom which has been explained in the documents of the Magisterium.114

Because of the fact that the hagiographer is a true author he has to exercise his faculties to do so. Primarily the spiritual faculties: the understanding and the will; but also the executive corporeal faculties. And since the human author functions as an instrument of God, these faculties have to receive the inspirational motion of God so that He could be considered a true author of the book. The action of God principally affects the spiritual faculties of the hagiographer because the objective which he proposes is of its nature and intellectual one. At the same time the divine action will also influence the executive potencies by means of a special assistance so that they will express the divine thoughts faithfully. This is what Leo XIII teaches clearly: «Because God so stimulated and moved (the hagiographers) with his supernatural influence that they would write, an so assisted them while they were writing that they conceived correctly all and only that which He wanted them to, and they willed to write it faithfully, and expressed it aptly with infallible truth; otherwise He would not be the author of Sacred Scripture*.115
The same doctrine was proposed by Benedict XV in *Spiritus Paraclitus*: «If we ask ourselves in what manner is this influence and action of God, as principal cause, on the hagiographer to be understood, it will be seen that there is no difference between the words of Jerome and the common catholic doctrine about inspiration which teaches that God with his grace provides a light for the mind of the writer so that he proposes to men the truth in the name of God; in addition he moves the will and impels him to write; finally, he assists him in a continuous and special manner until he finishes the book» 116.

In these descriptions of biblical inspiration, both Leo XIII and Benedict XV put in the first place the influence which God exercises on the mind of the hagiographer, that is in his understanding. Afterwards comes the motion in the will, and, finally, the assistance in the executive faculties.

— *Inspiration in the understanding*: God illuminates the intelligence of the hagiographer to make a judgement about the things which have to be written. This is so because what is proper to intellectual activity is to know the truth and this is to be found formally in the judgement. As a consequence the supernatural illumination of God falls on the judgement to enable it to judge with infallible certainty about the truth and the aptness of those things which have to be written in the inspired book 117.

— *Inspiration in the will*: This motion in the will is admitted expressly by Leo XIII in his encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*: «God so stimulated and moved (the hagiographer) with his supernatural influence that they would write... what he wished them to, and that they would want to write if faithfully» 118. The motion of God in the will has necessarily to be physical and it has to be exercised immediately on the will of the hagiographer in order that God be truly the principal cause of the book. A motion that would be moral and mediate on the part of God would make Him to be an author only in a moral and improper sense. The principal cause not only enables the instrument to produce an effect; it is also the cause of the instrumental action 119.
— Inspiration in the executive faculties: The effect of inspiration in the executive faculties is called assistance in the documents of the Magisterium, Leo XIII affirms «God so assisted them while they wrote... that they expressed it aptly with infallible truth» 120. In Spiritus Paraclitus Benedict XV writes: «God assists the hagiographer in a special and continuous manner until he finishes the book» 121.

2. The Divine and Human author in «Dei Verbum»

The collaboration of God and man in the composition of Sacred Scripture is described in Dei Verbum in the following manner:

«In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines eliget, quos facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit, ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente, ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, ut veri auctores scripto traderent» 122.

In this affirmation is given, in a concise form, all the elements which constitute the divine and human interaction in the composition of Sacred Scripture. Before everything there is the providential divine choice which destines these men to the mission of being qualified transmitters of revelation. Afterwards there is the contribution of the human qualities and capacities of the sacred writer which is in no way diminished by the superior divine actuation. This is followed by the statement of the divine action in and by means of the hagiographer as an authentic author is highlighted.

a) The development of the conciliar text

The formula of the definitive text went through various changes in the different schemas. In schema I the distinct phases of the divine actuation on the human author are described in detail: the internal stimulation and motion, followed by the divine assistance to conceptualise correctly and to record
faithfully only those things which God wished them to. At this point the text gives a referente to Providentissimus Deus which indicates how close the Council schema is to the leonine text, (cfr. Appendix 1, no. 8, p. 294).

The text of schema I goes on to give a very full description of the nature of inspiration which it suggests consists of three elements:

(i) a special charism ordained to putting things in writing;
(ii) by means of this charism God speaks to men in writing, acting in and by means of the hagiographer;
(iii) as a consequence, God is in a true sense the principal author of Sacred Scripture.

Finally, the function of the hagiographer in the composition of the Sacred books is compared to that of an organon or instrument of the Holy Spirit, but a living instrument endowed with reason, whose proper nature and individual characteristics can be inferred from the sacred book. Investigation of the note of reference at this point in the text (no. 4) confirms that what is said in schema I is a summary of the teaching of Divino afflante Spiritu on the action of the hagiographer in the process of inspiration.

The second schema abbreviates considerably the description of the divine-human interaction in the composition of the Bible: «Deus autem, hominibus ad id delectis, qui hagiographi vocantur, tamquam vivis instrumentis, omnibus nempe humanis facultatibus praeditis, usus est, ut ea omnia eaque sola quae ipse iuberet, universis hominibus scripto traderent».

It refers to the instrumentality of the hagiographer, to his rationality, and to his human qualities which are used by God to put in writing for men, only those things which he wanted them to. The reference to Divino afflante Spiritu is maintained as is the reference to Providentissimus Deus, but the latter in a reduced form.

After the publication of schema II, there were, as we have seen, many suggestions from the Council Fathers for its improvement. It was at this stage that the doctrinal Commision accepted a text proposed by Rev. C. Butler as the one which seemed to
best satisfy the requirements of the Council Fathers. This text read as follows:

«In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines elegit, quos omnibus facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit, ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipsi revelare placeret, universis hominibus scripto traderent».

Butler's text, modified slightly by the doctrinal Commission, became the text of schema III. It appeared as follows:

«In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines elegit quod omnibus facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit, ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente, ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, scripto traderent».

As can be seen there is no reference to God as the principal author or to the hagiographer as an instrument, but it does include a new phrase — *ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente* — to specify the relationship between God and the hagiographer, a phrase whose implications we will later discuss in detail.

The most important contribution of schema IV is the introduction of the phrase *ut veri auctores* to explicitate more fully the action of the hagiographers. The text of schema IV passed into the definitive text without any further changes.

b) *The divine-human interaction in the composition of the Bible: «ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente»*

As we have already seen, in the text of schema I the nature of biblical inspiration is explained very explicitly in terms of the principle of instrumental causality, as understood by Pius XII in *Divino afflante Spiritu*: «The hagiographer, in composing the books, is the «organon» or instrument of the Holy Spirit, a living instrument endowed with reason, whose proper nature as well as his individual characteristics can be inferred from the sacred book».

Schema I also rejects any attempt to reduce the supernatural character of inspiration to a mere natural impulse or to an emotion of the soul (Cfr. Appendix 1, no. 8, p. 294).
Schema II continues to use the traditional terminology in its statement of the authorship of Sacred Scripture. God is described as **principalem auctorem** and the hagiographers are referred to as **vivis instrumentis**. Also the two notes appended to this part of the text refer to two classic statements of the Magisterium on the instrumental causality of the sacred writer. The first reference is to *Divino afflante Spiritu* which affirms: «Catholic theologians following the teaching of the holy Fathers, and especially of the Angelic and Common doctor, have investigated and explained the nature and effects of divine inspiration better and more fully than was the custom in past centuries. Starting from the principle that the sacred writer is the *organon* or instrument of the Holy Spirit, and a living and rational instrument, they rightly observe that under the influence of the divine motion he uses his own faculties and powers in such a way that from the book which is the fruit of his labour all may easily learn the distinctive genius and the individual characteristics and features of each author» ¹³³. The other note refers to *Providentissimus Deus*, the core of which is the following: «Because He so animated them and moved them with his supernatural influence to write, and He so assisted them while they were writing that they conceptualised correctly only those things which He wished them to, they desired to write it faithfully and they expressed it aptly with infallible truth» ¹³⁴.

