

A MANUAL  
OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Volume I

AD. TANQUEREY

A MANUAL  
OF  
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

*Translated by*

RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN. J. BYRNES

RECTOR OF ST. THOMAS SEMINARY, BLOOMFIELD, CONN.



Ms. Angel Abbey Library  
St. Benedict, Oregon 97373

DESCLEE COMPANY

NEW YORK — TOURNAI — PARIS — ROME

1959



BX  
1751  
T313  
1959  
v.1

NIHIL OBSTAT.

JOHN J. STACK, S. T. D.

Censor Deputatus

IMPRIMATUR.

+ Most Reverend HENRY J. O'BRIEN, D.D., LL.D.,  
Archbishop of Hartford, Connecticut

February 13, 1959.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*Printed in Belgium*

ANGELICO DOCTORI

SCHOLARUM THEOLOGICARUM PATRONO

QUI AD ERUDITIONEM INCIPIENTIUM

THEOLOGÆ COMPENDIUM

SCRIBERE NON DUBITAVIT

BREVIOREM HANC SYNOPSISIM

AUCTORES HUMILLIME DEDICABANT

# KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS USED

A. A. S. = *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, Acts of the Apostolic See.  
 A. S. = Anathema Sit. These words indicate that the preceding proposition is heretical, and has been officially condemned by the Church.

The Code = *The Code of Canon Law*.

D. A. = *Dictionnaire Apologétique*, by P. D'Alès.

D. B. = Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*.

D. T. C. = *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique* (Vacant, Man-  
 genot, Amann).

P. G. = *Patrologia Græca*, J. P. Migne.

P. L. = *Patrologia Latina*, J. P. Migne.

R. P. A. = *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*.

R. A. = *Revue Apologétique*.

Summa Theologica = The Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas.

Summa Contra Gentiles = Work on the Truth of the Catholic Faith by St. Thomas Aquinas.

Major Synopsis = *Synopsis Major Theologiæ Dogmaticæ*, by A. Tanqueray.



# CONTENTS

FOREWORD .. .. .	xvii
INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY .. .. .	i

## FIRST PART

### GENERAL OR FUNDAMENTAL THEOLOGY

PREFACE TO APOLOGETICS .. .. .	3
Introductory Concepts .. .. .	3
His Certitude That Apologetics Offers .. .. .	4
Critical Survey of Apologetics .. .. .	6

## TRACT I.

### NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL RELIGION

CHAPTER I. RELIGION IN GENERAL .. .. .	11
The Concept of Religion .. .. .	11
The Necessity of Some Religion .. .. .	13
The Historical-Psychological Argument .. .. .	16
The Metaphysical Argument .. .. .	19
CHAPTER II. REVEALED RELIGION .. .. .	22
The Concept of Divine Revelation .. .. .	22
The Possibility of Divine Revelation .. .. .	24
The Necessity of Divine Revelation .. .. .	27
The Moral Obligation of Seeking and of Embracing Revelation .. .. .	31
The Catholic Doctrine on Revelation .. .. .	33
CHAPTER III. THE CRITERIA OF DIVINE REVELATION .. .. .	34
Criteria of Divine Revelation in General .. .. .	34
Miracles .. .. .	37
Prophecy .. .. .	46
Schism : The Catholic Teaching about Miracles .. .. .	47



TRACT II. CHRIST, A DIVINE LEGATE  
OR THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

Introductory Notes concerning the Books of the Old and of the New Testaments	49
CHAPTER I. THE DIVINE LEGATION OF CHRIST IS PROVED FROM ITS PREPARATION	52
The Preaching of the Prophets	53
The Prophecies Which Announce Christ's Ambassadorship	56
CHAPTER II. THE DIVINE LEGATION OF CHRIST IS SUPPORTED BY HIS TEACHING	59
Christ Taught a Doctrine	59
The Excellence of Christian Doctrine	60
<i>An Explanation of this Excellence</i>	60
<i>The Supernaturalism of Catholic-Christian Doctrine</i>	63
CHAPTER III. CHRIST'S DIVINE LEGATION IS PROVED HISTORICALLY FROM HIS LIFE	66
The Person and Testimony of Christ	66
<i>The Person of Christ</i>	66
<i>The Testimony of Christ</i>	67
<i>An Explanation of Christ's Testimony about His Divine Ambassadorship</i>	67
<i>The Meaning of Christ's Testimony</i>	71
Christ's Miracles and Prophecies	72
<i>Christ's Miracles</i>	72
<i>Christ's Prophecies</i>	73
Christ's Resurrection	76
CHAPTER IV. THE HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY CORROBORATES CHRIST'S DIVINE AMBASSADORSHIP	82
The Wonderful Propagation of Christianity	82
The Constancy of the Martyrs	86
CHAPTER V. CHRIST'S DIVINE AMBASSADORSHIP IS MORE FIRMLY ESTABLISHED BY DRAWING A COMPARISON BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS	89
Buddhism	89
Islamism	91
Conclusion of This Tract : All Should Accept the Christian Religion	93

TRACT III. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

Introduction .. .. .	95
Prefatory Notes about Various Christian Churches .. .. .	97
CHAPTER I. REASON SPEAKS IN FAVOR OF THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH .. .. .	
The Moral Necessity of an Infallible Authority .. .. .	99
The Moral Necessity of a Living Magisterium .. .. .	101
CHAPTER II. THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH IS PROVED FROM HISTORY .. .. .	
Christ Established the Church as a Society Properly Called	104
Christ Instituted the Church as an Hierarchical Society ..	106
<i>The Institution of the Apostles</i> .. .. .	107
<i>The Bishops Are the Apostles' Successors</i> .. .. .	111
<i>The Infallibility Conferred on the College of Apostles and of Bishops</i> .. .. .	114
Christ Established the Church as a Monarchical Society ..	118
<i>The Primacy of Peter</i> .. .. .	121
<i>The Roman Pontiffs Are Peter's Successors</i> .. .. .	128
<i>The Infallibility of Peter and of the Roman Pontiffs</i> .. ..	132
Conclusion : The Roman Catholic Church and This Church Alone Is the True Church of Christ .. .. .	136
CHAPTER III. THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS PROVED BY EXTERNAL MARKS .. .. .	
The Universal Unity and Indestructible Steadfastness of the Catholic Church .. .. .	133
The Extraordinary Sanctity and the Unexhausted Fruitfulness of the Catholic Church .. .. .	136
Conclusion of Apologetical Theology : Outside the Church There Is No Salvation .. .. .	138
TRACT IV.	
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	
CHAPTER I. THE INNERMOST CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OR THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE CHURCH..	
CHAPTER II. THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH .. .. .	
The Object of the Church's Authority or Power .. .. .	144
<i>The Object of the Doctrinal Magisterium of the Church</i> ..	144
<i>The Object of the Church's Power to Rule</i> .. .. .	147

## TRACT IV.

## THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

CHAPTER I. THE INNERMOST CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OR THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE CHURCH..	141
CHAPTER II. THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH ..	143
The Object of the Church's Authority or Power ..	144
<i>The Object of the Doctrinal Magisterium of the Church..</i>	144
<i>The Object of the Church's Power to Rule ..</i>	147



The Exercise of Ecclesiastical Power .. .. .	148
<i>The Exercise of Pontifical Power</i> .. .. .	149
<i>The Exercise of Episcopal Power</i> .. .. .	153
Members of the Church .. .. .	157

#### CHAPTER III. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE STATE .. .. .

Principles .. .. .	162
The Union of Church and State in Catholic Territories .. .. .	162
Relations of the Church with a non-Catholic State .. .. .	163
Manner of Acting as far as Modern Freedoms Are Concerned .. .. .	165
Conclusion of Tract: The Nature and Superiority of the Church .. .. .	168

### TRACT V. THE SOURCES OF REVELATION

#### CHAPTER I. TRADITION .. .. .

Existence of Divine Tradition .. .. .	169
The Organs of Tradition .. .. .	171
<i>The Solemn Magisterium of the Church</i> .. .. .	173
<i>The Ordinary and Universal Magisterium of the Church</i> .. .. .	174

#### CHAPTER II. SACRED SCRIPTURE .. .. .

<i>The Inspiration of Sacred Scripture</i> .. .. .	182
<i>The Use of Scripture as a Source of Revelation</i> .. .. .	182
Conclusion of Tract: Comparison between Scripture and Tradition .. .. .	186
.. .. .	190

## SECOND PART

### SPECIAL THEOLOGY

#### TRACT VI. FAITH

##### FIRST SECTION :

Faith Itself .. .. .	190
Concept and Division .. .. .	190

#### CHAPTER I. THE OBJECT OF FAITH .. .. .

The Formal Object or the Motive of Faith .. .. .	193
<i>The Formal Object Itself</i> .. .. .	193
<i>The Signs or Motives of Credibility</i> .. .. .	194
The Material Object of Faith .. .. .	197
<i>What Is the Material Object of Faith</i> .. .. .	201
<i>Formally Revealed Truths</i> .. .. .	202
<i>Virtually Revealed Truths</i> .. .. .	202
<i>The Material Object of Divine-Catholic Faith</i> .. .. .	204
<i>Private Revelations</i> .. .. .	205
<i>The Nature or Force of Dogmas</i> .. .. .	207
<i>The Increase of Dogmas</i> .. .. .	208
.. .. .	211

#### CHAPTER II. THE ACT OF FAITH .. .. .

The Causes Which Directly Produce the Act of Faith .. .. .	218
Controversy concerning the Final Resolution of Faith .. .. .	218
The Properties of the Act of Faith .. .. .	226
<i>The Certitude of Faith</i> .. .. .	228
<i>The Obscurity of Faith</i> .. .. .	228
.. .. .	231

#### CHAPTER III. THE HABIT OF FAITH .. .. .

The Infusion of the Habit of Faith .. .. .	232
The Subject of Faith .. .. .	232
.. .. .	234

##### SECOND SECTION :

The Theology or the Science of Faith .. .. .	237
--	-----

#### CHAPTER I. THE SOURCES WHICH THEOLOGY EMPLOYS .. .. .

.. .. .	238
---------	-----

#### CHAPTER II. THE THEOLOGICAL METHOD .. .. .

.. .. .	244
---------	-----



## TRACT VII. ONE GOD

CHAPTER I. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD	..	..	..	249
The Demonstrability of God's Existence	..	..	..	250
The Arguments by Means of Which God's Existence Is Proved	..	..	..	256
The Divine Names	..	..	..	262
CHAPTER II. THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD	..	..	..	264
God's Nature or Essence	..	..	..	264
The Divine Attributes	..	..	..	266
<i>The Attributes of God in General</i>	..	..	..	266
<i>The Specific Attributes of God</i>	..	..	..	268
<i>The Simplicity of God</i>	..	..	..	271
<i>The Immutability of God</i>	..	..	..	271
<i>The Eternity of God</i>	..	..	..	272
<i>The Immensity and Ubiquity of God</i>	..	..	..	273
<i>The Infinity of God</i>	..	..	..	275
<i>The Unity or Unicity of God</i>	..	..	..	276

## CHAPTER III. THE DIVINE OPERATIONS OR WORKINGS

God's Knowledge	..	278
<i>The Object of Divine Knowledge</i>	..	279
<i>The Divine Ideas and the Properties of Divine Knowledge</i>	..	282
<i>The Species of Divine Knowledge and the Medium of Divine Knowledge</i>	..	284
<i>The Divine Will</i>	..	286
<i>The Object of the Divine Will</i>	..	286
<i>The Properties of the Divine Will</i>	..	288
<i>The Divisions of the Divine Will</i>	..	294
Providence and Predestination	..	295
Providence	..	295
Predestination and Reprobation	..	298
<i>Catholic Doctrine concerning the Saving Will of God</i>	..	299
<i>The Theological Systems Relative to Predestination</i>	..	303
The Omnipotence of God	..	308
Conclusion of Tract: The Beatitude or Happiness of God	..	310

## TRACT VIII. THE TRIUNE GOD

The Concept of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity	..	311
CHAPTER I. THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY IS PROVED FROM REVELATION	..	314
The Trinity of Persons in the Unity of Nature	..	317

<i>This Mystery Is Proved from the New Testament</i>	..	318
<i>This Mystery Is Irrefutably Proved from Tradition</i>	..	323
The Divine Processions	..	329
<i>The Procession of the Son through Generation</i>	..	330
<i>The Procession of the Holy Spirit</i>	..	333
<i>Corollaries Relative to the Three Persons</i>	..	338
The Divine Missions	..	340
<i>Missions in General</i>	..	340
<i>An Invisibile Mission</i>	..	342
<i>A Visible Mission</i>	..	343

## CHAPTER II. PHILOSOPHIC-THEOLOGICAL EXPOSITION OF THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY

The Knowability of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity	..	344
Analogies and Philosophical Explanations	..	348
Logical Conclusions	..	352
Conclusion of Tract: Devotion to the Holy Trinity	..	356

## TRACT IX. GOD THE CREATOR

CHAPTER I. THE CREATION OF THE WORLD	..	357
The Mosaic Cosmogony	..	358
<i>Dogmatic Truths Which are Surely Contained in the First Chapter of Genesis</i>	..	358
<i>The Order of Creation Described by Moses</i>	..	364
Transformism	..	367

## CHAPTER II. THE ANGELS

Angels in General	..	371
<i>Definition of Angels</i>	..	371
<i>The Existence of Angels</i>	..	372
<i>The Natural Gifts or Properties of the Angels</i>	..	377
<i>The Grace of the Angels and Their Fall</i>	..	378
<i>The Orders of Angels</i>	..	380
Guardian Angels	..	381
<i>The Existence of Guardian Angels</i>	..	381
<i>Their Duties towards Men</i>	..	383
<i>Our Obligations towards Them</i>	..	384
The Bad Angels	..	384
<i>Diabolical Temptation</i>	..	384
<i>Diabolical Obsession and Possession</i>	..	386
<i>Magic</i>	..	388
<i>Facts Which Approach Magic, Magnetism, Spiritism, and Hypnotism</i>	..	389



CHAPTER III. MAN	..	..	..	..	..	394
The Origin of Man	..	..	..	..	..	394
<i>The Creation of Our First Parents</i>	..	..	..	..	..	394
<i>The Unity of the Human Race</i>	..	..	..	..	..	397
<i>The Nature of Man</i>	..	..	..	..	..	399
<i>The Propagation of the Human Race</i>	..	..	..	..	..	401
The Elevation of Man to the Supernatural State	..	..	..	..	..	403
<i>Introductory Concepts about the Supernatural Order</i>	..	..	..	..	..	403
<i>The Existence of Grace in Adam</i>	..	..	..	..	..	409
<i>The Gift of Integrity in Our First Parents</i>	..	..	..	..	..	412
Man's Fall	..	..	..	..	..	418
<i>The Sin of Our First Parents</i>	..	..	..	..	..	418
<i>Original Sin in Adam's Descendants</i>	..	..	..	..	..	421
<i>Its Existence</i>	..	..	..	..	..	421
<i>Its Effects</i>	..	..	..	..	..	421
<i>The Nature of Original Sin</i>	..	..	..	..	..	425
<i>The Agreement or Consistency of the Dogma of Original Sin with Reason</i>	..	..	..	..	..	430
	..	..	..	..	..	434

*It affords us great pleasure to recommend the present translation of Tanqueray's Brevior Synopsis of Dogmatic Theology. The theological works of this renowned scholar are well known to the American clergy. His textbooks have been the instruments by which many of the priests in the United States have acquired that solid training in Catholic doctrine so essential to the successful fulfilment of their priestly duties in the salvation of souls. The works of Father Tanqueray need no apology. The priest who has been nourished by the truths therein contained has received "that solid doctrine which has been handed down by the fathers and is commonly received by the Church." (Code of Canon Law, can. 129). His works come well recommended for the purity of doctrine, the clarity and precision of his explanation, and his fidelity to the teachings of the fathers and the great doctors of the Church.*

Those who are acquainted with the calibre of Tanqueray's Latin manuals have long awaited a translation into the vernacular. This work, from the talented pen of Monsignor Byrnes, will be an invaluable aid to the priest whose busy parish schedule affords him little time for intensive study but who, nevertheless, is keenly aware of the necessity of continued growth in his speciality. It will be of great assistance to the seminarian who wishes to review quickly in the vernacular those tracts which he is preparing for examinations. This conspectus of Dogmatic Theology will also have a special appeal for the religious, both men and women, who are searching for a deeper understanding of the divine truths which they must frequently present in the classroom. But perhaps the supreme value of a work such as this is that it makes available to the educated Catholic layman a systematic and scientific exposition of the fundamental truths of the Catholic faith. It will answer the urgent need among the faithful for a deeper and fuller grasp of the truths of divine revelation which Christ confided to His Church.

*The Catholic layman needs a more profound understanding of religious truths than that which is culled from simple catechism*



instruction. In order to develop that compelling ambition for worthy Christian living, he needs a deeper appreciation of the splendors of the Christian idea of life. Sacred Theology should become the cherished possession of every informed Catholic. For it is a discipline which showers upon the human race advantages and blessings far more valuable than those which spring from any other study within the competence of man. The most eminent among other functional sciences can assist man in procuring an ordered and cultured life in this world. The knowledge which they offer can serve to alleviate corporal and mental ills and can contribute to the attainment of temporal happiness. But the Queen of the Sciences, Sacred Theology, presents the only certain and completely satisfactory formula for an eternal beatitude, for an indescribable happiness far superior to any merely temporal joy. Other sciences assist man to ward off evils. Ignorance, suffering and injustice may be diminished and even extirpated from among men through certain studies which are purely natural both in their scope and in their method. Sacred Theology, however, holds a unique position among the sciences which are within the grasp of man in that it is capable of impeding the most disastrous misfortune which can befall man, an eternity of anguish and futility.

Moreover, Sacred Theology has a definite function to perform, an inestimable contribution to make toward our civilization. The temporal ills to which individual men and societies are subject can be cured only through the practice of Christian virtue and the recognition of the rights of Almighty God. Not until man and society realize that man is a creature of God, that every man has a peculiar God-given dignity and destiny, that God's eternal law must be observed in all the varied situations of life shall the world see true peace and prosperity. The only discipline which can offer a complete and satisfactory instruction in these eternal verities is Sacred Theology itself. This science alone can give to the world that divine wisdom which is so essential to the regeneration of our social order.

Certainly at no time in the history of the world has man had a greater need for ultimate answers, for a rule of life, for a pattern for happy living; for no other age has been so troubled by such widespread insecurity, by social and economic injustices, by such instability and unhappiness in family and individual

life. Sacred Theology is the one agent that can remedy these evils. It is the one science which has the ultimate and irrefutable answer to the complex problem of human living. The man who takes up this study, who has a sincere desire to know and to practice those divinely revealed teachings as they are proposed for our belief in the magisterium of the Catholic Church, the man who works to explain that doctrine in unequivocal and lucid terms is preparing himself for a glorious apostolate on behalf of human welfare.

Monsignor Byrnes has performed a service of major importance in making Tanqueray's Brevior Synopsis of Dogmatic Theology available in English. The lasting contribution that this translation will make towards extending the knowledge of the Church's teaching, towards intensifying and enriching the Christian spirit will amply justify the labors which have gone into its production.

† HENRY J. O'BRIEN

Archbishop of Hartford



# INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

1 Theology (*θεολογία*, λόγος, discourse about God) is a supernatural science which, with the help of reason and of revelation (formal object) treats of God and of creatures in as much as they are traced back to Him (the primary and the secondary material objects). Thus theology is distinguished from theodicy and from faith.

## 2 Divisions

A By reason of *method*, theology can be :

- a. *positive*, which explains and proves each dogma from the sources of revelation, Scripture and Tradition. It is called, on that account, *biblical* or *historical*;
- b. *scholastic*, which examines scientifically and philosophically the dogmas of faith by defining more clearly their meaning, by showing conclusions, by making evident the links which exist among revealed truths, by reconciling these truths with reason, and by combining them into one collection of doctrine;
- c. *mixed*, which harmoniously joins the positive method and the scholastic method. St. Pius X recommended this method and throughout this work we shall follow it.

<sup>1</sup> In the *Synopsis Major* the reader will find a fuller explanation of doctrine and an enumeration of the various authors who should be consulted. In this *Brevior Synopsis* we shall point out one or more books on each question. *Synopsis Major*, n. 1-13.



3 B By reason of the object, there have been various divisions. Today, however, theology is commonly divided into dogmatic and moral :

- a. *Dogmatic* theology is concerned with the truths which theoretically must be believed; it is called *the rule of what must be believed*.
- b. *Moral* theology treats especially of those things which must be done or of practices (morals); therefore, it is called *the rule of what must be done*.

Dogmatic theology is then subdivided :

1. into *fundamental* or *general*, which explains the foundations of all theology, namely, the fact of revelation and the divinity of the Church.

*Religion, the Religion of Christ, the Church of Christ, the Constitution of the Catholic Church, the Sources of Revelation.*

2. into *special* theology, which scientifically explains the individual doctrines.

General	Religion
Theology	The Religion of Christ
	The Church of Christ
	The Constitution of the Church
	The Sources of Revelation
	Faith
	The One God
Special	The Triune God
	God the Creator and the Upholder
	The Incarnate Word
Theology	God the Sanctifier { through grace
	God the Remunerator { through the sacraments

## FIRST PART

# GENERAL OR FUNDAMENTAL THEOLOGY

Because Apologetics occupies the first and the foremost place in this section, we shall introduce the subject at some length.

## I. PREFACE TO APOLOGETICS

4 **Meaning of the Word.** Apologetics (the Greek *ἀπολογία*, a defense, or a pointing out) is the science of the motives of credibility and of credibility of the entire divine revelation which was preached by Christ and which has been set forth through the Catholic Church<sup>1</sup>. Apologetics differs from apologies, which are defenses of dogmas taken one by one.

5 **Scope or Extent of the subject.** Apologetics leads to the *credibility* and the *credentia* of the Christian religion. Thus it is, so to speak, the vestibule or entrance to faith. *Credibility*<sup>2</sup> is the capacity of any truth to be believed in as much as it is proved by most certain signs (cf. note 52), which are called the motives of credibility, that this truth has been revealed by God. The judgment of *credentia* declares that this truth must be believed with a divine faith now that its credibility has been established.

<sup>1</sup> DE FOULFRIQUET, *L'objet intégral de l'Apologétique*.

LE BACHELET, a. *Apologétique*, *Apologie*, in D. T. C. *Synopsis Major*, n. 14-25.

<sup>2</sup> GARDEIL, *La Crédibilité et l'Apologétique*, a. *Crédibilité* in D. T. C.



*Faith*, however, is a supernatural virtue "by which we believe, with the grace of God assisting and animating, that those things revealed by Him are true, not because of the intrinsic truth which has been perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself revealing Who can neither be deceived nor deceive".<sup>1</sup>

Apologetics, of itself, is not sufficient for producing faith, for faith is primarily a gift of God and presupposes good will. Therefore, that one may be led to faith, the motives of credibility must be offered to him. At the same time he must be moved so that he will pray humbly to God and make a most sincere effort to perceive the force of the arguments which show that the doctrine of Christ can be accepted and must be accepted as revealed by God.

**6 Nature and Division.** Apologetics makes use of reason, for it would be a vicious circle to verify faith by faith and to establish revelation by revelation itself. However, Apologetics uses reason under the direction of faith: otherwise, how will reason prove that Catholic truths must be believed with divine faith if reason ignores the nature, the acts, the object of this faith?

This Christian-Catholic demonstration is concerned with:

1. *Religion*, both natural and revealed;
2. *Christ, the Divine Ambassador* or the *Religion of Christ*: herein we prove that Christ was truly sent by God;
3. *the Church of Christ*: in this division it will be evident that the Catholic Church has been instituted by Christ.

## II. THE CERTITUDE THAT APOLOGETICS OFFERS<sup>2</sup>

**7 The Meaning of Certitude.** In general certitude is a firm adherence of the mind to something which can be known, without fear of erring and without danger of falsity. Real

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session 3, chap. 3, *D. B.*, 1789.  
<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 26-35.

certitude implies two elements: an exclusion of doubt which admits *no* degree of doubt; and an adherence of the mind which is firm to a greater or less degree.

*Kinds of certitude.* We distinguish a threefold certitude: *metaphysical* certitude, which is founded in metaphysical necessity or in the very essence of things; *physical* certitude, which is based on the physical necessity of the laws of nature;

*moral* certitude, properly called, which is founded on the invariable manner in which men are accustomed to act.

**8 The objective certitude in Apologetics.** It is certain Catholic doctrine that the arguments of Apologetics ought to produce not merely probability but *true certitude*. This fact is distinctly deduced from the condemnation of the opposite opinion by Innocent XI, Pius IX, and St. Pius X. And truly the assent of faith should be the firmest kind of assent. Furthermore, the will cannot command such an assent unless this assent really is in agreement with the fact of divine revelation.

**9 The subjective assent to the truths of Apologetics.** This assent is elicited from the intellect as it perceives these truths both directly and indirectly. At some time, however, the influx of the will is required for offering this assent. For this influx of the will is obviously necessary in the matter of those truths which include practical conclusions about our moral life and which are proved by historical facts known from the testimony of man. But the truths of Apologetics are of this nature. Therefore, the certitude that is consistent with Apologetics is not *mathematical*; certain theologians, however, call it *moral* certitude because it is a firm adherence of the mind to truths that influence moral life. This adherence is given under the influence of moral dispositions and with the union of the will.

The will concurs in the assent to these truths of Apologetics:

- a. *by making ready for this assent beforehand* with moral dispositions, the principal of which are:



1. a sound mind, neither debilitated by scepticism nor deformed by prejudices;
2. mortification of the passions, especially of pleasure and of pride;
3. sincere love for truth;
- b. *by allowing oneself to be led into this assent through applying the intellect to the study of truth;*
- c. *by strengthening this assent through the practice of religion.*

### III. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF APOLOGETICS<sup>1</sup>

Apologetes have made use of various arguments according to the various attacks of adversaries and according to the different types of minds of those whose conversion they have sought.

#### A The Apologetic Method of the Fathers

##### 10 Among the Fathers we must mention :

In the second century, *St. Justin*, *Minucius Felix*, *Tertullian*. The sophistries of the pagans they rejected and the truth of the Christian religion they proved from its antiquity, its excellence and superiority, from the prophecies that were fulfilled in Christ, and from the miracles that were performed by Christ.

In the third century at the school in Alexandria, *Clement*, who regarded philosophy as a directive to Christ, and *Origen*, who contended against Celsus.

In the fourth century, *Lactantius* and *St. Augustine* who searched out the ways of Divine Providence in his work, *De Civitate Dei*.

#### B The Apologetic Method of the Scholastics

In opposition to Averroes *St. Thomas* explained philosophical and theological truths clearly and proved them completely. In his *Summa Theologica* he demonstrated with distinction the harmony between dogmas and reason.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 36-90.

#### C From the time of the Reformation to the 19th Century

*Bossuet*, in his work *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle*, showed the intervention of God in the origin, the progress, the spread, and the continuance of Christianity. *Huet*, in *Démonstrations Evangeliques* proved clearly and expressly the divinity of the Christian religion from prophecies. *Pascal*, in a work which he did not finish, *Les Pensées*, showed that religion alone could bring forward an explanation of the nobility and, at the same time, of the wretchedness of human nature. *Pascal* did not omit the external arguments of divine revelation, namely prophecies and miracles. However, he inclined overmuch to pessimism and fideism.

