

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 3a. 31, 1

Quæstio 31. de conceptione Salvatoris quoad  
materiam de qua

DEINDE CONSIDERANDUM EST de ipsa conceptione Salvatoris:

primo quantum ad materiam de qua ejus corpus conceptum est;  
secundo quantum ad conceptionis auctorem;  
tertio quantum ad modum et ordinem conceptionis.

Circa primum quærentur octo:

1. utrum caro Christi fuerit sumpta de Adam;
2. utrum fuerit sumpta de David;
3. de genealogia Christi quæ in Evangelii ponitur;
4. utrum decuerit Christum nasci de femina;
5. utrum fuerit de purissimis sanguinibus Virginis corpus ejus formatum;
6. utrum caro Christi fuerit in antiquis patribus secundum aliquid signatum;
7. utrum caro Christi in patribus fuerit peccato obnoxia;
8. utrum fuerit decimata in lumbis Abrahæ.

*articulus 1. utrum caro Christi fuerit sumpta de Adam*

AD PRIMUM sic proceditur:<sup>1</sup> 1. Videtur quod caro Christi non fuerit sumpta ex Adam. Dicit enim Apostolus, *Primus homo de terra terrenus, secundus homo de cælo cælestis*.<sup>2</sup> Primus autem homo est Adam, secundus est Christus. Ergo Christus non est ex Adam, sed habet ab eo distinctam originem.

2. Præterea, conceptio Christi debuit esse maxime miraculosa. Sed majus est miraculum formare corpus hominis ex limo terræ quam ex materia humana quæ de Adam trahitur. Ergo videtur quod non fuerit conveniens Christum ab Adam carnem sumpsisse. Ergo videtur quod corpus Christi non debuerit formari de massa humani generis derivata ab Adam, sed de aliqua alia materia.

3. Præterea, *Peccatum in hunc mundum intravit per unum hominem*, scilicet per Adam, quia omnes\* in eo originaliter existentes peccaverunt, ut patet *Rom.*<sup>3</sup> Sed si corpus Christi fuisset ab Adam sumptum, ipse etiam in Adam originaliter fuisset, quando peccavit. Ergo peccatum originale

\*Leonine: *gentes*, all peoples<sup>1</sup>cf *Compend. Theol.* 217. In *Isaiam* II. 3a. 4, 6

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## BODILY MATTER IN OUR SAVIOUR'S CONCEPTION

### Question 31. bodily matter in our Saviour's conception

WE NOW HAVE TO CONSIDER the Saviour's conception, considering  
first, the matter from which his body was conceived;  
secondly, the active principle of that conception (32);  
and thirdly, the mode and order of conception (33).

The question calls for eight points of inquiry:

1. whether Christ's flesh was derived from Adam;
2. whether it was derived from David;
3. the genealogy of Christ as recorded in the Gospels;
4. was it fitting that Christ should be born of a woman?
5. whether his body was fashioned from the most pure blood of the Virgin;
6. whether the flesh of Christ was in the patriarchs as determinate matter;
7. whether the flesh of Christ in the patriarchs was subject to sin;
8. whether Christ paid tithes in the person of his ancestor Abraham.

#### *article 1. whether Christ's flesh was derived from Adam*

THE FIRST POINT:<sup>1</sup> 1. It would seem not, since St Paul says, *The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man from heaven.*<sup>2a</sup> But the first man is Adam and the second is Christ. Therefore Christ is not derived from Adam; rather has he an origin distinct from him.

2. The conception of Christ must have been supremely miraculous. But there is more of a miracle in the fashioning of a man from the slime of the earth than from human material which derives from Adam. So it would not seem appropriate that Christ should derive his flesh from Adam.

