

Lectio 11

18 θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε:
μονογενῆς θεὸς
ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

Supra Evangelista ostendit quomodo gratiam apostoli acceperunt a Christo, eo faciente; hic ostendit quomodo acceperunt ab ipso eam docente. Et circa hoc tria facit. Primo ostendit huius doctrinae necessitatem, dicens *Deum nemo vidit unquam*; secundo doctoris ad docendum eam facultatem, ibi *unigenitus qui est in sinu patris*; tertio ipsam doctrinam declarat, ibi *enarravit*.

Necessitas autem huius doctrinae erat defectus sapientiae in hominibus, quem quidem defectum Evangelista insinuabat per ignorantiam Dei, quae in hominibus abundabat, dicens *Deum nemo vidit unquam*. Et hoc facit congrue: nam sapientia proprie in cognitione Dei, et divinorum consistit. Unde Augustinus dicit, quod sapientia est divinarum rerum cognitio, sicut et scientia humanarum.

Quod autem hic dicit Evangelista *Deum nemo vidit unquam* contrariari videtur pluribus auctoritatibus divinae Scripturae. Dicitur enim Is. VI, 1: *vidi dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum*; II Reg. VI, 2, fere idem habetur: *nomen domini sedentis super Cherubim* etc.; Matth. V, v. 8, dicit dominus: *beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt*. Sed si aliquis responderet ad hoc ultimum, dicens, verum esse quod in praeterito nullus vidit,

LECTURE 11

18 No one has ever seen God;
it is the Only Begotten Son,
who is in the bosom of the Father,
who has made him known.

208 Above, the Evangelist showed how the apostles received grace from Christ as its author; here he shows how they received it from him as a teacher. About this he does three things. First, he shows the need for this teaching. Secondly, the competency of the teacher. Thirdly, the teaching itself.

209 The need for this teaching arose from the lack of wisdom among men, which the Evangelist implies by alluding to the ignorance concerning God which prevailed among men, saying: **No one has ever seen God**. And he does this fittingly, for wisdom consists properly in the knowledge of God and of divine things. Hence Augustine says that wisdom is the knowledge of divine things, as science is the knowledge of human things.

2 10 But this statement of the Evangelist, **No one has ever seen God**, seems to contradict many passages of divine Scripture. For it is said in Isaiah (6:1): “I saw the Lord seated on a high and lofty throne.” And about the same is found in 2 Samuel (6:2). Again in Matthew (5:8), the Lord says: “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.” If someone were to answer this last statement by saying that it is true that in the past no one has seen God,

sed in futuro videbit, sicut dominus promittit, apostolus hoc excludit, dicens I Tim. ult., 16: *lucem habitat inaccessibilem, quam nullus hominum vidit, sed nec videre potest.*

Sed quia apostolus dicit: *nullus hominum vidit*, posset aliquis dicere, quod si non ab hominibus videri possit, saltem videtur ab Angelis; praesertim cum Deus dicat Matth. XVIII, 10: *Angeli eorum in caelis semper vident faciem patris*. Sed nec isto modo dici potest: quia, ut dicitur Matth. XXII, 30: *fili resurrectionis erunt sicut Angeli Dei in caelo*. Si ergo Angeli vident Deum in caelo, manifestum est etiam quod et filii resurrectionis eum vident; I Io. III, 2: *cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, et videbimus eum sicut est.*

Quomodo ergo intelligendum est hoc quod dicit Evangelista *Deum nemo vidit unquam*? Ad huius ergo intellectum sciendum est, quod Deus dicitur videri tripliciter. Uno quidem modo per subiectam creaturam, visui corporali propositam; sicut creditur Abraham vidisse Deum, quando *tres vidit, et unum adoravit*, Gen. XVIII; unum quidem adoravit, quia tres, quos prius homines reputaverat, et postmodum Angelos credidit, recognovit mysterium Trinitatis. Alio modo per repraesentatam imaginationem; et sic Isaias vidit *dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum*. Plures visiones huic similes in Scripturis reperiuntur. Alio vero modo videtur per aliquam speciem intelligibilem a sensibilibus abstractam, ab his qui per considerationem magnitudinis creaturarum, intellectu intuentur magnitudinem creatoris, ut dicitur Sap. XIII, 5: *a magnitudine speciei et creaturae cognoscibiliter poterit creator horum videri*, et Rom. I, 20: *invisibilia Dei a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur*. Alio modo per aliquod spirituale lumen a Deo infusum spiritualibus mentibus in contemplatione; et hoc modo vidit Iacob *Deum facie ad faciem*, Gen. XXXII, 30 quae visio, secundum Gregorium, facta est per altam contemplationem.