#### D Method Used in the 19th Century

**II** Châteaubriand represented, in the manner of the poet, the divinity of the Christian religion in *Le Génie du Christianisme*; *Félicité de Lamennais* attacked indifferentism in *Essai sur l'Indifférence* but, in so doing, he inclined somewhat to suppressing the power of human reason;

*Frayssinous* in *Conférences* and *August Nicolas* in *Etudes philosophiques sur le Christianisme* demonstrated the truth of the Christian religion by internal and external criteria; *Balmès* in *Le Protestantisme comparé au Catholicisme dans ses rapports avec la civilisation européenne* proved that Catholicism, under social consideration, is much superior to Protestantism.

*Lacordaire* carefully considered and eloquently explained the doctrinal authority and the power of the Church; he then progressed to the Founder of the Church, Christ, and proved His Divinity from His own testimony. Finally, in his very clear explanation of the other dogmas, he demonstrated how harmoniously they agree with reason. *Lacordaire's* method was the social or psychological method. In his work, *Histoire de la Civilisation au V<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *Ozanam* revealed the wonderful effects of the Christian religion in the intellectual and moral order.

*Brugère* adapted the traditional method to our times.

*Bougaud* proved the necessity of religion by a method which he called intrinsic or intimate.

*Cardinal Deschamps* rested his thesis on a twofold argument : internal, namely the necessity we feel for some authority in which we can trust completely in religious matters; and external, that is, the existence of the Catholic Church which lays claim to an infallible authority as her own



*Newman* showed that the Christian religion is entirely consistent with natural religion and that conscience testifies to the truth of natural religion. Also, he gave historical arguments which, when taken separately, have only probable value. He did not deny that the credibility of revelation rested on solid arguments, but his explanation of this fact inclined towards an elucidation of the way by which he arrived at faith.

### E Particular Methods used by Apologetical Writers of the 20th Century

12 I. Some have followed the traditional method; for example there is *de Broglie*, who, while using the internal and external criteria, added the argument of *transcendence*. From this it is apparent that Christianity, when compared with the other religions, surpasses all of them so much in excellence of doctrine, in the sanctity of its Founder, in the reality and number of miracles, that we must acknowledge its divinity.

2. Others have proposed new methods which they consider more effectual.

a. *Ollé-Laprune* showed that Christianity is necessary for the right disposition of our intellectual and moral life; also, he reminded us that certitude in the matter of religion is not attained without genuine sincerity and good will.

b. *Fousseraye* taught that a full and perfect life cannot be maintained without the Christian religion, for it alone can fulfill the many desires of our nature. He stated, further, that this religion exhibits signs of divinity which are most certain and reliable, namely miracles.

c. *Brunetière* thought that faith is reasonable because man fully aware of his inability to discover a rule of morals, perceives the obligation of believing as the condition on which he regulates his life rightly and promotes the social order. In this system human reason is reduced in its capability more than is right, for the human reason can supply certain motives of credibility, according to the affirmation of the Vatican Council.

13 3. Finally, still others defended the method of immanence: thus, for instance, were *M. Blondel*, *Laberghonnière*, *Mano*, *Tyrrell*, and many others who supported this method in one way or another.

*Blondel* reasons in this manner: Religion cannot be imposed upon man from without; however, the supernatural, although

not due to human nature, must be shown to be *required from within* us for the perfect fulfilling of our faculties in such a way that we are bound to embrace it. The conduct of man cannot reach its perfection without the cooperation and help of an Infinite Being, such as the Christian religion possesses; for within us are the most profound aspirations to do some great good which exceeds our powers. It is necessary, therefore, that in accomplishing this good we be helped by some Infinite Being. But since we cannot reach this Being through our own powers, we need His cooperation. Therefore, we need some revelation through which He manifests Himself to us. Once we have posited these assertions, the fact of revelation has been demonstrated historically.

It must be noted that this method should not be employed unless it is amended according to the mind of St. Pius X:

a. of itself this method without the historical arguments is not sufficient for proving the fact of Revelation;

b. it shows no absolute necessity but only a moral necessity of some revelation;

c. it does not prove that the supernatural, properly called, is really required by human nature<sup>1</sup> (confer note 50).

If these excesses are avoided, the method of immanence can prepare the way for the historical proof and can contribute new force to it. It is not, however, suited to all minds; for many have not experienced these noble aspirations which *Blondel* writes about at great length in his work.

<sup>1</sup> In the Encyclical Letter *Pascendi* those Catholics are censured "who as much as they reject the doctrine of immanence as a doctrine, nevertheless, use it in place of an apology; and they do this so incautiously and unreservedly that seemingly they admit not only the capacity or the fitness in human nature for the supernatural order — and indeed Catholic Apologists have always demonstrated this by employing suitable arguments — but they admit a genuine need in the true sense of the word". A fortiori those are condemned who can be called integralists; they want it accepted as proved that there lives hidden in the man who does not yet believe the very germ or embryo which was in the consciousness of Christ and which was transmitted by Him to men". (*D. B.*, 2103).



## TRACT I

# NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL RELIGION

**14 Scope of this tract.** Today everyone admits that among the various races and nations there exist certain diverse facts which are of a religious nature. Many explanations have been given for this situation. The purpose of this tract is to prove scientifically the truth of the Catholic teaching concerning religion and divine revelation; both of these are necessary for attaining our final end.

The importance of this question is obvious, for it involves our final destiny and the correct regulating of our entire life. All of this is, of course, very important to us.

### Division.

In the first Chapter we shall discuss religion in general, its notion and its necessity; in the second Chapter, the concept of revealed religion, its possibility and its necessity; in the third Chapter, the criteria for searching out divine revelation and for accepting it.

## CHAPTER I

# RELIGION IN GENERAL

## I. THE CONCEPT OF RELIGION<sup>1</sup>

### 15 1. Meaning of the word.

**A** According to many the word *religion* is derived etymologically from *relegere*, to gather together; others state that it comes from *re-eligere*, to choose again; more probably it has its origin in the word *religare*, to bind fast.

**B** Really, however, religion includes the whole order or arrangement under which an intelligent creature is morally subject to God. Herein we view it either objectively or subjectively.

**a.** Objectively considered, religion is a collection of truths and of services by means of which our entire life is directed toward God. Thus it includes three essentials:

1. for the intellect, a doctrine or dogmas about God, about man, and about a way to God.
2. for the will, a rule of precepts.
3. a worship through which man willingly professes in his actions God's supreme lordship or ownership.

From the history of the facts that pertain to religion we learn that these same elements are always present. Thus

<sup>1</sup> *Synopsis Major Theologiae Dogmaticae*, Ad. Tanqueray.



religion differs from philosophy, ethics, art; and to a greater degree it differs from superstition and magic.

b. Subjectively considered, religion is the voluntary inclination of man by which he acknowledges God and directs his life correctly towards God by accepting moral truths and by undertaking the offices and obligations of worship. The special acts of religion are faith, adoration, thanksgiving, petition, and penance for sins.

c. The following definitions of religion we must reject because they are false or incomplete :

1. the definition of Kant who held that religion consists only of morality, since the dictates of conscience are regarded as the voice of God;
2. the definition of Fichte, according to whom religion is a merely speculative science concerned with very lofty things;
3. the definition of the Modernists who think of religion as a certain emotional communion with divinity, which has arisen from the subconscious;
4. the definition of the Positivists who state that religion is a puerile explanation of natural phenomena, the cause of which is not known; therefore religion is the equivalent of superstition.

## 2. Division.

According to its origin religion may be

- a. natural, if it is founded in the very nature of things, if it is acquired by means of the reason alone, and if it is directed towards a natural end; as a matter of fact, a completely natural religion has never existed.
- b. supernatural or revealed if it is made known by a positive revelation, if it contains dogmas or precepts which have been manifested by the explicit will of God, and if it leads to a supernatural end. We call this supernatural religion primeval when it refers to the religion that was given to Adam and to the patriarchs; Mosaic when it concerns the religion promulgated by Moses; and Christian when it relates to that preached by Christ.

## II. THE NECESSITY OF SOME RELIGION

17 **State of the Questions.** Atheists, Materialists, Positivists, Agnostics, Pantheists, and the out and out Indifferentists deny that there is a need of any religion. Others, stating that God must be adored in spirit and in truth, reject the need of any external and public cult.

In the first thesis we shall show the need of some religion; in the second thesis, the need of a public cult. (second thesis, number 29).

**First thesis :** Everyone has a moral obligation of professing religion, i. e., of acknowledging God as the beginning on Whom we depend and to Whom we must give worship.

In proving this thesis we shall make use of a two-fold argument; the first, an historical-psychological argument, and the second a metaphysical one. The first argument *prepares the way for a demonstration* by showing directly that man needs religion, and by showing indirectly that he is obliged to give worship to God; the second argument *demonstrates* this obligation directly.

**First Argument :** *The necessity of some religion is proved by the historical-psychological argument.*

The arguments that are drawn from history and psychology can be reduced to one because they depend on one and the same fact, namely, the religious inclination of human nature as we study or consider it in the human race as a whole and in the individual man; both lead to the same conclusion.

### 1° AN EXPLANATION OF THE FACTS ABOUT RELIGION<sup>1</sup>

18 That the fact of religion is a universal fact no learned man today denies or can deny. Both among people whose history is known and among uncivilized people, who are called

<sup>1</sup> HUBY-CHRISTUS, *Manuel d'histoire des Religions*, Beauchesne, Paris, 1912; BRICOURT, *Où en est l'histoire des Religions*; LÉTOURNEY, Paris, 1912; PINARD DE LA BOULLAYE, *Etude comparée des religions. Major Synopses*, n. 109-171.



Primitives, we detect a certain religious worship. Everywhere we find dogmas, at least a belief in the existence of some Supreme Being superior to man, caring for or interested in man, capable of harming him or of benefiting him. Therefore, this Supreme Being must be appeased, adored, and conciliated. Everywhere we find moral precepts which, although different on many points, always forbid impiety towards the gods and parents, and injustice towards one's fellow men. Everywhere the gods are worshipped by rites which are very accurately marked out and which must be scrupulously observed.

19 That we may better understand the nature of this fact, religion, we shall make some brief references to the religion: a, of the Primitives, b, of the Nations of the Far East, c, of the Nations of the East, d, of the Nations of the West.

a. The Primitives<sup>1</sup> admit man's dependance on a Supreme Being who made all things; they admit the existence of spirits and of man's immortal soul, and a distinction between moral good and moral evil; they have rites, sacrifices and ceremonies, all of which they regard as obligatory.

b. Among the Nations of the Far East:

1. The Chinese practiced a three-fold worship, according to the testimony of Confucius, namely, of a Supreme Being, of geni who work wonders throughout the world, and of their elders and ancestors who after death are numbered among the geni.

2. The ancient inhabitants of India professed Brahmanism and its teachings are contained in their oldest books called Vedas. The Brahmins conceived divinity, somewhat obscurely, as a Superior Being to whom sacrifices were offered. In the popular or common Neo-Brahmanism the number of gods increased adorned with many heads and arms. Its ethics teaches a rigid asceticism, and at the same time encourages impure orgies. In the sixth century before Christ Buddhism arose. (See note under 151, Chapter V).

<sup>1</sup> By Primitives we do not mean the first men, but rather, the people of today, still uncivilized, living in Africa, America, and Oceania, who are believed to represent, as it were, a stage in the already accomplished evolution of the human race, and to retain, therefore, the earliest form of religion. Thus SAL. REINACH, *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, Introduction.

3. The Persians and the Medes followed the religion of Zoroaster which recognizes a two-fold principle, of good and light, of evil and darkness; each of these is eternal and independent. God who is pure must be revered; therefore, not only actions but also words and thoughts must be pure.

c. In the Orient:

1. The Semites, that is, the Assyrians and Babylonians, Chanaanites, the Arameans, the Arabs, the Edomites, the Moabites, the Ammonites — we shall refer to the Israelites later — acknowledged some Supreme Being which they called El or Il; however, they later added Baalim, Moloch, and Astaroth; to these they offered sacrifices of various kinds.

2. The ancient Egyptians had an idea of one invisible Supreme Divinity; to this they added various gods; Ra, Thot, Osiris. Animals as such they worshipped. Even a cult of the dead flourished among the Egyptians.

20 d. In the West:

1. The Greeks revered Zeus, the father of the gods and the king of men; he was provident and all other gods had to have recourse to him. The Greeks revered, also, the forces of nature and their outstanding men, their heroes. Their religion included, too, a cult of the family of the nation.

2. From ancient times the Romans adored Janus whom they considered the beginning of all things. Then, after capturing Greece, they worshipped the gods of this country. The Romans were very religious, first of all in the family over which Lares and Penates presided, then in the tribe or clan which solemnized a tribal worship, and finally in the state which had its own tutelary deities, Komulus and Remus, its own goddess, Vesta, to whom the Romans dedicated a special temple. In this temple virgins kept perpetual watch over a sacred fire.

3. In the time of Caesar, the Gauls were polytheistic; their rites were carried out by Druids.

4. The Scandinavians had three special gods; to these they united goddesses and many secondary gods. The priests offered sacrifices, at times even human sacrifices, to these deities.

5. In the forests the Germans honored a Supreme Divinity which they represented neither in pictures nor in statues; in addition, they had other gods which were almost the same as those of the Scandinavians. Many superstitions, magical arts, and impure and cruel rites debased their worship.



## I RELIGIOUS FACTS BRIEFLY EXPLAINED

21 We state: *From the history of religions we rightly infer that religion is so natural to human nature that it must be called necessary*; that is, it is necessary to man in this sense that man by his entire nature is moved to pay worship to a Supreme Being whose existence he recognizes, as it were, spontaneously.

This statement we prove:

1. by refuting the theories of the opposition
2. by setting down the true explanation.

22 A. *Opposing theories or hypotheses we reject as false and incomplete*, especially three theories which adversaries propose:

a. The *Positivists* teach that ignorance of the laws of nature produces the concept of a Supreme Being to whom worship is given. This means that religion, through a progressive evolution, assumes various forms: naturalism, animism, fetichism, idolatry, polytheism, and, finally, monotheism, which in turn will soon die away as science casts its light forward.

This hypothesis, first of all, takes for granted that true science is incompatible with the concept of a Supreme Being. That such a supposition is false is evident when we consider the cases of men who are skilled in the sciences and who at the same time are devoted to religion.

This hypothesis, secondly, is opposed to facts that are historically certain because religion among many peoples has little by little declined from monotheism to idolatry and polytheism.

Thirdly, this hypothesis has no foundation, for the first religion of man before revelation remains unknown to us, it cannot be shown that the uncivilized tribes living today have preserved a more ancient form of religion<sup>1</sup>, and many

<sup>1</sup> M. J. LAGRANGE, *Etudes sur les Religions sémitiques*, 1903, p. 5, rightly thinks that the Semites added many accidental and complex rites, and likewise many intricate precepts to primal or primeval religion; so much the more is this true of today's primitives.

affirm that these tribes were not given up to naturalism or animism only<sup>1</sup>.

Fourthly, this hypothesis is unequal to explaining the moral fruits of the religious idea, and by no means can it explain the ideas or notions that are essential to any religion whatsoever, for example, the ideas of a right, of a ceremony, and of a moral obligation.

23 b. *The Psychologists* think that the religious sense arises from the subconscious in certain circumstances and is, in the first place, a particular religious emotion; moreover, from this emotion the intellect extracts gradually certain concepts according to the ideas that have already been acquired. Thus in an inherent or subjective manner the concept of divinity is acquired which, substituted for various religious experiences, is thereafter associated with them according to the laws of evolution. This hypothesis the Modernists favor. It is based on the philosophical doctrine about the subconscious. This is a false doctrine in that it leads to pantheism; without cause it supposes that ideas originate from emotions; nor does it explain the moral obligation which all religions impose.

24 c. *The Sociologists* state that religion arises from a certain sense of *dependence on collectivity* (on people as a body) which is conceived by the ignorant as a certain Superior Being that must be religiously revered.

This explanation is insufficient, for society can give the idea of a coercive force, but not of a moral obligation<sup>2</sup>. Besides *Totemism*, upon which it depends, is not a universal fact, nor has it been thoroughly examined. Now many do not regard it as the first social form of Religion.

We must conclude, therefore, that these hypotheses are not sufficient for explaining the origin of Religion. We admit, however, that our opponents have collected many

<sup>1</sup> Mgr LE ROY, *La religion des Primitifs*, p. 464-465.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. MICHELET, *Dieu et l'agnosticisme contemporain*, p. 1-46.



facts which show the great contribution that the extraordinary phenomena of nature, the religious sense, and human society have made for preserving Religion.

25 **B** *The true explanation of the religious fact.* The true cause of the fact of religion must be sought in the whole man, who cannot attain his end or his happiness without religion.

The end of man and also the happiness of man consist in this that he attain the true and the good with all his faculties. But religion alone offers man the greatest truth and good, that is, God Himself. Therefore, only through religion can man attain his end and his happiness. Thus, religion is necessary for man.

a. *The end of man.* Man does not find happiness except in the complete gratification or contentment of his noblest aspirations:

1. The aspirations of his *intellect* which is striving toward a knowledge of the complete truth about his origin, his nature, his final end, and the means toward this end, etc.;

2. The aspirations of his *will* which is pursuing the whole and perfect good;

3. The aspirations of his *sensible nature* which is in need of some satisfaction and which is moved and borne onward by manifold affections towards the Supreme Being who is known by his intellect and sought for by his will.

26 **b.** *Religion satisfies these aspirations.*

1. For Religion teaches the *intellect* that our origin is from God, that our final end is God Himself; and further, Religion points out the means for attaining this end.

2. In Religion the *will* finds whatever is necessary for attaining good: namely, a supreme legislator, an effective sanction or authority, and powerful aids and assistance.

3. In worship our *sensibility* shares the happiness of our intellect and of our will. Thus the whole man attains his happiness and his end.

27 **c.** *Without Religion these aspirations cannot be satisfied.* Of those who reject religion, some profess dilettantism, others profess positivism, and still others avow spiritism, magic, or theosophy; and then there are those who fall into pessimism.

But dilettantism leaves man restless because it maintains that there is nothing certain to be known about those things which the human mind is searching after. Positivism offers no answer regarding the questions of man's ultimate end and the means for attaining that end because the positive sciences pursue phenomena only. Spiritism, magic, theosophy, and likewise various kinds of superstitions show themselves in the likeness of religion, but anyone who examines the foundations of these systems perceives how empty and unreal this likeness is.

Pessimism kindles new sorrows when it proclaims the extinction and the permanent annihilation of man's noblest aspirations.

Accordingly, the conclusion follows<sup>1</sup> that religion is entirely necessary for man in order that he may fulfill his loftiest desires. Also, in this conclusion only can there be found an explanation of why the fact of religion is universal in space and in time.

Second Argument: *The metaphysical argument demonstrates directly that there is in each man individually a moral obligation of professing Religion.*

28 The foundation of any obligation is the directing or regulating of any being to its ultimate end, or it is the *order*

<sup>1</sup> This same conclusion G. Husserl makes in *Christus*, p. 1011. Whoever will consider objectively the facts treated in this manual will learn that religion is an essential, permanent, and superior part of humanity. He must also admit its legitimacy or doubt completely that human activity has any direction or any purpose.



which right judgement directs must be followed either in the exercise of one's own faculties or in one's relations with other beings. Therefore, wherever a relation exists which rational nature orders must be kept, there arises a moral obligation<sup>1</sup>. But right reasoning dictates or lays down those relations between God and man which are included under the name of religion.

a. That Religion in general is obligatory can be deduced from the fact that God is the efficient cause of man. For an effect, as an effect, depends totally on its cause. But man, in his very entity, is the effect of God. Therefore, he depends entirely on God. Moreover, the voluntary and free recognition of this dependence is nothing other than religion itself, therefore, Religion is truly obligatory.

b. Particular acts of Religion are imposed on man :

1. because in as much as he has been created by God, has been preserved in existence, and has been helped by divine co-operation, he depends completely on God and therefore, ought to acknowledge the supreme dominion of God by adoration in order to preserve the moral order;

2. because man having freely received from God existence, rational life, and innumerable benefits, ought to return to Him acts of thanksgiving;

3. because man, conscious of the fact that he has offended God very often by his sins, is impelled by right reasoning to compensate for his committed offences by sincere repentance;

4. because man, perpetually needing new helps and benefits, should, according to all reason, have recourse through prayer to the Author of all good; for without changing His plan, God can nevertheless be pleased with our prayers since He has foreseen them, and He does want us to pray because He is supremely good and is our benefactor extraordinary. Therefore, on each man rests the grave obligation of professing religion, that is, of acknowledging God as the beginning

<sup>1</sup> Philosophers treat this topic in explaining the foundation of a moral obligation.

on Whom he depends, and of giving worship to Him. Accordingly, it must be stated that Religion is not only most useful to man, in that through it the aspirations of his nature are satisfied, but also obligatory to man in the strict sense that God has the right to be worshipped by every man.

29 Second thesis : *A worship not only internal but also external and public or social<sup>1</sup> is due to God.*

1. An external worship or cult is due to God :

a. *by reason of Himself.* The body as well as the soul comes from God and therefore God must be given glory in as much as He is the creator of the body. In an external cult this glory is given to God in a very great degree.

b. *by reason of an internal cult* because an internal worship, if it is sincere, necessarily must be expressed by gesture, words, and various external acts, and an internal worship is increased very much by external signs and ceremonies. Experience has shown all of this.

30 2. A social cult is due to God.

a. God is the founder and benefactor of human society as well as of every individual. Therefore, society as such ought to acknowledge God as the Supreme Lord and ought to offer Him worship.

b. Society should publicly promote religion because in this manner religion is preserved among the people most effectively; and without religion, the fear of God is taken away, the authority of our leaders is looked down upon, and soon all things are disrupted.

31 Conclusion.

1. No one, therefore, may look down upon Religion and reject it as an empty superstition which science must destroy; nor may one adopt an attitude of indifference towards it.

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 172-179.



But on everyone there is the grave obligation of embracing Religion so that God may be worshipped in a proper manner.

2. There are many religions flourishing today which differ greatly in dogmas, precepts, and rites. Which is the true Religion? Which one should be professed by all?

3. Some religions are spoken of as revealed by God. This statement must not be denied a priori as if all religions were equally the offspring of human ingenuity.

## CHAPTER II

# REVEALED RELIGION

Consequently we must investigate *Revealed Religion*.

In regard to revealed religion, we wish to discover :

1. What is revealed religion.
2. Whether it is possible.
3. Whether it is necessary.
4. Whether it is obligatory.

## I. THE CONCEPT OF DIVINE REVELATION

### 32 I. The Notion or Idea of revelation.

**A** *Revelation in general*. Revelation (drawing back the veil) is the making manifest of a thing which previously was obscure, hidden or unknown. This manifestation may be made by man or by God.

**B** *Divine revelation* properly called is the manifestation to us of some truth by God through the supernatural illumination of our mind<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ST. THOMAS, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 171-175. *Major Synopsis*, n. 182-192.

This illumination of our mind is called the *speaking of God*<sup>1</sup> because divine concepts are really and properly manifested to man who hears. In other words, God in revelation both manifests the truth, and at the same time gives witness by His own authority, that it is He who is speaking<sup>2</sup>.

33 Revelation is *something supernatural*, that is, something that surpasses the essence, the needs, and the forces of created nature. It is supernatural :

1. by reason of its *end*, which is God as He is to be seen in *Himself*, face to face;
2. by reason of its *proper object*, which is the very mystery of the divine life, containing the truths which can be known either by reason alone or not.

Revelation is called *supernatural quoad modum (supernatural as to manner) only*, when the truth revealed is knowable to reason; it is called *supernatural quoad modum and quoad substantiam (supernatural as to the manner and the substance)* when the revealed truth surpasses reason.

Revelation differs from the illuminations of actual grace; it differs from the inspiration of a sacred author; it differs from the divine assistance which enables us to avoid error.

**C** This idea of Revelation<sup>3</sup> must be carefully preserved in order that the *errors* of the Liberal Protestants may be detected. They retain the word but in an entirely different meaning. Thus Loisy says that revelation is the consciousness acquired by man of his relationship to God.

<sup>1</sup> *Hebrews*, I, 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *Révélation*, tract I, p. 150 sq. ST. THOMAS describes immediate revelation in the *Summa Theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 173, a. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the Decree *Lamentabili* — proposition 20 : Revelation could be nothing but a consciousness acquired by man of his relationship to God; proposition 22 : The dogmas which the Church presents as revealed are not truths which have come down from heaven, but are a certain explanation or interpretation of religious facts which the human mind has acquired for itself by laborious effort; proposition 26 : Dogmas of faith must be retained only in a practical sense, that is, as a preceptive norm of acting, but not as a norm of believing. Denzinger-Bannwart, 2020, 2022, 2026. Cf. *Encyclical Pascendi*, D. B., 2075.



2. **Kinds of Revelation.** Supernatural revelation is *immediate* when God manifests a truth through Himself or through an angel without the intervention of man; otherwise it is *mediate*.

Immediate revelation is effected *externally* or *internally* in as much as the truth is manifested by a preternatural action of God either to the external senses or to the imagination and intellect only.

Supernatural revelation is *public*, if it is set forth primarily and intrinsically for the usefulness of the human race or society generally; otherwise it is called private.

## II. THE POSSIBILITY OF DIVINE REVELATION<sup>1</sup>

We shall use a threefold thesis to prove this possibility; it has been assailed in a threefold way.

35 **Thesis I:** *Supernatural revelation in itself is possible and also is entirely appropriate.* This statement is philosophically certain, it is theologically *de fide*<sup>2</sup>.

Proof of the first statement in the thesis, namely, *supernatural revelation is possible*:

### A On the part of God

a. God can physically reveal since He is *omniscient* and *omnipotent*. Through His infinite power He can show things unknown to man by means of external images which He produces or by means of internal images which He awakens in the imagination and in the intellect, or fashions directly and without intermediary. Also, He can increase and assist the keenness of man's intellect by infusing a new light into it.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 193-208.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III can. 2, *On Revelation*; D. B., 1807.

b. God can *morally* reveal, for revelation is not repugnant to His majesty, His wisdom, or His other divine attributes.

From all other viewpoints, there is nothing contrary to reason in this.

### B On the part of man

When man's intellect has become submissive to God in all its acts, it is then aided by a supernatural light that God infuses; in that state it can perceive that, among all the ideas which it already possesses, there is a harmony, and that through its own power it cannot achieve this harmony. Also, his intellect becomes aware that this harmony is produced by God.

This does not mean that the dignity or autonomy of human reason is endangered or jeopardized; for what could be more fitting for human reason than to listen to a teacher who is pre-eminent in knowledge and in authority; and what could be more liberating than to receive truth from an infallible witness?

Proof of the second part of the thesis, namely, *supernatural revelation is fitting or appropriate*:

a. for God, who makes His attributes known in revelation;

b. for man, who is raised to a superior knowledge, who is preserved from many errors, and who is inspired to humility, to a love of God, and to other virtues.

36 **Thesis II:** *Mediate revelation is possible and is entirely fitting.* This is certain.

A *It is possible* — for by the power of His supreme dominion God can choose someone as His minister through whom He will communicate His will to others; then this man, under the influence of divine light, can perceive that God is making known this truth to him for the intention that he transmit it to others; finally, other men by most certain signs can discern God's message.



### B *Certainly it is appropriate:*

a. for *God*, who, while not multiplying miracles without necessity, is wont to govern the world according to the laws of unity and of simplicity: certainly He wishes that life, knowledge, and virtue in the natural order be communicated by parents to their children, and that all in society be bound together among themselves by a multiple bond. In like manner it is fitting in the supernatural order that revealed doctrine be made known to a few, who then can transmit it in its entirety to others.

b. for *man*, who instructed in the natural order by others, thus shuns the dreams and hallucinations that would arise from an immediate universal revelation, and can thus reach his ultimate goal more safely.