3. *Sin came into the world through one man.* i.e. through Adam, in as much as all in Adam at origin sinned, as is clear from *Romans*.<sup>3</sup> But if Christ's body was derived from Adam, then he himself would at origin have been in Adam and so would have contracted original sin. This is inconsistent

<sup>2</sup>1 *Corinthians* 15, 47

<sup>3</sup>*Romans* 5, 12

<sup>a</sup>A text taken by Marcionites and Manichees to bolster their position.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ, (3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

#### SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 3a. 31, 1

contraxisset, quod non decebat Christi puritatem. Non ergo corpus Christi est formatum de materia sumpta ab Adam.

SED CONTRA est quod Apostolus dicit, *Nusquam angelos apprehendit*, scilicet Filius Dei, *sed semen Abrahæ apprehendit*.<sup>4</sup> Semen autem Abrahæ sumptum est ex Adam. Ergo corpus Christi fuit formatum de materia ex Adam sumpta.

RESPONSIO: Dicendum quod Christus humanam naturam assumpsit ut eam a corruptione purgaret. Non autem purgatione indigebat natura humana, nisi secundum quod infecta erat per originem vitiatam, qua ex Adam descendebat. Et ideo conveniens fuit ut carnem sumeret ex materia ab Adam derivata ut ipsa natura per assumptionem curaretur.

1. Ad primum ergo dicendum quod secundus homo, idest Christus, dicitur esse de cælo, non quidem quantum ad materiam corporis, sed vel quantum ad virtutem formativam corporis ejus vel etiam quantum ad ipsam ejus divinitatem. Secundum autem materiam, corpus Christi fuit terrenum, sicut et corpus Adæ.

2. Ad secundum dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est,<sup>5</sup> mysterium incarnationis Christi est quiddam miraculosum, non sicut ordinatum ad confirmationem fidei, sed sicut articulus fidei. Et ideo in mysterio incarnationis non requiritur quid sit majus miraculum, sicut in miraculis quæ fiunt ad confirmationem fidei; sed quid sit divinæ sapientiæ convenientius et magis expediens humanæ saluti, quod requiritur in omnibus quæ fidei sunt.

Vel potest dici quod in mysterio incarnationis non solum attenditur miraculum ex materia conceptus, sed magis ex modo conceptionis et partus, quia scilicet Virgo concepit et peperit Deum.

3. Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est,<sup>6</sup> corpus Christi fuit in Adam secundum corpulentam substantiam, quia scilicet ipsa materia corporalis Christi derivata est ab Adam; non autem fuit ibi secundum seminalem rationem, quia non est conceptum ex virili semine. Et ideo non contraxit originale peccatum, sicut ceteri qui ab Adam per viam virilis seminis derivantur.

<sup>4</sup>Hebrews 2, 16

<sup>5</sup>3a. 29, 1 ad 2

<sup>6</sup>3a. 15, 1 ad 2

<sup>7</sup>St Thomas holds the 'classical' view about the transmission of original sin. cf 1a2æ. 81, 1. Vol. 26 of this series, ed. T. C. O'Brien. For the corruption of human nature which is an effect of original sin, see 1a2æ. 85, 1 & 2.

Cajetan, *in loc.*, explains that Christ never assumed a corrupted nature, but rather flesh which was vitiated *at origin*.

He also notes how St Thomas does not say that Christ assumed a corrupt human

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

#### BODILY MATTER IN OUR SAVIOUR'S CONCEPTION

with Christ's sinlessness. So Christ's body was not formed of matter derived from Adam.

ON THE OTHER HAND St Paul says of the Son of God, *it is not with angels that he is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham*.<sup>4</sup> But the descendants of Abraham were from Adam. Therefore the body of Christ was formed of matter derived from Adam.

REPLY: Christ assumed a human nature so that he might cleanse it from corruption. Now human nature only needed cleansing in so far as it was tainted at origin by being descended from Adam. So it was only right that he should assume a human body of matter derived from Adam. In this way the nature itself, on being assumed, would be cleansed.<sup>b</sup>

Hence: 1. The second man, i.e. Christ, is said to be from heaven in respect not of his bodily matter, but of what was formative of his body, or also respecting his very divinity. As regards matter, however, Christ's body was earthly, just as Adam's was.