Sed per nullam istarum visionum, ad visionem divinae essentiae pervenitur: nulla enim species facta, sive qua informatur sensus exterior, sive qua informatur imaginatio, sive qua informatur intellectus, est repraesentativa

but will see him in the future, as the Lord promises, the Apostle would exclude this, saying, “He dwells in unapproachable light, whom no man has seen or can see” (1 Tim 6:16).

Because the Apostle says, “no man has seen,” someone might say that if he cannot be seen by men, then at least he can be seen by angels; especially since God says, “Their angels in heaven always see the face of my Father” (Mt 18:10). But it cannot be taken in this way either, because it is said, “The sons of the resurrection will be like the angels of God in heaven” (Mt 22:30). If, therefore, the angels see God in heaven, then it is plain that the sons of the resurrection also see him: “When he appears we shall be like him, and we shall see him as he is” (1 Jn 3:2).

211 How then are we to understand what the Evangelist says: **No one has ever seen God**? To understand it we must know that God is said to be seen in three ways. First, through a created substitute presented to the bodily sight; as Abraham is believed to have seen God when he saw three [men] and adored one (Gn 18). He adored one because he recognized the mystery of the Trinity in the three, whom he first thought to be men, and later believed to be angels. In a second way, through a representation in the imagination; and in this way Isaiah saw the Lord seated on a high and lofty throne. Many visions of this sort are recorded in the Scriptures. In a third way, he is seen through an intelligible species abstracted from material things; and in this way he is seen by those who, considering the greatness of creatures, see with their intellect the greatness of the Creator, as it is said: “From the greatness and beauty of creatures, their Creator can be seen accordingly” (Wis 13:5); “The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood through the things that are made,” as found in Romans (1:20). In another way, God is seen through a certain spiritual light infused by God into spiritual minds during contemplation; and this is the way Jacob saw God face to face, as it says in Genesis (32:30). According to Gregory, this vision came about through his lofty contemplation.

But the vision of the divine essence is not attained by any of the above visions: for no created species, whether it be that by which an external sense is informed, or by which the imagination is informed, or by which the

divinae essentiae sicut est. Illud autem homo per essentiam cognoscit quod species quam habet in intellectu, repraesentat ut est: per nullam ergo speciem ad visionem divinae essentiae pervenitur.

Quod autem nulla creata species divinam essentiam repraesentet, patet: quia nullum finitum potest repraesentare infinitum ut est; omnis autem species creata est finita: ergo et cetera. Praeterea, Deus est suum esse; et ideo eius sapientia et bonitas, et quaecumque alia, idem sunt; per unum autem creatum non possent omnia ista repraesentari: ergo cognitio qua Deus per creaturas videtur, non est ipsius essentia, sed aenigmatica et specularis, et a remotis. Iob XXXVI, 25: *omnes homines vident eum*, aliquo dictorum modorum, *sed unusquisque intuetur procul*, quia per omnes illas cognitiones non scitur de Deo quid est, sed quid non est, vel an est. Unde dicit Dionysius libro mysticae theologiae, quod perfectus modus quo Deus in vita praesenti cognoscitur, est per privationem omnium creaturarum, et intellectuum a nobis.

Fuerunt autem aliqui dicentes, quod divina essentia numquam videbitur ab aliquo intellectu creato, et quod nec ab Angelis vel beatis videtur. Sed haec propositio ostenditur esse falsa et haeretica tripliciter. Primo quidem, quia contrariatur auctoritati divinae Scripturae; I Io. III, 2: *videbimus eum sicuti est*; et infra XVII, 3: *haec est vita aeterna ut cognoscant te solum Deum verum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum*. Secundo quia claritas Dei non est aliud quam eius substantia: non enim est lucens per participationem luminis, sed per seipsam. Tertio quia impossibile est quod aliquis perfectam beatitudinem consequatur, nisi in visione divinae essentiae: quia naturale desiderium intellectus est scire et cognoscere causas omnium effectuum cognitorum ab eo; quod non potest impleri nisi scita et cognita prima universali omnium causa, quae non est composita ex effectu et causa, sicut causae secundae. Et ideo auferre possibilitatem visionis divinae essentiae ab hominibus, est auferre ipsam beatitudinem. Necesse est ergo ad beatitudinem intellectus creati, ut divina essentia videatur, Matth. V, 8: *beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt*.

intellectus informatus, est representative of the divine essence as it is. Now man knows as to its essence only what the species he has in his intellect represents as it is. Therefore, the vision of the divine essence is not attained through any species.