After the publication of schema II the use of the traditional terminology such as *principal author* and *living instruments* to explain the nature of inspiration was criticised by a number of the Council Fathers for different reasons:

(i) The German speaking and Scandanavian bishops thought the word *instrumentum* was equivocal and proposed that the hagiographers be described explicitly as *true authors* «to avoid the sacred writers being considered merely as secretaries of the Holy Spirit» ¹³⁵.

(ii) One Council Father (Bishop Butler) considered the use of the terms *auctor principalis* and *instrumentum* as too scholastic ¹³⁶.

(iii) Another Council Father regarded the term *instrumentum* as an unworthy description of the hagiographer ¹³⁷.
(iv) The Conference of Indonesian bishops requested an alternative to the word *instrumentum*\(^{138}\).

When schema III was published there was no reference to the traditional terminology of instrumental causality in the text, but the phrase *ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente* was added after the word *adhibuit*: «In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines elegit, quos omnibus facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit, ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente, ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, scripto traderent»\(^{139}\). This additional phrase bears a striking resemblance to the phrase *quo Deus in hagiographo et per hagiographum operando* of schema I.

Apart from the two notes of reference already seen, there is an additional note (n°2) added by the doctrinal Commission in schema III which reads as follows: «In et per hominem: cfr. Heb. 1,1 et 4,7 (*in*); 2 Sam. 23,2; Matt. 1,22 et passim (*per*); Conc. Vat. I: *Schema de doctr. cath.*, nota 9, Coll. Lac. VII, 522»\(^{140}\). The purpose of this note is, clearly, to indicate precisely how the phrase *«ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente»* is to be understood.

The first part of the note gives two references to specify how God works *in* men. These are:

*Heb. 1,1*: «Multifariam et multis modis olim Deus locutus patribus *in prophetis*».

*Heb. 4,7*: «iterum terminat diem quendam, 'Hodie', *in David* dicendo post tantum temporis, sicut supra dic-tum est: Hodie, si vocem eius audieritis, nolite obdurare corda vestra».

These texts, which indicate that God spoke to the Israelites in the persons of David and the prophets, are scriptural confirmation of the fact that God, *in* the person of the hagiographer, spoke to men. The other scriptural references, both to the Old and the New Testament, confirm that God spoke *through* or *by means* of men:
2 Sam. 23,2: «Spiritus Domini locutus est per me, et sermo eius super linguam meam».
Matt. 1,22: «Hoc autem totum factum est, ut adimperetur id quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem».

The final part of this note n°2 in schema III is a reference to note 9 of the «Schema constitutionis dogmaticae de doctrina catholica» of Vatican Council I. This note 9 gives the background considerations to the text of Vatican I defining divine inspiration as a dogma of faith. One of these considerations in note 9 indicates the continuity of doctrine in the decree on the canonicity of sacred Scripture in the Council of Trent with the definition of Vatican I on inspiration and comments: «Afterwards (i.e. after the listing of the canonical books) follows a positive declaration of catholic doctrine, in what sense all the books of scripture and for what reason intrinsic to themselves they were declared to be sacred by the Church, and how for this same reason they passed into the canon of scripture. The reason derives from the divine origin or writing of these books. This writing is declared to be divine because (i) the books were written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. There was therefore a supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit in men ordained to the writing of these very books. (ii) For this reason that the action of the Holy Spirit referred to the writing of books by means of men who were inspired for this work, the books themselves are said by the apostle to be divinely inspired scripture. (iii) Finally, that action of inspiration was of such a kind that God is the author of the books or the author of the writing, in such a way that the very writing itself is to be attributed principally to the divine operation acting in and by means of men, and for this reason the books contain the written word of God» 141. The writing of Scripture is thus to be attributed principally to a divine operation in homine et per hominem agenti, that is with the man as an instrument in the hands of God.

Thus we see by means of note 2 of schema III, together with notes 1 and 3 of the same schema, already referred to,
that the doctrinal Commission, without using the traditional terminology, indicates that the nature of the relationship between God and the sacred writer is one of instrumental causality which is confirmed both by Sacred Scripture and the Magisterium of the Church.

It should also be added that during the discussion of schema III in September/October 1964, there was a strong plea from the bishop of Barbastro for the retention of the traditional concept and terminology of the instrumental causality of the hagiographer. He pointed out that to explain (divine inspiration) the idea and word instrumentum had been used continuously from the time of the early Fathers of the Church down to the encyclical Divino afflante Spiritu in our own day. He said that the word had been used in the sense of men chosen by God to write the sacred books as live instruments endowed with all their faculties, and that understood in this way it should not be excluded from the conciliar text. In reply the doctrinal Commission commented that since instrumentum was a technical term it would not be included in the text, but the substance of the concept would be.

c) The Hagiographers «ut veri auctores», and the co-authorship of Scripture

The divine intervention in inspiration receives in the Constitution another denomination which is already classical and which has been repeated in a number of councils: it is the expression author. We have already seen that the action of inspiration is of such a kind that the putting of the Scriptures in writing is to be attributed principally to the divine operation acting in and by means of men. That this was always the way of understanding Scripture in the Church can be demonstrated from the consensus of the Fathers and from the documents of the Magisterium of the Church.

The word author is also applied to the hagiographer, and in the conciliar text in an original way, by calling them ut veri auctores. This expression has, however, its textual history in Dei Verbum. In the first schema God is called auctor primarius
and *auctor principalis*\(^{146}\), and also *Auctor* and *Scriptor*\(^{147}\). The hagiographers are referred to as *auctor* and *auctores humani*\(^{148}\) and *sacer scriptor*\(^{149}\). In schema II the term *auctor principalis* for God is repeated, but the mention of the word *auctor* for the hagiographer is suppressed in no. 11; in no. 12 the term *sacer auctor* is used\(^{150}\). In the third text God is simply called *auctor* and the hagiographer *auctor inspiratus* and *sacer auctor*\(^{151}\). In schema IV the words *ut veri auctores* appear for the first time. However, reference to this denomination had been made at an earlier stage of the conciliar debate.

In the discussion of schema II, the German speaking bishops proposed that the hagiographers be described explicitly as *true authors*. In their submission they also point out that in this way it will be understood more clearly why God is referred to as *principalem auctorem* in the same schema\(^{152}\). This formula —*ut veri auctores*— was also proposed by two other council Fathers during the same discussion on schema II\(^{153}\), but the change was not incorporated into the text of schema III.

In the discussion on schema III one Council Father (Bishop J. Flores Martin) commented that in the history of the tract *De inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae*, that fact that the hagiographer is truly and properly an author, although subject to the principal author (who is God), is an idea which has greatly helped in the understanding of the concept of inspiration. He also pointed out that it was because the hagiographers were considered true authors of Sacred Scripture, the doctrine about literary genres developed\(^{154}\). As a consequence he proposed that the phrase *veri auctores* be introduced into the text. This suggestion was acceded to by the doctrinal Commission\(^{155}\), and in schema IV the text read as follows: «In sacris vero libris conficiendis Deus homines elegit, quos facultatibus ac viribus suis utentibus adhibuit, ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente, ea omnia eaque sola, quae Ipse vellet, ut veri auctores scripto traderent»\(^{156}\).

Subsequently in the debate on schema IV, three council Fathers wanted to have the words *ut veri auctores* removed because, they asserted, «hagiographi non sunt nisi instrumenta». The reply of the doctrinal Commission was that the words
"veri auctores" were deliberately chosen to describe the action of the hagiographers and thus the proposal was not accepted\textsuperscript{157}. The suggestion that the hagiographers were "mere instruments" is reminiscent of the error of the Montanists who exaggerated the part which God played to the extent that the hagiographer was unaware of what he was doing. The early Protestants committed the same error when they explained scriptural inspiration as "dictation" in the most rigorous sense of the word, reducing the part played by the hagiographer to that of a mere machine.