### 37 Thesis III: *The revelation of mysteries is possible and is most expedient. This is philosophically certain, it is theologically de fide<sup>1</sup>.*

A theological mystery properly called is to be understood as a *truth which reason by itself cannot discover, and which reason cannot understand or prove intrinsically even after the truth has been revealed for example, the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity.*

Proof of the first part of the thesis, namely, *the revelation of mysteries is possible:*

a. On the part of *God*: God knows many things that are impervious to human reason and these He can show us just as He reveals other knowledge to us.

b. On the part of *man*: man can understand that the agreement between two concepts which he already has is being corroborated for him by God even though he cannot discover this agreement nor prove it intrinsically, nor even see it. For indeed we can believe that a thing is so although

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, D. B., 1816.

we cannot perceive how it is thus. A mystery is above or beyond reason, but it is not contrary to reason.

Proof of the second part of the thesis, namely, *the revelation of mysteries is most expedient:*

a. on the part of *God*: God, the greatest good, thus communicates Himself to man through revelation;

b. on the part of *man*: the revelation of a mystery enriches our intellect and offers us the opportunity of practicing many virtues, namely, humility, faith and religion. For example, the Incarnation is the object of faith and also an example of humility.

### 38 Corollary. God can reveal positive precepts:

1. since He is the supreme Lord of men, He has the right of giving them orders and instructions which will direct them in the present life without any suppression of their liberties;

2. he can manifest His will in these same ways, and also he can manifest speculative truths.

### III. THE NECESSITY OF DIVINE REVELATION<sup>1</sup>

39 *This necessity we can consider either in regard to the truths and precepts of the natural law or in regard to supernatural mysteries and positive precepts.*

1. *The necessity of a revelation of the truths and precepts of the natural law.*

40 In regard to this matter the *Traditionalists* and the *Fideists* are in error, for they teach that revelation is absolutely necessary even for these truths because human reason is in no way capable of attaining them.

The *Rationalists* also err on this point, for they deny the necessity of revelation since human reason can know fully,

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 209-233.



in the physical and moral orders, whatever pertains to natural religion. The Catholic doctrine stands between these extremes.

41 *Thesis : Continuing in its present state and operating by its own powers, the human race is not morally capable (unless some special help of God, such as revelation, is given to it) of knowing with readiness, with real certitude and without some mixture of error, the sum total of religious truths which is needed for the correct ordering of life; as a result it may be stated that the revelation of these truths is morally necessary.*

This is certain.

- a. This thesis applies to the human race collectively taken, as it exists now, that is, after original sin.
- b. It treats of a moral inability, which nevertheless implies the physical power of placing an act; but this power is impeded by so many obstacles (among them the customs of men) that it can pass over into act only with great difficulty. We do not at all deny that within man there is the physical power of knowing the truths and precepts of natural religion. Thus we are at variance with the Fideists and the Traditionalists.

c. *without the special help of God or without an intervention which is not due to us, no matter what the nature of this intervention may be.* Some intervention other than revelation can be conceived, but if de facto God chooses revelation as the medium by which He comes to the assistance of man, then this revelation becomes a necessity.

d. *know readily, for the human race stands in need of this easy, certain, and safe knowledge of natural religion by means of which it may pursue its goal.*

e. *the sum total of truths, not one truth or another, but a collection of the truths and of the duties which are necessary for rightly arranging moral life.*

This thesis we prove with a twofold argument, one historical, and the other psychological.

A *The historical argument*<sup>1</sup>. If all the people who have been placed outside revelation have fallen into most evil errors concerning religion and into most wicked customs, which reason alone could not correct or relieve, then the human race truly lies in a state of moral impotence in regard to knowing readily, certainly, and safely the truths of natural religion — provided, of course, that the power which never elicits an act is deservedly called morally impotent of eliciting this act.

But, it is evident from history that all people who have been outside revelation, have fallen into the most evil errors concerning religion and into the most wicked customs, which reason alone could not correct.

Therefore, the thesis holds true.

43 *The minor is proved by setting forth the facts*

a. It is evident from history that all people who have been placed outside revelation have fallen into the most vicious errors :

1. *concerning religion.* Polytheism, dualism and idolatry corrupted the idea of the divinity; the gods were subordinated to destiny or fate, and indulged in vices and lusts; worship more often fostered license; the immortality of the soul was either denied or affirmed with great doubt; the future life was considered unpleasant enough even to the good.

2. *concerning customs* many perverse things were not only not forbidden, but rather they were permitted as licit : fornication, sins against nature, exposition of infants.

b. These errors reason alone could not correct. The most illustrious philosophers among the pagans *could not* lead the people to the true worship of God because of the failure of knowledge and of authority; in fact, it is true that *they did not wish* to, because many of them looked down upon the common populace.

We may not state that modern philosophers enjoy greater authority than the ancient philosophers : for they have taught scepticism, subjectivism, pantheism; also positivism, materialism,

<sup>1</sup> Confer Abbé DE BROGLIE, *Les fondements intellectuels de la foi chrétienne*, p. 83-96.



agnosticism; they have got rid of natural ethics; they have even held that the religious sense is an infirmity of the intellect.

Nor can the natural sciences offer religious truth to us, as is evident from the affirmations of the experts in these fields.

Therefore, we rightly conclude that some divine help is morally necessary. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that almost all religions have presented themselves as divinely revealed.

**44 B Psychological Argument.** This is evident from the debilitated state of human nature.

In order that the human race may be morally able to know easily, certainly, and safely the truths that are necessary for the right ordering of life, it is required:

- a. that these truths be adapted to the understanding of all, even of the ignorant;
- b. that they may be acquired by all without hindrance or delay;
- c. that they may be acquired by all without serious effort.

But these required conditions are lacking.

- a. since they may not at all be adapted to the understanding of everyone, many ignore them because of a lack of natural talent, or of time, or of diligence;
- b. they are so lofty that only after a long time, and very often after youth, do men of mature age attain them.
- c. finally, they often are not perceived on account of the debility of our intellects, and also because of the maze of confusion in our minds; and therefore many fall into error or remain in doubt<sup>1</sup>. Nor may we say that the uninstructed can learn these abovementioned truths from those who are more learned. For according to experience, the learned themselves have fallen into the most vicious errors, and even today are still falling into these errors. Moreover, they lack the authority to teach the people.

<sup>1</sup> Confer St. THOMAS, *Contra Gentiles* I, I, C. 4.

Therefore in its present state the human race is far removed from the moral capability of possessing by its own power a sufficient knowledge of natural religion. Thus it is morally necessary that God come to the help of man in another way: such a way is supernatural Revelation.

2. *The necessity of revelation in regard to supernatural mysteries and positive precepts.*

**45 Thesis:** *If we accept the hypothesis of man's elevation to a supernatural order, then the revelation of mysteries is absolutely necessary* because by reason alone we cannot know what is divine life. No one can discover something supernatural by natural means. *But apart from this hypothesis, the revelation of mysteries cannot be called absolutely or morally necessary, but only convenient or suitable* on the part of God or of man.

Now that the necessity of Revelation has been proved, the human mind is well disposed to seeking and embracing Revelation.

#### IV. THE MORAL OBLIGATION OF SEEKING AND EMBRACING REVELATION<sup>1</sup>

**46** In opposition to the Rationalists who reject this obligation we lay down.

**Thesis I:** *If we posit the moral necessity of revelation in regard to natural religion and the suitableness of the revelation of supernatural truths, then there is a grave obligation incumbent on everyone to search for revelation and to embrace it when it has been found.* This is certain.

*Proof:*

- a. *from the reverence due to truth and to God.* If we take as probable the existence of divine revelation, then this reverence demands that we seek after true revelation and accept it.

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 234-238.



47 b. *from the obligation of professing religion*: This obligation has already been proved. Therefore man is bound to use the means that are necessary for knowing the true religion. But from the moral impotence of the human race it is evident that revelation is a morally necessary medium for seeking the true religion.

Therefore, a serious obligation binds everyone of using the special help that has been given by God, and accordingly of finding out what this help is, for we cannot use it unless first of all we know it. Moreover, men have always been convinced that help of this kind is Revelation properly called. Nor can we say that arguments which establish the fact of Revelation are lacking. Therefore, man is bound to find out whether this help is really Revelation, since this is an a priori hypothesis which must not be rejected.

We may not claim that Revelation is a *gratuitous gift of God* and that, therefore, it can be refused. It is gratuitous indeed in this sense that God is not bound to reveal anything to us. But it is, not withstanding, *obligatory* if God, as one who has the right wishes to impose positive precepts on man. Moreover, actually He did wish thus, as is more than probably evident from the fact that the human race needs Revelation for the correct planning of its life. Besides, when we posit the raising of man to a supernatural state, revelation is absolutely necessary for knowing his end<sup>1</sup>.

48 In opposition to the *Indifferentists*, who think that all religions are equally good and that anyone is permitted to remain in whatever religion he has been born or to embrace another religion which is more adapted to himself, we state.

**Thesis II**: *Man cannot indifferently profess any religion at all which claims that it is revealed, but he is bound to seek out the true Religion and to embrace it*<sup>2</sup>.

*Proof*: 1. *From the unity of religious truth*:

If God has revealed some religion to man, this religion is certainly one, just as truth is one. Therefore, since it is one and only one, all must search for it and accept it.

<sup>1</sup> Confer MGR PIE, *Instruction Synodale*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>2</sup> Confer LAMENNAIS, *Essai sur l'Indifférence*.

2. *From the very nature of God*: God cannot be worshipped equally in truth and in error. Furthermore, religions that differ cannot at the same time be true. Therefore, they are not equally good; thence it is not licit to accept any religion you wish.

#### SCHOLION. THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE IN REGARD TO REVELATION

49 The Church teaches:

1. Supernatural Revelation is not absolutely necessary for human nature even in its present state in order that it may know the truth of natural religion, but it is very useful; however, it is absolutely necessary for directing man to a supernatural goal<sup>1</sup>.

2. The Revelation of mysteries is useful, although mysteries are above and beyond the human intellect<sup>2</sup>.

It is de fide from the Vatican Council that:

1. Supernatural revelation *quoad modum* (as to the manner) is possible, nay, rather it is expedient, although God can certainly be known by human reason;

<sup>1</sup> "It is to be ascribed to this divine revelation, that those divine things which are not inaccessible to human understanding in itself, can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by everyone with facility, with firm assurance, and with no admixture of error. This, however, is not the reason why revelation is to be called absolutely necessary; but because God of His infinite goodness has ordained man to a supernatural end". *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 2; *D. B.*, 1786.

<sup>2</sup> "Reason indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks earnestly, piously, and calmly, attains by a gift from God some, and that a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries; partly from the analogy of those things which it naturally knows, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man; but reason never becomes capable of apprehending mysteries as it does those truths which constitute its proper object. For the divine mysteries by their own nature so far transcend the created intelligence that, even when delivered by revelation and received by faith itself, they remain covered with the veil of faith itself, and shrouded in a certain degree of darkness, so long as we are pilgrims in this mortal life...". *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 4; *D. B.*, 1796.



2. Supernatural revelation *quoad substantiam* (as to the substance) is possible;
3. Revelation contains de facto true and proper mysteries;
4. Divine Revelation can be made credible by external signs<sup>1</sup>.

## THE CRITERIA OF DIVINE REVELATION

### CHAPTER III

We shall consider successively *criteria in general* and then *miracles and prophecy*.

#### I. THE CRITERIA OF DIVINE REVELATION IN GENERAL :

##### 50 1. State of the question.

a. It is certain, *contrary to the opinion of the Rationalists, that the sole criterion of Revelation is not its conformity to the principles of reason*. This criterion can indeed prove that

<sup>1</sup> If anyone shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through things that have been created, let him be anathema.

If anyone shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man should be taught by divine revelation, about God and the worship to be paid to Him, let him be anathema.

If anyone shall say that man cannot be raised by a divine power to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection..., let him be anathema.

If anyone shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by external signs..., let him be anathema.

If anyone shall say that in divine revelation there are no mysteries, truly and properly so called, but that all the doctrines of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles, by properly cultivated reason, let him be anathema. Vatican Council, Session III. D. B. 1806 et sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 240-251.

a doctrine is true, but not that a doctrine is revealed. For the historical fact of revelation should be investigated historically with diligent examination, and not considered speculatively only. Nor can this criterion be taken for the truths of the supernatural order which surpass human understanding.

b. *The erroneous opinion of the Modernists must likewise be rejected. Rejecting miracles and prophecies, they teach that intimate religious experience is the only sign of Revelation, and therefore that Apologetics should be directed to this end, namely that each one may experience within himself the truth of Christianity.* St Pius X deservedly rejected this theory of the religious experience of each one who believed, for it leads to subjectivism. Also, if it is accepted, all religions will be equally good and equally revealed because everyone believes that he experiences the truth of the religion he professes<sup>1</sup>. (refer to note 13.)

c. *The Vatican Council* teaches that divine revelation is proved primarily by external arguments, namely by "divine facts, and especially by miracles and prophecies which... are the most certain signs of revelation and are adapted to the intelligence of all"<sup>2</sup>. These signs are called the *criteria of revelation* or the *motives of credibility*.

51 2. **The idea of criteria and the kinds of criteria.** If these criteria are taken from revealed doctrine, they are called *internal*; if they are taken from facts which follow Revelation, they are called *external*. (refer to note 5.)

a. *Internal criteria* are *negative* or *positive*.

1. From the *negative criteria* nothing can be concluded except the possibility of divine Revelation, for from these we are shown that nothing hinders this Revelation from being divine. Criteria of this kind are *freedom from error, from all contradiction, from fraud*. If these negative signs

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclical Pascendi*, D. B., n. 2102.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 1790; refer to 1812.



are present, then there is a presumption in favor of the divine nature of this Revelation.

2. The *positive* signs show, with greater or less certitude, that the religion, in favor of which they are given, is revealed by God. Criteria of this kind are the *perfect conformity of a doctrine with reason, the excellence of a doctrine both in itself and its effects*: the doctrine is such that it is completely suitable to human nature, and omits nothing which is necessary for integrity of living. The evidence will be stronger if, after a comparison has been made of the foremost religions, one of them is apparently transcendent, especially if this excellence is so great that it cannot be explained without special divine intervention.

b. *External criteria* are taken from marvellous facts, especially from miracles and prophecies, which accompany the doctrine extrinsically and show its divinity. These criteria are *negative*, if they prove that nothing opposes the divine origin of this doctrine; or they are *positive* if they directly prove its divine origin: for example, the miracles of Christ.

## 52 3. The use of criteria.

A All Catholics acknowledge that the truth of revelation is to be discovered from both intrinsic and extrinsic signs; but they disagree in regard to method. Some wish that the historical method, which rests upon extrinsic signs, be used almost exclusively; others choose the philosophical method which is based on intrinsic arguments<sup>1</sup>.

B But if we seek the perfect method, which is sufficient for persuading the minds of our contemporaries, then we must join the intrinsic arguments with the extrinsic arguments.

a. The intrinsic argument prepares the way for our proof because it is through the intrinsic argument that it becomes evident that religion is entirely in accord with human nature;

<sup>1</sup> LE BACHELET, *De l'Apologétique traditionnelle et de l'Apologétique moderne*; DE FOULQUIER, *L'Objet intégral de l'Apologétique*, p. 425-465.

- b. The historical arguments complete the proof; it is through that the place of divine intervention becomes apparent;
- c. Finally, a comparison of the various religions confirms our proof.

## II. MIRACLES

There are four points to be considered in regard to a miracle: the concept of a miracle, its possibility, its discernibility and its demonstrative force.

### I° THE CONCEPT OF A MIRACLE

53 A The word miracle, coming from *miror*, to *marvel at*, etymologically signifies that which is likely to excite wonder or astonishment. In the strict sense a miracle is a *deed that is sensible, extraordinary and divine*.

a. *a deed*, that is, a certain effect like the curing of a blind person, the changing of water into wine, the resurrection of a dead person.

b. *sensible*, that is, in some way this deed or fact can be perceived by the *external senses*, either directly as in the case of curing a paralytic, or indirectly, as in the conversion of St. Paul or in the knowledge and manifestation of the secrets of the heart. Somewhat differently should we consider an action that is preternatural and divine, such as the changing of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. This should not be regarded as an obvious sign of divine Revelation.

c. *extraordinary*, that is, this action is accomplished outside the usual order of nature, or beyond or above or contrary to the laws of nature.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 105, a. 7; q. 110, a. 4. — *Contra Gentiles*, I, III c. 101, 102, 109; cf. VAN HOVE, *La doctrine du miracle chez S. Thomas*; TONGUET, a. *Miracle in Dictionnaire Apologétique*. — *Major Synopsis*, n. 252-258.



God governs creatures in a two-fold manner :

1. by preserving and following the order of the world or by universal laws;
2. by directly intervening in a particular case independently of the usual laws of nature in order to produce a special effect; for example, the resurrection of a dead person. Thus a miracle takes place. Therefore, a miracle is not a *violation* or a *suspension* of the laws of nature, for these laws are hypothetically unchangeable, but a miracle is an effect produced immediately by God, Whose power transcends the force of all nature.

d. *divine*<sup>1</sup>, that is, this action can be produced only by God through the power that is proper to Him. And so, after all the circumstances of this concrete fact have been examined, this action or fact must be attributed to God alone. It is not necessary that this miraculous work in itself reach an infinite power; rather, it is sufficient that, after all things have been most carefully considered, it be evident that there is no proportion between the natural causes and the effect produced; moreover, that the effect does not proceed from the devil. When proportionate natural causes are lacking, it will truly be a miracle as long as the effect must be attributed to God.

54 B *Kinds* A miracle is *physical, intellectual, moral*, according to whether it happens beyond the laws of the physical, intellectual, or moral order. In the past theologians made this distinction among miracles: *beyond nature, above nature, and against nature*. A miracle is said to be *beyond nature* when the miraculous effect could have been brought about by nature, but in a completely different way; a miracle is said to be *above nature* when it could not have been produced by nature in any manner; a miracle is *contrary* to nature when nature, following its usual laws, would have produced an opposite effect. However, a miracle is not against nature directly, but more truly it is against the tendency that is a part of any nature<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologica* I, q. 110, a. 4; q. 114, a. 4; I<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 111, a. 4; q. 113, a. 10; 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 178, a. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 103, a. 6.

55 C. *False Theories* — Many retain the name, *miracle*, but they reject the actual thing. Thus there are the *Rationalists*, according to whom miracles are merely natural facts, the causes of which are not known. Also, there are the *liberal Protestants*, who teach that miracles are extraordinary natural happenings. And then the *Modernists* think that a miracle arises from faith, and that it must be considered as a manifestation of a superior natural law.

### *The Possibility of a Miracle*

All Atheists and pantheists deny the possibility of a miracle; some theists who falsely think that a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature also deny this possibility.

56 **Thesis** : *If we admit the existence of God, then a miracle is in no way inconsistent or repugnant; rather it is possible and in many ways it is entirely proper.* This thesis is philosophically certain; it is theologically *de fide*<sup>1</sup>.

*Proof of the first part of thesis* : If miracles were repugnant, then this repugnance would exist on the side of the laws of nature, or on the part of God. But neither can be said.

*In regard to the minor premise :*

A A miracle is not inconsistent with the laws of nature. The thing must be viewed philosophically, for through philosophy alone can we discover whether the intervention of God in this world outside or beyond the order of the laws of nature is, of itself, impossible. God's intervention beyond these laws would be repugnant if the laws which govern created forces limited divine freedom itself. But it is evident from Philosophy that God is eminently free both in establishing and in fulfilling the dynamic laws of beings, the forces of which He directly brings forth and puts into action according to His own will. Therefore, He remains the Master of the laws which He has established, and nothing impedes

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Gentiles* I, II, c. 22-30; I, III, c. 98-99; *Quest. disp.*, *De Potentia*, VI; — *Major Synopsis*, n. 259-265.



His ability to comply with these laws or to produce an effect independently of them in any way He wishes.

It would be contradictory to think that divine action is restrained by the laws of nature, as if created forces could exist without the Creator, could be employed independently of a divine Cause, or could oppose the will of the Creator<sup>1</sup>.

57 *Science* cannot prove the impossibility of a miracle because it does not trouble itself with preternatural causes; but it is apparent from a true concept of the unchangeableness of the laws of nature that *there is a place in the world for free intervention on the part of God*. Truly the law of nature demands that, given only all natural causes in necessary circumstances, an effect follow; but it does not hinder a free agent from intervening for the purpose of laying down new causes, or of removing those which exist, of changing circumstances. Everyday these things are being done by man.

Furthermore, if man is able to intervene in order to prevent or to gain some effect, when he wishes, a fortiori God. This free intervention of man is not a miracle because man indeed applies the laws of nature, but in a different way. He is always dependent on nature and in obeying nature, he protects nature. But the intervention of God is a miracle because God works the effect independently of the laws (since He is the Lord and governor of all beings) by producing their entire reality, functioning, and efficacy.

Some offer the objection that the order of nature is upset by a miracle; however, there is no merit to this objection, for the laws are not changed, but only the circumstances in which natural beings act are somewhat modified<sup>2</sup>.

58 B A miracle is not inconsistent with God.

a. His *unchangeableness* remains unimpaired, since God from all eternity foresaw and decreed a miracle together with a law;

<sup>1</sup> P. De Tonquédec, *Introduction à l'étude du merveilleux et du miracle*, p. 200.  
<sup>2</sup> PÉRIER, *Le miracle est-il une violation des lois de la nature?* in *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*, April 1-15, 1920.

b. His *wisdom* remains unimpaired, which orders that laws be observed in common but which does not exclude extraordinary intervention provided that it takes place for a sufficient reason and not by the arbitrary will or desire of improving the world's failures<sup>1</sup>.

59 *Proof of the second and third parts of the thesis*

A A miracle is possible because immediately and by Himself God can bring about effects through His omnipotence which commonly works with secondary causes, and also because God can accomplish many other things which surpass the forces of created nature. Divine action in the working of a miracle is not more difficult for the intellect to grasp than divine action in ordinary daily encounters: the power of the divine influence which proceeds from the Infinite does always escape our notice.

B In many ways a miracle is entirely proper because through miracles God can accomplish many excellent ends, namely, a manifestation of His power or goodness, and especially the confirmation of some truth or some other end in the moral and religious order<sup>2</sup>. It appears morally necessary in an hypothesis on revealed religion because hardly any other sign that is open and obvious to all can be imagined through which God makes it apparent that He on His own authority bears witness to this religion.

### III. THE DISCERNIBILITY OF A MIRACLE<sup>3</sup>

60 The Positivists and many Rationalists deny the discernibility of a miracle. In order that a miracle may be recognized, three things must be made known: 1 the reality or the *historicity* of the fact, 2 the *preternaturalness* of the fact, 3 the *divine quality* of the fact.

<sup>1</sup> SORTAIS, *La Providence et le miracle*.

<sup>2</sup> P. De Tonquédec, *Introduction à l'étude du merveilleux et du miracle*, p. 207

<sup>3</sup> Major Synopses, n. 266-275.



A *The historicity or historicalness  
of a miraculous happening can be established*

- 61 a. According to its definition a miracle is a *sensible* (evident to the senses) fact, and thus it can be observed as any other fact.
- b. By written or oral *testimony* it can be preserved and handed down, like any other happening, for example, the healing of a blind man.

The *preternaturalness* of a miraculous happening offers no obstacle, for a miracle is not preternatural in itself as a fact, but only in its cause since it proceeds from a supernatural agent. Therefore, it can be looked at by those who are not philosophers — for example, the resurrection of a dead person.

Hume states that a thousand witnesses come forward in opposition to the one witness who supports a miracle. This statement is just a sophistry, for the thousand witnesses confirm a law which ordinarily holds, but the one witness of a miracle confirms one extraordinary fact which has been produced by the special intervention of God. Therefore they are not bearing witness about one and the same object.

B *The preternaturalness of a miraculous  
happening can be discerned*<sup>1</sup>

- 62 In order that the preternaturalness of a miraculous happening be established it is *required* and it *suffices* that, after the nature of the thing and all the concrete circumstances have been studied, it is apparent that there is no proportion between the means used and the effects produced, so that such effects can be attributed to a preternatural agent<sup>2</sup>. Indeed all this can be established:

1. from the *nature of the fact* — the resurrection of a dead person is certainly preternatural as is also the multiplication of matter;

<sup>1</sup> DE LA BARRE, *Faits surnaturels et forces naturelles*; — LE BÉC, *Preuves médicales du miracle*.

<sup>2</sup> DE BONNIOT, *Le miracle et ses contrefaçons*.

2. from the *circumstances* — in natural phenomena three things are found namely, regularity, proportion, time.

But these are lacking in miracles.

- 63 The objection is put forward that *not all the forces of nature are known* and that therefore certitude is never possible concerning the preternaturalness of any fact. In answer to this — in order that we be certain in regard to the preternaturalness of a concrete fact, it is not necessary that we know all the forces of nature, and that we be able to state how far their power can extend itself, but it is sufficient that we be able to judge practically what they cannot work in definite circumstances. Instructed by the experience of centuries, we know that certain effects in certain conditions cannot be produced by physical nature; thus we know that a dead man that is fetid cannot be recalled to life only by the command of a voice. Whence, if effects of this kind are produced in these circumstances, rightly it is concluded that these proceed from a preternatural power, either divine or diabolic<sup>1</sup>.

- 64 Another objection claims that many happenings are regarded as miracles which can be attributed to imagination or to hypnotism. We answer this objection thus:

1. The force of imagination is known by Catholic Doctors, as is likewise the power of somnambulism, of magnetism and of hypotism; however, according to medical doctors diseases which proceed from an injury of a certain organ cannot be healed by any of these means; therefore, all marvellous cures cannot be explained by the force of phantasy.
2. When a cure is obtained by these natural causes, the natural laws known by the skilful are observed; in the case of a miracle the cure is effected beyond or outside these laws.
3. Finally, all miraculous events are not the curing of diseases; many others are listed, for example, the resurrection of the dead in the Gospels.

<sup>1</sup> LE BÉC, *Les forces naturelles et les guérisons miraculeuses in Etudes*, August 20, 1922, p. 423-432.

<sup>2</sup> BÉNÉDICT XIV, *On the Beatification of the Servants of God*, hands down clearly the rules for discerning miraculous cures.



### C The divine nature of a miraculous event can be discerned

65 A priori there should be signs by which the works of God are distinguished from *diabolical prodigies*. There signs arise:

- a. from the nature of the work which can be performed at any time by God alone — as the resurrection of a dead person, the foretelling of future happenings;
- b. from the moral qualities of the work, namely,
  1. from the character of the *miracle worker*,
  2. from the manner in which the miracle takes place,
  - 3 especially from the effects;
  4. from the doctrine with which it is connected.

In this way divine miracles are very often distinguished from the prodigies of the devil. We should realize that God allows extraordinary things to be performed by devil.

66 We must conclude, therefore, that many works can certainly be recognized as miraculous if the effect produced is carefully examined and if the natural causes and the moral and the religious circumstances are thoroughly investigated. This certitude is greater or less in regard to different works, but it should always be called *moral certitude* in as much as it is acquired under the influence of moral dispositions with the union of the will <sup>1</sup>.

