



## **Happiness and the Need For Revelation**

*Matthew Fox, O.P.*

Man seeks happiness. Contemporary man appears ever seeking and seldom attaining his goal. Critics of twentieth century society from psychiatrist to playwright, from sociologist to theologian decry the *status*

quo. What Erich Fromm sees as the "disintegration of love"<sup>21</sup> Walter Kerr terms an "enervating restlessness" and a "brilliantly led half-life,"<sup>22</sup> David Riseman calls the "fetish of other-directedness,"<sup>23</sup> Martin Buber names "the eclipse of the light of heaven, eclipse of God."<sup>24</sup> The causes posed for our age being an age of frustration are manifold. Erich Fromm would remind us that love is a lost art—a rare phenomenon buried beneath the ersatz love of our culture; Walter Kerr would have us raise the flag of our intellect and take a stand for excellence and good taste and perfection. David Riseman suggests that only autonomy promises a reasonable alternative to the outer-directed individual who is "torn between the illusion that life should be easy" and the "half-buried feeling that it is not easy for him."<sup>25</sup> And Martin Buber would remind us that an eclipse of the sun is something that occurs between the sun and man's eyes, not in the sun itself.

The solutions suggested are legion. Some would establish a new religion, a cult of the sacred science of science, and would promise a new era of human felicity when the present gods of society are replaced by man's latria to his own knowledge. But two World Wars have sobered others into thinking that man can be wrong, very wrong, and evil, very evil; and thus man can never replace God. In some this naked fact of man's littleness has engendered despair. Sartre is able to see nothing good in man or in creation. Since nothing is good, nothing is God. Though "man fundametally *is* the desire to be God,"<sup>26</sup> he is not of God. Thus man is a thwarted creature, frustrated at his very roots. Life is contradiction and non-entity and life with others or society is hell.

It is the conviction of this author that a solution that is in any way to solve man's dilemma must begin with man. And not with man as a decimal in mass society nor with man as a consumer of this product or a promoter of this fad or a defender of this faction (much as—and with similar effects as—high schoolers will defend to the death the football team they root for). But we must begin with man as a *person*. With *each* man. With you and with me. Each man with his hopes and his fears and his aspirations—his joys and his sorrows, his sins and his triumphs, his goals and his rules. The person is the beginning of society and the end of society. While it is readily agreed upon that there can be no person without society, it is of more importance today to emphasize that there is no society without persons. Society *is* persons. It is you and I related to one another. If we are not related we are not persons; we are parts. And society is not society; it is a ma-

chine. Could it be that when a society begins to wane, the person has been neglected? That when alcohol replaces hard work, when tranquilizers substitute for recreation, when marriages become temporary arrangements or part-time commitments, when one out of seven individuals is pin-pointed for a mental institution and one out of four needs psychiatric care, that the person (or lack of person) is ultimately at fault?

A person is a many-splendored thing. His wants are complex. He must eat, he must sleep, he must have shelter. He must keep healthy and whole, he must keep busy and exercise. All these needs a person shares with other animals. But today it is not the dogs in our society (except when they sometimes come in touch with some of our people) who live in discontent. They appear as happy as dogs ever have been. It is *persons* who are disgruntled. What is the unique area in which a person is distinct from an animal? What other desires besides the practical ones already enumerated does man need fulfilled?

A recent study undertaken by the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation uncovered the following needs of our society.

What most people, young or old, want, is not merely security, or comfort, or luxury—although they are glad enough for these. They want *meaning* [sic] in their lives. If their era and their culture and their leaders do not or cannot offer them great meaning, great objectives, great convictions, then they will settle for shallow and trivial meanings. "Our chief want in life," said Emerson, "is someone who will make us do what we can."<sup>7</sup>

Man seeks meaning to life. The polarization of life's activities demands an axis or frame of reference to which the person may relate his experiences. Teillard de Chardin calls this "universal centre of psychical-interiorization" an absolutely final principle of irreversibility and personalization.<sup>8</sup> Adrift from the mooring of a meaning to life, one's actions and person are tossed about in the storm and confusion of the swells and waves and shocks of day to day living. As a person grows older and is required to shoulder increased responsibilities,

no longer can parents, friends, and teachers provide all the answers that are necessary for effective living. Nor can wife, children, friends, and work provide the solace that is required for peace of mind. Disappointments, failures, depression, discouragement, and conflicts require something more than human relations or the joy of work can make available.<sup>9</sup>

C. J. Jung, from his years spent in helping the unhappy, makes the following observations.

The problem of neurosis extends from the disturbed sphere of the instincts to the ultimate questions and decisions of our whole *Weltanschauung*.