By the use of the phrase \textit{ut veri auctores} the active part played by the sacred writer in the process of inspiration is underlined more strongly than in previous documents of the Magisterium. It avoids a terminology which could be interpreted unilaterally and leaves no doubt but that the hagiographers are authentic authors\textsuperscript{158}.

d) \textit{The phrase "Quae Ipse Vellet"}

The phrase "\textit{quae Ipse iuberet}" in schema II is replaced by the phrase "\textit{quae Ipse vellet}" in schema III at the request of five council Fathers whose petition was recognized by the doctrinal Commission\textsuperscript{159}.

One Council Father (Card. Silva Henriquez) gave as his reason for the suggested change the fact that the use of "iuberet" implied that the hagiographer was to some extent conscious of the fact that he was being inspired\textsuperscript{160}. The episcopal conference of Argentina gave as reason for substituting \textit{iuberet} by \textit{voluit} «in order that the human participation in the writing of sacred Scripture would not seem to be diminished and that nevertheless it would remain quite clear that God was the principal author»\textsuperscript{161}. The German speaking and the Scandinavian bishops\textsuperscript{162} proposed the change although conscious of the fact that the word \textit{iuberet} was used by Leo XIII in his encyclical \textit{Providentissimus Deus} - «... ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipse iuberet...»\textsuperscript{163}. However, they considered that the use of \textit{iuberet} could give rise to a "mechanical" concept of inspiration which some Protestants affirmed in the 16th century.
Another Council Father (Bishop Carli) proposed the same change for the following reason: «ne perperam intelligatur esse inspiratas solas iussiones Dei, non vero ceteras res.» He, like the German bishops, admits that the words quae ipse iuberet are to be found in Providentissimus Deus but comments that it is not legitimate to select certain words from a text while omitting others so that as a consequence the meaning of these words becomes unclear.¹⁶⁴

Thus we see that the doctrinal Commission agreed to replace the phrase «quae Ipse iuberet» by the phrase «quae Ipse vellet» to avoid interpretatione which could seem to imply that the hagiographer was to some extent conscious of the fact that he was being inspired, or that inspiration was a «mechanical» concept as affirmed by some 16th century Protestants, or that the inspiration of the Bible was limited to those things which were commanded by God to be written down. It might also be added that the use of the verb «vellet» implies a respect on God’s part for the full freedom of the hagiographer in his collaboration with God in the composition of Sacred Scripture.

c) The Divine Influence on the Faculties of the Sacred Writer

In schema I the manner of the divine actuation on the hagiographer is described in terms of the influence of the primary Author on the spiritual and executive faculties of the human author: «Ad hanc vero divinam Scripturam exarandum, Deus ipse sacros quosdam scriptores seu hagiographos ita as scribendum interne excitavit et movit, ita quoque scribentibus abstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipse primarius Scripturarum Auctor intenderet, recte mente conciperent fideliterque scriptis mandarent»¹⁶⁵. This articulation of the divine-human interaction in the process of inspiration contains all the basic elements of the traditional explanation of this process as given in Providentissimus Deus¹⁶⁶ (to which this text of schema I is referred) and in Spiritus Paraclitus¹⁶⁷, which, in summary, consists of a light in the intelligence, a motion in the will, and a special assistance to the executive faculties¹⁶⁸.
In schema II the description of the involvement of the hagiographer's faculties is by means of the phrase: *omnibus nempe humanis facultatibus praedictis*, which is a much more general description than that given in schema I. While the reference to *Providentissimus Deus* of schema I is retained, there is also in schema II a reference to *Divino afflante Spiritu* which describes the divine influence on the hagiographer in a more general way *suis uti facultatibus ac viribus*.

In schema II the words *universis hominibus scripto traderent* are used to describe the action or work of the hagiographer. One of the Council Fathers (Bishop Carli) suggested that the words *universis hominibus* were superfluous. They did not appear in any of the subsequent schemas. This same Father proposed that instead of the phrase *hominibus ad id delectis* the phrase *hominibus ad id specialiter delectis* be used to avoid the danger of interpreting inspiration as a collective charism. This proposal was not, however, followed up by the doctrinal Commission.

In schema III the articulation of this idea is expanded somewhat by the addition of the word *viribus* as follows: *quos omnibus facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit*.

The German speaking bishops in their comments on schema III, suggested that after the word *utentes*, the phrase *eorum limitibus non obstantibus* should be inserted. Another Council Father (Archbishop F. Cornelis) proposed the same addition because he considered that the limitations of the human authors should be recognised explicitly in the conciliar text. This proposal was not recognised by the doctrinal Commission.

However, in schema IV the word *omnibus* is omitted by the doctrinal Commission for the reason that it cannot be asserted as a fact that each of the hagiographers used *all* their faculties to put in writing what they were inspired to do. Thus in schema IV, and in the definitive text, the phrase simply reads: «*Quos facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit*».
Benet) and at the same time rejected the proposal of another Council Father (Bishop G. Maloney) that the word humanis be used instead of omnibus.

Thus we see that while in schema I the influence of the divine actio on the faculties of the hagiographer is described explicitly as a light in the intelligence, a motion in the will, and a special assistance to the executive faculties, as explained in Provindentissimus Deus and Spiritus Paraclitus, nevertheless the definitive text (quos facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit) is a more general affirmation along the lines of the text in Divino afflante Spiritu (suis uti facultatibus ac viribus). The fact that the conciliar text does not specify as precisely as in some of the previous magisterial documents the nature of the divine actuation in the faculties of the human writer, may perhaps indicate that the Council was of the opinion that there was scope for more theological reflection on the nature of the cooperation between the divine causality and the human and literary paternity in the authorships of Sacred Scripture, before a more specific affirmation could be made on this point.

f) Conclusions

As a result of our analysis of this part of the text of Dei Verbum which refers to the relationship between the divine and human authors in the composition of Sacred Scripture we are lead to the following conclusions:

1. To specify the relationship between God and the sacred writer, the Council uses the phrase «ut Ipso in illis et per illos agente». Although there were requests from some of the Council Fathers to do so, the doctrinal Commission did not use the traditional terminology of «principal author» and «instrumental cause» to explain the mechanism by which the books of Sacred Scripture came to be written. The Commission gives as its reason for not using the word instrumentum the fact it is a technical term, but the Commission emphasised that the substance (res) of the concept is the basis of its explanation of the relationship between the divine and human authors.

2. In support of its understanding of the divine and
human interaction in the composition of the Bible the conciliar text refers to three notes:

(i) In note no. 3 it confirms, by means of references to the Old and the New Testament, the instrumental causality of the sacred writer. This same note has a reference to a note in the Vatican I decree on revelation which affirms that the writing of Sacred Scripture is to be attributed principally to a divine operation *in homine et per bominem agenti*, that is with the man as an instrument in the hands of God.

(ii) Notes nos. 2 and 4 refer to the two classic statements of the Magisterium on the instrumental causality of the sacred writer in *Providentissimus Deus* and *Divino afflante Spiritu*. It is of interest to note that these two references are retained intact right through the editorial *iter* of the different schemas.

3. The doctrinal Commission introduced the phrase *ut veri auctores* to describe the action of the sacred writers. The word *author* as applied to God is a classical expression as can be seen from the consensus of the Fathers and from the documents of the Magisterium of the Church. The word *author* as applied to the hagiographer has also greatly helped in the understanding of the nature of divine inspiration. In the conciliar text it is applied to the hagiographer in an original way by the use of the phrase *ut veri auctores* to emphasise that the sacred writers are authentic authors in the human sense of the term apart from their participation in the charism of divine inspiration. In this way the active part played by the sacred writer in the process of inspiration is underlined more strongly than in previous documents of the Magisterium. It avoids a terminology which could be interpreted unilaterally and leaves no doubt that the hagiographers are authentic literary authors.