The reason why no created species can represent the divine essence is plain: for nothing finite can represent the infinite as it is; but every created species is finite; therefore [it cannot represent the infinite as it is]. Further, God is his own *esse*; and therefore his wisdom and greatness and anything else are the same. But all those cannot be represented through one created thing. Therefore, the knowledge by which God is seen through creatures is not a knowledge of his essence, but a knowledge that is dark and mirrored, and from afar. "Everyone sees him," in one of the above ways, "from afar" (Jb 36:25), because we do not know what God is by all these acts of knowing, but what he is not, or that he is. Hence Denis says, in his *Mystical Theology*, that the perfect way in which God is known in this present life is by taking away all creatures and every thing understood by us.

212 There have been some who said that the divine essence will never be seen by any created intellect, and that it is seen neither by the angels nor by the blessed. But this statement is shown to be false and heretical in three ways, First, because it is contrary to the authority of divine Scripture: "We shall see him as he is" (1 Jn 3:2); "This is eternal life, that they know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent" (below 17:3). Secondly, because the brightness of God is the same as his substance; for he does not give forth light by participating in light, but through himself. And thirdly, because it is impossible for anyone to attain perfect happiness except in the vision of the divine essence. This is because the natural desire of the intellect is to understand and know the causes of all the effects that it knows; but this desire cannot be fulfilled unless it understands and knows the first universal cause of all things, which is a cause that is not composed of cause and effect, as second causes are. Therefore, to take away the possibility of the vision of the divine essence by man is to take away happiness itself. Therefore, in order for the created intellect to be happy, it is necessary that the divine essence be seen. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Mt 5:8).

Quo ad visionem autem divinae essentiae, oportet tria attendere. Primo, quia numquam videbitur oculo corporali, vel aliquo sensu, vel imaginatione, cum per sensus non percipiuntur nisi sensata corporea; Deus autem incorporeus est; infra IV, v. 24: *Deus spiritus est*. Secundo, quia intellectus humanus quamdiu corpori est coniunctus, Deum videre non potest, quia aggravatur a corruptibili corpore, ne possit ad summum contemplationis pertingere. Et inde est quod anima quanto magis est a passionibus libera, et purgata ab affectibus terrenorum, tanto amplius in contemplationem veritatis ascendit, et gustat quam suavis est dominus. Summus gradus autem contemplationis est videre Deum per essentiam; et ideo quamdiu homo in corpore subiecto ex necessitate passionibus multis vivit, Deum non potest per essentiam videre. Ex. c. XXXIII, 20: *non videbit me homo et vivet*. Ad hoc ergo quod intellectus humanus divinam essentiam videat, necesse est ut totaliter deserat corpus; vel per mortem, sicut apostolus dicit II Cor. V, 8: *audemus, et bonam voluntatem habemus magis peregrinari a corpore, et praesentes esse ad dominum*; vel quod totaliter abstrahatur per raptum a corporis sensibus, sicut de Paulo legitur II Cor. c. XII, 3.

Tertio modo, quod nullus intellectus creatus quantumcumque abstractus, sive per mortem, vel a corpore separatus, videns divinam essentiam, ipsam nullo modo comprehendere potest. Et ideo communiter dicitur, quod, licet divina essentia tota videatur a beatis, cum sit simplicissima et partibus carens, tamen non videtur totaliter, quia hoc esset eam comprehendere. Hoc enim quod dico totaliter, dicit modum quemdam. Quilibet autem modus Dei est divina essentia; unde qui non videt eum totaliter, non comprehendit eum. Comprehendere autem proprie dicitur aliquis aliquam rem cognoscendo, qui cognoscit rem illam quantum in se cognoscibilis est; alias, quamvis cognoscat eam, non tamen comprehendit. Sicut qui cognoscit hanc propositionem: *triangulus habet tres angulos aequales duobus rectis*, syllogismo dialectico, non cognoscit eam quantum cognoscibilis est, et ideo non cognoscit totaliter; sed qui cognoscit eam syllogismo demonstrativo, totaliter scit eam. Unumquodque enim tantum cognoscibile est, quantum habet de ente et veritate; sed ipse cognoscens tantum cognoscit quantum habet de virtute cognoscitiva. Omnis autem substantia intellectualis creata est finita: ergo finite cognoscit. Cum ergo Deus sit infinitae virtutis et entitatis, et per consequens infinite cognoscibilis, a nullo intellectu creato cognosci potest