2. As was said above,<sup>5</sup> the mystery of Christ's incarnation is something miraculous not because arranged for the confirmation of faith, but as an article of faith. So what we should expect in that mystery is not the miraculous precisely, as when faith has to be strengthened—but a high degree of consonance with divine wisdom, and of usefulness for man's salvation, qualities called for in all the articles of faith.

Or, you can argue that in the mystery of the incarnation there is not only a miracle in the matter which was conceived, but rather more in the mode of conception and of giving birth, because a virgin conceived and gave birth to God.

3. As we have explained,<sup>6</sup> the body of Christ was in Adam as regards bodily substance, seeing that the very bodily matter of Christ was derived from Adam. But it was not there seminally, because Christ was not conceived from male seed.<sup>c</sup> Thus he did not incur original sin, as do others who derive from Adam through male generation.

---

nature, but flesh which at origin had been vitiated: Christ healed nature which was vitiated in the rest of mankind by assuming a nature which was not corrupt yet descended from corrupt origins. The context is referring only to the healing of human nature, not of persons.

<sup>c</sup>The terms are taken from Augustine who distinguishes between bodily origin (*secundum corpulentam substantiam*) and seminal origin (*secundum seminalem rationem*). All human beings descend from their ancestors by bodily and by seminal origins, i.e. they all receive from their parents their bodies which come from the joint action of both sexes. Christ alone is an exception: his birth did not ensue from sexual union, yet through the blessed Virgin he received his body from human ancestors.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ, (3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 3a, 31, 2

*articulus 2. utrum caro Christi fuerit sumpta de David*

AD SECUNDUM sic proceditur:<sup>1</sup> 1. Videtur quod Christus non sumpserit carnem de semine David. Matthæus enim genealogiam Christi texens, eam ad Joseph perducit. Joseph autem non fuit pater Christi, ut supra dictum est.<sup>2</sup> Non ergo videtur quod Christus de genere David descenderit.

2. Præterea, Aaron fuit de tribu Levi, ut patet *Exod.*<sup>3</sup> Maria autem mater Christi cognata dicitur Elisabeth, quæ est filia Aaron, ut patet *Luc.*<sup>4</sup> Cum ergo David fuerit de tribu Juda, ut patet *Matt.*,<sup>5</sup> videtur quod Christus de semine David non descenderit.

3. Præterea, dicitur de Jechonia, *Scribe virum istum sterilem; nec enim erit de semine ejus vir qui sedeat super solium David.*<sup>6</sup> Sed de Christo dicitur *Isa.*, *Super solium David sedebit.*<sup>7</sup> Ergo Christus non fuit de semine Jechoniæ et per consequens nec de genere David, quia Matthæus a David per Jechoniam seriem generationum perducit.

SED CONTRA est quod dicitur *Rom.*, *Qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem.*<sup>8</sup>

RESPONSIO: Dicendum quod Christus specialiter duorum antiquorum patrum filius dicitur esse, Abrahæ scilicet et David, ut patet *Matt.*<sup>9</sup> Cujus est multiplex ratio. Prima quidem, quia ad hos specialiter de Christo promissio facta est. Dictum est enim Abrahæ, *Benedicentur in semine tuo omnes gentes terræ*,<sup>10</sup> quod Apostolus de Christo exponit dicens, *Gal.*, *Abrahæ dictæ sunt promissiones et semini ejus. Non dicit, Et seminibus, quasi in multis, sed quasi in uno. Et semini tuo, qui est Christus.*<sup>11</sup> Ad David autem dictum est, *De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam.*<sup>12</sup> Unde et populi Judæorum, ut regem honorifice suscipientes, dicebant *Matt.*, *Hosanna filio David.*<sup>13</sup>

Secunda ratio est quod Christus futurus erat rex, propheta et sacerdos. Abraham autem sacerdos fuit, ut patet ex hoc quod Dominus dixit ad eum, *Sume tibi vaccam triennem*, etc.<sup>14</sup> Fuit etiam Propheta, secundum illud quod dicitur, *Propheta est et orabit pro te.*<sup>15</sup> David autem rex fuit et propheta.