4. The doctrinal Commission refined its articulation of the true nature of divine inspiration:

(i) by the substitution of the phrase *quae Ipse vellet* for the phrase *quae Ipse iuberet* to avoid a mechanical concept of inspiration, or the idea that the inspiration of the Bible was limited to those things which were commanded by God to be
written down. It also eliminated the possible implication that the hagiographer was to some extent conscious of the fact that he was being inspired.

(ii) by the omission of the word *omnibus* from the phrase «quos omnibus facultatibus ac viribus suis utentes adhibuit», since it cannot be asserted as a fact that each of the hagiographers used *all* their faculties to put in writing what they were inspired to do.

5. The conciliar text does not specify as precisely as in *Providentissimus Deus* and *Spiritus Paraclitus* the nature of the divine actuation in the faculties of the human author. This may perhaps indicate that the Council was of the opinion that there was scope for further theological reflection on the nature of the cooperation between the divine causality and the human literary paternity in the authorship of Sacred Scripture, before a more specific affirmation could be made on this point.

6. Thus we see that the Council, while it does not use the traditional technical terminology of instrumental causality to explain the relationship between God and the hagiographer in the writing of Sacred Scripture, in the constitution *Dei Verbum* it nevertheless articulates the concept of instrumental causality in non-technical terminology, while at the same time excluding the errors of allowing too much or too little freedom to the human author. In articulating its perception of the nature of the relationship between God and the inspired writer, the conciliar text makes it clear that what *Dei Verbum* has to say about this points is solidly based on scriptural support and on previous affirmations of the Magisterium of the Church.
NOTES


2. Cfr. II Tim. 3,16: «omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata est et utilis ad docendum...».


7. Cfr. Is. 8,1; 22,15; Jer. 1,4-11; Ezek. 6,11; etc.

8. Cfr. Deut. 31,9-26; 2 Mac. 2,13; Dan. 9,2; etc.

9. Cfr. PHIOLO, De spec. leg. 1,65; 4,69; and FLAVIUS JOSEPH: Contra Apión, 1,8, as cited in J. SALGUERO, o.c., p. 65.

10. Cfr. Matt. 21,42; 26,31-54; Lk. 4,21; Jn. 5,34-39; Gal. 3,10; etc.

11. Cfr. Matt. 1,22; 3,3; 4,14; etc.


14. «Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata est et utilis ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corrigendum, ad erudiendum in justitia: ut perfectus sit homo Dei, ad omne opus bonum instructus» (II Tim. 3,16-17). In this and other latin quotations of Scripture, the Neo-Vulgate text is used. English translations are taken from the New Testament, Authorised Catholic Edition (New York 1941).

15. «Hoc primum intelligentes quod omnis prophetia Scripturae propria interpretatione non fit; non enim voluntate humana prolata est prophetia aliquando, sed a Spiritu Sancto ducti locuti sunt a Deo homines» (II Pet. 1,20-21).
16. «Sicut et in omnibus epistolis, loquens in eis de his, in quibus sunt quaedam difficilia intellectu, quae indocti et instabiles depravant sicut et ceteras Scripturas ad suam ipsorum perditionem» (II Pet. 3,16).


18. Apoc. 1, 11.19; 2.1; 19.9.
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27. ORIGEN, De principitis, I, 4: PG 11, 118.

28. ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, In gen. hom., 2 1,1: PG 53, 175.


30. ST. AUGUSTINE, Enarrat. in Ps 144, 17: PL 37, 1880.

31. ST. GREGORY THE GREAT, Mor., praef. 1,2: PL 75,517.

32. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Strom. 1,5: PG 8,717.


34. S.Tb., I, q. I, a. 10, c.


39. Canon 8 of the Antiqua Regula Fidei says: «Si quis dixerit atque crediderit alterum Deum esse priscae legis, alterum evangeliorum; anathema sit» (EB 28).

40. Canon 12 of the same document states: «Si quis, aliquas Scripturas, praeter quas catholica Ecclesia receptip, vel in auctoritate habendas esse crediderit, vel fuerit veneratus; anathema sit» (EB 29).

41. This letter of Pope St. Leo IX says: «Credo etiam Novi et Veteris Testamenti, legis et prophetarum et apostolorum unum esse autorem Deum et Dominum omnipotentem» (EB 38).

42. The Waldensian profession of faith included the following: «Novi et Veteris Testamenti unum eundemque autorem credimus esse Deum, qui in Trinitate, ut dictum est permanens de nihilo cuncta creavit» (EB 39).
43. The second council of Lyons (1274) affirmed: «Credimus etiam Novi et Veteris Testamenti, Legis ac Prophetarum et Apostolorum, unum esse auctorem Deum ac Dominum Omnipotentem» (EB 40).

44. The following is the statement of the council of Florence: «Unum atque eundem Deum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, hoc est Legis et Prophetarum atque Evangeli, profitetur auctorem, quoniam eodem Spiritu Sancto inspirante utrumque Testamenti sancti locuti sunt, quorum libros suscepit et veneratur» (EB 47).

45. Cfr. G. Perrella, o.c., p. 79.

46. «Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet,... propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspiranti conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt» (EB 77).

47. «Si quis Sacrae Scripturae libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaveris: anathema sit» (EB 79).

48. «Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt; tantum vero abest ut divinae inspirationi error ullus subesse possit, ut ea per se ipsa, non modum errorem excludat omnem, sed tam necessario excludat et respuat, quam necessarium est, Deum, summam Veritatem, nullius omnino erroris auctorem esse.

Haec est antiqua et constans fides Ecclesiae, sollemni etiam sententia in concilii definita Florentino et Tridentino; confirmata denique exprimuntur in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipliendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habbet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore continente: sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem' (Conc. Vat. sess. 3, c. 2 de revel.).

Quare nihil admodum refert, Spiritum Sanctum assumpsisse homines tamquam instrumenta ad scribendum, quasi, non quidem primum auctori, sed scriptoribus inspiratis quidpiam falsi elabi potuerit. Nam supernaturali ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum exicitat et movit, ita scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia caece sola, quae ipse iuberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apte infallibili veritate exprimenterent: secus, non ipse esset auctor Sacrae Scripturae universae» (EB 124, 125).

49. In the decree Lamentabili St. Pius X condemned the following proposition: «Nimiam simplicitatem aut ignorantiam prae se ferunt qui Deum credunt vere esse Scripturas Sacrae auctorem» (EB 200).
In the encyclical *Pascendi* he says of the modernists: «Generalem utique modernistarum Sacrorum Librorum inspirationem asseverant: catholicum tamens sensu nullam admittunt...» (EB 273).

50. «Qua in re nullam profecto in scriptis Doctoris Maximi paginam reperias, unde non liceat, cum cum universa catholica Ecclesia firmiter constanterque tenuisse, Libros sacros, Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscriptos, Deum habere auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditos esse» (EB 448).

51. «Divino afflante Spiritu, illos sacri scriptores exararunt libros, quos Deus, pro sua erga hominum genus paterna caritate, dilargiri voluit *ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad erudiendum in iustitia, ut perfectus sit homo Dei, ad omne opus bonum integrus*» (EB 538).


53. «Patres omnes et Doctores professi unanimes, libros eos et integros et per partes a divino etque esse afflatu» (EB 127).

54. St. Pius X condemned the following proposition in the decree *Lamentabili*: «Inspiratio divina non ita ad totam Scripturam Sanctam extenditur, ut omnes et singulas eius partes ab omni errore praemuniat» (EB 202).