Long years of experience have again and again taught me that a therapy along purely biological lines does not suffice, but requires a spiritual completion.<sup>10</sup>

Erich Fromm, too, insists on the primacy of meaning in one's life.<sup>11</sup>

To *have* a meaning in one's life is not the same as to *attain* meaning in one's life, however, and a person attains his goals only to the extent that he is well-disciplined, integral, honest, virtuous, or in a word, in so far as he cultivates character or self-value. Erich Fromm comments:

The practice of any art has certain general requirements, quite regardless of whether we deal with the art of carpentry, medicine, or the art of love. First of all, the practice of an art requires *discipline*. . . . But the problem is not only that of discipline in the practice of the particular art, . . . but is that of discipline in one's whole life.<sup>12</sup>

To attain and to live up to one's meaning in life demands character and self-discipline. Are people of our society achieving this self-discipline?

The fact, however, is that modern man has exceedingly little self-discipline outside of the sphere of work. When he does not work, he wants to be lazy, to slouch, or, to use a nicer word, to "relax." . . . He has become distrustful of all discipline, of that enforced by irrational authority, as well as of rational discipline imposed by himself. Without such discipline, however, life becomes shattered, chaotic, and lacks in concentration.<sup>13</sup>

Other psychologists bear witness to the same phenomenon.

Happily the man whose character has been formed from a well-balanced disposition under the influence of unquestioned ideals and of a definite supreme goal or master purpose. His self-respect and the ideals to which he is attracted . . . will supply him with dominant motives in all ordinary situations, motives strong enough to overcome all crude promptings of his instinctive nature; he is in little danger of becoming the scene of serious enduring conflicts.<sup>14</sup>

A. A. Roback (*The Psychology of Character*) and Rudolf Allers (*The Psychology of Character*) carry on an illuminating discussion of character. For both psychiatrists and students on the subject, character is inexorably bound up with regulative principles. Roback defines character as "an enduring psychophysical disposition to inhibit instinctive impulses in accordance with a regulative principle." It "suggests variability in accordance with a rule or principle."<sup>15</sup> Rudolph Allers thinks similarly.

Every law of preference in accordance with which an individual determines his course of action is nothing else than what we call his "character." The character of a man, then, is the justification of his action, something in the nature of a rule or maxim.<sup>16</sup>

If character and the norms which govern men's behavior are as indispensable to the perfection of a person (and of society) as these two men would have us believe, whence is a person to derive his character? What system of values is to be adhered to by a person of character? Are the governing principles for one's life a strictly personal and subjective decision? Categorically no, respond these two psychiatrists.

Character is to be judged on its own merit, and not by some external criterion such as benefiting humanity, a criterion which would bring us perilously near a utilitarian conception of character. That a great character will benefit humanity is a corollary which emanates from the nature of the case . . . , but we are by no means warranted in concluding that character derives its value because of the benefits that accrue to mankind as a result of it.<sup>17</sup>

Dr. Roback supports his argument by submitting the example of the geese which saved Rome: While they performed humanity a great service, we do not credit them with character.

Allers insists that objective maxims exist but that psychology is not the science in which to determine them.

In the realm of values of objective validity, there are and must be definite laws of preference and rejection; it is inherent in the nature of a value that it has a definite place in a scale of values. Whether and to what extent we may be in a position to recognize the objectively existing system of values is a question of theoretical axiology, and must be left out of consideration.<sup>18</sup>

Roback is fond of referring to the principles of value as "absolute principles." Their origin is of less concern than their existence and recognition.

