

Is the significance of a miracle more important than the fact of a miracle?

The significance of a miracle is more important than the factuality of the miracle. That is because the significance of the miracle can be determined more easily than determining if the miracle happened. And also because a miracle happening is not as important as the importance of the meaning of the miracle. If a miracle happening was what was important then we should concern ourselves with reports that apples came to life and started talking to people for a few seconds!

Jesus' miracles were not significant because he did small things like casting out demons and withering fig trees and claimed to rise from the dead leaving only apparitions to prove this. If the ghost of your father appeared to you saying it was not a ghost but his resurrected body you would be mad to pay any attention!

God is supposed to have cured people at Lourdes to show that his mother Mary really appeared there. The significance was the message that Mary was there. The trouble with the significance is that it diminishes the importance of the healings. A decent doctor who cures a patient does it entirely to cure the patient. He does not even partly do it to prove his ability or to get glory. Whatever cured at Lourdes, it was not God. Not surprisingly doctors have debunked many of the alleged miracle cures there.

What kind of person would want to believe in miracles coming from a God who worries more about giving signs than healing and who uses healings as propaganda or to get converts?