#### The demonstrative force of Miracles

67 Thesis: Since miracles point out very clearly the omnipotence of God, they are most certain signs of divine revelation; (besides, they are suited to the intelligence of everyone;) so that the doctrine

<sup>1</sup> De Tonquédec, *Introduction à l'étude du merveilleux et du miracle*, p. 228; De Poulpique, *Le miracle, et ses suppléances*, chap. IV.

which is confirmed by their presence must be regarded as revealed by God.

This thesis is certain philosophically; it is *de fide theologica*.

1. *Explanation of thesis*: In order that a miracle may be a most certain sign of revelation, it is absolutely necessary that it be accomplished in order to confirm a doctrine which is regarded as revealed. For if there were no connection between the miracle and the doctrine, the miracle would indeed be an extraordinary intervention on the part of God, but it would not be the seal of God impressed upon the doctrine.

In confirming a doctrine a miracle can be helpful in a twofold way:

- a. *directly*, if someone explicitly or equivalently asserts that a miracle will follow in order that in this way the truth of a doctrine may be manifested;
- b. *indirectly*, if someone, declaring that he is a divine legate, appeals to miracles previously performed by himself.

68 2. *Proof of thesis*: It is impossible for God to deceive. Moreover, God would equivalently be producing falsehood if He were performing miracles in order to demonstrate that some false doctrines or a doctrine that is altogether human has been revealed by Himself. Ergo.

This argument is confirmed by using the comparison of a royal seal which is not affixed to writings unless they are truly authentic.

Since the demonstrative power of a miracle is of itself entirely decretory or decisive, a miracle is suited or accommodated to the intelligence even of our contemporaries. This is evident from the fact that many return to God witnessing a miracle. If certain contemporaries of ours do not understand, the fault should be attributed to them, to their prejudices<sup>2</sup>, not to the miracle.

<sup>1</sup> De Poulpique, *L'objet intégral de l'Apologétique*, p. 69-75; *Le Miracle et ses suppléances*, 1914, p. 188 and following *Major Synopsis*, n. 276-279.

<sup>2</sup> De Tonquédec, book I (see previous footnote).



The legitimate autonomy or independence of reason presents no obstacle to this reason: since a miracle is produced directly and immediately by God, it offers a sufficient motive for giving assent.

Often the objection is voiced that miracles are found in false religions and that, therefore, there is no demonstrative force to miracles. A very serious inquiry should be made to discover whether these alleged facts are historically true and preternatural or whether they are produced by the devil. If they should be true miracles, then it is certain that they have not been performed in order to confirm false doctrine.

#### IV. PROPHECY<sup>1</sup>

1. *The concept of prophecy* (A prophecy (from *πρόφητις*) means *to foretell, to predict, or to speak for another*. Here it is taken in the sense of foretelling. In the strict sense a prophecy is a certain foretelling of a future event which cannot be foreseen naturally.

2. *Possibility of prophecy*. A prophecy is possible because God knows all things even future contingencies, in accordance with His eternity, His causality to all things, and His infinite perfection; and then God can manifest all things.

3. *Discernibility of prophecy*. At one time or another, with historical certainty, prophecies can be known and distinguished as truly supernatural that is to say, as divine, especially when a miracle is announced.

4. The probative force of prophecy is the same as that of miracles because prophecy is a miracle in the intellectual order.

It should be noted that miracles in the moral order have great force in the Christian apologetic. They are facts which are produced beyond the order of *moral* nature by the *special intervention of God*: for example, the heroic fortitude of the martyrs. They can be recognized:

I. as *historical* because they are evident to the sense either in themselves or through their effects;

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 280-284.

2. as *supernatural* because they surpass the moral powers of man and must be attributed, by reason of circumstances, to the special help of God.

For a discussion of the *possibility* and of the *demonstrative force* of prophecy reference should be made to number 56 and what follows, to number 67 and what follows.

#### *The Catholic teaching about Miracles*

70 From the *Vatican Council* it is certain that:

- a. miracles can happen;
- b. miracles can be known with certainty at some time or another;
- c. miracles rightly prove the divine origin of the Christian religion;
- d. divine revelation can be made credible by external signs and, therefore, men should be moved to faith<sup>1</sup> not by each person's internal experience alone or by private inspiration alone.

<sup>1</sup> "Nevertheless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of His revelation; namely, divine facts, and especially miracles, and prophecies, which, as they manifestly display the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God are most certain proofs of His divine revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all men."

Can. 3. "If anyone shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each or by private inspiration; let him be anathema."

Can. 4. "If anyone shall say that miracles are impossible, and therefore that all the accounts regarding them, even those contained in Holy Scripture, are to be dismissed as fabulous or mythical; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved by them; let him be anathema." Vatican Council, session III, chap. 3, can. 3 and 4. *D. B.*, 1790, 1812, 1813.

In the formal statement, *fasisymandi* prescribed by *St Pius X* it is stated: "Secondly, I admit and recognize the external arguments of revelation, that is, divine facts, and especially miracles and prophecies as most certain signs of the divine origin of the Christian religion; these same I hold are best adapted to the intelligence of all ages and of all men, even of this day". *D. B.*, 2145.



# INTRODUCTORY NOTES CONCERNING THE BOOKS OF THE OLD AND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT<sup>1</sup>

## TRACT II

### CHRIST, A DIVINE LEGATE OR THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION<sup>2</sup>

71 The necessity of some religion and also the possibility and at least the moral necessity of revelation have been shown. Now we state as certain that *Jesus Christ was the true ambassador of God* sent for the purpose of revealing the true religion to mankind. This office of ambassador or this legation can be historically proved by using the chronological order. We shall show:

1. that the divine legation of Christ was *prepared* by divine providence;
2. that it has been *proved* by an internal argument — that is, its own excellence;
3. that it has been *proved* by an external argument — that is, from the person and testimony of Christ, from His miracles and especially from His resurrection;
4. that it has been *corroborated* from the history of early Christianity;
5. that it has been *confirmed* by comparing the Christian religion with other religions.

<sup>1</sup> LÉONCE DE GRANDMAISON, *Jésus-Christ, sa personne, son message, ses preuves*; LEFÈVRE, *Le Christ Jésus*; P. LAGRANGE, *L'évangile de Jésus*; J. B. BORD, *L'apologétique par le Christ*.

## I. The Books of the Old Testament

72 The books which will be used in the following historical proof are the *Pentateuch*, the *Books of Kings* and the *writings of the Prophets*. All Catholics and many rationalists admit the authenticity of these books.

## II. The Books of the New Testament

73 The sources from which evidence about Christ's mission is drawn are the books of the New Testament, especially the *Gospels*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the *Epistles of St. Paul*. The authenticity and the historical authority of particular Epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles, the non-Catholic critics themselves admit<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the following comments refer only to the Gospels<sup>4</sup>.

In the field of Apologetics the credibility of the Gospels is the *human authority* of the Gospels: we ask whether they give an account of facts to which complete human credence can be given. In order that complete belief be given to these books, they must be 1. *authentic*, 2. at least substantially *entire*, and 3. *truly historical*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Major Synopses, n. 287-298.

<sup>4</sup> PRAT, *La Théologie de S. Paul*, I, p. 9-16; E. JACQUIER, *Histoire des Livres du N. Testament*, I, III.

<sup>5</sup> On June 19, 1911 and June 26, 1912 *The Commission on the Bible Question* gave their answers to the questions concerning the authorship, the time of composition, and the historical truth of the Gospels according to Matthew, according to Mark and according to Luke; also concerning the mutual relationships among the three first Gospels. Refer to E. LEVESQUE, *Nos Quatre Évangiles*, Paris, 1917. This author shows learnedly and wisely that the three Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John, although different in scope, are so joined or united that they by no means contradict one another, but rather that they complete and explain one another.

<sup>6</sup> E. JACQUIER, *Histoire des Livres du N. Testament*, II, IV; LEFÈVRE, in *Diction. Apologétique*, a. *Évangiles*, vol. I, p. 1598.



74 1. *The authenticity of the Gospels.* Catholic authors admit that the *synoptic* Gospels were composed by Matthew, Mark and Luke before the year 63, and that the fourth gospel was written by the Apostle John at the end of the first century.

*By extrinsic arguments we prove that the four Gospels :*

- a. at the end of the second century were commonly attributed to those authors in whose name they were published or spread abroad. This is evident from the testimony of *Irenæus* (died in 202), of *Tertullian*, of *Tatian*, and from the *Muratorian fragment* ;
- b. were already known among the Christians in the first part of the second century; for they are mentioned by *Justin*, *Papias*, *Hermas*, in the *epistle of Polycarp*, in the *epistles of Ignatius*, of *Clement of Rome*, and of *Barnabas* ;
- c. were regarded as genuine by the heretics and pagans.

How could these Gospels alone, to the exclusion of the apocryphal writings, have been received as genuine by the diverse and scattered Churches; how could they have been read in the liturgical gatherings unless they had been composed in the times of the Apostles?

The genuineness of the Gospels is confirmed by *internal criteria*, for the Gospels make reference to the smallest circumstances (describing these circumstances with a truth which only contemporaries can acquire in describing places, customs, persons, and things) which were entirely changed when Jerusalem was captured and the Temple destroyed.

2. The substantial *integrity* of the Gospels is not to be impugned, for it is evident from the harmonious and concordant testimony of manuscripts and of quotations.

75 3. The *historicity* of the Gospels. The *sincerity* of the evangelists is acknowledged by nearly all scholars. Their testimony has *historical validity and force* for they were not deceived. They knew the events; their descriptions of places and of the customs of the people disclose writers who were perfectly informed; they tell even those happenings which show the Apostles in an unfavorable light. Further, they could not have been deceivers since they were narrating facts at a time when many of the witnesses of these facts were still living.

76 For the purpose of rejecting this historical validity the rationalists have thought up many systems and theories: for example, naturalism, the theory of myths, the theories of those engaged in "higher criticism". Many today think that the words and deeds of Jesus were somewhat transfigured by the *enthusiasm and faith of His disciples* between the time of His death and the time in which the Gospels were written.

A We insist that :

a. this idealization is *not very likely* because the Synoptists are intent on narrating true history, and are reporting the political, moral, and religious state of the Jews.

b. this idealization is *morally impossible*, for how could the Christian teaching, as it is explained by the Synoptic writers, be discovered or devised or how could it be substantially unchanged? And who could alter facts while witnesses of these facts were still living?

c. this idealization is *contrary to the facts* : if the words and deeds of Christ had been gradually transformed to this end that the Master was at first believed to be a faultless man, then the Messiah delegated by God, and finally the true God incarnate, the Gospels would not have narrated the infirmities, the griefs, the sadness and anxieties of Jesus, but very clearly and explicitly they would have set forth His divinity and the reparatory force of His death, since these dogmas were being accepted on faith at the time when these books were being written.

Therefore, we can make use of the *Synoptic books as historical documents*<sup>1</sup>, especially if we mention not just one or another text but recount many evidences which unite harmoniously to prove one point.

77 B Liberal critics state that facts narrated in the *Fourth Gospel* are fabricated, that they are *allegories or symbols* for inculcating some doctrine, that the discourses in this Gospel which have been ascribed to Christ are not the Lord's words, but are theological compositions of the writer<sup>2</sup>. We do not deny that the fourth Gospel, in as much as it was written for more learned readers, delivers a *loftier* teaching than do the *Synoptic Gospels*, and that it is dogmatic as well as historical : from this it can be inferred that the author selected those words and deeds

<sup>1</sup> MANGENOT, *Les Evangiles synoptiques*.

<sup>2</sup> LEBIN, *Valeur historique du 4<sup>e</sup> Evangile*.



which prove more effectually the divinity of Christ. But we deny that the reported events are just allegories and that the words ascribed to Christ were not mentioned, at least as regards their substance<sup>1</sup>.

Consequently nothing keeps us from giving to the fourth Gospel the faith which we give to the others. However, in Apologetics we shall use the Synoptic Gospels more often so that the arguments may have greater force among unbelievers.

## CHAPTER I

## THE DIVINE LEGATION OF CHRIST IS PROVED FROM ITS PREPARATION

### 78 State of the Question.

a. *The preparation that pertains to the prophets*<sup>2</sup>. God, who sets all things in order prepared the way for the Christian religion by selecting the Jewish people and by instructing them in a special way; to them He entrusted a deposit of revelation. However, because this chosen people, in spite of the light of revelation, was prone to idolatry and to injustice, God continued to recall it in many places and in many ways to *monotheism* and to the observance of the divine law through a long line of *Prophets*. These Prophets prepared the way for Christianity both by *preaching* the fundamental truths on which Christianity rests, and by *predicting* the coming of a messianic kingdom which is nothing other than the Christian religion.

<sup>1</sup> *Commission on the Bible*, on May 29, 1907 teaches that the *historical truth of the Fourth Gospel must be retained*. *Decree Lamentabili*, D. B., 2014-2019.

<sup>2</sup> MANCENOT, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, a. entitled *Prophètes*; FELT, *Histoire de l'Ancien Testament*; ABBÉ DE BROGLIE, *Questions bibliques*.

79 b. *Preparation that preceded the Prophets*<sup>1</sup>. Among the Hebrews prophets are called the *Seers* or the *interpreters* or legates of God. According to the biblical manner of speaking, prophets are the *interpreters of God impelled by Him to make known to other men divine orders which have been revealed to them about things of the past, of the present, or of the future*.

Prophets advance the kingdom of God by words and by deeds. Prophecy supposes therefore:

1. a supernatural revelation
2. a mission accepted from God for the purpose of communicating to others what has been revealed.

Prophecy differs from *inspiration*, for every prophet is no impelled to write. Prophets have been both *proclaimers* and *predictors*. We shall treat successively of their *proclaiming* or *preaching* and of their *prophecies*.

c. *The argument in general*. It is historically evident that prophets in a wonderful manner prepared the way for Christianity by their religious and moral preaching and by their *prophecies* concerning Christ, the legate of God.

But that preaching and the prophecies cannot be explained by natural causes.

Therefore, it must be said that God prepared the way for Christianity by extraordinary interventions and that God proved that Christ is His true Ambassador.

## ARTICLE I. THE PREACHING OF THE PROPHETS

### I. *The Preaching of the prophets prepared the way for Christianity*

80 A *Some prophets preached with deeds*. Thus:

- a. *Moses* taught monotheism and promulgated the moral law and the civil law in the name of God;

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 301-323.



- b. by the intervention of the *Judges* God turned the Israelites away from the worship of Baal and Astarte;
- c. in the time of the *Kings* He sent prophets such as *Nathan*, who impressed the moral law on the kings themselves.
- d. after the schism of the Israelite Kingdom of Israel, *Elias* and *Eliseus* proved that worship was to be given to Jahweh alone.

81 B Others among the prophets recorded their preaching in writings.

a. In the kingdom of Israel. *Amos* preached pure monotheism and internal religion. *Osee* gave a very vivid description of the people's sins and warned them that they were soon to be chastised for their transgressions.

b. In the kingdom of Judah. *Isaias* told the people about the great holiness of God and encouraged them to practice purity of heart, justice, kindness towards the poor, and true repentance.

c. *Jeremias* foretold the downfall of the Jews; he likewise foretold their restoration: a new covenant that would embrace not only a relationship between God and the people, but even a union between God and the individual faithful soul. *Ezechiel* asserted that sins were their outstanding trait and that a new kingdom had to be established which would have its foundation in justice and in observing the old laws.

82 Thus, through eleven centuries the Prophets preached faith in one God, infinite, holy, merciful, provident, and rewarding: they preached religious worship, external and internal, purity in morals, justice and charity. In this way they prepared the way for a more perfect order, and this they announced was the complement to the old religion. This order, in which the fatherly mercy of God towards all and the brotherly love among all creatures even towards our enemies, would be more clearly impressed and the worship of God and justice and charity would be spread throughout the world, this order is Christianity which does not differ from the Mosaic religion in regard to essentials, but which perfects it or completes it: for Jesus did not come to destroy the law, but rather to fulfill or complete it.

It is evident, therefore, that the Prophets prepared the way for Christianity by their preaching.

## II. The Preaching of the Prophets cannot be explained by natural causes <sup>1</sup>

83 A False Expositions.

a. The preaching of the Prophets cannot be considered as the expression of the thought of the times, for very often they preached a doctrine that was contrary to the prejudices of their fellow citizens, and as a result suffered many afflictions. As a matter of fact, they can be distinguished from the false prophets in this way that they announced to the kings and to the people not what would please them, but only what would promote the worship of the one God.

b. Neither can it be stated that the prophets drew their doctrine from the soothsayers and diviners of the neighboring nations, since these nations were ignorant of absolute monotheism and taught a natural ethics that was defiled by numerous errors.

84 B Real Explanation.

The teaching of the Prophets has its origin in the revelation of God. To this the Prophets bear witness explicitly and often. Because they are certainly honorable and mentally competent, their testimony is entirely worthy of trust. This fact becomes more apparent when we realize that some of the prophets, ignorant of the others, depict various characteristics of the messianic kingdom separately and singly and yet all arrive at the same conclusion. This can be explained only by concluding that God Himself directed their minds and their writings.

85 C The force of these facts as a proof of Christ's ambassadorship. The Jewish religion as announced by the Prophets remained imperfect and, as it were, fragmentary. It required a complement. As a matter of fact, it found this complement to perfection only in Christ's doctrine concerning the fatherly mercy of God concerning charity, patience in adversity,

<sup>1</sup> CRUVEILHIER, *Revue pratique d'Apologétique*, VI, p. 814.



and universality of religion. Furthermore, such an unexpected doctrinal innovation certainly proves that the same God who once spoke to us through the prophets has spoken most recently and lastly through Christ, who did not destroy the law, but who fulfilled or completed it.

#### ARTICLE II. THE PROPHECIES WHICH ANNOUNCE CHRIST'S AMBASSADORSHIP

##### 86 State of the Question.

We shall omit the prophets' predictions in respect to the Jews and the neighboring nations and shall treat of the *messianic prophecies only*.

Some prophecies are applied to the Messiah in a *literal sense*; others are applied in a *figurative or spiritual sense*. These are true prophecies and among Christians they offer absolutely certain proof, but the Rationalists reject them. Therefore, it is wise to use only those prophecies which are applied to Christ in a *literal sense*. Our intention is not to expound all the literal prophecies, however, but to present *only* those that are considered *special*, those which the Rationalists who are in good faith cannot reject.

**The argument.** If Christ fulfilled the messianic prophecies, we should believe that He is the Messiah, that is, a divine legate; and that His religion proceeds from God. But it is evident that the messianic prophecies have been perfectly fulfilled in Christ. Therefore.

#### I. Explanation of the Prophecies

87 Particular prophecies are related to the rule or kingdom of God and to the Messiah;

I. Prophecies about the *universal rule or kingdom of God* in monotheism — All the Prophets foretold with complete

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 324-342.

faith that *monotheism* would prevail among all nations, that Yahweh would rule over the whole earth. They foretold that the universal rule of the true God alone was to be established and proclaimed through Israel; that the kingdom of God would be not only external but internal also, since it is to be an intimate union of God with the soul of each of the faithful.

2. Prophecies about the *Messiah*, the head of this kingdom. — The Prophets taught:

- 1) that the Messiah King would arise from the ancestry of David and would be born in the town of Bethlehem;
- 2) that He would be called the son of God, strong God, and that He would be filled with the gifts of the Holy Spirit;
- 3) that He would judge His people in justice and equity, that He would inscribe His law in the hearts of His disciples;
- 4) that He would be opposed but that He would overcome His enemies;
- 5) that the Messiah would complete His work and would save His people by His humble obedience, His passion, and His glorious death;
- 6) that after various struggles He would gain a final victory when, at the end of the world, He will judge all nations, and will crown the just in glory and in honor.

#### II. The fulfillment of the Prophecies in Christ

##### 88 A Explanation of the facts.

The prophecy in regard to the *universal kingdom of God* through Christ has been perfectly fulfilled. For the religion which was preached by Jesus Christ is the pure and absolute monotheism of the Jewish nation; it was spread throughout the world by the Jews; it exacts worship in spirit and in truth; it proclaims and extols an intimate union between God and the soul. In this way all the prophecies concerning



the *Messiah* are surely fulfilled in Christ. Jesus was born of the family of David in Bethlehem; He was acknowledged as the Son of God and as one filled with the Holy Spirit; He taught equity and justice by word and by example; He instituted a kingdom wholly spiritual, peaceful, and universal; He saved His people not by an earthly triumph, but by humiliations and sufferings borne in patience; Christianity has been subjected to many persecutions, but it continues invincible.

### 89 B The force of these facts as proof.

These proclamations in regard to the victory of monotheism and in regard to the life and works of the Messiah-Christ are truly divine. For they *preceded the event* and are so many, so certain and so extraordinary that it cannot be said that they have been brought about through *human sagacity*. Many of the prophecies were contrary to the expectations and desires of the Jews, particularly those concerning the passion of the Messiah and the conversion of the Gentiles. It cannot be stated that they are *diabolical*, but rather it must be said that from their end, from their circumstances and results, they are divine. Christ, therefore, is truly an ambassador sent by God, and His religion is divine.

90 The *objection* is proffered that the prophecies were not fulfilled because temporal happiness and the restoration of the Israelitic kingdom were predicted.

*In answer.* — Temporal happiness and the restoration of the Israelitic Kingdom were a completely secondary element in the prophecies, an element which was lacking in certain prophecies and which was excluded from others. Consequently, these texts are to be understood as figures of a spiritual Jerusalem, that is, the Church of Christ. Whatever was spiritually fulfilled in the prophecies is also daily fulfilled in the Christian religion. Prepared and foretold by the Prophets, Christ extended and perfected the doctrines that were contained in the Old Testament in embryo form; at the same time He fulfilled the predictions set forth by the Prophets. Therefore, this first-in-importance and *principal ambassador is divine*; His teaching we should willingly and fully accept as divinely revealed.

## DIVINE LEGATION OF CHRIST IS SUPPORTED BY HIS TEACHING

91 Proved *indirectly* through prophecies, the divine legation or ambassadorship of Christ is demonstrated *directly* from *history* particularly; the *internal* argument, from Christ's doctrine itself, offers a good introduction to this proof. Proceeding logically, we shall show that :

1. Christ truly taught a *certain doctrine*;
2. this doctrine is so *excellent* that it must be attributed to *God alone*.

### ARTICLE I. CHRIST PROCLAIMED HIS DOCTRINE

92 In opposition to the liberal Protestants and Modernists, who state that Christ taught nothing specifically but left us only a model of living, the following thesis is laid down :

**Thesis :** *Christ truly taught a doctrine properly so called, that is, a sum total of dogmatic and moral truths which all must believe.* This is historically certain and theologically de fide.

*Proof :*

- a. *from the Synoptic Gospels* — in these Christ appears among the Jews as the messenger of a teaching which has

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 350-371.



been published in the name of God, which is necessary for salvation, and which is imposed on all;

b. *from the Gospel of St. John* — in this Jesus is shown as the light of the world, as truth itself; belief in Him is absolutely necessary for salvation;

c. *from the Acts and the Epistles* it is equally evident that the Apostles understood the teaching of Christ as a dogmatic collection or unit which had to be taught and preserved faithfully.

#### ARTICLE II. THE EXCELLENCE OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

93 **The Argument in general.** The Catholic Christian doctrine, considered *in itself*, in a very special way gives an answer to the legitimate aspirations and needs of man's higher faculties.

But a religious doctrine that is so outstanding, that is concerned with the weakness of human nature and also with divine Providence, is deservedly called supernatural.

Therefore the Catholic Christian teaching is truly supernatural.

#### I. An explanation of the excellence of the Catholic-Christian doctrine

94 **Thesis:** *The Catholic-Christian doctrine is entirely superior; or this doctrine before all others gives an answer to the aspirations of man's higher faculties*<sup>1</sup>.

Man possesses the noblest of aspirations: to discover truth, to do what is honorable and good, to gain happiness. All these aspirations are *proper* because they arise from the rational nature of man, and the more each one strives to live according to reason, the more vigorously he experiences these aspirations.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 345-349.

<sup>2</sup> *LACORDAIRE, Conférences*, 14-37.

95 This thesis we shall prove part by part.

A *The Catholic-Christian doctrine gives the best answer to the legitimate aspirations of the human intellect.*

a. *The anxious intellect is searching for:*

1. A doctrine which is complete in regard to the origin, the existence and nature of the Supreme Being, the origin and nature of man, the final end and the means necessary for attaining this end.

2. A doctrine which is not opposed to any certain truth, even in the scientific order, since truth cannot contradict truth.

3. A doctrine which is harmoniously one, that is, a doctrine the parts of which are united among themselves.

4. A doctrine which is adapted to the talents of all, because all should profess religion.

b. *But the Catholic-Christian doctrine gives an answer to these aspirations. For it offers:*

1. A doctrine which is complete: it teaches that the world was created from nothing; it sets forth wonders concerning the nature of the Supreme Being; it explains the nature of man, and the existence of physical evil; it states that our final end is the beatific vision.

2. A doctrine which is opposed to no certain truth: for no error could ever be found in Christian doctrine. A worthless theory that implies contradiction between science and Catholic doctrine arises principally because either the dogmas of faith are not understood or explained according to the mind of the Church, or because the conjectures of opinion are taken in place of the axioms of reason.

3. A doctrine which is harmoniously one: for all the dogmas are so joined among themselves that one proceeds from the other and one cannot be denied without impairing the others. Besides, Christian ethics cannot continue without dogmas.

4. A doctrine which is adapted to the talents of all: because, as experience shows, this doctrine in its profundity affords matter for the investigations of the learned, and in its simplicity it can be explained in so few words that children and the uneducated are aware of all those necessary teachings which are required for salvation.



96 **B** *The Catholic-Christian doctrine gives an answer to the legitimate aspirations of the will.*

- a. *The will rightfully requires :*
  1. *A safe and complete rule of acting* because man cannot embrace a good unless he first knows it. Each one wishes to know his own individual duties; also he wishes a prudent rule of life that is safe and binding;
  2. *A sufficient authorization* by means of which he will be attracted to good and drawn away from evil;
  3. *Powerful incentives* for observing the law, the more difficult the law the more powerful the stimulus;
  4. *Consolation in the tribulations* of this life.
- b. *But the Catholic-Christian doctrine satisfies these proper aspirations of the will.*

1. It offers a *safe rule of acting* which, all acknowledge, has integrity and excellence; also a *complete rule* which includes all the duties of man toward himself, his neighbor, and God, and which at the same time gives the reason for the obligation, namely, the will of God Who creates us and raises us to a supernatural order.

This rule of conduct, although difficult, cannot be called ruinous to human nature, or harmful to living, since it extols all the natural and supernatural virtues through which we imitate divine perfection, since it enjoins mortification not as an end but as a means for increasing moral living, and since it reminds us that we can gain eternal life only by fulfilling these duties in the present.

2. It offers a *sufficient authorization* : to the just it promises eternal life in heaven; to the evil it threatens eternal punishment in hell.

From this we may not infer that the practice of Christian virtues is a mercenary work; they are cultivated for the sake of integrity as well as of a reward. Further, the reward itself is nothing more than love of God and nothing nobler than this can be conceived.

3. It offers *powerful incentives* for observing law, namely, the examples of Christ and of the saints — and graces with which God supports us that we may always be able to do our duty.

4. By faith we know that the miseries of this life are a punishment for sin, that they can bring about an increase in virtue and in reward, and that they offer a sure way to happiness.

97 **C** *The Catholic-Christian doctrine gives an answer to the legitimate aspirations of man's sensible nature.*

- a. *Certainly man needs :*
  1. to be led from the exterior things that appeal to his senses to the things of God, for he has a soul as well as a body;
  2. to have his bodily energies awakened and made holy.
- b. *But the Catholic-Christian doctrine satisfies these inclinations :*

1. *It practices an external cult*, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and performs an entire Liturgy which leads man to God through hymns, prayers, ceremonies and communal services.