Whether these principles have originated with man or with Deity, they are binding; for our whole culture structure presupposes them. Not only morality, but all science and art would be in the most precarious condition destitute of a *raison d'être*, unless the sovereignty of the values were taken for granted. . . .<sup>19</sup>

Jung emphasizes the value of an open discussion on character and insists on the need for an objective hierarchy of values. Every man (and every man helping another man) must resolve these questions if he (and his society) are to be oriented well to the world within, about and above him.

I can hardly draw a veil over the fact that we psychotherapists really ought to be philosophers or philosophic doctors—or rather that we already are so, though we are unwilling to admit it. . . . We could also call [our work] religion *in statu nascendi*, for in the vast confusion that reigns at the root of life there is no line of division between philosophy and religion. . . . The highest dominant always has a religious or a philosophical character.<sup>20</sup>

We have seen that the attainment of meaning in one's life demands character while at the same time the building up of character requires purpose in one's life.

Achieving meaning in one's life and acquiring character are not by themselves goals of human existence. For persons do not exist by or for themselves; man, a social creature, attains his perfection within the gathering of other persons, within society. Sigmund Freud says: "The capacity for the radiation of libido towards other persons in object-investment must, of course, be ascribed to all normal people."<sup>21</sup> To the extent that a person has integrated the problems of meaning in life and value of self, to that degree is he capable of surrendering himself in a genuine relationship of love to another. When a person lacks knowledge of self or fails to appreciate value in himself and fumbles opportunities to harmonize meaning and a disciplined character in his life, the most prominent symptom of his maladjustment will appear in the area of interpersonal relationships.

The dysfunction present in most people with emotional disorders stems from the inability to make satisfying relationships with other people, particularly with those whom they love.<sup>22</sup>

The act of love is a person's supreme opportunity to get outside of himself and make up for his own lacks and deficiencies (in short, his

creatureliness) in union with a good outside of himself. The acts of opening up and of surrender which characterize love are essential to the perfecting process of an individual, and if one is stunted in a capacity for love, his other faculties—even his intellectual gifts—are affected adversely. Freud is adamant on this point.

A human being is therefore on the whole only accessible to influence, even on the intellectual side, in so far as he is capable of investing objects with libido; and we have good cause to recognize, and to fear, in the measure of his narcissism a barrier to his susceptibility to influence, . . .<sup>23</sup>

The question arises: How does modern space-age man score on the question of love of others? Erich Fromm, who has spent considered years of research in addressing this question, minces no words.

Modern man has transformed himself into a commodity; he experiences his life energy as an investment with which he should make the highest profit, considering his position and the situation on the personality market. He is alienated from himself, from his fellow men and from nature. His main aim is profitable exchange of his skills, knowledge, and of himself, his "personality package" with others who are equally intent on a fair and profitable exchange. Life has no goal except the one to move, no principle except the one of fair exchange, no satisfaction except the one to consume.<sup>24</sup>

The malaise of modern man is this: love is a superficial relationship which consists in pooling extrinsic and ultimately meaningless goods. Too seldom a union of profound and lasting dimensions between persons sharing what is intrinsic and most valuable to each, love is frequently a communion of feelings and surface interests alone; a communion of those intrinsic goods of infinite worth which make each person (and how much more the union of two persons) of ineffable value is assiduously avoided. A shallow and incidental love relationship becomes a matter of possessing or having (or even conquering with the bragging of conquest which follows), and not a relationship of *being*: of being oneself thoroughly with another. In short, love is not a reality, but an incident, an affair.

Erich Fromm burrows into the causes of our society's shallow love relationships.

In a non-theistic system, there exists no spiritual realm outside of man or transcending him. The realm of love, reason and justice exists as a reality only because, and inasmuch as, man has been able to develop

these powers in himself throughout the process of evolution. In this view there is no meaning to life, except the meaning man himself gives to it.

Satisfaction in individual love [and how much more societal love!] cannot be attained without the capacity to love one's neighbor, without true humility, courage, faith and discipline. In a culture in which these qualities are rare, the attainment of the capacity to love must remain a rare achievement.<sup>25</sup>

While love may itself be the meaning man seeks in life, still to achieve its perfection, a person requires meaning and purpose (a hierarchy to his love-objects) and character or self-discipline.