56. Cfr. EB 539.

57. Cfr. EB 612.


60. Cfr. «Divinitus revelata ... Spiritu Sancto afflante *consignata sunt*» (no. 11); «Sacra Scriptura est locutio Dei quatenus divino afflante Spiritu Scripto consignatur» (no. 9); «Quae enim apostoli ex mandato Christi predicaverunt, postea divino afflante Spiritu, *in scriptis ... nobis tradiderunt*» (no. 18).


As we have already seen in Chapter I, the first schema of the conciliar text, after much critical comment in the Council Hall, was effectively abandoned in the preparation of schema II. As a consequence, there is little continuity between schema I and the subsequent schemas in the treatment of the divine origin of Scripture. Suffice it to say that in schema I the articulation of the doctrine of biblical inspiration is based on the assumption of the two source theory of Revelation. It is also assumed that the word of

Because schema I had little effective influence on the shaping of the definitive text, in this study we shall in general be confining our comments to the second and subsequent schemas. We will however, draw attention to those aspects of schema I which are relevant to our study.


66. The following proposal was made by Archbishop Aloisius Carli: «Locution, uti jacet, ambigua. Nam quis falso intelligere posset... omnes hagiographos necessario conscios fuisse se scribere sub influxu Spiritus Sancti». Cfr. *Acta Synodalia*, III, III, 821.


Apart from the Fathers referred to by the doctrinal Commission, there were some interesting comments by other Council Fathers in relation to this point. Cardinal Siri suggested: «In cap. I huius scherumatis n. 8 brevissime agitur de relatione S. Scripturae et S. Traditionis et quidem modo deficienti. Quae deficientia adhuc crescit, quando in initio cap. II, n. 11 fere insinuat traditionem revelacionem in sola S. Scriptura continer, atque prostand.» (Acta Synodalia, III, III, p. 800).

Bishop Muldoon commented: «Divina revelatio... prostat». Non placet, quia non obstantibus ii quae in cap. I dicta sunt, aliquis ex istis verbis arguerre possit (sicur de facto non paucis arguent) *totam* revelationem dividam in Sacra Scriptura inveniri, ita ut nihil sit in sacra traditione quod in Sacra Scriptura non inveniatur. Quod evidenter falsum est. Ergo, loco verborum in texto schematibus, haec alia propono sufficienda: «Eae veritates revelatae quae, afflante
divino Spiritu, litteris consignatae sunt, in sacra Scriptura continen-

It was also at this stage in the discussion of the conciliar text that
one of the Council Fathers (Bishop A. Tabera Araoz) made the sug-
gestion that something be added about the canonicity of the Bible in
the context of inspiration: «Forsan opportunum esset, ne dicam
necessarium, aliquid in hoc numero addere de canonicitate eiusque
relatione, vestigia sequentes Conc. Tridentini et Vaticani I (cfr.
(lin. 3), ita mutari possit: 'Quae Scriptura, prout in libris N. et V.
Testamenti prostat Ecclesiae traditis, ex apostolica fide...'» (Bishop
text chosen by the doctrinal Commission did fulfil the requirements
of this proposal.

68. The Doctrinal Commission commented: «Loco 'Divino Spiritu'
dicitur 'Spiritu Sancto', ut evitetur repetitio vocabuli 'Divinum' in

69. The reply of the Doctrinal Commission was as follows: «Melior
claritas obtinetur invertendo ordinem phraseos. Scribatur ergo
'Divinitus revelata, quae in Sacra Scriptura continetur et prostant,
Spiritu Sancto afflante litteris consignata sunt. Libros enim integros
tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum omnibus eorum partibus,
Sancta Mater Ecclesia... pro sanctis et canonicos habet...». Cfr. Acta
Synodalia, IV, V, 707.

74. This text was proposed by Rev. C. Butler (E/2230). Cfr. Acta
Synodalia, III, III, 814.

75. The Doctrinal Commission made the following proposal: «Loco textus
prioris, linn. 4-19, ponitur textus E/2230 cum paucis modificationibus
infradescribendis. Hoc enim textus diversi desiderii satisfit: E/2166;
E/223; E/458; E/239; E/285; E/313; E/229; E/442. Cfr. Acta
Synodalia, III, III, 92, (D) in the relatio to n. 11.
76. In the relatio de n. (cfr. Acta Synodalia, III, III, 92 (E)) the Doc-
trinal Commission made the following point: «Bonum videbatur ex
antiquo textu illa verba ex apostolica fide recipere, ut origo apostolica
doctrina de inspiratione Scripturae exprimeretur. Additur referentia
77. «Haec autem scripta sunt ut credatis, quia Iesus est Christus Filius Dei;
et ut credentes, vitam habeatis in nomine eius» (Jn. 20,31).
78. «Et Domini nostri longanimitatem, salutem arbitremini: sicut et
Charissimus frater noster Paulus secundum datam sibi sapientiam
scrispit vobis, sicut et in omnibus epistolis, loquens in eis de his in
quibus sunt quaedam difficilia intellectu, quae indocti et instabiles depravant, sicut et caeteras Scripturas, ad suam ipsorum perditionem» II Pet. 3, 15-16.

79. Cfr. note 14 of this chapter.

In this context it is of interest to note a comment which Card. Ruffini made about the text of schema III. «In num. 11, linn. 6-10., legitimus: 'Libros enim Veteris et Novi Testamenti Sancta Mater Ecclesia ex apostolica fide» (cfr. Io. 20,31; 2 Tim. 3.16; 2 Pet. 3,15-16) pro sacris et canonicis habet, propterea quod, Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt'. Haec verba, ex cap. II constitutionis dogmaticae De fide catholica Concilii Vaticani (I) deprompta, digne vere sunt quae in nostro schemate repetantur; sed ut sententia, iisdem verbis expressa, perfecta atque plena sit, nec non ab omni ambiguitate removeatur, oportet post dictionem: 'Libros enim tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti' continuo adiciatur: 'integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Tridentini Concilii Decreto (de canonicis scripturis) recensentur'. Quid additamentum eo magis necessarium esse censeo quia testimonia biblica in textu allata minime probant omnes libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti haber ab Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis ex apostolica fide». (Cfr. Acta Synodalia, III, III, p. 273).

Although the doctrinal Commission did not respond to Card. Ruffini’s suggestion in the draft of schema IV, his proposal was effectively adopted in schema V as we have seen above.

Another Council Father, (Bishop E. González Arbeláez) in relation to the text of schema III, drew attention to the fact that the phrase «libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus» was taken from a decree of the Council of Trent (cfr. EB 60) where it was used in the context of the canonicity of Scripture, and not in relation to inerrancy, which is the case in schema III. «Nitide appareat hic usurpari hoc modo illegitimo et extra contextum Tridentini», he comments (cfr.
However, in schema V the phrase «libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus» is now used in the context of the canonicity of Scripture, as was originally the case.

84. The three references in note 1 are as follows:
   — cfr. Conc. Vat. I, *Const. dogm. de fide catholica*, cap. 2 de revelatione: Denz. 1787 (3006);


86. «...dogmate item catholico de inspiratione et inerrantia sacrarum Scripturarum, quo omne id quod hagiographus asserit, enuntiat, insinuat, reteneri debe assertum, enuntiatum, insinuatum a Spiritu Sancto...» (EB 420).


88. «Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quod Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recepit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dixtante, conscripti sunt» (EB 499).

89. The condemned proposition in *Lamentabili* was as follows: «Inspiratio divina non ita ad totam Scripturam Sanctam extenditur, ut omnes et singulas eius partes ad omni errore praemuniat» (EB 202).