2. *It calls forth man's energy* by impressing on him the fact that all are bound by the law of work. In this way it directly fosters the sciences and the arts; it supports commerce and industry. Indirectly it promotes material progress by awakening a love for spiritual progress.

Therefore our *major premise stands*, namely, that Catholic-Christian doctrine in itself answers in a very special way the rightful desires of our faculties. It is possible to strengthen this argument by referring to the effects which the Catholic religion produces. (Refer to notes 137 and the following in this volume).

## II. *The supernaturalism of Catholic-Christian doctrine*<sup>1</sup>

98 **Thesis :** *This Catholic-Christian doctrine, which answers perfectly the aspirations of our higher faculties, is good and transcendent; but more than that, it deserves to be called supernatural. Therefore, it must be considered divinely revealed.*

**A Proof of the first part :** *This doctrine is good and transcendent.* Through his own powers and without the divine help which is not due to him, man cannot morally discover the sum total of truths which suffice for correct living. Therefore, *a fortiori*, he cannot, without God's intervening discover the religious doctrine which perfectly satisfies all the rightful aspirations of his rational nature.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 372-385.



Christianity alone enjoys this special faculty<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, it is good and transcendent.

Proof of the second part: *This doctrine must be called supernatural*. No natural cause can explain the transcendence or supremeness of Catholic doctrine.

The opponents state that man alone, endowed as he is with remarkable qualities, could perhaps discover such a doctrine. But experience shows that outstanding ability rarely rises above mediocrity unless the circumstances of place, of time, and of education are also present. Furthermore, Jesus-Christ, Who preached the Catholic-Christian religion, never spent His time studying in the schools of science.

If we admit the hypothesis that this doctrine is divinely revealed, we can understand the extraordinary fact of its transcendence: for the same God Who is the Author of the human mind has revealed a doctrine that is suitable to human nature.

If we do not admit this hypothesis, we have an inscrutable mystery: a doctrine, which even the greatest of philosophers could not discover, was proclaimed in Judea by a workman inexperienced in the sciences, and by fishermen and publicans addressing the crowds.

**B** *The systems of the Rationalists* which deny the supernaturalism of this doctrine have come to naught.

99 *The Christian doctrine has not been changed by other religions or by philosophers.*

**a.** *It was not changed by the Jewish doctors of the law.*

Although both doctrines have many things in common, and while it is true that Christianity is the complement to the Mosaic religion, nevertheless there are so many differences that Christianity could not have been naturally evolved from Mosaism without God's special and new intervention.

<sup>1</sup> DE BROGLIE, *Problèmes et conclusions de l'histoire des Religions*, chap. IX and X.

Thus, Mosaism is a religion proper to one people; Christianity is universal. The Messias expected by the Jews was a temporal King; Jesus was a spiritual Messias.

In regard to dogma — the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption through the cross, justification through faith and through good works, all these were unknown to the Jews. In regard to ethics — the precepts of Christ differ greatly from the traditions of the Elders and of the Pharisees.

100 **b.** *The Christian doctrine was not changed by the Greeks or Latins of that time.*

We acknowledge the fact that many things are found among the pagans which are in accord with Christian doctrine — human reason can attain to certain truths in moral or religious matters — but the differences between Christ's religion and the philosophers' opinions are so many and so great that it is morally impossible that Christianity has been evolved from these — without God's special intervention.

In regard to dogma — the pagans have no knowledge of the Trinity, of the Redemption, of sanctification through grace. In fact, many of the most distinguished are in doubt about the immortality of the soul, about Providence. In regard to ethics — some precepts are almost identical in the matter of phrasing, but the motives upon which they rest are manifestly exceedingly different.

101 **c.** *This Christian doctrine cannot be explained by syncretism.* According to the opponents of Christianity, syncretism is a synthesis of oriental cults (of Isis, of Mithra, etc.) and of Greek wisdom, which Paul preached. However, this hypothesis is contrary to the facts: Paul was hostile to these religions and taught the doctrine which he had received from Christ Himself. If syncretism advanced a religion which is universal as well as individual, it did not do so in the same sense and in the same spirit as Christianity did. Syncretism inclines towards pantheism and fosters a sanctity that is merely external. On the other hand, the Church, at the time of St. Paul, was ever opposing those (for example, the Gnostics) who were trying to mix Christian dogma with external religions. When these people persisted in their teachings, the Church expelled them from her fold.



## Conclusion

Therefore it is rightly concluded that the Christian doctrine or the Christian religion is truly an *original* religion and that it has been promulgated by Jesus Himself. If Jesus has been sent by God to teach men the true religion, all things are understandable; but if otherwise, then something is to be considered incomprehensible, that is, there is an effect without a sufficient cause. Thus the *transcendence* of the Christian doctrine *proves its supernaturalism*.

## CHAPTER III

## CHRIST'S DIVINE LEGATION OR AMBASSADORSHIP IS PROVED HISTORICALLY FROM HIS LIFE<sup>1</sup>

In regard to Christ we must consider three things:

1. His *person* and *testimony*,
2. His *miracles* and *prophecies*,
3. His *resurrection*.

## ARTICLE I.

## THE PERSON AND TESTIMONY OF CHRIST

**102 Thesis:** *Christ's natural qualities and His sanctity are so superior that they must be regarded as a miracle in the moral order and as a sign of His divine legation.*

<sup>1</sup> PASCAL, *Pensées*, a. XII; P. LÉONCE DE GRANDMAISON, a. *Jésus-Christ* in *D. A.*, col. 1361-1404; *Major Synopsis*, n. 388-395.

1. *Description of Christ's natural qualities.* By all the Evangelists Christ is described as the perfect man:

- a. in regard to *intellectual endowments*. 1. In Jesus these shine out: a wonderful keenness of mind and correctness of judgement, the greatest wisdom, a sublimity and at the same time a simplicity of doctrine, authority accompanied by gentleness and humility.
- b. in regard to the *will*: 1. Both His disciples and His enemies acknowledged that *Jesus was free from all sin*.
2. He cultivated the *positive virtues*:
  - a) His charity *towards man* was universal, active, effectual, constant and unsurpassable; He had no faults.
  - b) *Towards Himself* He practiced complete self-denial in a spirit of great sincerity and of genuine humility. In a word, His virtue was all-embracing and very pleasing.
  - c) *Towards God* He showed piety and all-surpassing religion in His prayers and in His acts.

**103 2. Conclusions that are to be drawn from Christ's supernatural legation.** Christ's gifts of mind and of will are so eminent that without a doubt they constitute a miracle in the moral order. This fact Jesus explains thus: with authority and gentleness He announces this sublime but simple doctrine because *He has been sent by God and teaches God's doctrine*. "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me"<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, there is a real link between the eminence of the person of Christ and His doctrine and His divine ambassadorship.

## B THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST

1. *An explanation of Christ's testimony about His divine ambassadorship.*

**104 State of the question:**

*Catholics* affirm that Jesus Christ, in the entire course of His public life, taught that His mission was divine, but

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, VII, 16; St. John, V, 30; St. Luke, X, 16.



that He set this forth gradually in order that He might slowly prepare the minds of the Jews for receiving His spiritual kingdom.

But *Rationalists* deny that Jesus said that He was the Messiah; they assert that the messianic declarations referred to in the Gospels arise from the idealization of the first Christian generation. *Certain Liberals and Modernists* think that Jesus said that He would be the Messiah of an eschatological kingdom in the very near future, which actually did not take place. He was mistaken; and His disciples, after vainly awaiting for a time the parousia, established the Church.

**105 Thesis :** *Christ very often declared both implicitly and effectively, and explicitly and solemnly, that He was God's legate foretold by the prophets, especially sent by God to teach men the true religion*<sup>1</sup>. This is historically certain, it is theologically de fide.

It was necessary that *the Messiah* (The Anointed, a word which means the same as Christ) announced by the prophets, have the three-fold mission, of king, of priest, and of prophet. This title Jesus claimed for Himself and in a very special way He fulfilled the doctrinal mission of Messiah. This is proved *historically from the Gospels*. In order that *the testimony of Jesus about Himself* may be more manifest, we shall distinguish four periods chronologically in His public life.

**106 A From the beginning of His public life** Christ proclaimed His messianic and doctrinal mission :

1. *by His manner of acting*, for He performed the offices of the Messiah; and as one sent by God, he taught His religion. He declared that the messianic kingdom announced by the prophets had drawn nigh<sup>2</sup>, and He spread His teaching abroad in the villages, streets, and synagogues, as one having power<sup>3</sup>. He selected and instructed and endowed His disciples, whom

<sup>1</sup> LEPIN, *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu*, fourth edition, p. 78-218; *Major Synopsis*, n. 396-413.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Mark, I, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. Mark, I, 22.

He sent out to publish the coming of the messianic kingdom, with the power of casting out devils and of healing the sick<sup>1</sup>.

He purified the Mosaic law by eliminating certain customs, and in His own name He fulfilled and perfected it, stating, "It was said to them of old... but I say to you..."<sup>2</sup>. At the same time He performed miracles in order to prove His divine mission.

2. *by words that were equivalent* in meaning when He declared that He was the Lord of the Sabbath<sup>3</sup>, greater than David, Jonah, and Solomon<sup>4</sup> — He who is to come — and upon whom rests the spirit of the Lord<sup>5</sup>. Certainly on these occasions He affirmed that the messianic prophecies had been fulfilled in Himself.

3. *in clear and open words*, as early as the occasion of His speaking to Nicodemus<sup>6</sup>, during His encounter with the Samaritan woman<sup>7</sup>, after healing the paralytic at the pool called Probatica in Jerusalem<sup>8</sup>.

**107 B. During the last year of His life** He spoke explicitly :

1. *to His disciples*. — At Caesarea Philippi He asked them : "Whom do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered : "Thou art Christ"<sup>9</sup>. To this declaration Jesus gave the most solemn approbation<sup>10</sup>.

2. *To the people*. — If you read chapters VII, VIII, X of the Gospel according to St. John, you will see that Jesus could not have affirmed His messianic and religious mission more clearly. Likewise, Jesus made His entrance into Jerusalem as the Messiah -King while the young boys were crying out : "Hosanna to the son of David"; and when the Pharisees questioned Him about this, He replied that in this way the Prophecies were being fulfilled. During the following days He taught in the Temple as the Messiah, openly declaring to the magistrates who questioned Him, by what authority He was doing this<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, IV, 18-22.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, V, 21-22.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XII, 8.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. Mark, XII, 35-37.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XI, 4-5.

<sup>6</sup> Gospel according to St. Luke, IV, 21-25.

<sup>7</sup> Gospel according to St. John, III, 13-18.

<sup>8</sup> Gospel according to St. John, IV, 26.

<sup>9</sup> Gospel according to St. John, V, 19-46.

<sup>10</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XVI, 13-19.

<sup>11</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXI, 23.



C At the time of His Passion when the Chief Priest, rising up, said to Him: "I adjure thee by the living God that you tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of the Living God", Jesus replied to him: "Thou hast said it". Jesus realized that this declaration would be the cause of His condemnation, but nevertheless He spoke out explicitly, and after that He sealed His testimony with His own blood by freely accepting death.

D Finally, after His resurrection, He appeared to His disciples, when they were in doubt about His divine mission, in order to strengthen them in faith. "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and so to enter into His glory?"<sup>1</sup>

Therefore it is historically established that Jesus Christ affirmed that He was the Messiah especially sent by God for the purpose of teaching men the true religion.<sup>2</sup>

### 108 Conclusions.

A That these declarations are not the genuine words of Jesus but the inventions of the first generation of Christians cannot be granted for:

a. They are so integrally a part of the whole narrative that, if they were eliminated, the thread or the design of the Gospel would be lastingly rent or upset; and the few fragments that remained would be entirely unintelligible. For example, the death of Jesus could not be explained historically.

b. Moreover, it is certain that the Apostles at the time of Pentecost were teaching that Jesus was truly the Messiah.<sup>3</sup> Thus the time necessary for idealizing the life of Jesus was lacking. Also, Paul proclaimed in the synagogue that Jesus was the Messiah foretold by the Prophets.<sup>4</sup>

B Nor can it be said, as Loisy states, that Jesus affirmed that He would be a Messiah only in an eschatological sense. A Messianic Kingdom should embrace a two-fold stage or period: the first on earth, the second in heaven after the final coming of the Messiah.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXVI, 62-66.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Luke, XXIV, 13-43.

<sup>3</sup> The following proposition is condemned: "While He was exercising His ministry, Jesus did not speak with the object of teaching that He was the Messiah, nor did His miracles tend to prove it". Decree Lamentabili, Proposition 28. D. B., 2028.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Acts of the Apostles, II, 36.

<sup>5</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XIII, 27.

Jesus declared that He was already the Messiah in the first sense, that He was performing the offices of the Messiah; (all this is evident from previous notes) Jesus declared that He would be the Messiah in the second sense when all things would be consummated.<sup>1</sup>

### II. The Meaning of Christ's testimony

109 Thesis: If we examine Christ's character and talents, then we must admit that the testimony which He expressed concerning His divine mission is true; and that therefore Christ is a divine ambassador.<sup>2</sup>

In order that the testimony of Jesus of Nazareth about Himself may be worthy of belief, two things are required: 1) that Jesus was not a deceiver; 2) that Jesus was not deceived. But these are evident. Therefore.

110 Proof of the minor: a. Jesus was not a deceiver. All concede this. It was a settled point in Christ's mind that He had been sent by God as the Messiah for the purpose of teaching men the true Religion.

b. Jesus was not deceived. Certain Rationalists, along with Renan, contend that Jesus was somewhat deceived; and that this belief or persuasion was nothing more than a very vivid consciousness of His union with God.

This opinion has to be rejected. From the beginning of His public life Jesus affirmed that He had been sent by God in order to teach men the doctrine necessary for salvation. Further, He proclaimed this divine mission as a principal dogma which must be believed under the penalty of eternal damnation. If such an affirmation were false, the conclusion would follow that Jesus was truly deluded, and perpetually deluded. Such a condition could arise only from a pathological state of the mind or of the will. But perpetual or continuous

<sup>1</sup> Cf. DE LA BRIÈRE, a. Eglise, in Dictionnaire Apologétique, vol. I, 1230.

<sup>2</sup> PICARD, La Transcendance de Jésus-Christ.



hallucination on the part of Christ cannot be admitted. His wisdom and His extraordinary sanctity do not allow it.

**113** Therefore, the testimony of Jesus, Who was neither deceiving nor deceived, is worthy of full belief. (This is more effectually proved from His miracles.) So, Jesus of Nazareth was truly the Messiah sent by God in order to reveal the true religion to men; accordingly the Christian Religion which He preached is truly divine and must be embraced.

#### ARTICLE II. CHRIST'S MIRACLES AND PROPHECIES

**112 Thesis :** *In order to prove His divine mission Christ performed many historical and divine miracles, and proclaimed many prophecies.* This thesis is historically certain, it is theologically de fide.

#### A CHRIST'S MIRACLES<sup>1</sup>

**113** Christ accomplished many miracles; in fact the gospels tell the individual stories of more than forty. St. Thomas observes that these miracles were performed in relation to spiritual substances, to heavenly bodies, to men and irrational creatures. Through miracles Christ *progressively* manifested His divine ambassadorship. Also, to His Apostles He gave the power of performing miraculous deeds.

Christ's miracles can be viewed either *singly* or *collectively* for the purpose of proving the divinity of Christianity. Because it is briefer and more effective we shall regard them collectively<sup>2</sup>.

**114 The Argument in general :** If Jesus of Nazareth worked true miracles in order to confirm the divinity of His religious

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 414-435.

<sup>2</sup> FULLON, *Les miracles de N. S. Jésus-Christ*.

mission, we ought to believe that He has been sent by God to teach us the true Religion which all men should embrace.

But it is evident that Jesus of Nazareth performed true miracles for proving the divinity of His religious mission. Therefore.

The major premise is evident from what has been stated under number 67.

The minor premise is proved part by part : 1. Christ's miracles are historically certain; 2. they are truly supernatural and divine; 3. they were performed in proof of His divine mission.

#### I. Christ's miracles are historically certain

**115** That this is so has already been deduced from the historicity of the Gospels. However, there are those who admit the historicity of the Gospels and yet reject the miracles. In opposition to these we appropriately add these special arguments.

a. *The same witnesses* report the life of Christ and tell of Christ's miracles. They are worthy of equal belief as they narrate incidents in each category. After all, miracles are sensible, extraordinary, and public happenings.

b. In regard to several miracles a *judiciary examination* was instituted by Christ's enemies; for example, concerning the cure of the boy born blind.

c. Further, the miracles are so much intertwined with the plan of the *evangelical narrative* that they cannot be denied without rejecting at the same time Christ's entire history.

d. Finally, both the *Apostles* and the *Fathers* appeal with confidence to Christ's miracles as to the best known facts.

#### II. Christ's Miracles are truly preternatural and divine

**116** Many state that these facts were acknowledged as preternatural by Christ's contemporaries because the Jews were inclined to admitting miracles readily on account of their ignorance of the laws of nature. But :



hallucination on the part of Christ cannot be admitted. His wisdom and His extraordinary sanctity do not allow it.

**113** Therefore, the testimony of Jesus, Who was neither deceiving nor deceived, is worthy of full belief. (This is more effectually proved from His miracles.) So, Jesus of Nazareth was truly the Messiah sent by God in order to reveal the true religion to men; accordingly the Christian Religion which He preached is truly divine and must be embraced.

#### ARTICLE II. CHRIST'S MIRACLES AND PROPHECIES

**112 Thesis :** *In order to prove His divine mission Christ performed many historical and divine miracles, and proclaimed many prophecies.* This thesis is historically certain, it is theologically de fide.

#### A CHRIST'S MIRACLES<sup>1</sup>

**113** Christ accomplished many miracles; in fact the gospels tell the individual stories of more than forty. St. Thomas observes that these miracles were performed in relation to spiritual substances, to heavenly bodies, to men and irrational creatures. Through miracles Christ progressively manifested His divine ambassadorship. Also, to His Apostles He gave the power of performing miraculous deeds.

Christ's miracles can be viewed either singly or collectively for the purpose of proving the divinity of Christianity. Because it is briefer and more effective we shall regard them collectively<sup>2</sup>.

**114 The Argument in general :** If Jesus of Nazareth worked true miracles in order to confirm the divinity of His religious

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 414-435.

<sup>2</sup> FULLON, *Les miracles de N. S. Jésus-Christ*.

mission, we ought to believe that He has been sent by God to teach us the true Religion which all men should embrace.

But it is evident that Jesus of Nazareth performed true miracles for proving the divinity of His religious mission. Therefore.

The major premise is evident from what has been stated under number 67.

The minor premise is proved part by part : 1. Christ's miracles are historically certain; 2. they are truly supernatural and divine; 3. they were performed in proof of His divine mission.

#### I. Christ's miracles are historically certain

**115** That this is so has already been deduced from the historicity of the Gospels. However, there are those who admit the historicity of the Gospels and yet reject the miracles. In opposition to these we appropriately add these special arguments.

a. *The same witnesses* report the life of Christ and tell of Christ's miracles. They are worthy of equal belief as they narrate incidents in each category. After all, miracles are sensible, extraordinary, and public happenings.

b. In regard to several miracles a *judiciary examination* was instituted by Christ's enemies; for example, concerning the cure of the boy born blind.

c. Further, the miracles are so much intertwined with the plan of the *evangelical narrative* that they cannot be denied without rejecting at the same time Christ's entire history.

d. Finally, both the *Apostles* and the *Fathers* appeal with confidence to Christ's miracles as to the best known facts.

#### II. Christ's Miracles are truly preternatural and divine

**116** Many state that these facts were acknowledged as preternatural by Christ's contemporaries because the Jews were inclined to admitting miracles readily on account of their ignorance of the laws of nature. But :



a. Not all of Christ's contemporaries, certainly not the Pharisees or His enemies, were inclined to multiplying the miracles which He performed.

b. Even if we grant that His contemporaries were deceived because of their ignorance of the laws of nature, certainly they could see and report these happenings correctly; then it becomes our concern to judge whether these happenings are truly preternatural. If we consider the *nature* of many things that Christ accomplished and the *manner* in which these things were carried out, then it is certain that they go beyond the laws of nature — for example, the sudden healing of the paralytic (*St. John*, V, 5-9), the complete cure of the leper by mere touch (*St. Matthew*, VIII, 3) the resurrection of the dead man who was fetid (*St. John*, XI).

c. These miraculous happenings cannot be explained by the power of suggestion or by hypnotism. For :

- I. the cures are too diverse;
2. Christ performed His healings instantaneously, without assistance, by a mere command or touch, sometimes, in fact, at a distance<sup>1</sup>.

### III. The divine nature of Christ's miracles is manifest:

117 a. oftentimes from the *nature* of the work which could be accomplished only by God, for example, the resurrection of a dead person;

b. from the *character* of the *miracle-worker*, who possessed all virtues;

c. from the *circumstances* of the miracles and especially from the *effects* of the miracles.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the Gospel according to *St. Matthew*, VIII, 5; XV, 22-28.

### IV. Christ's miracles were performed as a proof of His divine mission

118 Very often He *explicitly* appeals to His works, that is, to His miracles, when He wishes to prove the divinity of His mission to His disciples or to the people<sup>1</sup>. Before He called Lazarus back to life, He openly and clearly declared His purpose: "that they may believe that thou hast sent me"<sup>2</sup>.

Consequently because of His miracles the disciples acknowledged the divine authority of Jesus, and from His miracles they proved that His mission was divine.

Therefore the minor premise stands.

119 **Conclusion.** We should believe that Jesus of Nazareth has been truly sent by God in order to teach us the true Religion which all ought to embrace. If this is not so, then we have been deceived by God.

### B CHRIST'S PROPHECIES<sup>3</sup>

120 If Jesus of Nazareth uttered true prophecies in order to confirm His disciples' faith in His divine mission, it is necessary to believe that He has been truly sent to teach us the true Religion.

But it is evident that Jesus uttered true prophecies in order to confirm His disciples' faith in His divine mission. Therefore :

I. Jesus of Nazareth uttered true prophecies<sup>4</sup>. Clearly and minutely He predicted many future events which were perfectly fulfilled :

a. in regard to His Passion and Resurrection<sup>5</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to *St. Matthew*, XI, 4-5; Gospel according to *St. Luke*, VII, 21; Gospel according to *St. John*, V, 36; X, 24; XIV, 10; XV, 24.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to *St. John*, XI, 42.

<sup>3</sup> Major Synopsis n. 436-442.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to BATTIFOL, *L'enseignement de Jésus*, p. 251.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to *St. Matthew*, XVI, 20-23; XVII, 21-22; XX, 17-19.



b. in regard to His disciples and the destiny of the Church <sup>1</sup>,  
 c. in regard to the Jews or in regard to the destruction of Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>.

2. These prophecies prove the divine mission of Christ.

a. They are truly divine: They greatly preceded the events; further, they could not be foreseen naturally, in as much as clearly and certainly they announced determined acts with detailed circumstances at a time when all these still depended on the free will of men and of God. Moreover, all of these very many predicted events, even the most unimportant, were brought to pass — as history shows.

b. Jesus uttered prophecies in order to strengthen the faith of His disciples in His divine mission, in order to confirm the souls of the Apostles lest perhaps they might be scandalized by His death. This is evident from the Gospel according to St. John, XIV, XV, XVI. Therefore, if the doctrine of Jesus be false, it is God Himself who is the patron and protector of this falsity.

#### ARTICLE III. CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

121 **Argument.** If Jesus of Nazareth actually arose from the dead, we must believe that He has been really sent by God in order to teach us the true Religion.

But it is historically established that Jesus rose from the dead.

The Major premise is certain; for

1. rising from the dead is a miracle, possible to God alone.  
 2. Jesus had often prophesied His death and His resurrection, and had offered His resurrection as a proof of His miracles and as an argument for His divine mission.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXVI, 21-25, 31, 34; X, 17-18.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXIV, 7, 11, 15-18; according to St. Luke, XXI, 20-24.

<sup>3</sup> MANGENOT, *La Résurrection de Jésus*; LADEUZE, *La Résurrection du Christ devant la critique contemporaine*; L. DE GRANDMAISON, in D. A., a. Jésus-Christ, col. 1414-1514; *Major Synopsis*, n. 443-471.

In order to demonstrate the minor premise, we shall establish three points:

1. Jesus was truly dead,
2. Jesus was buried in the sepulchre,
3. Jesus rose.

#### I. JESUS TRULY DIED ON THE CROSS

122 It is certain that Jesus died on the cross.

1. This is evident from the witnesses who stood by the cross: from friends who report that he expired crying out with a great voice; from enemies who very carefully kept guard in order that the sentence of death be carried out;

2. This is evident from the testimony of the centurion whom Pilate summoned before he handed over the body to the disciples, and from the testimony of the soldiers who ascertained that He was dead and for that reason did not break His bones;

3. This is evident from the fact that no one contradicted the Apostles when they preached in public that Jesus had died on the cross.

#### II CHRIST WAS BURIED IN THE SEPULCHRE

123 This is manifest from the narratives of the Evangelists, from the authority with which St. Paul describes the honorable burial of Christ <sup>1</sup>, from the words of St. Peter in which he compares the burial of Christ with David's burial <sup>2</sup>. Loisy's opinion, which states that Christ was cast into a pauper's grave, contradicts the testimony of history and the customs and the laws of the Jews in regard to those condemned to death and their burial.

<sup>1</sup> I Corinthians, XV, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Acts of the Apostles, II, 24-32.



## III JESUS ROSE FROM THE DEAD

**124 Errors.** No one today claims that the *Apostles were deceivers*; but *Liberals* and *Modernists* believe that the *Apostles were deceived* by some delusion or some spiritual vision; or they say that belief in the resurrection was not a belief of the first age, but that it gradually originated from faith in Christ's immortality.

**125 Thesis:** *Christ truly rose from the dead in His own flesh, glorified, it is true.* This is historically certain, it is theologically de fide <sup>1</sup>.

The thesis states: 1. that *He truly rose in His own flesh*, for the very flesh or body which hung on the cross, this possessed life once again; 2. that *the body was glorified*, because after the Resurrection Christ's body enjoyed impassibility, definiteness, brightness, quickness, and all the endowments of glorified bodies <sup>2</sup>. The testimony of St. Paul and that of the Evangelists are particularly à propos on this point.

**126 A The Testimony of St. Paul <sup>3</sup>.**

In the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* Paul relates the resurrection as an unshaken fact, known to all, handed down through tradition: "For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received, how that Christ *died* for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He *was buried*, and that He *rose* again the third day according to the Scriptures, and that He was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once...." after that He was seen by James, then by all the Apostles; and last of all He was seen also by me as by one born out of due time" <sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> From symbols, from the ordinary magisterium, and from the liturgical practice of the Universal Church.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to *Diction. de Théologie Cathol.*, a. *Corps glorieux* by D. D. CHOLLET.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to MANGENOT, *La Résurrection de Jésus*, p. 74.

<sup>4</sup> *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XV, 3-8.

In this testimony, preeminent because of its antiquity, Paul narrates Christ's death, burial, resurrection; and the resurrection he proves by means of the six appearances which he mentions.