213 Three things should be noted about the vision of the divine essence. First, it will never be seen with a bodily eye, either by sense or imagination, since only sensate bodily things are perceived by the senses, and God is not bodily: “God is spirit” (below 4:24). Secondly, that as long as the human intellect is in the body it cannot see God, because it is weighed down by the body so that it cannot attain the summit of contemplation. So it is that the more a soul is free of passions and is purged from affections for earthly things, the higher it rises in the contemplation of truth and tastes how sweet the Lord is. Now the highest degree of contemplation is to see God through his essence; and so as long as a man lives in a body which is necessarily subject to many passions, he cannot see God through his essence. “Man will not see me and live” (Ex 33:20). Therefore, if the human intellect is to see the divine essence it must wholly depart from the body: either by death, as the Apostle says, “We would prefer to be absent from the body and present with the Lord” (2 Cor 5:8); or by being wholly abstracted by rapture from the senses of the body, as is mentioned of Paul in 2 Corinthians (12:3).

Thirdly, no created intellect (however abstracted, either by death, or separated from the body) which does see the divine essence, can comprehend it in any way. And so it is commonly said that although the whole divine essence is seen by the blessed, since it is most simple and has no parts, yet it is not wholly seen, because this would be to comprehend it. For “wholly” implies a certain mode. But any mode of God is the divine essence. Hence one who does not see him wholly does not comprehend him. For one is properly said to comprehend a thing through knowledge when he knows that thing to the extent that it is knowable in itself; otherwise, although he may know it, he does not comprehend it. For example, one who knows this proposition, “A triangle has three angles equal to two right angles,” by a dialectical syllogism, does not know it as well as it is knowable in itself; thus he does not know it wholly. But one who knows this by a demonstrative syllogism does know it wholly. For each thing is knowable to the extent that it has being and truth; while one is a knower according to his amount of cognitive power. Now a created intellectual substance is finite; hence it knows in a finite way. And since God is infinite in power and being, and as a consequence is infinitely knowable, he cannot be known by any created

quantum est cognoscibilis; et ideo omni intellectui creato remanet incomprehensibilis; Iob XXXVI, 26: *ecce Deus magnus vincens scientiam nostram*. Solus autem ipse comprehendendo contemplatur seipsum, quia tanta est eius virtus in cognoscendo quanta est eius entitas in essendo. Ier. XXXII, 18: *fortissime, magne, potens dominus exercituum nomen tibi, magnus consilio, incomprehensibilis cogitatu*.

Sic ergo, secundum praemissa, intelligitur *Deum nemo vidit unquam*. Primo sic: *nemo*, idest nullus hominum, *vidit Deum*, idest essentiam divinam, oculo corporali et imaginario. Secundo *nemo*, in hac mortali vita vivens, *vidit* divinam essentiam in seipsa. Tertio *nemo*, homo vel Angelus, *vidit Deum*, visione comprehensionis. Quod autem de aliquibus dicitur, quod Deum viderunt oculo, seu viventes in corpore, intelligitur non per essentiam, sed per subiectam creaturam, ut dictum est. Sic ergo necessarium erat quod reciperemus sapientiam, quia *Deum nemo vidit unquam*.

Huius autem sapientiae sufficiens doctor nobis proponitur ab Evangelista, cum subdit *unigenitus filius qui est in sinu patris*, in quo ostendit nobis doctoris ipsius facultatem per tria. Scilicet per naturalem similitudinem, et per singularem excellentiam, et per perfectissimam consubstantialitatem.

Per naturalem similitudinem, quia filius naturaliter similitudinem patris habet. Et inde est etiam quod intantum aliquis dicitur filius Dei, in quantum similitudinem filii naturalis participat; et intantum cognoscit, in quantum de similitudine eius habet: quia cognitio fit per assimilationem. I Io. III, 2: *nunc filii Dei sumus*, et sequitur: *cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, et videbimus eum sicuti est*. Et ideo in hoc quod Evangelista dicit *filius*, importatur similitudo, et aptitudo ad cognoscendum Deum.