90. Cfr. text of Vatican I in note (85) above.

91. Cfr. text of Vatican I in note (85) above.
92. «Tandem, in decreto Pontificiae Commissionis Biblicae diei 18 iunii 1915 edicitur, ex dogmate catholico de inspiratione et inerrantia Sacrarum Scripturarum consequi, quod 'omne id, quod hagiographus asserit, enuntiat, insinuat, retineri debet assertum, enuntiatum, insinuatrum a Spiritu Sancto'» (EB 420).

93. «Quod speciatim ad inerrantiam absolutam Sacrae Scripturae attinet, sufficiat in mentem revocare doctrinam Leonis XIII in encyclical Providentissimus: Nullatenus 'toleranda est eorum ratio, qui... falsa arbitrantur, de veritate sententiarum cum agitur, non adeo exquirendum, quaenam dixerit Deus, ut non magis perpendatur, quam ob causam ea dixerit. Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesiam tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt; tantum ver abest, ut divinae inspirationi error ullus subesse possit, ut ea per se ipsa, non modo errorem excludat omnem, sed tam necessario excludat et respuat, quam necessarium est, Deum, summam Veritatem, nullius omnino erroris auctorem esse. Haec est antiqua et constans fides Ecclesiae, sollemni etiam sententia in conciliis definita Florentino et Tridentino; confirma ta denique atque expressius declarata in Concilio Vaticano (I)... Quare nihil admodum refert Spiritum Sanctum assumptisse homines tamquam instrumenta ad scribendum, quasi, non quidem primario auctori, sed scriptoribus inspiratis quidpiam falsi elabi potuerit. Nam supernatrali Ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum excitavit et movit, ita scribentibus adsttit, ut ea omni eaque sola, quae ipsa iuberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apte infallibili veritate exprimerent; secus, non Ipse esset auctor Sacrae Scripturae universae... Consequitur, ut qui in locis authenticis librorum sacrorum quidpiam falsi conteneri possit, ii profecto aut catholicam divinae inspirationis notionem perverterant, aut Deum ipsum erroris faciant auctorem'». EB 124-126.


95. Cfr. EB 77 in note (85).

96. This point is referred to in the Acta Synodalia as follows: «Ad num. 11... alius Pater, contra inspirationem stricte dictam, explicat inspirationem per evolutionem cognitionis religiosa, quam auctores et Ecclesia primitiva cum fidelitate erga opus et mentem Christi referunt, sub Dei providentia scribentes». The reply of the doctrinal Commission was as follows: «Explicatio quae inspirationem ad solam divinam Providentiam reducit nequit admitti». Cfr. Acta Synodalia, IV, V, 706, Modi ad num. 11.

97. In n° 5 of the Modi to paragraph 11, the following proposal is made: «Unus Pater proponuit ut, post vocem 'elegit' addatur: modi singulari vel sociali». The doctrinal Commission replied: «In hanc
considerationem hic non videtur intrandum». Cfr. Acta Synodalilia, IV, V, 707, Modi, n. 5 ad num. 11.


99. «De Iuda Maccabeo et fratribus eius et de templi magni purificatione et de arae dedicatione, sed et de proeliis, quae pertinent ad Antiochum Epiphaneum et filium eius Eupatorem, et de illuminationibus, quae de coelo factae sunt ad eos, qui generose pro Judaismo fortiter fecerunt, ita ut universam regionem, cum pauci essent, vindicarent et barbaram multitudinem fugarent et famosissimum in toto orbe templum recuperarent et civitatem liberarent et leges, quae fururum erat ut abolerentur, restituerentur, Dominicum omni clementia propitio facto illis, quae omnia ab Iasone Cyreneaeo quinque libris declarata sunt, tentavimus nos uno volumine breviare. Considerantes enim multitudinem numerorum et difficultatem, quae adest voluntibus aggredi narrationes historiarum propter multitudinem rerum, curavimus voluntibus quidem legere, ut esset animi oblectatio, studiosis vero, ut facilius possint memoriae commendare, omnibus autem legentibus utilitas conferatur. Et nobis quidem ipsis, qui hoc opus breviandi causa suscepimus, non facilem laborem, immo vero negotium plenum vigiliarum et sudoris assumpsimus. Sicut praeparanti convivium et quaerenti aliorum utilitatem non facile est, tamen propter multorum gratiam libenter laborem sustinebimus, accurate quidem de singulis elaborare auctori concedentes, ipsi autem persecuti datam formam brevitati studentes. Sicut enim novae domus architecto de universa structura curandum est, ei vero, qui inurere et pingere curat, quae apta sunt ad ornatum exquirenda sunt, ita aestimo et in nobis. Inire quidem et deambulacrum facere verborum et curiosius partes singulas quasque disquirere historiae congruit auctori; brevitatem vero dictionis sectari et exsecutionem rerum vitare brevianti concedendum est. Hinc ergo narrationem incipiemus. Praedictis tantulo subiuncto; stultum etenim est ante histotiam effluere, ipsam autem historiam concidere» (2 Mac. 2,20-33).

100. «Quoniam quidem multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem, quae in nobis completæ sunt, rerum, sicut tradiderunt nobis, qui ab initio ipsi viderunt et ministri fuerunt verbi, visum est et mihi, adsecuto a principio omnia, diligenter ex ordine tibi scribere, optime Theophile, ut cognoscas eorum verborum, de quibus eruditus est, fìrmitatem» (Lk. 1,1-4).

101. ST CLEMENT OF ROME, Ad Cor. 45,2; 53,1: PG 1,300,316.
102. ST JUSTIN MARTYR, Cohortatio ad Graecos, 8: PG 6,256.
103. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Strom. VI 18: PG 9,401.
104. ST AUGUSTINE, De const. evangelistarum, 1,35,54: PL 34,1070.
105. «Auctor principalis sacrae Scripturae est Spiritus Sanctus, qui in uno verbo sacrae Scripturae intellexit multo plura quam per expositores
sacrae Scripturae exponantur, vel discernantur: nec est etiam in­conveniens quod homo, qui fuit auctor instrumentalis sacrae Scrip­turae, in uno verbo plura intellegaret» (Quodlibet., VII, q. 6, a. 14, ad 5).

106. The following is St Thomas' explanation of efficient causality: «Et ideo aliter dicendum: quod duplex est causa agens, principalis et in­strumentalis. Principalis quidem operatur per virtuem suae formae, cui assimilatur effectus: sicut ignis suo calore caelefecit... Causa vero instrumentalis non agit per virtuetem suae formae, sed solum per motum quo movetur a principali agente. Unde effectus non assimilatur instrumento, sed principali agenti: sicut lectus non assimilatur securi, sed arti quae est in mente artificis» (S.Tb., III, q. 62, a. 1, c).

107. Applying the principles of instrumental causality in an analogical manner to inspiration, the following affirmations can be made:

(i) The writing of the inspired books is a divine action, which assumes and elevates to a supernatural plane the human work of the hagiographer. God, as principal agent, works by means of a perfection which is proper to him with his infinite power and wisdom; and he uses the human writer as an instrument, giving him a capacity to realize a task which is very much beyond the powers of his nature.

(ii) The sacred writer had his own personal capacities in conformity with his talents and aptitudes. God in choosing him, willed to make use of these human circumstances the writer's thinking and language, his way of conceiving things, etc. Because of this the action and intentionality of the sacred author in the writing of the Bible is not something distinct from the action and intentionality of god, but is a capacity which is at god's service without losing its human characteristics.

(iii) In making the hagiographer participate in his causality, god acts with the sacred writer as one unique cause, in full identification of intentions. In this unity, god intention were more complete, going beyond the range of knowledge and prescience of the hagiographer. The divine causality transcends the operations of the human writer. Because of this the Bible not only contains divinely revealed truths; by divine inspiration God enjoys a true and proper paternity of the sacred books, being also the literary author in the true and proper meaning of the term.