**127** The Rationalists are in error when they offer the objections:

1. that Paul does not relate the appearances in Jerusalem, since Paul's purpose was not to enumerate *all* the appearances of the risen Christ;
2. that Paul presents these appearances only as of the spirit, for the context demands *corporeal* appearances: He who was dead and buried in the flesh, the same has risen and has been seen in like manner in the flesh. Christ, in His resurrection in the flesh, is the *exemplar* of our resurrection in the flesh.

Therefore Paul bears witness that *Jesus has arisen from the dead in His own flesh*, glorified, it is true.

Verses 42-44 in the 15th Chapter of St. Paul's *First Epistle to the Corinthians* make this apparent.

**128 B Testimony of the Evangelists <sup>1</sup>.**

Two Evangelists demonstrate: 1. that on the third day the tomb was found to be empty; 2. that after His death the living Christ appeared on many occasions.

- a. *The empty tomb.* According to the Evangelists, the body of Christ, taken down from the cross, was wrapped in a sheet and buried in a new tomb which had been cut out of rock. A great stone was rolled to the entrance of the tomb, the stone was sealed, and guards were assigned. Then on the first day after the sabbath the tomb was found empty. Where was Christ's body?

Certainly it was not swallowed up in the earth; nor was it taken away by Christ's disciples who have never been condemned as violators of the tomb; nor was it carried off by the Jews who would have brought the dead body forward

<sup>1</sup> Refer to MANGENOT, *La Résurrection de Jésus*, p. 177.



to the Apostles when they were proclaiming Christ's resurrection.

One explanation remains, namely, the real resurrection of the Lord, as reported by the Apostles.

#### 129 b. *The Appearances or Apparitions of Christ.*

There has been an objection that the tradition concerning Christ's appearances has been two-fold, one tradition centered in Galilee and the other established in Jerusalem. The objectors claim that the two are in opposition to each other. From this the Rationalists infer that the apparitions were contrived during the first Christian generation in order more readily to convince souls of Christ's resurrection.

This conclusion does not follow from these premises. The apparitions in Galilee do not exclude the apparitions in Jerusalem. The risen Christ appeared to the Apostles and to the disciples first in Jerusalem, and then in Galilee; He showed Himself as a living being in various ways: He walked with them, He talked to them, He ate with them; His body, which had been nailed to the cross, He exhibited in its usual appearance; He ordered that the print of the nails in His hands and in His feet and that His wounded side be touched.<sup>1</sup>

After these happenings the Apostles on many occasions affirmed that they were witnesses to Christ's resurrection<sup>2</sup>, which had been made manifest to them in a sensible manner, even though it was supernatural in cause, and even though the renewed and resurrected body had been endowed with supernatural qualities.

130 Those who bear witness to the appearances of the risen Christ have not been deceived. For there are many witnesses; at many times, in many places, over a period of forty days they saw Christ appearing, they touched Him, they talked with Him and they remained with Him.

Those who bear witness are not deceivers. At first they did not wish to believe in the resurrection, they scoffed at the women when they announced the resurrection, and only

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXVIII; Gospel according to St. Mark, XVI; Gospel according to St. Luke, XXIV; Gospel according to St. John, XX, XXI.

<sup>2</sup> Acts of the Apostles, I, 22; II, 32; III, 15; IV, 33; V, 32.

after being won over by the evidence did they finally give themselves up to a belief in the risen Christ.

Therefore, they are worthy of belief and from their testimony we can be certain that Christ truly arose.

131 It cannot be claimed that the Apostles were suffering from delusions, for any delusion from which men of sane mind might suffer would not be of long duration. Nor can it be said that the appearances were only of a spiritual nature, because the Apostles not only saw the body of the Lord, but also they touched it. In answer to the charge that the disciples' belief in the resurrection originated from the idea of an immortal Christ, we reply that from the very beginning both Peter in the Acts of the Apostles and Paul in his preaching and in his Epistles bear witness to the fact of the resurrection.

132 C The fact of Christ's resurrection is further corroborated by the wonderful change which took place in the Apostles after the resurrection. After this event the Apostles, strengthened by the Holy Spirit, became fearless, daring, constant in soul. Publicly they proclaimed the resurrection in the face of threats, blows, and imprisonment, and in a short time they sealed their belief by shedding their blood.

If the crucified Christ remained in the tomb, then this transformation is unintelligible to everyone. Only the bodily resurrection of Christ can explain it.

Therefore, it is historically<sup>1</sup> obvious that Jesus of Nazareth truly arose from the dead.

<sup>1</sup> In the decree *Lamentabili* these two propositions concerning Christ's resurrection are condemned:

36. The Resurrection of the Saviour is not properly a fact of the historical order. It is a fact of merely the supernatural order, neither demonstrated nor demonstrable, which the Christian conscience gradually derived from other facts.

37. In the beginning faith in the Resurrection of Christ was not so much in the fact itself of the Resurrection as in the immortal life of Christ with God.



## I THE FACTS SET FORTH

136 A *The very rapid spread of Christianity.*

1. *Numbers.* — While the Apostles were still living, there were great numbers of Christians. This fact is obvious from a reading of the *Acts of the Apostles* and of the *Epistles*. After the death of the Apostles, St. Clement, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Junior affirm that the Christians comprise a vast group.

2. *Geographic extension.* — Around the middle of the fourth century Christianity prevailed in Asia Minor, Thrace, Cyprus, and the territory of Edessa. It had spread into Coelestria, Egypt, southern and central Italy, into proconsular Africa and Numidia, into Spain, Greece and southern Gaul.

3. *Social extension.* — It soon spread through all classes of society. In this respect Christianity, unlike Mithraism, was not spread exclusively among soldiers.

From these facts we may infer that through the first three centuries Christianity was diffused very rapidly throughout the entire Roman Empire, in fact even outside the boundaries of the Empire.

137 B *The force of Christianity in restoring morality.*

1. It strengthened *men individually* because it proclaimed religious truth to each man and to all men, even to the uneducated, to the poor and to the slaves. It condemned impurity, drunkenness, and other offenses against nature which philosophers had approved of and tolerated; and in marvellous manner it promoted virtues. (The pagans acknowledged this).

2. It restored the *family* by protecting the children, the wife and the slaves.

a. It maintained the dignity of *wives* because it enjoined the unity and indissolubility of marriage, it praised virginity, and promoted devotion to the Blessed Mother.

b. It preserved the lives of *children* because it forbade and, with the severest penalties, it punished abortion, the exposing, the selling, and the killing of infants.

c. Little by little it moderated the condition of *slaves* because it preached the brotherhood of all men, it regarded all with equal reverence and love, it commended the freeing of a slave as an outstanding work of charity, it ennobled work.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY CORROBORATES CHRIST'S DIVINE AMBASSADORSHIP.

133 The change that Christianity introduced into the world can be accounted for only by divine power; in fact, it is really a *miracle* — a miracle in the intellectual order (the fulfillment of Christ's prophetic declarations and of the prophecies) or a miracle in the moral order, a miracle which was effected in favour of Christ's *divine* ambassadorship.

## ARTICLE I.

THE WONDERFUL PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY<sup>1</sup>

134 Because the rationalists teach that the spread of Christianity was natural, it is proper (for the purpose of drawing up the argument as strongly as possible) to unite two facts, namely, the very rapid *propagation* of Christianity and its *effect* on morality.

The *constancy of the martyrs* (number 144) gives further strength to our argument<sup>2</sup>.

135 *Thesis: In the face of the circumstances then prevailing, the most rapid spread of the Christian religion throughout the world and its force in restoring morality must be recognized as a miracle in the moral order, which proves its divinity.*

First, we shall set forth the facts; then we shall explain them.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 473-507.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to DE FOULPIQUET, *L'objet intégral de l'Apologétique*, p. 121-127.



138 3. *It renewed civil society.*

a. It promoted *liberty* by teaching that all authority comes from God and is to be exercised for the common good of the citizens, not for the usefulness of the ruler.

b. It restored *justice* among men by proclaiming the dignity of every man redeemed by the blood of Christ, a candidate for eternal life. Everywhere it set up charitable institutions for orphans, for abandoned infants, for the sick and the old. (Our adversaries willingly admit all this<sup>1</sup>).

c. It introduced *humane behavior* into the relations among the different peoples: thus the horror of wars was gradually diminished, defenceless people were treated with more kindness, those who caused wars were not put to death when they were defeated; faith in treaties was better preserved, quarrels among nations were oftentimes adjusted according to the judgement of Bishops<sup>2</sup>.

The Christian Religion, therefore, was truly the mistress of life, the destroyer of vice, the fruitful parent of virtue; thus by far it excels other religions<sup>3</sup>.

## II. EXPLANATION OF THE FACTS

139 It can be stated that these facts represent a *miracle in the moral order*, that is, they can be explained only by the extraordinary intervention of God. This statement becomes apparent when we compare the *impediments* which stood in the way of Christianity with the *natural means* Christianity employed.

140 A *The impediments were very great.*

1. They were *from without*:

a. from the *Jews* who clung tenaciously to the rites and ceremonies which Moses had prescribed, and to the traditions which the Pharisees had spread abroad. Another Messiah

<sup>1</sup> Refer to LALLEMAND, *Histoire de la Charité*, vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to E. CHENON, *Le Rôle social de l'Eglise*, Paris, 1921; LALLEMAND, *Histoire de la Charité*, vol. II.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Abbé DE BROGLIE, *Religion et Critique*, p. 131-139.

they hoped for, and this Jesus Whom they had crucified they would not adore;

b. 1. from the *Gentiles*, some of whom were indifferent to religion, and others of whom, deceived by the many prejudices that were spread among the people, or led on by pride and ambition and by political motives, opposed and obstructed Christianity in every possible manner.

2. *The impediments were from within:*

a. on the side of *doctrine* which contained mysteries that could not be proved by reason but that had to be accepted by faith alone.

b. on the side of *ethics* which, although pleasing to the pure of heart, was very odious to a corrupt society.

Anyone who is acquainted with the difficulties which today, after centuries, oftentimes hold back the conversion of our contemporaries and sometimes, in fact, make their conversion impossible will be able to understand how great these impediments or obstacles were.

141 B *The natural means employed were of themselves unequal to producing this effect.*

The first preachers of the Gospel were *few*, in general were *Jews*, unlettered, poor, ignorant of philosophy and of the art of argumentation. They used no *violence* or *force of arms*; since each one became a Christian only willingly; violence was rather the method used to deter souls from Christianity. Nor did they employ the allurements of *pleasure* since the new religion openly waged war on all vice. Finally, they did not depend on eloquence — the Apostles relied on no persuasive words of human wisdom.

142 **Conclusion.** By themselves the natural means employed cannot explain the very rapid spread of the Gospel among the Romans and the barbarians, among all classes of society. Even if the previously mentioned obstacles were not present, there still would be no natural explanation for the expansion.



This fact is all the more unexplainable when we consider the marvellous transformation that swept over the world. Such a change implies a mentality converted and a will strengthened to so great a degree that ancient vices are eradicated and virtues, loftier than most of the pagan world even knew, flourish. Only God's preternatural intervention could bring about such an effect.

To put the argument more briefly :

If the wonderful spread and tremendous force of the Christian Religion can be explained only through the extraordinary intervention of Providence, then we must believe that it is true and all should embrace it<sup>1</sup>. For God cannot deliberately propagate error in any matter, religious or otherwise.

But it is obvious that the amazing spread and force of the Christian religion can be explained only through the extraordinary intervention of Providence. Therefore.

**143** The *assertion* that other religions have been auspiciously propagated is not a valid or meritorious one for this reason : the fact that many people accept a certain doctrine is not miraculous; but what is miraculous is this : a religion which is full of mysteries and which is opposed to pleasure spreads very quickly without human assistance and produces an abundant field of virtues in a society that has been given over to vices. Such an accomplishment can be found only in the history of Christianity.

#### ARTICLE II. THE CONSTANCY OF THE MARTYRS<sup>1</sup>

**144** *Etymologically* the word *martyr* means a witness; *quoad rem* or in this case it signifies a disciple of Christ who patiently and heroically suffers death for affirming and maintaining the Christian Religion.

<sup>1</sup> This nexus between a miracle and the Christian religion is evident from the very purpose of divine intervention.  
<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 508-517.

**145** *Thesis* : All things considered, the heroic constancy of the martyrs is a miracle of the moral order ; it proves the divine ambassadorship of Christ for whom the martyrs gave up their lives<sup>1</sup>.

#### 1° What are the facts?

It is evident from the written testimony of the Fathers and of the pagans, also from many other documents, that there were *very many* martyrs. Even the rationalists of today acknowledge this.

In the Roman Empire and in the kingdom of Persia many thousands suffered death for Christ. Later among the Mohammedans, more recently among the Japanese and the Chinese, in our days among the natives of Africa, many have endured great torments.

Actually never in the history of the Church has the testimony of blood been wanting. These martyrs were men and women, boys and girls, of all ranks, of every state in life. The most intense physical and moral torments they endured so meekly, bravely, and constantly, in fact, so eagerly for the sake of Christ that they offered at all times a splendid example of heroic patience.

**146** 2° All things duly considered, this constancy is a miracle in the moral order.

a. In the moral order that is a miracle which cannot be explained by means of the natural powers of the human will. But the constancy of the Martyrs, all things considered, cannot be explained solely by means of the natural forces of the will ; for while *certain* men at any time can be heroes, an *immense crowd* of all ages, of all conditions, of both sexes, cannot be heroes. It is the lot of few naturally to accomplish heroic acts, especially when there is no human motive, no hope of praise, no blind wilfulness, no wild enthusiasm leading them on and aiding them.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to P. ALLARD, *Dix leçons sur le Martyre* ; D. LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*.



147 b. *The following facts confirm this argument.*

1. The martyrs believed that they were being helped by divine aid, and that they could overcome these torments only by means of the grace of the Omnipotent God.
2. This divine aid was made manifest in many miracles which strengthened the martyrs' spirit and which sometimes converted the persecutors.
3. The blood of Martyrs was the seed of Christians. Viewed naturally, Christianity should have been diminished or been destroyed by so many and such great persecutions; it should not have increased.

The Martyrs, therefore, were strengthened by God so that they might not deny the faith. Thus we should exclaim: *The Finger of God is Here!* Since God, then, by this moral miracle has confirmed the faith of the Martyrs in Christ's divine ambassadorship, this faith cannot be false.

148 *Scholion.* Some apologists present the argument differently: they proceed from the *testimony* of the martyrs concerning the miracles of Christ, of the Apostles and of the Christians<sup>1</sup>.

- a. The force of this argument depends on miracles that were performed previously, not on the martyrs who only bear witness to facts which were already known in another way;
- b. It is not established that the Martyrs are witnesses to the facts; many think (this opinion seems sounder) that the Martyrs are *witnesses to doctrine*, and that therefore their constancy demonstrates their unconquered persuasion and belief, but that it does not prove the truth of the Christian religion.

149. The opposition states that other religions have their martyrs. We answer that martyrdom can prove the divinity of a religion only if martyrdom occurs under circumstances which are bound up inseparably with the truth of this religion. At the same time the martyrdom must not be ascribed to human forces, even though they have reached a point of the most intense zeal, but it must be ascribed to divine power. In the light of this principle, the claims alleged by opponents appear and are feebly futile.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to P. ALLARD, *Dix leçons sur le Martyre*, p. 309; RIVIÈRE, *Autour de la question du Martyre*, in R. P. A., IV, p. 625-643.

## CHRIST'S DIVINE AMBASSADORSHIP IS MORE FIRMLY ESTABLISHED BY DRAWING A COMPARISON BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS<sup>1</sup>.

150 Since we have proved the divinity of the Christian Religion by means of *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* arguments, it is necessary to do nothing more than confirm our argument by making a comparison with other religions.

There are two religions in particular which some put on a basis of equality with Christianity or set before Christianity, namely *Buddhism* and *Islamism*. We shall enlarge somewhat on these two.

### I. *Buddhism*<sup>2</sup>

151 *Buddhism* flourished in India during the sixth century before Christ and even now it thrives in the island of Ceylon, in Siam, among the Chinese people, in Tibet, and in Japan. It has a great following — between 220,000,000 and 400,000,000.

#### 1. History of Buddhism.

It is difficult to learn much about the life of its founder. It appears that Siddharta, of the Gautama family and of royal

<sup>1</sup> Refer to ABBÉ DE BROGLIE, *Problèmes et conclusions de l'Histoire des Religions*.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to HUBY, *Christ*, p. 138, 258; BRICOURT, *Où en est l'Histoire des Religions*, I, p. 267; DE LA VALLÉE-POUSSEN, *Bouddhisme; Major Synopsis*, n. 519-530.



race, later called Buddha or the wise one, was born approximately in the year 557 before Christ. He abandoned his country, his home, his wife and children in order to pursue wisdom among the Brahmins. Afterwards he withdrew into solitude where through constant meditation he discovered a way of salvation. This doctrine he preached and an order of monks he instituted who, following in his foot-steps, preached and taught with him.

### 152 2. Its Doctrine.

**A** Buddhism teaches nothing about God; all beings are essentially equal; *all things are changing constantly*, except the Law alone by force of which good actions produce a reward, and bad actions bring forth punishment; therefore man does not differ essentially from other beings; he is subjected to a *metempsychosis* until he acquires perfection in *nirvana*.

**B** The highest perfection is the *extinction of any desire whatsoever* in the soul. This is attained by meditation and by a confession of faults. Siddharta recommended a *universal sympathy* and ordered his followers to give alms to the religious. To the faithful lying, drunkenness, murder and adultery are forbidden; for the religious celibacy and poverty are prescribed.

Today there are many sects among the Buddhists. While there is no atheism among the people, nevertheless, there is polytheism with many idols and many obscenities.

### 153 3. Criticism of Buddhism.

If at first consideration there seem to be certain similarities between Buddhism and Christianity, the likeness rests in certain rites or practices, but not in the doctrines which are worlds apart: Christianity leads to a perfect life, Buddhism leads to annihilation.

These likenesses are easily explained (without suggesting that one religion is influencing the other) from the common aspirations which flourish among men and which all religions strive to satisfy.

154 But there are so many dissimilarities between Buddhism and Christianity that the two religions cannot be compared or put on an equality.

**A** Christ performed miracles in order to prove the divinity of His teaching; these miracles are lacking in Buddhism. Even if miracles were present, they would not establish the divinity of Siddharta's mission because he said nothing about God.

**B** The excellence of Christian doctrine is an argument in favor of its divine origin: the dogma of Buddhism, however, is greatly defective and incomplete (refer to above notes); its ethics, while superior to its dogma, nevertheless inclines one to pride and to love of oneself.

**C** The spread of Christianity is a miracle in the moral order; but the spread of Buddhism is not — its propagation is adequately accounted for by the qualities and defects of this religion.

Thus it is evident that Buddhism is the result of human invention or ingenuity; that it is entirely inferior to Christianity.

## II. Islamism<sup>1</sup>

155 Islamism had its birth in Arabia during the seventh century after Christ; it spread into Asia, Africa and part of Europe.

### I. Its History.

Mohamed, born about the year 570, tended his flocks, and later worked as a tradesman. He said that the angel Gabriel appeared to him; then he began to preach a new doctrine. In the year 622 he migrated from Mecca to Medina. Later, this day on which he escaped became the beginning of the Mohammedan era. By force of arms he imposed his religion on many. He died on June 8, 632.

<sup>1</sup> Huys, *Christus*, p. 541; Brécourt, *Où en est l'Histoire des Religions*, I, p. 424; Carra De Vaux, *Le Mahométisme*; *Major Synopsis*, n. 531-540.



### 2. Its Doctrine.

Six special dogmas Mohammed proclaimed :

- 1) the existence of God, with the trinity of persons excluded;
- 2) the existence of angels;
- 3) the divine mission of the prophets (he is the greatest of the prophets);
- 4) the revelation of a sacred book called the Koran;
- 5) the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body;
- 6) fatalism.

Gambling, wine, the flesh of swine, and images were forbidden; prayers, ablutions, fasts, pious pilgrimages, alms, and circumcision were obligatory; above all the holy war was recommended. Polygamy and divorce are allowed; also the slavery of the infidels.

### 157 3. Criticism of Islamism.

**A** Islamism contains many truths. This fact is easily explained: They were borrowed from Judaism and Christianity. However, Islamism cannot be considered as a renewal of an ancient revelation and of Christianity since dogmas which are essential to Christ's religion Mohammed denied.

**B** Besides, absolutely nothing proves that Mohammed was sent by God to restore the true religion :

- a. He asserted his mission, but his testimony is not worthy of belief since he confirmed it with no miracle;
- b. His affirmation is false, for God cannot allow wanton and inordinate passion;
- c. The spread of Mohammedanism was accomplished by force of arms;

d. The effects of this religion must be attributed to fragments of truths (to monotheism especially) which Mohammedanism preserved.

Finally, Mohammedanism is a human accomplishment, Christianity greatly transcends it.

### 159 Conclusion.

From this comparison of Christianity with other religions it follows that *only Christianity is supreme*<sup>1</sup>. Thus it may be inferred very probably that Christianity is divine, for without the special intervention of Providence this transcendence cannot be accounted for. This conclusion becomes certain when the historical argument (previously explained) is added. From the latter we deduce that Christ's testimony concerning His religious and doctrinal mission, corroborated by His sanctity and His many miracles, is completely worthy of belief.

### CONCLUSION OF THIS TRACT

All should accept the Christian Religion

160 We have proved :

1. everyone should reverence some religion;
2. some revelation is morally necessary for the human race;
3. Christianity is today the only revealed religion;

<sup>1</sup> Abaé De Broglie very learnedly develops this argument in *Problèmes et conclusions de l'Histoire des Religions*; chap. VIII, IX, X and XI should be read in their entirety. From them it becomes evident that Catholics do not fear that a history of Religions become common knowledge; but on the contrary, that they expect much from a comparison between Christianity and other Religions. No other religion can be found which shows so many obvious signs of divine intervention: in its Founder; in its institution, spread and preservation; in its moral force; in its preparation. Therefore not only does the Catholic religion surpass all others, but also, considered by itself, it is so transcendent that all should regard it as *the work of God*.



Therefore upon everyone there is the obligation of embracing the Christian faith.

161 This conclusion can be proved directly from the words of Christ and of the Apostles :

a. "He that believeth in him is not judged; but he that doth not believe is already judged, because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten Son of God" <sup>1</sup>;

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned" <sup>2</sup>.

b. Likewise spoke Peter :

"Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" <sup>3</sup>.

And Paul :

"Man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ" <sup>4</sup>.

Thus God has openly promulgated this obligation.

We have, then, an answer to the question which we set up for a solution in the beginning of this Tract : *is man bound to embrace a religion, and, if so, what religion must he accept?*

The answer — *all must profess the Christian religion.*

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, III, 18.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Mark, XVI, 16.

<sup>3</sup> Acts of the Apostles, IV, 12.

<sup>4</sup> Epistle to the Galatians, II, 16.

### TRACT III

## THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

162 As a matter of fact there are many societies today that glory in the name of Christian : and yet they are entirely different, one from the other. Thus, the *Protestants* deny that Christ established a supreme and infallible authority which preserves revelation safely and propagates it. The *Greek schismatics* admit an infallible authority which they place in the corporate body of Bishops acting together. The *Catholics* maintain that the supreme authority belongs to the corporate body of Bishops, but also that it rests in the Head of this body, the Roman Pontiff, who carries on the offices of Christ on earth.

We ask consequently : *which of these three concepts is true, or which is in accord with the mind of God? Which is true Christianity?*

### INTRODUCTORY <sup>1</sup>

#### 163 I. Meaning of the word, "Church".

A According to the name :

1) *In the Greek version of the Old Testament* church means either the act of congregating, or the group congregated, or the place where the congregation comes together.

2) *In the documents of the New Testament* church signifies either a group of Christ's faithful or all the faithful of one

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 542-548.



place, or the universal society of the faithful; sometimes it refers to the Church (learning), being taught, or the Church teaching, etc.

**B** *Actually* the Church is the gathering of Christian pilgrims or travellers united because they profess the same Christian faith and participate in the same sacraments under the rule of the Roman Pontiff.

#### 164 2. Division of this Tract.

In order to prove by rational and historical arguments that Christ founded the Catholic Church only, we shall establish three points :

**A** Once we posit the fact of revelation, then the institution of some living and infallible magisterium must be expected *a priori*;

**B** It is *historically* true that Christ founded a Church with a living and infallible magisterium in the College of the Apostles under the authority of the Roman Pontiff;

**C** The divine institution of the Catholic Church is demonstrated by special signs or marks<sup>1</sup>.

#### 165 3. The nature of the arguments to be employed at this point.

We shall make use of :

**A** *The testimony in the books of the New Testament*, especially the words and doings of Christ and of the Apostles. It should be noted that a scientific and complete portrayal of the Church should not be looked for in Scripture, but only its essential nature or constitution;

<sup>1</sup> We use this order because it is better suited to the present and general state of the discussion. However, because the arguments of apologetics must be adapted to various minds, Apologists may invert the order in accordance with the psychological dispositions of the hearers or readers.

**B** *the oral apostolic traditions*, received from the Lord, which preserve the teachings that He handed over;

**C** *natural reason*, which points out those things that are better adapted to attaining the purpose which God intended when He instituted the ecclesiastical society.

#### PREFATORY NOTES ABOUT VARIOUS CHRISTIAN CHURCHES<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the Roman Church there are many non-Catholic societies in which the idea of the Church is understood differently.

##### 1° THE GREEK CHURCHES SEPARATED FROM THE SEE OF ROME

The Greeks, who call themselves Orthodox, teach that the visible Church was set up by Christ, and that this Church was endowed with the privilege of teaching and of proposing laws infallibly; and that this privilege rests in the *corporate body of Bishops*. They contend that the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is not a matter of divine law, but only of church law, granted at first to Roman Pontiffs because of the greatness and dignity of the city of Rome. Further, they maintain that this primacy was later deservedly transferred to the Archbishops of Constantinople, at least in reference to the Eastern Churches. They acknowledge the authority of the first seven Ecumenical Councils. Therefore, they hold that the Church is an *aristocratic* society, ruled by a college of Bishops.

##### 2° THE VARIOUS PROTESTANT SECTS

167 All of these reject the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and acknowledge only one rule of faith, namely, Sacred Scripture.

The *Lutherans* say that while the true Church of Christ is invisible, the faithful on earth are, nevertheless, united by the bonds of baptism, of the Lord's Supper, and of the preaching of the

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 549-571.



Gospel. But because this society was not set up by Christ as a visible society, many have recourse to *Cæsarism*, acknowledging the authority of the State over the Church.

The *Calvinists* admit a visible Church in which the administration of the church rests with the presbyters delegated by the people and equal to bishops by divine right. This system is called *Presbyterianism*.

Many of the *Anglicans* grant a visible society instituted by Christ and governed by bishops. Thus their name — *Episcopalian*.

Finally, very many groups hold that Churches exist of their own right and enjoy the power of constituting laws for themselves and of appointing ministers according to their own wishes. This is the error of the *Multitudinists*.

### 3° THE LIBERALS AND MODERNISTS

#### 168 A Liberal Protestants

1. These deny that Christ established a Church as a society since he believed that the kingdom of heaven, together with the end of the world, would soon come;

2. They explain the formation of the Church by means of a natural process: at first the faithful were equal; then they chose *elders* who presided over their religious meetings. In the face of serious opposition from the *Montanists*, the power of the Bishops, who presided over the Churches, gradually increased until soon they were regarded as the successors of the Apostles. By the time that *Gnosticism* arose, a rule of faith was established, namely, a tradition reaching from the Apostles to our times, through the succession of Bishops. Afterwards, the authority of the Roman Pontiff became powerful and finally reached a point of being entirely supreme. But since this ecclesiastical power of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Bishops is only human, and oftentimes is tyrannous, everyone enjoys the right of approaching God directly and of entering into a very close union with Him.