Sed quia iste doctor specialius quam alii filii Deum cognoscit, ideo Evangelista hoc insinuat per excellentiam singularem, cum dicit *unigenitus*; quasi dicat: iste cognoscit Deum prae aliis filiis. Ideo dicitur *unigenitus*, quia

intellectu to the degree that he is knowable. And thus he remains incomprehensible to every created intellect. “Behold, God is great, exceeding our knowledge” (Jb 36:26). He alone contemplates himself comprehensively, because his power to know is as great as his entity in being. “O most mighty, great, powerful, your name is Lord of hosts, great in counsel, incomprehensible in thought” (Jer 32:18).

214 Using the above explanations, we can understand, **No one has ever seen God**. First, No one, i.e., no man, has seen God, that is, the divine essence, with the eye of the body or the imagination. Secondly, No one, living in this mortal life, has seen the divine essence in itself. Thirdly, No one, man or angel, has seen God by a vision of comprehension. So when it is said that certain ones have seen God with their eyes or while living in the body, he is not seen through his essence, but through a creature acting as a substitute, as was said. And thus it was necessary for us to receive wisdom, because No one has ever seen God.

215 The Evangelist mentions the competent teacher of this wisdom when he adds, **it is the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father**. He shows the competence of this teacher in three ways: by a natural likeness, by a singular excellence, and by a most perfect consubstantiality.

216 By natural likeness, because a son is naturally like his father. Wherefore it also follows that one is called a son of God insofar as he shares in the likeness of his natural son; and one knows him insofar as he has a likeness to him, since knowledge is attained through assimilation [or “likeness to”]. Hence 1 John (3:2) says, “Now we are sons of God,” and he immediately adds, “when he comes, we will be like him, and we will see him as he is.” Therefore, when the Evangelist says Son, he implies a likeness as well as all aptitude for knowing God.

217 Because this teacher knows God in a more special way than other sons do, the Evangelist suggests this by his singular excellence, saying, **the Only Begotten**. As if to say: He knows God more than other sons do. Hence, because he is the natural Son, having the same nature and knowledge as the

est filius naturalis, eandem habens cum patre naturam et cognitionem; Ps. II, 7: *dominus dixit ad me: filius meus es tu.*

Quamvis autem singulariter cognosceret, posset tamen sibi deesse facultas docendi, si non cognosceret totaliter; et ideo addit tertium, scilicet consubstantialitatem eius ad patrem, cum dicit *in sinu patris*: ut non accipiatur sinus prout in hominibus veste praecinctis dici consuevit, sed pro patris occulto. Illud enim in occulto gerimus, quod in sinu portamus. Occultum autem patris est, quia superexcedit omnem virtutem, et cognitionem, cum divina essentia sit infinita. In illo ergo sinu, idest in occultissimo paternae naturae et essentiae, quae excedit omnem virtutem creaturae, est unigenitus filius; et ideo consubstantialis est patri.

Et quod Evangelista hic significavit per sinum hoc David expressit per uterum, dicens Ps. CIX, 3: *ex utero ante Luciferum*, idest ex intimo et occulto meae essentiae, incomprehensibili omni intellectui creato, *genui te*, et consubstantialem mihi, et eiusdem naturae et virtutis et potestatis et cognitionis; I Cor. II, v. 11: *quae sunt hominis, nemo novit nisi spiritus hominis (...) et quae sunt Dei, nemo novit nisi spiritus Dei*. Comprehendit ergo divinam essentiam, quae sua est.

Anima autem Christi Deum cognoscendo non comprehendit, quia hoc non dicitur, nisi de unigenito, qui est in sinu patris. Unde et dominus dicit Matth. XI, 27: *nemo novit patrem, nisi filius, et cui voluerit filius revelare*; ut utrumque intelligatur de notitia comprehensionis, de qua hic videtur loqui Evangelista. Nullus enim divinam comprehendit essentiam, nisi solus Deus pater, et filius, et spiritus sanctus. Sic ergo patet facultas doctoris ad docendum.

Notandum etiam, quod per hoc quod dicit *qui est in sinu patris*, excluditur error quorundam, dicentium, patrem invisibilem esse, filium vero visibilem, et non visum fuisse in veteri testamento. Nam, ex hoc quod est in abscondito

Father, he is **called the Only Begotten**. “The Lord said to me: ‘You are my Son’” (Ps 2:7).