It seems we have run a full circle and have returned to our starting point in our inquiry into man's quest for happiness. To discuss the needs of society we explored the needs of persons who are the subjects of society. A person is in need of meaning to life, of acquisition of intrinsic goods of character and virtue, and of love or a union of sharing these goods with others. Love is a societal commitment and friendship is the end of society. The fundamental questions remain outstanding: Is there meaning to life? If so, what is it? How can I be sure of being correct in my answers (or those which my teachers or my ethos supply me with) to this pivotal question? How can the majority of men, who must spend their time working out their mere existence and survival, address themselves to such immense questions?

The fact is, of course, that the majority of men are too busy to answer such questions for themselves. Thus the majority of men do not occupy themselves with the profound meaning to life, but settle for work intermixed with concern for their immediate charges, some pleasure and satisfactions. Theirs is a day to day existence, buttressed perhaps by the passing meanings society may furnish them, for example, the satisfaction of a fair exchange, the thrill of driving one's new car, owning one's own home, being up to date on the most recent Broadway hits, etc. But, as we have also seen, the majority of men (even in our affluent society) are not happy. Could it be that the question of the meaning to life cannot be put off, cannot be gainsaid? Who is to answer these questions?

There exists in our midst (as in the midst of many cultures over the last 4000 years of man's history) a group of people with a startling message. They call themselves an *ecclesia*, the people of God, the chosen ones of Yahweh. They claim that God, the author and sustainer of all life, the exemplar in whose image man is fashioned and

to whose bosom man is destined, has taken compassion on the human race and has bent down to proclaim to man the answers to the important questions of meaning to life, of good and evil, of justice and love. These people claim that God has loved man and cares for him and is anxious to instruct him and lead him by the hand to man's happiness. This group claims Revelation: that God has revealed, uncovered, exposed His own and man's nature to man.

Revelation is best explained within the Sacred Scriptures themselves. Thus St. Paul speaks of God's communication with man.

God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days has spoken to us by his Son, . . . (Heb. 1:1, 2.)



Revelation is a disclosure of God's inner person and marks the entrance of God into the historical affairs of men. In Revelation God tells us about himself. He is a living God living in man's midst. "By this you shall know that the Lord the living God is in the midst of you. . . . Behold the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth shall go before you into the Jordan." (Josue 3:10, 11) God has chosen to make a covenant or a pact with mankind; he is a free God who chooses for himself.

You have seen what I have done to the Egyptians, how I have carried you upon the wings of eagles, and have taken you to myself. If therefore you will hear my voice, and keep my covenant, you shall be my peculiar possession above all my people. (Ex. 19:4, 5.)

In the New Testament the Revealed One is Christ. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." (Jn. 1:4) Revelation culminates with Christ's presence in man's midst. "But these things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." (Jn. 20-31) Only Christ has known the person of God intimately and can tell mankind. "No one has at any time seen God. The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has revealed him." (Jn. 1:18) The mystery "spoken to us by God's Son" who is Christ is "the mystery of godliness." (1 Tim. 3:16)

Every earnest and intimate exchange with another person teaches one about himself. God's revelation of himself to man instructs man about his own creatureliness. Revelation in the Old Testament is invariably of a practical bent and answers man's question, "What must I do?"<sup>26</sup>

Secret things to the Lord our God: things that are manifest, to us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law. (Dt. 29:29.)

Consider that I have set before thee this day life and good, and on the other hand death and evil: That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways, and keep his commandments and ceremonies and judgments, . . . (Dt. 30:15, 16.)

Man is a creature and needs norms and rules for his actions if they are to flow from what is noble and worthy of the best in man. The law of the Old Testament fulfilled the function of the *torah* or instruction and teaching.<sup>27</sup> It presaged the new Law of love of neighbor and love of God in the New Testament.