B Insisting on this same evolution in the setting up of the Church, the *Modernists* think that private judgment of conscience should be placed before the Church's authority; but they reject a religious individualism and hold the Church is necessary for preserving and spreading the true faith, and that obedience must be given to it as to social authority.

### CHAPTER I

## REASON SPEAKS IN FAVOR OF THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH

169 **State of the Question.** The most important question is this: *did Christ establish a living and infallible teaching office for the purpose of protecting and propagating His teaching?* This subject must be considered *historically*. However an *a priori* argument, by way of introduction, can prepare our minds to realize the force of the historical proof.

Among the Protestant :

1. Some called *Liberals*, repudiate any kind of authority, even the authority of Scripture, and advocate a religion of the spirit;

2. Other maintain that there is an authority, not indeed a *living* one, but a written authority, namely Sacred Scripture, which is to be interpreted through private examination and consideration.

Our purpose now is to prove the following two statements :

1. A certain *infallible authority* is necessary;  
2. Scripture is insufficient; rather, a *living* and *infallible* magisterium is desirable.

I. THE MORAL NECESSITY OF SOME AUTHORITY WHICH IS DISTINCT FROM CONSCIENCE AND WHICH IS INFALLIBLE IS STRONGLY RECOMMENDED<sup>1</sup>.

170 In this matter *authority* is called a *rule of faith*, or a *pattern through which those things are known which must be believed*

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 573-581.



and performed in order to attain to eternal life; infallible, that is, we can place complete confidence in this authority<sup>1</sup>.

**Thesis :** If this matter is regarded *a priori*, then it is entirely probable that Christ established an infallible authority to set forth, to preserve, and to spread His teaching.

I. Proof of the statement concerning the necessity of some authority :

a. *From the social nature of religion :*

Just as a society contributes very great strength to men in political, industrial, and scientific affairs, so too in the matter of religion; in fact, religion is more easily preserved, more quickly propagated and more fortunately protected from enemies in a society. For this reason many religions have assumed a social character or aspect. The history of religions attests to the truth of this statement.

But a religious society, like every other society, cannot continue without supreme authority.

Therefore, it is exceedingly probable that Christ established the Church endowed with social authority.

171 b. *From the nature of Christian revelation :*

The Christian Religion, divinely revealed, (Refer to preceding tract) embraces dogmas, precepts, and rites which cannot be preserved entire and uncorrupt without authority. Dogmas are intellectually difficult and full of mysteries and therefore easily changed; precepts are irksome and opposed to all the vices, and accordingly are subject to a milder interpretation; rites very easily decline into various superstitions; these are facts needing no proof. Therefore, it is most probable that Christ bequeathed real authority to His Church.

c. *From the history of religions :*

Religions cannot for any length of time avoid errors unless there is some authority to help them. When all authority

<sup>1</sup> *Infallibility* is not here understood in a strictly theological sense.

has been rejected, they fall into errors and into great dissensions. Therefore, in all likelihood, Christ gave doctrinal authority to His Church.

d. *From the testimony of conscience :*

In things pertaining to religion conscience very strongly feels the need of some authority.

172 2. *Proof of the statement about the necessity of an infallible authority.*

a. *from the necessity of certitude* which is required especially in matters that pertain to eternal salvation;

b. *from the nature of divine revelation* which cannot teach error;

c. *from the nature of religious authority* which would be only a human teacher if it were capable of making a mistake.

Therefore, in all likelihood, it should be stated *a priori* that Christ, Who was endowed with extraordinary genius, foresaw that an infallible authority would be necessary and so instituted such an authority. Through this His religion would be preserved and propagated.

II. THE MORAL NECESSITY OF A LIVING AND INFALLIBLE MAGISTERIUM OR DIRECTING OFFICE IS STRONGLY RECOMMENDED<sup>1</sup>.

173 **State of the Question.** The need of some infallible authority in the religion which Christ established has been asserted. Now this question follows : *What is this authority?* is it an inspired book only? or is it a living and infallible magisterium?

Nearly all Protestants teach that *Scripture is the only rule of faith*. If difficulties arise, many Lutherans and Calvinists hold that they must be solved by private consideration;

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 582-597.



mystical sects rely on private inspiration; the Anglicans find the solution in history and human tradition.

The Catholics admit a two fold rule of faith, a remote rule and a proximate rule. The *remote* rule is the word of God, written or handed down by tradition. The *proximate* rule is the living and infallible magisterium of the Church, which magisterium sets forth the word of God in an authoritative and trustworthy manner.

**174 Thesis :** *If this subject is viewed a priori, it is very probable that Christ established a living and infallible magisterium, through which His teaching would be set forth, preserved, and propagated.*

We prove this statement by examining the *qualities* or *properties of a rule of faith*. The rule of faith necessary for preserving and spreading revealed teaching must be :

- a. *secure and complete,*
- b. *attainable by everyone,*
- c. *appropriate for settling disputes.*

Otherwise it would be impossible for many to know from it what must be believed and practised for salvation.

But the Protestant rule of faith, that is, the Sacred Scriptures without a living magisterium, does not possess these qualities; on the other hand, the Catholic rule of faith, the living and infallible magisterium of the Church, does enjoy such properties.

Therefore.

**175 Proof of the first part of the minor premise.**

The Protestant rule of faith

- a. *is not safe and complete* since it does not offer a certain criterion by which the inspired books may be distinguished, nor can it prove that all the revealed truths are contained in Scripture;

- b. *it is not attainable by all*, for all Christians in all times could not lay hold of the Sacred Scriptures; nor could they understand that from them they were to produce for themselves a creed of faith. We realize this when we consider the innumerable difficulties which arise from the peculiarities of the languages in which these books are written, from the errors of the translations, from the manner in which the teaching is examined, from the obscurity of the prophecies, from the profundity of the dogmas, from the numerous senses which are made use of in the Scriptures, etc.;

- c. *it is not adequate for settling disputes*, because even if there were such a thing as private inspiration, it could not authentically be discerned; further, more often than not, no certitude about the true meaning of a text can be obtained from private examination. All this becomes apparent when we think of the multiplicity of Protestant sects.

**176 Proof of the second part of the minor premise.**

- a. On the other hand, the living and infallible magisterium of the Church is a *secure and complete rule*, because it faithfully explains all the revealed truths contained in Scripture and in Tradition;

- b. *It is a rule of faith which is attainable by all*, because it offers the word of God to all and explains it to all;

- c. *It is a rule which is capable of settling disputes*, because the teachers or directors are living who, by spoken and written word, are able to make known their thoughts and intentions and to explain the real meaning of dogma.

**177**

### Conclusion

In all likelihood, therefore, we should believe that Christ, who wanted His Gospel preached to every creature, chose as a religious authority a living and infallible magisterium. The historical proof of this follows.



to persevere and to last until the end of the world. This thesis is historically certain; it is theologically de fide.

We prove the thesis :

1. by explaining Christ's preaching on the Kingdom of God and by showing that this preaching prepared the way for the institution of the Church;
2. by demonstrating that Christ wished to unite within the Church the disciples of the Kingdom of God.

180 1. In preaching the coming of the Kingdom of God Christ prepared the way for the establishing of the Church.

The prophets had announced the messianic kingdom, national, and at the same time universal, spiritual and eschatological; in the time of Christ, the Jews were awaiting a particular type of kingdom which was temporal and national.

From the very beginning of His preaching Jesus announced the kingdom of God. What is that kingdom of God? As to what it is the Liberals and the Catholics are in disagreement.

With Loisy some think that the kingdom of God which Christ proclaimed is only *eschatological*, and that the many words which Christ uttered about the eternal life of the just in heaven are to be thus understood. But others, with Harnack and Sabatier, teach that the kingdom of God is *internal*, for Christ disclosed the dispositions of soul necessary for entering into this kingdom, namely, penitence, faith, etc.

181 However, the kingdom of God is not only of the future : it has arrived already, already it is present at the time of Christ : nor is it *internal only*, abiding in the faithful soul, but it is *external and social*, as is evident from the parables in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, chapter XIII.

If we bring together and consider all the Gospel texts concerning the kingdom of God, we can distinguish three periods or stages so to speak : there is the ultimate and perfect

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XI, 12-15; XII, 28; Gospel according to St. Luke, XVI, 16; XVII, 20, 21.

## CHAPTER II

# THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF CHURCH PROVED FROM HISTORY

178 In a three-fold division we shall explain the official Catholic teaching concerning the institution of the Church by Christ — Christ founded the Church :

1. in the manner of a *society properly called* ;
2. in it He set up *Bishops with the power of teaching and of ruling* ;
3. He conferred the primacy of jurisdiction on the *Roman Pontiffs* in this Church.

To put it more briefly — Christ founded the Church as a society properly called, hierarchical and monarchical.

## ARTICLE I

### CHRIST ESTABLISHED THE CHURCH AS A SOCIETY PROPERLY CALLED <sup>1</sup>

179 **State of the Question.** According to liberal Protestants and Modernists Christ thought of His kingdom as an eschatological one; according to many orthodox Protestants He did not institute the Church as a visible society. In opposition to these we assert the following thesis :

**Thesis :** *Without intermediary and with determined deliberation Christ established the Church as a visible society, one that was*

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 599-622.



period which is the *eschatological* kingdom; but this must be prepared for by the *internal* reign or kingdom of God in each one's soul; and this internal kingdom must be proclaimed and extended by a *social* and *external* kingdom already existing in the time of Christ.

By preaching the kingdom of God Jesus prepared the way for the institution of the Church; for:

- a. He ordained the *end* of the Church, or the glory of God which is to be obtained in the eternal kingdom of heaven; its beginning is the kingdom of divine grace in the just.
- b. also, he arranged the *means* which He Himself chose for this end, namely, a society which is visible, external, spiritual, progressive, universal — the Church.

182 2. *Christ united the disciples who were devoted to the preaching of the Kingdom of God into a true society which He called the Church.*

In the days of the Apostles those believing in the Kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus formed a *true society*. This group on Pentecost had their own doctrine, their own rites, their own leaders; they were not dependent on the Synagogue. Approximately 20 to 30 years later, spread throughout the world, this group exists as a visible united society, which would endure unto the end of the world, a society which had been founded by Christ, which was called the *Church*. Truly, therefore, Christ established the Church as a *society properly called* with a purpose or end, a doctrine, its own rites; and as a society which would continue in existence.

## ARTICLE II

### CHRIST INSTITUTED THE CHURCH AS AN HIERARCHICAL SOCIETY

183 Every society implies or supposes *authority*; this authority comes from God *directly* or *immediately* when prelates receive authority from God or His legate; the authority comes from

God *indirectly* or *mediately* when the leaders or heads hold authority from God with the people acting as intermediary. In the first case (immediate) the society is called *hierarchical*; in the second (mediate) it is called *democratic*.

We purpose to prove that Christ established a true hierarchy in His Church, namely the *Apostles* and their successors, *Bishops*; and that He bestowed on the company (college) of Apostles and of Bishops *infallibility* in teaching.

## I. THE INSTITUTION OF THE APOSTLES<sup>1</sup>

184 *Thesis: Christ established the Church as an hierarchical society by bestowing on the Apostles the threefold power of teaching, of ruling and of sanctifying the faithful.*

This thesis is historically certain, it is theologically de fide.

### 185 Proof of the Thesis

#### I. Proof from the Gospels.

Not only did Christ announce a social and external kingdom, but also He very explicitly marked out and settled the essential elements of this kingdom when He trained the Apostles and sent them out into the world.

A Christ chose twelve Apostles whom He called expressly and individually by name; He *trained* them by the example of His own life which they observed day by day, and by the many explanations with which He set forth the parables about the kingdom of God; He *sent* them forth to preach the kingdom of God to the children of Israel. Do not all these facts intimate that Jesus was in this way preparing preachers of the Gospel?

B Very explicitly He made known His mind by *promising* them the power of teaching, or ruling, and of sanctifying the faithful in His kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 624-636.



- 1) He gave assurance to *Peter* :
- a. that he would be the foundation of His Church;
  - b. that he held in his hand the keys of the kingdom;
  - c. that he had the right of imposing or of removing various obligations in the spiritual order<sup>1</sup>.
- 2) He promised to the twelve *Apostles* :
- a. the power of binding and of loosing, that is, the power of ruling the Church<sup>2</sup>;
  - b. the special assistance of the Holy Spirit in preaching the Gospel<sup>3</sup>.

C The resurrected Christ gave the power which He had promised to Peter<sup>4</sup>, and to the Apostles<sup>5</sup>. Thus the College of Apostles received from Jesus Christ, who was administering the offices of God, the power and authority to teach the Gospel to all peoples, to impose laws through which the divine law was preserved, and to sanctify souls through the administration of the sacraments.

#### 186 2. *Proof from the early history of the Church.*

From the day of Pentecost the Apostles established the company of Christians as an hierarchical society both in Palestine and in the Gentile nations.

187 A *In Palestine*, especially in *Jerusalem*, the community of the faithful was manifestly an *hierarchical society*, *distinct from the Synagogue*, having *their own special rites*, not just a certain mystical sect of illuminati.

- 1) *Hierarchical*, in as much as this society was ruled by the corporate body of the Apostles, who exercised the three-

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XVI, 18-19; Refer to numbers 207 and ff.  
<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XVIII, 18.  
<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XIV, 16-17, 26; XV, 26-27; XVI, 13.  
<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XXI, 15-18.  
<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XX, 21-33; St. Matthew, XXVIII, 18-20; St. Mark, XVI, 15-16; St. Luke, XXIV, 44-49.

fold power of teaching, of governing, and of sanctifying as a power divinely received, and to which body the faithful made themselves subject<sup>1</sup>.

2) *Distinct from the Synagogue* : although at first the Apostles offered prayers in the Temple<sup>2</sup>, very soon thereafter they openly declared that they were independent of the Jewish authorities<sup>3</sup>; and then they separated themselves entirely from the Jews by admitting into their society uncircumcised Gentiles<sup>4</sup>.

3) *Having their own special rites*, in particular :

- a. *baptism*, distinct from the baptism of John the Baptist<sup>5</sup>; without which no one could enter this new community<sup>6</sup>;
- b. *imposition of hands*, which was conferred by the Apostles alone and through which the Holy Spirit was bestowed in a special manner<sup>7</sup>;
- c. *the breaking of bread*, which obviously was the celebration of the Eucharist, instituted by Christ at the Last Supper<sup>8</sup>.

From these facts we infer that the community at Jerusalem from the time of its very beginning was truly an hierarchical and an independent society.

#### 188 B *Among the Gentiles.*

After the conversion of Cornelius, the centurion, the Gospel was preached far and wide outside Palestine; among the Gentiles Christian communities were set up which were in turn subject to a *holy hierarchy* and which formed *one body* under the Apostles :

<sup>1</sup> Acts of the Apostles, I, 12-26; II, 37-43; IV, 35-37; V, 1-11; 28-41; VIII, 14-20, etc.  
<sup>2</sup> Acts of the Apostles, II, 46; III, 1, 2, 11, etc.  
<sup>3</sup> Acts of the Apostles, IV, 8-20; V, 27-33.  
<sup>4</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XI, 3-33.  
<sup>5</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XI, 16; XIX, 1-5.  
<sup>6</sup> Acts of the Apostles, II, 37-41.  
<sup>7</sup> Acts of the Apostles, II, 33; VIII, 14-17; XIX, 6.  
<sup>8</sup> Acts of the Apostles, II, 42 and 46.



1. *They were subject to a holy hierarchy*, that is, to the Apostles who exercised supreme authority among all the communities of the Gentiles; indeed this authority was viewed as divinely received. The Apostles oftentimes claimed it for themselves in their epistles, in *teaching*<sup>1</sup>, in *judging*<sup>2</sup>, in *correcting*<sup>3</sup>, in *proposing laws or precepts*, not just for the faithful but also for the elders who took care of the faithful. Serving under the Apostles were inferior ministers: deacons, priests or bishops, who in turn took upon themselves some authority in spiritual matters and who thus formed, along with the Apostles, a true hierarchy<sup>4</sup>.

109 2. *They formed one body under the Apostles.*

This body at this time was called the *Church*; its unity St. Paul made clear with various comparisons, likening it:

- a. to a *temple*, the unity of which is visible since its foundation is the Apostles and the Prophets<sup>5</sup>;
- b. to a *body*, in as much as the Church is the body of Christ of which we are the members. But this body is one, not only because there is one Spirit, one God, one faith, but also because there is one baptism<sup>6</sup>, and one magisterium which comes together into the edifice of the one body of Christ. Therefore in the Church unity is visible, and is preserved through the mediating hierarchy of its ministers<sup>7</sup>.

190 From these facts we conclude that Christ Himself established the Church as an *hierarchical society*; for, first of all, immediately after Pentecost the Apostles organized a community of the faithful after the manner of an hierarchical society, distinct

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's First Epistle to Corinthians, II, 1-5; VII.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's First Epistle to Corinthians, V.

<sup>3</sup> St. Paul's First Epistle to Corinthians, VI.

<sup>4</sup> St. Paul's First Epistle to Corinthians, XI, XII, XIV.

<sup>5</sup> First Epistle of St. Peter, II, 9, 12, 25; V.

<sup>6</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to Ephesians, II, 20.

<sup>7</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to Ephesians, VI, 5.

<sup>8</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to Ephesians, IV, 14.

from the Synagogue; and secondly, they acted in this way because of the *authority* which Christ had conferred on them, and for the purpose of *fulfilling the mission* entrusted to them.

## II. THE BISHOPS ARE THE APOSTLES' SUCCESSORS<sup>1</sup>

191 **Thesis:** *By divine right the Apostles' successors are the Bishops collectively taken, as far as the powers to teach, to rule, and to sanctify the faithful are concerned.*

This thesis is historically certain; it is theologically de fide since it has been proposed to faith through the ordinary magisterium of the Church.

The words *by divine right* are used because Jesus wished the office of the Apostles to be a perpetual one in the Church. Therefore, we should not use the term *by ecclesiastical right only* as the Protestants and Modernists do.

We say *Bishops collectively taken*, because only the college of Bishops was made the heir of the Apostolic College.

We shall prove the thesis part by part:

1. The Apostles had to have successors in office;
2. The successors of the Apostles in their three-fold power of teaching, of ruling, and of sanctifying the faithful are the Bishops.

192 1. *The Apostles had to have successors in office* — This is de fide.

A Reason very strongly suggests this point. For Christ committed to His Apostles the office through which the integrity and unity of the faith would be preserved, and through which the faithful would be able to attain their supernatural goal more safely because of protection of the laws.

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 637-663.



But even to the end of the world the integrity and unity of the faith will have to be preserved and the faithful will have to be safely led to their supernatural goal. In almost like manner can we reason in the matter of the *lawgiving and judiciary power and authority*.

Therefore, it is altogether likely that Jesus willed that the Apostles would have successors in their office.

### 193 B *Scripture proves this point.*

According to the *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, Chapter XXVIII, verse 20, even unto the consummation of the world, Jesus will be with the Apostles as they teach, rule, and sanctify the faithful of all nations.

*But* this work the Apostles do not carry on in their own person.

*Therefore*, they will carry it on through successors who will obtain this same office.

### 194 2. *The successors of the Apostles in the three-fold power of teaching, of ruling, and of sanctifying the faithful are the Bishops.* This is *de fide*.

It has already been shown that the Apostles ruled the Church by divine right. Opponents admit that at the end of the second century the episcopacy was in existence with this three-fold power. It remains to be proved that these two extremes join each other: through the Apostolic age, the beginning and the end of the second century.

### 195 A *The Apostolic Age.*

From the *Acts of the Apostles* and the *Epistles* we gather that leaders or directors were chosen by the Apostles at Jerusalem, at Ephesus, in Crete, in order that they might carry on in a stable manner the work of teaching and of ruling. While the Apostles were still living, a *single bishop* was appointed, at least in certain churches. This fact is evident from the pastoral epistles, from the history of St. John in

Asia Minor, from the history of the early Church in Jerusalem. The authority thus granted to priests or to delegates of the Apostle Paul embraces the work of ruling, of teaching and of sanctifying.

### 196 B *The Beginning of the Second Century.*

From the year 70 to the year 110 the number of Bishops who were ruling the Churches monarchially was greatly increased because of necessity. The Apostles, in particular St. John in Asia Minor, appointed them. This hierarchy enjoyed the three-fold power which proceeds from God through Christ and the Apostles.

### 197 C *The Close of the Second Century.*

Throughout the entire Christian world the monarchical episcopacy with its triple authority was very much in evidence. A proof for this statement is the many documents of episcopal rites, the catalogue of Hegesippus, the testimony of St. Irenaeus in respect to all the churches, and, in a special way, to the church of the Romans and of the inhabitants of Smyrna.

Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen tell us the same story about the third century.

### Conclusion

198

From the previous facts we may licitly infer that :

1. the Apostles gave to certain disciples of theirs the *fulness of the priesthood*, and that these governed the churches;
2. that these are the men who in the second century and thereafter were called *Bishops*;
3. that a monarchical episcopacy goes back to the days of the Apostles, and that, therefore, it was intentionally established by Christ, since the Apostles openly declared that they were following out their Master's commands.



Therefore, Bishops, as such, are by divine right the successors of the Apostles in regard to the power of teaching, or ruling, and of sanctifying the faithful<sup>1</sup>.

### III. THE INFALLIBILITY CONFERRED ON THE COLLEGE OF APOSTLES AND OF BISHOPS<sup>2</sup>

199 **Thesis:** *The power of teaching granted to the College of Apostles and of Bishops causes or brings about the privilege of infallibility, so that the Church teaching is infallible in the matter of faith and of morals.* This is historically certain, it is theologically de fide from the ordinary magisterium.

*Infallibility* is a privilege granted by God through which error is always safely avoided in matters of faith and of morals. It arises from the fact that the Holy Spirit is present in a special manner in the Church teaching, preserving it from error. Infallibility differs from inspiration which, in addition to inerrancy, indicates a positive motion to write; Infallibility differs from revelation which supposes the manifestation of a truth formerly unknown. This privilege belongs to the College of Apostles and likewise to the College of Bishops, but not to individual bishops singly.

We shall prove this thesis by means of three arguments; these, if joined together, offer an historical proof which is entirely convincing.

#### 200 1. From the Promises of Christ.

A Christ promised that He would give to the Apostles the Spirit of truth who would remain with them forever, and who would bring to their minds whatever He had said<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Rightfully, therefore, is this proposition of the Modernists condemned in the Decree, *Lamentabili*, 50: "The elders who fulfilled the office of watching over the gatherings of the faithful were instituted by the Apostles as priests or bishops to provide for the necessary ordering of the increasing communities and not properly for the perpetuation of the Apostolic mission and power".  
*D. B.*, 2050.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 664-678.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, XIV, 16-17, 26; XV, 26, 27.

But this promise:

1) was made to the college of Apostles and to their successors;

2) it implies and signifies the special assistance of the Holy Spirit since He is the teacher of truth;

3) and indeed this promise had to be set forth and published in the teaching of Christ.

Therefore Christ truly promised infallibility in the sense previously mentioned.

B Likewise, Christ<sup>1</sup> promised to the College of Apostles:

1) that for all days even unto the end of the world He would remain with them as they taught His doctrine,

2) in order that they might publish it more faithfully.

For this, indeed, is the meaning of the words: *Behold I am with you. Therefore.*

#### 201 2. From the Apostles' manner of speaking and of acting.

A The Apostles understood the promises of Christ thus: they say that the Holy Spirit (with themselves) is a witness of all the things which they preach<sup>2</sup>, together with them settling dogmatic principles and establishing disciplinary decrees<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, they claim and demand full assent<sup>4</sup> and anathemize those teachers, even if they be Angels, who preach a different Gospel.

B In their writings they affirm that the Church is the pillar and foundation of truth<sup>5</sup>; that the doctrine which they teach is a deposit which must be faithfully guarded, and which must not be confused with novelties which are erroneous<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, according to the Apostles the only

<sup>1</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXVIII, 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, V, 32.

<sup>3</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, XV, 28.

<sup>4</sup> *Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, X, 5.

<sup>5</sup> *First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy*, III, 15.

<sup>6</sup> *First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy*, VI, 20-21; Refer to *First Epistle of St. John*, IV, 5-6.



true rule of faith is the doctrine which they deliver in their written or spoken words<sup>1</sup>: this doctrine is the only entire truth, free from any mixture of error, because the Holy Spirit is assisting them as they teach<sup>2</sup>.

### 202 3. *From Christian antiquity.*

When heresies arose, the Fathers who had known the mind of Christ and of the Apostles, did not rely on arguments taken from reason or from Sacred Scripture alone, but they appealed to the authority of Tradition which is manifested through the infallible magisterium of the Bishops.

A St. Ignatius wrote to the Ephesians (*Letters* III, IV, V, VI, XVII), to the Trallians, to the people of Smyrna and of Philadelphia, that the safe rule of faith, from which it was wrong to separate themselves, was the teaching handed down from their Bishops. So, too, Polycarp, Papias, and Hegesippus held that the preaching of the elders, of the Apostles and of the Bishops was the orthodox belief. These testimonies point out directly the Catholic rule of faith; indirectly they prove our thesis concerning the infallibility of Bishops: for without the special assistance of the Holy Spirit the preaching of Bishops could not be safe and always true.

203 B In his *Epistle to Florinus*, and in his work *Adversus Hæreses*, St. Irenæus very plainly taught that the rule of faith is "The Tradition which comes from the Apostles which is guarded in the Churches through the succession of priests, and which reaches us through the succession of Bishops". And then he adds: "Who have received the certain *charism* of truth with the succession of the episcopacy"<sup>3</sup>. In this manner he points out that a special grace is given to the lineage of Bishops by means of which error may be avoided with certainty in handing down Christ's teaching. *Tertullian*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*, II, 14.

<sup>2</sup> This statement refers to matters of *faith* and *morals*, not to ordinary, everyday affairs in which the Apostles could make mistakes without any danger to the faith. Refer to *Acts of the Apostles*, XX, 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Adversus Hæreses*, or *Detection and Overthrow of the False Knowledge*.

<sup>4</sup> *De Prescriptis*, c. 28.

agrees with this, maintaining that the Holy Spirit promised by the Father as the teacher of truth is truly given to the Church.

204 C At the end of the second century, the *Councils of Bishops* came together in opposition to the heretics, and these Councils were regarded as the *authentic organs of truth* by the Fathers themselves and by the faithful.

Therefore our thesis stands, namely: the Corporate Body of Bishops, as the heir and successor to the Apostolic College, enjoys infallibility as long as it is handing down or transmitting the teaching of Christ. Therefore, the *rule of Christian faith* is the living and infallible magisterium of the *Body of Bishops*.

This teaching, which was already an accepted one at the time of the Church's beginning, because it had been explicitly given by Christ Himself, later became more explicit when the conditions for infallibility were defined.

### COROLLARIES

205 A *Cæsarism is to be rejected.*

Christ bestowed the spiritual authority in the Church, not on the secular princes, but on the Body of Bishops. Thus judging from what has been stated previously, we must stand contrary to the Anglicans and the Lutherans.

B Likewise to be rejected are *Multitudinism* and *Presbyterianism*. Here we refute the Calvinists, the Congregationalists, and many Liberals who believe that ecclesiastical authority was conferred on the multitude who are to exercise it through delegates<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that in the episcopal elections held in the early Church the faithful only designated the candidate whom they wished. On this candidate they could confer neither jurisdiction nor consecration.