Tertia ratio est, quia in Abraham primo incepit circumcisio, in David autem maxime manifestata est Dei electio, secundum illud quod dicitur *Quæsiuit Dominus sibi virum juxta cor suum.*<sup>16</sup>

<sup>1</sup>cf *In Hebr.* 7, *lect.* 3. *In Rom.* 1, *lect.* 2

<sup>2</sup>3a. 28, 1; 29, 2

<sup>3</sup>*Exodus* 6, 16–20

<sup>4</sup>*Luke* 1, 5

<sup>5</sup>*Matthew* 1, 3

<sup>6</sup>*Jeremiah* 22, 30

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ, (3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## BODILY MATTER IN OUR SAVIOUR'S CONCEPTION

### *article 2. whether Christ's flesh was derived from David*

THE SECOND POINT:<sup>1</sup> 1. It would appear that Christ did not take flesh of the seed of David. Matthew sets out a genealogy of Christ and traces it down to Joseph, who, however, was not the father of Christ, as we have agreed.<sup>2</sup> So it seems that Christ did not descend from the stock of David.

2. Aaron was of the tribe of Levi.<sup>3</sup> Mary, mother of Christ, is said to have been a relation of Elizabeth who was a daughter of Aaron.<sup>4</sup> Now as David was of the tribe of Judah,<sup>5</sup> it seems that Christ did not descend from the seed of David.

3. It is said of Jechoniah, *Write this man down as childless; none of his offspring shall succeed in sitting on the throne of David.*<sup>6</sup> But of Christ it was said, *He will sit upon the throne of David.*<sup>7</sup> So he was not of the stock of Jechoniah, and so neither of the stock of David, seeing that Matthew traces the series of generation from David through Jechoniah.

ON THE OTHER HAND we read of the son *who was descended from David according to the flesh.*<sup>8</sup>

REPLY: Christ is specially said to be the son of two ancient patriarchs, Abraham and David, as is clear in *Matthew*.<sup>9</sup> There are many reasons for this. The first is that it was to them particularly that a promise of Christ was made. To Abraham it was said, *By your descendants shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*<sup>10a</sup> St Paul interprets this of Christ, *Now the promises were made to Abraham and to his offspring. It does not say, and to offsprings, referring to many, but, referring to one, and to your offspring, which is Christ.*<sup>11</sup> To David, however, it was said, *One of the sons of your body I will set on your throne.*<sup>12</sup> Thus it was that the Jewish people recognizing and honouring Christ as king cried out, *Hosanna to the son of David.*<sup>13</sup>

A second reason is that Christ was to be king, prophet, and priest. That Abraham was a priest is clear from God's words to him, *Bring a heifer three years old, etc.*<sup>14</sup> And he was also a prophet; *He is a prophet and will pray for you.*<sup>15</sup>

A third reason is that circumcision first began with Abraham; and then in David came the supreme manifestation of divine election, as is said, *The Lord sought a man according to his heart.*<sup>16</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Isaiah 9, 7

<sup>9</sup>Matthew 1, 1

<sup>11</sup>Galatians 3, 16

<sup>13</sup>Matthew 21, 9

<sup>15</sup>Genesis 20, 7

<sup>8</sup>RSV, *bless themselves.*

<sup>8</sup>Romans 1, 3

<sup>10</sup>Genesis 22, 18

<sup>12</sup>Psalms 131, 2

<sup>14</sup>Genesis 15, 9

<sup>16</sup>I Samuel 13, 14

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ, (3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 3a. 31, 2

Et ideo utrusque filius Christus specialissime dicitur, ut ostendatur esse in salutem et Circumcisioni et electioni Gentilium.