For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. (Gal. 5:14) A new Commandment I give to you, that you love one another. (Jn. 13:34)

Weak mankind stumbles along the rocky road of righteous living and pure love. But Christ, the Revealer and the Revealed One, is the light that cuts the darkness; he gives to those who listen to Revelation the light of life. "I am the light of the world. He who follows me does not walk in the darkness, but will have the light of life." (Jn. 8:12) More than merely instructing the mind, Christ also sends the Spirit of love who dwells in men's hearts and loves them so that they may love other men in truth and in action. (Jn. 14:16, 17; Acts 2)

What is our conclusion from this digression into the nature of revelation? It is that society's questions of what is the meaning in life, what constitutes character and how love among men is achieved receive answers—and very profound answers—from revelation. As for meaning in life, we read:

The Son of Man has not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Mt. 20:28)

I am in your midst as he who serves. (Lk. 22:27) This is why I was born, and why I come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. (Jn. 18:37)

As to character, history acknowledges the person of Christ as the embodiment of man's noblest aspirations. Jesus Christ died rather than relinquish the purpose he had set himself in life. He taught that "where one's heart is, there his treasure will be also," that man's greatest claim is the good within him and what a person *is*, not what he *has*: "For lo, the kingdom of God is within you." (Lk. 17:21) "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth consumes, nor thieves break in and steal." (Mt. 6:20) Christ teaches that only a truly good tree will produce good fruit. By the fruit of their actions man will be distinguished from man. Character's regulative principles are enunciated in the commandments of the Old Law with their appendix from the Sermon on the Mount.

But "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." (Mk. 2:27) Rules are not the end, but are for the sake of the perfection and liberty of the sons of God. "For you have been called to liberty, brethren." (Gal. 5:13) The freedom experienced by those who consent to the revealed mysteries is the freedom of those who love. "The fruit of the Spirit is: charity, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faith, modesty, continency. Against such things there is no law." (Gal. 5:22, 23) A slave lives in fear. But he who listens and lives the revealed word, far from being a slave, is an heir. For "there is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear, because fear brings punishment. And he who fears is not perfected in love." (1 Jn. 4:18)

The message of revelation seems to be the message that our society strains to find. It is a message of meaning in life found in service and forgetfulness of self; a message of the intrinsic worth of every person—especially to him who struggles in season and out of season to fashion his character and rid himself of the old man; a message of love, for

love is the meaning in man's life and the ability to love is the touchstone of a fine character. Revelation reveals that man's capacity to love is so real, so profound, so immense in its dimensions that man cannot be happy with merely the love of one person (who is in turn only a creature and therefore lacking something of supreme goodness), nor can he be happy with human love alone: Man's love reaches out, above and beyond. Such love answers the poet's anguished cry,

The abyss of my spirit calls for ever with a cry  
To the abyss of God: Tell me, which is deeper? . . .

The world is too narrow, the sky too small:  
Where is there room for my soul?

The knowledge of the Cherubim is not enough for me:  
My desire is to fly high above him, in the Unknown.<sup>28</sup>

Revelation replies: "God is greater than our heart." (1 Jn. 3:20)

Courage, noble soul! Reflect upon yourself, reflect on the splendour you bear within you: Are you not honoured above all other creatures by your resemblance to God? Disdain all that is small, for you are created for what is great!<sup>29</sup>

Could this be the message our society is listening for?

Beloved, let us love one another, for love is from God. And everyone who loves is born of God, and knows God. He who does not love does not know God; for God is love. (1 Jn. 4:7, 8)

There are those who will insist that revealed religion has been granted its opportunity and has failed. That after four thousand years of consent to Judaeo-Christian revelation, mankind has not seen fewer wars nor less injustice, nor an end to misery. Such observations are correct: Religion is no panacea. Faith is more than God's revealing; it is man's response. Faith must be more than an assent of the mind, it must include a commitment of body and will and emotions—the whole person must listen to revelation, just as the whole person must love. Faith begets good works. Belief in Christ is not separate from Christ-like action: The action of loving one's neighbor truly, genuinely, honestly.

Faith, indeed, reassures us—but not on our level, or so as to produce a paralyzing illusion, or a complacent satisfaction, but so as to enable us to act. It gives man the confidence to become worthy of himself,

and helps him not to succumb in the great crisis in his growth to maturity, when consciousness awakens from animality.<sup>30</sup>

Far from being a refuge for the inactive or a rest home for intellectual dullards, the *ecclesia* is a fueling station for the committed. It is a teacher for those who desire to know where they are going, who they are and what they should do so that they may get on with the task of rebuilding the world.