218 Although he may know in a unique way, he would be lacking the ability to teach if he were not to know wholly. Hence he adds a third point, namely, his consubstantiality to the Father, when he says, **who is in the bosom of the Father**. “Bosom” is not to be taken here as referring to men in their garments, but it indicates the secret things of the Father. For what we carry in our bosom we do in secret. The secret things of the Father refer to his unsurpassed power and knowledge, since the divine essence is infinite. Therefore, in that bosom, i.e., in the most secret things of the paternal nature and essence, which transcends all the power of the creature, is **the Only Begotten Son**; and so he is consubstantial with the Father.

What the Evangelist signifies by “bosom,” David expressed by “womb,” saying: “From the womb, before the daystar,” i.e., from the inmost secret things of my essence, incomprehensible to every created intellect, “I begot you” (Ps 109:3), consubstantial with me, and of the same nature and power, and virtue and knowledge. “What man knows the things of a man except the spirit of the man that is in him? So also, no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God” (1 Cor 2:11). Therefore, he comprehends the divine essence, which is his own.

219 But the soul of Christ, which knows God, does not comprehend him, because this is attributed only to the Only Begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father. So the Lord also says: “No one knows the Father except the Son, and any to whom the Son wishes to reveal him”(Mt 11:27); we should understand this as referring to the knowledge of comprehension, about which the Evangelist seems to be speaking here. For no one comprehends the divine essence except the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And so we have shown the competence of the teacher.

220 We should note that the phrase, **who is in the bosom of the Father**, rejects the error of those who say that the Father is invisible, but the Son is visible, though he was not seen in the Old Testament. For from the fact that

patris, manifestum est quod naturaliter invisibilis est, sicut pater. Et propter hoc dicebat de ipso Is. XLV, 15: *tu es vere Deus absconditus*. Et ideo in Scriptura divina fit mentio de incomprehensibilitate filii; Matth. XI, 27: *nemo novit filium nisi pater, neque patrem quis novit nisi filius*; Prov. XXX, 4: *quod nomen filii eius, si nosti?*

Consequenter Evangelista modum tradendi ipsam doctrinam insinuat, cum dicit *ipse enarravit*. Olim enim unigenitus filius manifestavit Dei cognitionem per prophetas, qui eum intantum annuntiaverunt in quantum aeterni verbi fuerunt participes. Unde dicebant: *factum est verbum domini* et cetera. Sed nunc *ipse unigenitus*, filius, *enarravit* fidelibus. Is. LII, 6: *ego ipse qui loquebar, ecce adsum*; Hebr. I, 1: *multifariam, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis, novissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in filio*.

Et haec doctrina ideo omnibus aliis doctrinis supereminet dignitate, auctoritate et utilitate, quia ab unigenito filio, qui est prima sapientia, immediate est tradita. Hebr. II, 3: *quae cum initium accepisset enarrari per dominum, ab eis qui audierunt, in nos confirmata est*.

Sed quid narravit nisi unum Deum? Hoc ipsum et Moyses enarravit, Deut. VI, 4: *audi, Israel: dominus Deus tuus, dominus unus est*. Quid ergo amplius Moyses? Multum per omnem modum, quia mysterium Trinitatis, et multa alia, quae nec Moyses, nec aliquis prophetarum narravit.

he is among the hidden things of the Father, it is plain that he is naturally invisible, as is the Father. So it is said of him: “Truly, you are a hidden God” (Is 45:15). And so Scripture mentions the incomprehensibility of the Son: “No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son” (Mt 11:27), “What is the name of his son, if you know?” as we read in Proverbs (30:4)

221 Then the Evangelist indicates the way in which this teaching is handed down, saying that it is the Only Begotten Son **who has made him known**. For in the past, the Only Begotten Son revealed knowledge of God through the prophets, who made him known to the extent that they shared in the eternal Word. Hence they said things like, “The Word of the Lord came to me.” But now the Only Begotten Son **has made him known** to the faithful: “It is I who spoke; here I am” (Is 52:6); “God, who in many and varied ways, spoke to the fathers in past times through the prophets, has spoken to us in these days in his Son” (Heb 1:1).

And this teaching surpasses all other teachings in dignity, authority and usefulness, because it was handed on immediately by the Only Begotten Son, who is the first Wisdom. “It was first announced by the Lord, and confirmed to us by those who heard him” (Heb 2:3).

222 But what did he make known except the one God? And even Moses did this: “Hear, O Israel: the Lord your God is one” (Dt 6:4). What did this add to Moses? It added the mystery of the Trinity, and many other things that neither Moses nor any of the prophets made known.