1. Ad primum ergo dicendum quod hæc obiectio fuit Fausti Manichæi volentis probare Christum non esse filium David, quia non est conceptus ex Joseph, usque ad quem seriem generationis Matthæus perducit. Contra quem Augustinus respondet quod *cum idem Evangelista dicat et virum Mariæ esse Joseph, et Christum esse ex semine David; quid restat, nisi credere Mariam non fuisse extraneam a cognatione David, et eam Joseph conjugem non frustra appellatam propter animorum confæderationem, quamvis ei non fuerit carne commixtus; et quod potius propter dignitatem virilem ordo generationum usque ad Joseph perducitur?* Et mox, *Sic ergo nos credimus etiam Mariam fuisse de cognatione David, quia Scripturis credimus, quæ utrumque dicunt, et Christum ex semine David secundum carnem, et ejus matrem Mariam, non cum viro concumbendo, sed virginem.*<sup>17</sup> Ut enim dicit Hieronymus, super illud, *Christi generatio sic erat, Ex una tribu fuit Joseph et Maria; unde ex lege eam accipere cogeatur ut propinquam; propter quod et simul censentur in Bethlehem, quasi simul de una stirpe generati.*<sup>18</sup>

2. Ad secundum dicendum quod huic objectioni Gregorius Nazianzenus respondet, dicens quod *hoc nutu superno contigit ut regium genus sacerdotali stirpi jungeretur, ut Christus, qui rex est et sacerdos, ab utrisque nasceretur secundum carnem.*<sup>19</sup> Unde et Aaron, qui fuit primus sacerdos secundum legem, duxit ex tribu Juda conjugem Elisabeth filiam Aminadab. Sic ergo potuit fieri ut pater Elisabeth aliquam uxorem habuerit de stirpe David, ratione cujus beata Virgo Maria, quæ fuit de stirpe David, esset Elizabeth cognata; vel potius e converso, quod pater beata Mariæ de stirpe David existens, uxorem habuerit de stirpe Aaron.

Vel, sicut Augustinus dicit,<sup>20</sup> si Joachim pater Mariæ de stirpe Aaron fuit, ut Faustus hæreticus per quasdam scripturas apocryphas asserebat,<sup>21</sup> credendum est quod mater Joachim fuerit de stirpe David, vel etiam uxor ejus, ita ut per aliquem modum Mariam dicamus fuisse de stirpe David.

3. Ad tertium dicendum quod per illam auctoritatem propheticam, sicut Ambrosius dicit,<sup>22</sup> *Non negatur ex semine Jechoniæ posteros nascituros; et ideo de semine ejus Christus est. Et quod regnavit Christus, non contra*

<sup>17</sup>Contra Faustum xxiii, 3, 8, 9. PL 42, 468 & 471

<sup>18</sup>Super Matt. i, 1. PL 26, 24

<sup>19</sup>Carmina i, 1, 18. PG 37, 480. cf Bede, on Luke i, 36. PL 92, 319

<sup>20</sup>lib. cit. note 17, 9. PL 42, 472

<sup>21</sup>lib. cit. note 17, 4. PL 42, 468

<sup>22</sup>On Luke 3, 25. PL 15, 1690

<sup>b</sup>The position adopted here differs from Hebrews 7, 13, which definitely opposes the idea of the levitical priesthood continuing in Christ. cf 3a. 22, 1, 'The priesthood



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## BODILY MATTER IN OUR SAVIOUR'S CONCEPTION

Thus it is that Christ is very specially termed a son of Abraham and David. This is seen to be for the salvation of the Circumcised and for the election of the Gentiles.