Let us also, having such a cloud of witnesses over us, put away every encumbrance and the sin entangling us, and run with patience to the fight set before us; looking towards the author and finisher of faith, Jesus, . . . so that we may not grow weary and lose heart. (Heb. 12:1, 2, 3)

One thing I do: forgetting what is behind, I strain forward to what is before, I press on towards the goal, to the prize of God's heavenly call in Christ Jesus. (Phil. 3:13, 14)

In this paper we have not attempted to prove that revelation is a fact. That is impossible. We feel that, by examining our society in the words of its contemporary critics, and by examining the claims of those who hold revelation, we have arrived at a two-fold conclusion. First, that our epoch is an age for virtue, for self-discipline, for genuine justice and friendship. When the world can be annihilated by the decision of a single mistaken individual, or set free from its poverty by the ingenuity and generosity of affluent peoples, the present hour is no time for aimless thinkers, petty hearts or timid friendships. Courage and honesty, justice and love, right and wrong have never meant so much nor demanded the commitment of so many. Our second finding has been that revelation provides amazingly profound replies to the needs of the present hour.<sup>31</sup> A third question remains outstanding and is probably best answered in each person's conscience: Is revelation a reality?

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Erich Fromm, *The Art of Loving* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Walther Kerr, *The Decline of Pleasure* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1962), p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> David Riseman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1963), *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> Martin Buber, *Eclipse of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1952), p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

<sup>6</sup> Jean Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 506. In James Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1959), p. 371.

<sup>7</sup> Cited in T. P. Maher, *Lest We Build on Sand* (Catholic Hospital Association, 1963), p. 40.

<sup>8</sup> Cited in Henri de Lubac, *The Discovery of God*, trans. Dru (New York: Kenedy & Sons, 1960), p. 70.

<sup>9</sup> Alexander Schneiders, *Personality Development and Adjustment in Adolescence* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1960), pp. 188f.

<sup>10</sup> In his preface to Victor White, *God and the Unconscious* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953), pp. xiiiif.

<sup>11</sup> *op. cit.*, p. 72 and *passim*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> W. M. McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), pp. 216f.

<sup>15</sup> A. A. Roback, *The Psychology of Character* (Cambridge, Mass.: Sci-Art Publishers, 1952), pp. 450, 468.

<sup>16</sup> Rudolph Allers, *The Psychology of Character* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1943), p. 32.

<sup>17</sup> Roback, *op. cit.*, p. 551.

<sup>18</sup> Allers, *loc. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> Roback, *op. cit.*, p. 553.

<sup>20</sup> *Collected Works*, xvi, pp. 76ff. Cited in Victor White, *Soul and Psyche* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 37.

<sup>21</sup> Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, trans. Riviere (New York: Permabook, 1957), pp. 453ff.

<sup>22</sup> Braceland and Stock, *Modern Psychiatry* (New York: Doubleday, 1963), pp. 275f.

<sup>23</sup> Freud, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

<sup>24</sup> Fromm, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 72 and vii.

<sup>26</sup> J. de Fraine, "Revelation," *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. can den Born, trans. Bushinski (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), 2041.

<sup>27</sup> J. de Fraine, "Law," *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. *cit.*, trans. Hartman, 1310.

<sup>28</sup> Angelus Silesius. Cited in De Lubac, *op. cit.*, pp. 13 and 135.

<sup>29</sup> Master Eckhart. Cited in *ibid.*, p. 17, ft. 25.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170f.

<sup>31</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, a Christian scholar of seven centuries ago, predicted that "truth about God, when explored by reason, is arrived at by few men and by these only after a long period of time and replete with many mistakes. Yet the entire salvation of mankind, which is in God, depends on the knowledge of this truth. Consequently in order that salvation be attained by men, with less trouble and with more surety it was necessary that divine revelation teach men about divine matters." (I, q. 1, a. 1.) In another work St. Thomas elaborates on this point. Few men arrive at these sublime truths because many are not equipped to pursue such knowledge, many are too busy with other tasks of daily living, and some are just too indolent. (*Con. gen. I, c. 4.*)