(iv) The gift which permits the hagiographer to collaborate as an instrumental power in a task which transcends the powers of his nature —the chrarism of inspiration— does not radicate in the sacred writer in a stable manner, but is of its nature transitory. Because of this the sacred writer was not the original determining cause of the intentional content of his work without taking divine
inspiration into account: he acts only when, and in the manner, in which he receives the supernatural impetus from God.

(v) Finally we can say that Sacred Scripture, taking all human contingencies into account, bears in all its parts the determining stamp of divine wisdom. God as the principal author, leaves on Scripture the divine imprint which exceeds what the hagiographer would have been able to achieve by his own efforts. Because of this the language of the Bible, without ceasing to be human, is also totally divine.

This analysis of instrumental causality as applied to divine inspiration is based largely on the treatment given to this topic in M. A. Tabet, o.c., pp. 88-96.

108. S.Tb., II-II, q. 174, a. 2 ad 3.

109. «Ipsorum praeterea de Scripturis lectam doctrinae copiam admodum produnt, tum de theologia libri, tum in easdem commentaria; quo etiam nomine Thomas Aquinas inter eos habuit palmam» (EB 88).

110. «Providendum igitur, ut ad studia biblica convenienter instructi munitique aggrediantur iuvenes; ne iustam frustrentur speram, neu, quod deterius est, erroris discrimen incaute subeant, Rationalistarum capti facalciis apparataeque specie eruditionis. Erunt autem optime comparati, si, qua Nosmetipsi monstravimus et praescripsimus via, philosophae et theologiae institutionem, codem S. Thoma duce, religose coluerint penitusque perceperint. Ita recte incident, quum in re biblica, tum in ea theologicae parte, quam positivam nominant, in utraque laetissime progressuri» (EB 107).

111. Benedict XV, outlining the principal aspects of the teaching of St Jerome in his encyclical Spiritus Paraclitus, says the following: «Etenim non modo universe affirmat quod omnibus sacris scrip­toribus commune est, ipsos in scribendo Dei Spiritum secutos, ut omnis sensus omniumque sententiarum Scripturae Deus causa princeps habenda sit; sed etiam quod uniuscuiusque proprium est, accurate disepic... Quam quidem Dei cum homine communitatem laboris ad unum idemque opus conficiendum, Hieronymus comparat­ione illustrat artificis, qui in aliqua re factitanda organo seu in­strumento utitur; quidquid enim scriptores sacri loquuntur, 'Domini sunt verba et non sua, et quod per os ipsorum dicit, quasi per organum Dominus est locutus (Tract. de Ps 88)' (cfr. EB 448).

112. «Inter haec illud videtur peculiari mentione dignum, quod catholic theologi, Sanctorum Patrum ac potissimum Angelici Communisque Doctoris doctrinam securi, inspirationis biblicae naturam et effectus aptius perfectiusque explorarunt ac proposuer, quam praetetris saeculis fieri assoleret. Ex eo enim edisserendo profecti, quod hagiographus in sacro conficiendo libro est Spiritus Sancti organon seu instrumentum, idque vivum ac ratione praeditum, recte animadvertunt illum, divina motione actum, ita suis uti facultatibus


114. Benedict XV comments on St Jerome's assessment of the personal contribution of each of the sacred writers as follows: «Etenim non modo universe affirmat quod omnibus sacris scriptoribus commune est, ipsos in scribendo Dei Spiritum secutos, ut omnis senus omniumque sententiarum Scripturae Deus causa princeps habendus sit; sed etiam quod uniuscuiusque proprium est, accurate dispicit. Nam singillatim, in rerum compositione, in lingua, in ipso genere ac forma loquendi ita eos suis quemque facultatibus ac viribus usus esse ostendit, ut propriam uniuscuiusque indolem et veluti singulares notas ac lineamenta, praesertim prophetarum et apostoli Pauli, inde colligat ac describat» (EB 448).

Pius XII affirms this same doctrine in Divino afflante Spiritu (EB 556); cfr. nota 106 above.

115. «Nam supernaturally ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum excitavit et movit, ita scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipse iuberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apti infallibili veritate exprimerent: secus, non ipse esset auctor Sacrae Scripturae universae»; Providentissimus Deus, EB 125.

116. «Quod si etiam inquirimus, qua ratione haec Dei, uti causae principis, virtus atque actio in hagiographum sit intelligenda, cernere licet, inter Hieronymi verba et communem de inspiratione catholicam doctrinam nihil omnino interesse, cum ipse teneat, Deum, gratia conlata, scriptoris menti lumen praferre ad verum quod attinet, 'ex persona Dei' hominibus proponendum; voluntatem praeterea movere atque ad scribendum impellere; ipsi denique peculiariter continenterque adesse donec librum perficiat» (EB 448).


118. Cfr. EB 125 in note (115) above. «God so stimulated and moved them to write with his supernatural influence..., what he wished them to, and that they would want to write it faithfully». Cfr. also EB 448 in note (116) above. Spiritus Paraclitus describes this influence on the will of the hagiographer in the most explicit terms: «God with his grace also moves his will and impels him to write».


120. Cfr. EB 125. «Ita scribentibus adstitit, ut... apte infallibili veritate exprimerent».

121. Cfr. EB 448. «... ipsi denique peculiariter continenterque adesse donec librum perficiat». Cfr. also G. PERRELLA, o.c., p. 102.

123. «Ad hanc vero divinam Scripturam exarandam, Deus ipse sacros quosdam scriptores seu hagiographos ita ad scribendum interne excitavit et movit, ita quoque scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipse primarius Scripturarum Auctor intenderet, recte mente conciperent fideliterque scriptis mandarent» Acta Synodalia, I, III, p. 17.

124. «Nam supernaturali ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum excitavit et movit, ita scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola, quae ipse iuberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apte infallibili veritate exprimerent» (EB 125).

125. «Hagiographus autem, in conficiendo libro, est Spiritus Sancti 'organon', seu instrumentum, idque vivum ac ratione praeditum, cuius proinde propria in doles ac veluti singulares notae ex libro sacro colligi possunt». Acta Synodalia, I, III, p. 17. The parallel passage in Divino afflante Spiritu is as follows: «Ex eo enim edisserendo profecti, quod hagiographus in sacro conficiendo libro est Spiritus Sancti organon seu instrumentum idque vivum ac ratione praeditum, recte animadvertunt illum, divina motione actum, ita suis uti facultatibus et viribus, 'ut propriam uniuscuiusque indolem et veluti singulares notas ac lineamenta' (cfr. BENEDICTUS XV, Enc. Spiritus Paraclitus: AAS 12 (1920) p. 390) ex libro, eius opera orto, facile possint omnes colligere» (EB 556).


127. The reference to Providentissimus Deus in schema I, was by means of Denz. 1952, which refers to parts of EB 125, 127 and 128. In schema II the reference is simply to EB 125.