Hence: 1. This is the objection of Faustus the Manichee who wanted to prove that Christ was not the son of David because he was not the son of Joseph who comes at the term of Matthew's generation series. Augustine answers him thus: *Since the same evangelist affirms that Joseph was Mary's husband, that Christ's mother was a virgin, and that Christ was of the seed of Abraham, what must we believe but that Mary was not a stranger to the house of David; and not without reason was she called the wife of Joseph because of the close alliance of their hearts, although not mingled in the flesh; and that the genealogy is traced down to Joseph rather than to her by reason of the husband's dignity?* Later he says, *So then we believe that Mary was also of the family of David, and this because we believe the Scriptures which assert both that Christ was of the seed of David according to the flesh, and that Mary was his mother, not by marital intercourse, but retaining her virginity.*<sup>17</sup> For, as Jerome says, *Joseph and Mary were of the same clan, and so he was induced by law to marry her, as she was his kinswoman. Hence it is that they were enrolled together at Bethlehem, as being descended from the same stock.*<sup>18</sup>

2. Gregory Nazianzen answers this objection by saying that God's will brought it about that the royal line should be linked to the priestly, so that Christ, who is both priest and king, should be born of both according to the flesh.<sup>19b</sup> Thus Aaron, who was the first priest according to the Law, married a wife of the tribe of Judah, Elizabeth, daughter of Aminadab. It is accordingly possible that Elizabeth's father married a wife of the family of David, through whom the blessed Virgin Mary, who was of the family of David, would be a cousin of Elizabeth. Or, conversely, and still more likely, blessed Mary's father, who was of the family of David, married a wife of the family of Aaron.

Again we can say with Augustine,<sup>20</sup> that if Joachim, Mary's father, was of the family of Aaron, as the heretic Faustus maintained from certain apocryphal writings,<sup>21</sup> then we must believe that Joachim's mother, or else his wife, was of the family of David, so long as we hold that Mary was in some way descended from David.

3. Ambrose notes<sup>22</sup> that this prophetic passage does not deny that posterity will be born of the seed of Jechoniah. And so Christ is of his seed.

---

of the Old Law was a figure of Christ's priesthood. Thus Christ was in no wise to be born of that priestly line which served to prefigure his priesthood. He thus shows that the two priesthoods were distinct, one being in reality, the other in figure.'



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

### SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 3a. 31, 3

*prophetiam est; non enim seculari honore regnavit; ipse enim dixit,  
Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo.*<sup>23</sup>

*articulus 3. utrum convenienter genealogia Christi ab Evangelistis texatur*

AD TERTIUM sic proceditur.<sup>1</sup> 1. Videtur quod genealogia Christi inconvenienter ab Evangelistis texatur.<sup>2</sup> Dicitur enim *Isa.* de Christo, *Generationem ejus quis enarrabit?*<sup>3</sup> Ergo non fuit generatio Christi enarranda.

2. Præterea, impossibile est unum hominem duos patres habere. Sed Matthæus dicit quod *Jacob genuit Joseph virum Mariæ*,<sup>4</sup> Lucas autem dicit Joseph fuisse filium Heli.<sup>5</sup> Ergo contraria sibi invicem scribunt.

3. Præterea, videntur in quibusdam a se invicem diversificari. Matthæus enim in principio libri incipiens ab Abraham descendendo usque ad Joseph, quadraginta duas generationes enumerat. Lucas autem post baptismum Christi generationem Christi ponit, incipiens a Christo, et producens generationum numerum usque ad Deum, ponens generationes septuaginta septem, utroque extremo computato. Videtur igitur quod inconvenienter generationem Christi describant.

4. Præterea, legitur quod Joram genuit Ochoziam;<sup>6</sup> cui successit Joas filius ejus: huic autem successit filius ejus Amasias; postea regnavit filius ejus Azarias, qui appellatur Ozias, cui successit Joatham filius ejus.<sup>7</sup> Matthæus autem dicit quod *Joram genuit Oziam*.<sup>8</sup> Ergo videtur inconvenienter generationem Christi describere, tres reges in medio prætermittens.

5. Præterea, omnes qui in Christi generatione describuntur patres habuerunt et matres; et plurimi etiam ex eis fratres habuerunt. Matthæus autem in generatione Christi tres tantum enumerat matres, scilicet Thamar, Ruth et uxorem Uriæ; fratres autem nominat Judæ et Jechoniæ; et iterum Phares et Zaram: quorum nihil posuit Lucas. Ergo videntur Evangelistæ inconvenienter genealogiam Christi descripsisse.

SED CONTRA est auctoritas Scripturæ.

RESPONSIO: Dicendum quod, sicut dicitur 2 ad *Tim.*, *Omnis Scriptura sacra est divinitus inspirata.*<sup>9</sup> Quæ autem divinitus fiunt, ordinatissime fiunt,

<sup>23</sup>*John* 18, 36

<sup>1</sup>cf *In Matt.* 1

<sup>2</sup>*Matthew* 1 & *Luke* 3

<sup>3</sup>*Isaiah* 53, 8

<sup>4</sup>*Matthew* 1, 16

<sup>5</sup>*Luke* 3, 23

<sup>6</sup>*II Kings* 8, 24. *II Chronicles* 26, 1

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-02960-5 - Summa Theologiae: Volume 52 - The Childhood of Christ,  
(3a. 31-37)

Roland Potter, O.P.

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## BODILY MATTER IN OUR SAVIOUR'S CONCEPTION

And it is not contrary to the prophecy that Christ reigned, for he did not reign with worldly honour, for he declared, *My kingship is not of this world.*<sup>23</sup>

*article 3. whether Christ's genealogy is suitably traced by the Evangelists*

THE THIRD POINT:<sup>1</sup> 1. Seemingly not.<sup>2</sup> Isaiah says of Christ: *Who can describe his generation?*<sup>3a</sup> Thus Christ's genealogy should not be traced.

2. One man cannot have two fathers. But Matthew says that Jacob was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary.<sup>4</sup> But Luke says that Joseph was son of Heli.<sup>5</sup> So they contradict each other here.

3. The genealogies differ in particulars. Matthew starts his gospel with a genealogy which goes down from Abraham to Joseph; and he lists 42 generations. Luke puts the generation of Christ after his baptism, and, starting from Christ, traces generations right up to God: this makes 72 generations if we include both end terms. It would seem, then, that they do not well trace Christ's ancestry.

4. It is said that Joram was the father of Achaziah.<sup>6</sup> He was followed by his son Josiah who in turn was followed by his son Amaziah. The next to rule after him was Azariah, also known as Uzziah.<sup>7</sup> But Matthew writes that Joram was the father of Uzziah.<sup>8</sup> So he would not appear to be tracing Christ's genealogy rightly, and leaves out three intervening kings.

5. All the people mentioned in the generation of Christ had fathers and mothers; very many had brothers too. But Matthew only mentions three mothers in the generation of Christ, namely, Tamar, Ruth and the wife of Uriah. He mentions also the brothers of Judah and Jechoniah, as also Perez and Zerah. Luke, however, says nothing about these. So it would seem that the evangelists did not rightly trace the genealogy of Christ.

ON THE OTHER HAND is the authority of Scripture.

REPLY: As is said in II *Timothy*, *All Scripture is inspired by God.*<sup>9</sup> What is done by God is supremely well ordered, as is said in *Romans*,<sup>b</sup> *What is of*

<sup>1</sup>II *Kings* 15, 17

<sup>2</sup>Matthew 1, 8

<sup>3</sup>II *Timothy* 3, 16

<sup>a</sup>The text as cited is that of *Acts* 8, 33; in *Isaiah* the question is obscured.

<sup>b</sup>St Thomas fastens upon the term *ordinata* (Vulgate), and expands it to make the theological point that what God does is very well ordered, for God is supreme Wisdom. However, context and text of *Romans* refer to divine authority. RSV., *For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God.*