133. Cfr. EB 556 in note (112) above.


135. The German speaking bishops made the following comments: «Op tum est ut doctrina de hagiographis Scripturae ut veris auctoribus, quae in priore antecedenti schemate explicite habeabatur, etiam his explicite proponatur, ne putentur hagiographi meri — 'secretarii' — Spiritus Sancti. Huic falsae interpretationi inspirationis nondum satis occurrurit dicendo hagiographos esse — 'viva instrumenta omnibus facultativus praedita' —. Nam haec etiam dicie


141. The following is the reference to Vatican I: «...sequitur deinde positiva declaratio doctrinae catholicae, quo sensu omnes libri scripturae et ob quam rationem eis intrinsecam fuerint ab Ecclesia sacri declarati, et iam hoc ipso in canonem relati. Ratio nimirum est ex divina origine seu scriptione ipsorum librorum. Haec vero scription divina declaratur, quod: 1) libri conscripti sunt *inspirante* Spiritu Sancto. Erat igitur supernaturalis operatio Spiritus Sancti in homines ad ipsos libros scribendos. 2) Ex hoc ipso quod actio Spiritus Sancti referebatur ad scribendos libros per homines ad hos opus inspiratos, ipsi libri sunt et ab apostolo dicuntur *scriptura divinitus inspirata*. 3) Denique actio illa inspirationis erat huiusmodi, ut Deus sit *librorum auctor seu auctor scriptionis*, ita ut ipsa rerum signatio seu scriptio tribuenda sit principaliter operationi divinae in homine et per hominem agenti, et proinde libri continant *scriptum verbum Dei*. Cfr. MANSI, *Collectio Conciliorum*, Vol. 50, Anni 1869-1870, Schema constitutionis dogmaticae de doctrina catholica contra multiples errores ex rationalismo derivatos patrum examini propositum, nota n. 9, col. 79.

142. The bishop of Barbastro commented as follows: «Circa numerum 11: de *instrumentalitate hagiographi* in divina inspiratione Scripturarum. Idea instrumentalitatis et vocabulum ipsun inde fere a primis Ecclesiae Patribus..., usque ad Encyc. *Divino afflante Spiritu*, indesinenter usita fuerunt cum de explicando, praeertim apud quodam Ecclesiae Patres, nimir aut plus aqueo deprimi ideam instrumentalitatis humanae, ita ut hagiographus, tubae, citharae, vel


145. Following the exposition of the nature of inspiration which we have seen in note 106 of the Schema Constitutionis Dogmatica de Doctrina Catholica of Vatican I (cfr. note 141), the text goes on to show that it is in this way that inspiration has always been understood in the Church. «Hoc modo inspirationem scripturae in ecclesia Dei semper intellectam et intelligendam esse, demonstrat (1) sanctorum patrum consensus. Dicunt enim, scripturas esse conscrip tas per Spiritum sanctum vel per operationem Spiritus sancti; esse litteras Dei ad homines missas; scripturas esse a Deo dictas; esse a Deo vel operatione Dei datas vel conditas; homines in its sribendis fuisse instrumenta sub operatione divini Spiritus. (2) In specialibus documentis authenticis fidei ecclesiae explicite dicitur Deus profitendus auctor librorum utriusque Testamenti. In professione fidei episcopis ordinandis praescripta in concilia Carthag. IV; in professione fidei a Leone IX missa ad Petrum Antiochenum; in symbolo Graecis proposito in concilio Lugdunensi II haec fides enuntiatur: 'Credo (credimus) etiam novi et veteris Testamenti, legis et prophetarum et apostolorum unum esse auctorem Deum et Dominum omnipotentem'. Adhuc expressius in concilio Florentino decreto pro lacobitis idem declaretur: sacrosanta Romana ecclesia 'unum atque eundem Deum veteris et novi Testamenti, hoc est, legis, et prophetarum atque evangelii profitetur auctorem, quoniam eodem Spiritu Sancto inspirante utriusque Testamenti sancti locuti sunt, quorum libros suscipit et veneratur, qui titulus sequentibus continentur' (sequitur recensio omnium librorum, ut in canone

154. «In historia tractatus De inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae, quod hagiographus sit vere et proprie auctor, etsi auctori principaliter (scil. Deo) subjectus, idea est quae non parum ad rectam conceptus inspirationis intelligentiam iuvavit. Hagiographus enim tam proprie et totaliter auctor est et coram quae ipse scribit, quam nos sumus auctores eorum quae scribimus. Sub influxu quidem divino scribunt hagiographi, sed proprie loquendo et ipsi sunt veri auctores. Et ita
Sacra Scriptura ipsa dicit: libros conciperunt, conscripserunt, absolverunt, fontes adhibuerunt, amplicaverunt, cotraxerunt.

Propeterea eadem idea, no tantum plurimum iuvavit ad inspirationis naturam rite intelligendam, sed ad normas rectae interpretationis Scripturarum determinandas quamplurimum contulit. Immo quia hagiographi, tamquam veri auctores Librorum Sacrorum considerandii sunt, propeterea doctrina de generibus litterariis, evoluta est. Genera autem litteraria, debito moderamine ad studium Sacrae Scripturae applicata, ad altiorem eiusdem Scripturae cognitionem procul dubio nos ducunt.


157. The proposal of the three council Fathers concerned was as follows: «Tres Patres expungere volunt verba ‘ut veri auctores, quia hagiographi non sunt nisi instrumenta.’ Aliunde proponitur additio; ‘pro sua quiscue natua et ingenio’. The Commission replied: ‘Quia hagiographi verbi auctores sunt, haec verba consulto apposita fuerunt. Additio non videtur necessaria.’ Cfr. Acta Synodalia, IV, V, 707, Modus no. 6 ad no. 11.


161. — E/443 (Conference of Argentinian bishops). «As regards no. 11 in lin. 8 it seems appropriate to substitute the word iuberet by the word voluit so that the human participation in the composition of sacred scripture would not seem to be diminished and that at the same time it would be clear that God was the principal author» (Cfr. Acta Synodalia, III, III, 896).

162. — E/414 (German speaking bishops and conference of Scandinavian bishops): pag. 9, lin. 8. Post verba «usus est» sequentia verba ita componentur: vel a) «usus est, ut revelationem universis hominibus scripto traderent» vel ita: b) «usus est, ut ea omnia eaque sola quae ipse voluit

163. Cfr. EB 125.


166. Cfr. EB 125 in note (115).


170. Bishop Carli who, as seen in note 164 of Section d, was referred to by the doctrinal Commission with regard to the redrafting of paragraph 11, has some relevant comments to make about the phrase 'universis hominibus'. «Verba 'universis hominibus', he suggests, 'utpote inutilia immo et ambigua, saltem relate ad hagiographos. S. Paulus scribens ad Philemonem probabiliter non cogitatbat se scribere pro universis hominibus: Deus vero inspirator, utique!» Cfr. *Acta Synodalia*, III, III, 821.


175. The Commission commented as follows: «Deletum est 'omnibus' sec.
E/3134, quia de facto de singulis hagiographus edici non potest, illos 'omnibus' facultatibus suis usos esse. E/3222 loco 'omnibus' proponit 'humanis', quod videtur superfluum. E/3221 scribere vult loco 'utentes': 'praeditos', quod omisione supra dicta admissa superfluum est. Neque admissa est propositio ut dicatur: 'facultatibus limitatis'.

Cfr. Acta Synodalía, IV, I, 358 (D), in the relatio de no. 11, schema IV.

176. The proposal of E/3134 (Bishop Ioannes Hervás Y Benet) was as follows: «Ad pag. 27, lin. 13, par. 11. Votum: omittendum videtur verbum 'omnibus'. Ratio: hoc autem id intendit, ut vitetur quæstio de facto: utrum nempe hagiographi omnes facultates suas posuerint in redactione uniuscuiusque libri, partis vel phrasis, etc. Aliquando enim sufficere videtur ut tantum facultatibus superioribus uterentur. Certum quidem est oportere hagiographos omnibus facultatibus praeditos esse (cfr. Divino afflante Spiritu ad rem); sed ponere omnes in quocumque casu, forsitan haud necessarium est.» Cfr. Acta Synodalía, III, III, p.469.

# SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. THE DOCTRINE OF BIBLICAL INSPIRATION</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The traditional Catholic notion of Inspiration</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Inspiration of the Bible in no. 11 of «Dei Verbum»</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. THE COLLABORATION OF MAN WITH GOD IN THE COMPOSITION OF SACRED SCRIPTURA</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Nature of Divine Inspiration</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Divine and Human author in «Dei Verbum»</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>