ARTICLE III. CHRIST ESTABLISHED THE CHURCH  
AS A MONARCHICAL SOCIETY

**206 State of the Question :** We wish to know whether Christ placed a director or a head over the Body of Bishops — or whether Christ established a primate to whom both the faithful and the bishops would be subject; in other words, whether the Church is, by divine right, monarchical. The Protestants and the Greeks answer "No", although not in the same way. The Catholic response is in the affirmative. This doctrine we shall enlarge upon in a threefold thesis :

1. *The Primacy of Peter ;*
2. *Peter's Successors ;*
3. *The Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.*

I. THE PRIMACY OF PETER<sup>1</sup>

**207 Thesis :** *Christ conferred on Blessed Peter directly and immediately a primacy not only of honor but also of jurisdiction — or the authority of teaching, of ruling, and of sanctifying the Universal Church.* This thesis is historically certain; it is de fide from the definition of the *Vatican Council*<sup>2</sup>.

**Proof**

**A From the Preeminence Granted to Peter.**

In the Gospel Peter is shown by the Evangelists as the special companion and friend of Christ, indeed, as the first among them; so, too, Christ prayed especially for him, and when Christ arose from the dead, He appeared to Peter separately.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 686-701.

<sup>2</sup> "If anyone therefore shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant by Christ the Lord or that the same directly and immediately received from the same Our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honor only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction, let him be anathema". (*Vatican Council*, session IV, Canon 1); *D. B.*, 1823.

**B Proof from the Promise of the Primacy<sup>1</sup>.**

The primacy was promised to Peter; for :

1. Jesus was speaking to *Peter alone*, as is evident from the text and from the context. Therefore, the rock upon which Christ will build His Church is nothing other than the Apostle Peter;

2. Peter cannot be the foundation on which the Church is to be made firm and solid unless *he is to be powerful with the supreme authority* of teaching and of ruling in spiritual affairs. The same authority he is promised in the following words: "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven" and: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth...";

3. This supreme jurisdiction which was promised by Christ is *true primacy*: for Christ was addressing Peter only, with the other apostles excluded, and to him alone did He promise that same authority which He would give to the other Apostles when, united to Peter, they form one unit. Today Modernists and Liberals admit this interpretation of this text, but deny its historicity.

St. Luke states that Christ prays for one, Peter, although all are assailed by Satan. But such a prayer is sufficient since Peter, being the head of the Apostles, will strengthen the faith of those who will be found wanting.

**208 C Proof from the Conferring of the Power to Feed the Whole Flock.**

The resurrected Christ bestowed on Peter the supreme power previously promised to him: "Feed my lambs... Feed my sheep". Indeed the words of Christ :

<sup>1</sup> "And I say to thee that thou art Peter (kepha) and upon this rock (lepha) I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven". (*St. Matthew*, XVI, 13-19. Refer to Yves De LA BRIÈRE in *D. A.*, t. III, 1333 and ff.)



1. are directed to *Peter alone* who is called by name "Simon son of John"; from him Christ requires a love that is entirely personal: "Do you love me more than these"?

2. The words of Christ *confer the primacy*, for the word "pascere" (βοσκειν, ποιμαίνει) among both profane and sacred writers, intimates and denotes authority in society. Since this authority is given only to Peter, then Peter holds the true primacy through which he performs the offices of the supreme pastor of Christ's Church.

3. these words of Christ: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep", apply to the *universal Church*, for they refer to all Christ's disciples, no matter what their dignity may be.

209 D Finally this thesis is confirmed by the fact that this authority was exercised.

Peter understood that the true primacy was conferred on him<sup>1</sup>: after Christ's Ascension he exercised in the Church the authority of the Supreme Leader thus: in the election of Matthias<sup>2</sup>, in preaching the Gospel<sup>3</sup>, in the conversion of the Gentiles<sup>4</sup>, in visiting the Churches<sup>5</sup>, in the Council of Jerusalem<sup>6</sup>.

Paul recognized the primacy of Peter. There are instances that prove this point.

1. He named Peter of nobler position<sup>7</sup>;
2. He came to Jerusalem to see Peter<sup>8</sup>. When he stood up to Peter, face to face, he did not deny Peter's authority, but he feared that Peter's example would induce many to observe

<sup>1</sup> Thus in direct opposition to the Modernists: "Simon Peter never even suspected that Christ entrusted the primacy in the Church to him". Proposition 35, Decree *Lamentabili*; D. B., 2055.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, I, 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, II, 14; III, 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, X.

<sup>5</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, IX, 32.

<sup>6</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, XV, 7, 12.

<sup>7</sup> St. Paul, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, I, 12; III, 22.

<sup>8</sup> St. Paul, *Epistle to the Galatians*, II, 18-19.

practices of the law, and that such a way of acting would hold back the Gentiles from the faith<sup>1</sup>.

For the argument from Tradition refer to notes 214 and following.

## II. THE ROMAN PONTIFFS ARE PETER'S SUCCESSORS\*

210 Thesis: *The primacy of jurisdiction over the Universal Church was bestowed by divine right not only on Peter but also on his successors, namely, the Roman Pontiffs.*

This is historically certain, it is theologically de fide from the definition of the *Vatican Council*<sup>2</sup>.

To establish this thesis it is necessary to prove three points:

1. Christ wished the primacy of jurisdiction which had been bestowed on Peter to pass over to his successors;
2. Peter came to Rome and there he firmly established his seat or see or residence;
3. Peter's successors are the Roman Pontiffs and therefore the primacy belongs to them.

### 1° CHRIST WISHED THE PRIMACY TO BE PERPETUAL AND TO PASS OVER TO PETER'S SUCCESSORS

#### 211 A Proof from Scripture.

From the texts quoted above, Peter was constituted the foundation of the Church, he received the keys of the kingdom and the power of binding and of loosing, the authority to feed the entire flock.

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul, *Epistle to the Galatians*, II.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 702-741.

<sup>3</sup> "If any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by the divine right, that Blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the Primacy over the Universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter in this primacy, let him be anathema". (Session IV, can. 2; D. B., 1825).



*But* the Church, which Christ wishes to remain until the end of the world, cannot remain standing without a foundation; it cannot open heaven to the faithful without the keys; it cannot direct souls by means of suitable laws without the authority to govern. *Therefore.*

#### B *Proof from History.*

Refer to note 214 and following, where texts are explained.

#### C *Proof from Reason.*

A safe and permanent authority is useful if the Church is to be able to direct the faithful to their supernatural goal.

*But* this authority will more successfully gain its goal if it is held by one person rather than by a group. *Therefore.*

#### 2° PETER CAME TO ROME, AND AT ROME HE ESTABLISHED HIS DEFINITIVE SEAT OR SEE

212 Catholics are not in agreement on the subject of the *duration* of Peter's Roman episcopate; however, all realize that what really concerns us is the *fact itself*.

Peter's Roman episcopate is clearly proved :

**A** from the *Fathers* — Caius, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Irenaeus, Dionysius of Corinth are well worth citing in this matter. Also, St. Ignatius and Pope St. Clement very plainly establish the fact that Peter and Paul came to Rome;

**B** from *memorials* through which the remembrance of Peter at Rome has endured.

**C** from the *general agreement of all the oriental churches* that none of them enjoys the glory of possessing Peter's tomb. All the churches in their liturgies solemnize Peter's episcopate and his martyrdom suffered at Rome;

**D** from the *lists of the Roman Bishops*, all of which go back as far as St. Peter, and from which it is apparent that the Roman Church immediately after St. Peter was ruled by a monarchical bishop. St. Irenaeus, Eusebius, and St. Epiphanius make reference to these lists.

Therefore, the Roman episcopate of Peter, attested to by many witnesses and denied by no ancient author, is historically a fact.

#### 3° THE ROMAN PONTIFFS ARE BY DIVINE RIGHT PETER'S SUCCESSORS IN THE PRIMACY

213 Even if Peter had not been the bishop of the city of Rome, (from what has been stated ostensibly this supposition is false) nevertheless, the fact remains that *the Roman Pontiffs are Peter's successors in the primacy; further, they are thus by divine right.*

Our thesis will be established if we prove that the universal Church admitted the primacy of the Roman Pontiff as the primacy of Blessed Peter's successor; (for already we have shown that the Corporate Body of Bishops is infallible in passing down Christ's teaching.) This primacy is manifest from the testimonies which declare and affirm the primacy at first implicitly and obscurely but truly, afterwards, however, very clearly.

214 **A** *In the first three centuries the preeminence of the Roman Church is acknowledged in words and in deeds.*

1. At the end of the first century (93-97) the *Roman Church* thought that the right and duty rested on them to recall the Corinthians to peace; at this time the Apostle John was still living. The letter from the Roman Church, far from being rejected, was reverently received and was read during divine services for many years. The letter was written by Clement, the Bishop of Rome, who gave instructions and orders as one having authority. At the same time he declared that Christ was speaking through his mouth, and that those who did not obey were guilty of a serious failing.

2. At the beginning of the second century Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch (107) wrote to the Romans, "to the Church which presides over the territory of the Romans, worthily holy, and directing the company of love".

3. During the second century many came to Rome in order to visit the Bishop and to make inquiries in matters of faith and of discipline : for example, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna,



Abercius, Bishop of Hierapolis; so too some heretics like Marcion and the Montanists.

215 4. *From the end of the second century* we possess the distinguished testimony of *St. Irenaeus*. He said that truth is found in the churches which were founded by the Apostles and which faithfully preserve tradition through the succession of Bishops. But since it would take a long time to discover the traditions of all the churches, it will be sufficient to have knowledge of those which are accepted in the Roman Church; for this Church is the rule of faith with which all other churches must be in accord because of the spiritual preeminence it holds from the Apostle Peter who founded it: "It is necessary that every church be in harmony with this Church because of its preeminence; that is, it is necessary for those who are the faithful wherever they may be; in this Church the tradition which is the tradition handed down from the Apostles has always been preserved by those who are from all parts...<sup>1</sup>".

216 In the *Controversy concerning Easter*.

Victor I (189-198) commanded the Eastern Bishops to hold synods in order to come to a decision in regard to the day of Easter. Certain bishops of Asia very determinedly held on to their own custom, even after the Roman practice had become widespread. These Victor threatened with excommunication; however, he changed his mind and his orders at the intercession of St. Irenaeus. Nevertheless, very soon the Roman custom prevailed even in Asia Minor.

217 5 In the *third century*, before Montanism came into being (202), in his work *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, *Tertullian* acknowledged the primacy of Peter and a certain preeminence of the Roman Church because it had become illustrious through Peter's blood.

In the time of the Novation Schism (250), St. *Cyprian* wrote his book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*; in this he discusses straight forwardly the unity of each individual church under the rule of the

<sup>1</sup> *Adversus Hæreses*, I, III, C. 3, P. G., VII, 848-849.

bishop. In Chapter IV there are certain words about the primacy of Peter which are not found in every copy and, for this reason are rejected by many. But it is unjust to do so since they have been written by Cyprian himself in the second edition of his book. In other places he clearly asserts that the Church was founded on Peter and that the Roman Church is the beginning from which sacerdotal unity has originated. Also, in his Epistles he affirms that the Roman Church is the root and the mold (womb) of the Catholic Church. Further, he asks the Roman Bishop to excommunicate Martianus, Bishop of Arles (Arles).

But in the controversy concerning the Baptism of heretics he believed that the custom of the Church of Carthage was legitimate and he refused to accept orders from Stephen, the Roman Bishop. From this it does not follow that Cyprian denied the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, but that he thought that their custom on this practical matter could be retained.

In the same century also, many Bishops from various provinces had recourse to the Roman Bishop either to give them reasons for their faith or to settle their controversies. Heretics and schismatics likewise appealed to the Roman Bishop.

218 B In the *fourth and fifth centuries* the *primacy of the Roman Church* is so clearly declared in writings and in deeds that no doubt can be had about its existence.

1. The *Roman Bishops* speak and act fully aware of their primacy.

Thus :

a *Sylvaester*, in the case of Arianism, laid down the rules for the council of Nicaea through his legates; *Julius I* restored Athanasius to the see of Alexandria; *Liberius*, was sent into exile because he would not comply with the wishes of Constantius; *Damasus* imposed on the disapproving Council of Sirmium a rule of faith for the Eastern Bishops.

b In the matter of Priscillianism *Siricius* was considered the judge by everyone.

c In regard to Pelagianism, the subject was judged by Innocent I and by Zosimus who sent his *Epistola Tractoria* to all the Bishops.



219 2. *The Fathers* of the fourth and fifth centuries acknowledged, without any doubts, the primacy of the Roman Bishop.

Thus:

- a. *St. Optatus of Milevis*, writing against the Donatists, showed that the true Church of Christ is marked and distinguished by a unity which proceeds from the Chair of Peter established at Rome;
- b. *St. Ambrose* taught that the Roman Church is the head of the entire Catholic world and that the sign of true faith is communion with the Roman Church;
- c. *St. Augustine* admitted that appeal might be made from his judgment to the *Holy See*, and that provincial councils took on their own particular authority from the approbation of the Holy Pontiff;
- d. *St. Jerome* wrote to Pope Damasus: "I am united by communion to your Blessedness, that is, to the Chair of Peter. He who will consume the lamb outside this dwelling is unholy..."<sup>1</sup> So, too, among the Orientals — *St. Athanasius* had recourse to the Roman Bishop and recognized his right to judge other bishops; likewise, *St. Chrysostom* and *Eusebius* who, in the year 346, submitted himself to the Roman Pontiff.

220 C *From the unanimous agreement of the whole Church clearly manifested in the councils.*

- 1. In the *Council of Ephesus* (431):
  - a. St. Cyril asked for an opinion and a definition from the Roman Pontiff;
  - b. The Holy Pontiff Celestine created Cyril as his vicar in order to have him preside over the Council;
  - c. He sent legates, one of whom was Philip, a priest; in the presence of the Fathers, with no one contradicting, he openly proclaimed the primacy of Peter and of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, over the universal Church.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ROUET DE JOURNEL, *Enchiridion Patristicum*, 1346. The above mentioned texts are found in the Patristic Enchiridion and in *D. B.*  
<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 112.

2. In the Council of *Chalcedon* (451) the letter of the great Leo, in which the errors of Eutyches were condemned, was read to the Fathers. Nearly all of them were Orientals. They were in complete accord with Leo, exclaiming: "Peter has spoken through Leo". In a report which was later sent to Leo these same Fathers openly acknowledged the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.<sup>1</sup>

3. In the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680) the Fathers acclaimed the Roman Bishop in similar fashion.

4. At the *Second Council of Lyons*<sup>2</sup> (1274) and at the Council of *Florence*<sup>3</sup> (1438-1445) the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was defined in very clear terms.

Therefore it is certain that the Bishops of the Universal Church have assented to the fact that the primacy of jurisdiction over all Christ's faithful, the shepherds and the sheep, belongs to the Roman Pontiff.

But, from what has been previously stated, the Body of Bishops is infallible when it sets forth Christian doctrine. Therefore.

To charge that the primacy of the Roman See was established because of the *ambition* of the Roman Bishops is to speak untruthfully, for all Roman Pontiffs claimed this supreme authority as their charge and their duty. Further, this primacy was conceded by the other Bishops, among whom we find men distinguished as much for their doctrine as well as for their zeal and fortitude.

Nor may this primacy be ascribed to the *political preeminence* of the city of Rome, for the Roman Pontiffs and all the other Fathers maintain that the primacy arose from the succession of Blessed Peter who had been made Head of the Universal Church by the free will of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 149.  
<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 466.  
<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 594.



### III. THE INFALLIBILITY OF PETER AND OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS<sup>1</sup>

**221 Thesis :** *When the Roman Pontiff speaks ex cathedra, he possesses infallibility in defining a doctrine of faith and of morals, so that his definitions of themselves, not from the agreement of the Church, cannot be reformed or changed.*

This thesis is historically certain; it is theologically de fide.

The Protestants and the schismatic Orientals deny the first part of this thesis; the Gallicans deny the second part.

The Catholic teaching is laid down by the *Vatican Council* in these words: "We define that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance... is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."<sup>2</sup>

#### 222 A Explanation of Thesis.

1. We are concerned with infallibility in teaching (refer to section 199), not with impeccability.

2. The conditions, all of which must be present at the same time in order that the Pontiff's judgement may be infallible are :

a. The Roman Pontiff may not be speaking as a private doctor, nor as the bishop of the city of Rome, nor as a prince of state, but as the Pastor and Doctor of the universal Church according to his supreme authority;

b. The Roman Pontiff should be teaching a truth of faith or of morals (refer to section 250 and following);

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 742-763.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1839.

c. The Roman Pontiff must be defining, that is, he must be determining with finality which doctrine must be held with internal faith;

d. The definition must bind the universal Church.

3. The cause of infallibility, namely, the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is stated.

4. The subject of infallibility is mentioned, the Roman Pontiff, whose definitions are irreformable of themselves, independently of the judgement of Bishops and of the consent of the entire Church.

#### 223 B Proof of Thesis.

##### 1. Proof from Scripture.

a. The text previously quoted: "Thou art Peter..." — Peter and his successors are established by Christ as the foundation upon which the Church would be built and from which it would be strengthened.

But unless the Supreme Pontiff possesses infallibility when he speaks ex cathedra, he is not the foundation on which the Church is made firm. Therefore.

b. The text containing Christ's prayer for Peter: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, (*ἐπιστρέψας*) confirm thy brethren<sup>1</sup>". Here Christ is speaking to Peter alone (as is evident from the context) and he is praying for Peter alone; for him He is asking indefectibility in faith, "that thy faith fail not", in order that he may be able to confirm or strengthen the faith of his brethren. Christ's prayer is effectual; therefore, He obtained from God the special assistance by which Peter's faith would remain constant and unshaken.

c. The text referring to the power of feeding the whole flock. From these words Peter and his successors received from Christ the duty of feeding the entire flock with the word

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Luke, XXII, 31-32.



of truth, so that all are bound to obey this teaching. But this position cannot be admitted unless the teaching is infallible.

#### 224 2. *Proof from Tradition.*

a. In the first four centuries the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was handed down implicitly only. Correct doctrine was this: the Roman Church is the *center of unity of faith* (refer to St. Irenaeus previously quoted<sup>1</sup>; likewise, the Roman Church is the *safe norm of orthodoxy* for destroying heresies, v. g., Montanism, Sabellianism, and for solving questions that arose concerning faith and morals.

b. At the beginning of the fifth century the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was affirmed more clearly by the Roman Pontiffs themselves, v. g., *Innocent I*, and *Zosimus*, who declared that in matters of faith recourse should be had to the Holy See because its doctrine is *pure and irreformable*. Infallibility was corroborated also by the Bishops, v. g., St. Optatus, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and others who proclaimed that it was the judgement of the Holy Pontiff that truly concluded controversies. The Councils, too, taught this doctrine of infallibility, maintaining at Ephesus, at Chalcedon, at Constantinople, (III and IV), that Peter had spoken through the Pontiff who was ruling at that time, and that thus the matter in hand was settled.

c. *The Council of Florence* defined that, "the full power of teaching has been handed down to the Roman Pontiff". This statement implies infallibility. Finally, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was explicitly defined by the Vatican Council — de Ecclesia, chapter 4.

225 It is not right to say that Tradition held definitions of the Supreme Pontiff as irreformable because of the agreement of the Church, for inerrancy was attributed to the authority of the Pontiff himself, who, as Peter's successor, is the center of unity and the authentic interpreter of faith. Nor can we offer in opposition the famous distinction of the Gallicans between the *Chair* and Him who occupies the Chair. This distinction is entirely

<sup>1</sup> At this point it is sufficient to call to mind texts and facts already explained.

foreign to the minds of the Fathers, for they gave their obedience to the ruling Pontiff himself.

Too, this distinction would take away from the Pontiff all authority since each one could then declare that he was adhering to the infallible Chair of Peter, but not to the Pontiff who at the particular time was occupying it and who was guilty of error.

226 The Protestants offer the *objection* that certain Pontiffs de facto made mistakes: Liberius subscribed to the formula of Sirmium; Honorius taught monothelism; Paul V and Urban VIII condemned Galileo.

We leave these charges to the historians. At this point let it be sufficient to understand that these Pontiffs, even if perchance they did make mistakes as private individuals, or if they explained doctrines obscurely and incompletely, did not teach error while they were speaking *ex cathedra*. Therefore the Catholic thesis stands.

#### 227 *Proof from Reason.*

Admit the infallibility of the Body of Bishops and still the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff is most *advantageous* to the Church, because Ecumenical Councils cannot be assembled easily or promptly whenever some new error arises. Further, the consent or agreement of the universal Church cannot be looked for often, nor can it easily be ascertained.

It would be foolish to claim that general councils would be useless, (in the light of the infallibility of the Holy Pontiff) for they are of service in discerning ecclesiastical tradition and in judging the opportune time for a new definition. Also, there is no merit in the charge that this authority of the Supreme Pontiff is despotic, that it takes away all freedom of thought, for when this authority authentically interprets the word of God, it imposes only truth and deprives man of no liberty except that of error.

228

#### Conclusion

It is historically evident that Christ established the Church as a society properly called; as an hierarchical society which was to be ruled by an infallible College of Bishops; as a monarchical society which was to be nourished by means of the supreme authority of the infallible Roman Pontiff.

Therefore, the true Church of Christ is the Church which the Roman Pontiff rules over.



**Corollary.** *Episcopatism* must be rejected because it is directly in opposition to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

## 229 General Conclusion of the Complete Chapter.

*The Roman-Catholic Church and this Church alone is the true Church of Christ.*

From what has been demonstrated it is obvious that the true Church of Christ is the Church which has retained visibility, the episcopacy and the supreme Roman Pontificate.

But this can be asserted of the Roman-Catholic Church only.

Thus it follows that a perfect sign of adherence to Christ and to the true Church is communion with the Seat of Peter.

The separated Churches, in fact, cannot be the true Church of Christ: thus the Eastern Schismatic Church and the Protestant Churches have kept neither the primacy of the Roman Pontiff nor visible unity.

## CHAPTER III

# THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS PROVED BY EXTERNAL MARKS

**230 State of the Question.** *The Vatican Council* teaches that the Roman Church is itself a motive of credibility because of the external marks of divine intervention which it shows; further, the Council points out these marks. "Because of her wonderful power to increase and to multiply, her extraordinary sanctity, and her inexhaustible fruitfulness

in all good things, because of her Catholic unity, her unconquered steadfastness, the Church is, of herself, a great and perpetual motive of credibility and the irrefragable (undeniable) testimony of her own divine legation<sup>1</sup>.

We pass over the subject of the great spread of Christianity (we have discussed it previously); in a two-fold thesis we shall make clear:

1. the universal unity and stability of the Roman Church;
2. that her sanctity and fruitfulness can be accounted for only by divine intervention<sup>2</sup>.

## ARTICLE I. THE UNIVERSAL UNITY AND INDESTRUCTIBLE STEADFASTNESS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH<sup>3</sup>

**231 Thesis:** *Because of its universal unity and its invincible stability the Roman Catholic Church offers irrefutable testimony of its own divine legation.*

### I. Explanation of Facts.

#### A The Roman Church is universal.

1. *By right* it is universal, or it possesses the aptitude to diffuse and extend itself among all nations. Its doctrine excludes individualism because the Roman doctrine is proclaimed to all without distinction; its doctrine is comprehended and received by all; it satisfies in a special way the legitimate aspirations of all minds. By its nature the Roman Church is opposed to nationalism, for it remains free of all States and accommodates itself to any form of civil rule.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1794.

<sup>2</sup> The argument can be proposed in a different manner namely, by proving that the true Church, from its institution by Christ, should be adorned with the four marks of *unity, apostolicity, sanctity, and catholicity*; and then by showing that these marks belong to the Roman Church alone, but not to the other Christian societies. (In previous editions of the *Major Synopsis*, in the manner of many other theologians, we have offered the argument thus).

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 771-786.



232 2. *In fact* it is truly universal: for it is spread out to all nations, and it is diffused into all territories; daily its missionaries are sent to the pagans, to the schismatics and the heretics, and wherever the freedom to preach flourishes, it draws to itself and it receives into its embrace new followers; it penetrates all classes of society equally, it preaches the gospel lovingly to the poor and the proletariat, it baptizes the rich and the powerful, it is happy to have as its sons many who are learned and skilled in the sciences. Deservedly, therefore, is the Roman Church called *Universal* or *Catholic* by all.

233 B *The Roman Church is one in a perfect unity of faith, of rule, and of worship*, in as much as it recognizes a principle of authority, and in matters of faith and of morals it promptly obeys the supreme authority which was established by Christ, namely, the Roman Pontiff. The more universal the Catholic Church, the more wonderful its unity, since men naturally are accustomed to hold on tenaciously to their own private opinions.

C *The Roman Church enjoys invincible steadfastness* in the midst of all the changes in affairs generally. In spite of the great persecutions which the Church has long suffered and still is suffering, the Church remains essentially the same and shows no indications of weakening in the future, while it is evident from sad experience that all human institutions are frail. The Church ejected from its bosom heresies, either of ancient times or of the years of the Reformation, or the more recent heresies like Modernism, and preserved its teaching in its entirety.

234 II. **The Argument.** *From these facts it is legitimate to infer that God is assisting the Roman Church in a special way.*

*Proof of Argument.*

A *Proof from the nature of these marks:*

1. From the *Universality* of the Church: since this mark is found in the Roman Church only, this Church should be

considered transcendent because the *natural means* by which it is spread, that is, the preaching and martyrdom of the missionaries, are not of themselves sufficient for explaining this extension. (We have referred to this topic in discussing early Christianity 134 and following.)

Today Protestants send preachers to the pagans, but their efforts are supported greatly by natural means; they are not inspired by a similar zeal, nor do they obtain so many conversions as do the Catholic missionaries. All of this is acknowledged even by many non-Catholics. The results which they produce can be explained by referring to the human aids which they employ and to the ordinary graces which are granted to those outside the true Church who attempt to spread the kingdom of God in good faith.

235 2. *From the Oneness of the Church:*

The Unity of faith, of rule, and of worship which is preserved in the Roman Church spread throughout the world, cannot be elucidated by any human means, especially if we consider the obstacles which oppose this oneness; for example, the determination of human nature which persistently holds on to its own opinions, the obscurity of the dogmas which oftentimes contain mysteries, the difficulty of the moral law which stands in opposition to all the passions. How could the Roman Church alone have preserved this oneness through so many ages unless it was aided by the special and supernatural assistance of Christ and of God?

3. *From the Steadfastness (Stability) of the Church.*

Only the Roman Church has remained stable and unchangeable throughout the centuries while sects and heresies and diverse religions have sprung up and passed through many changes. This constancy is all the more marvellous in the face of the fewer and weaker human helps which the Church can rely on. How often have the enemies of the Church predicted her ruin! And still she continues on, invincible, wonderfully sustained, not by men, but by God Himself who directs all issues.



236 **B** *Proof from the prophecies which announce these marks of the Church.*

Proof of divine intervention is strongly established by the fact that this universality, oneness and stability have been foretold by the prophets of old (refer to heading 88 and the following) and by Christ Himself as a divine work. We possess true prophecy and, in the intellectual order, a real miracle inseparably joined to the Roman Church. Therefore, by His own preternatural intervention God points out that the Roman Church is His Church.

#### ARTICLE II. THE EXTRAORDINARY SANCTITY AND THE UNEXHAUSTED FRUITFULNESS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

237 **Thesis** : *Because of its extraordinary sanctity and its inexhausted richness in all good things the Roman-Catholic Church is itself a great and perpetual motive of credibility.*

##### I. Explanation of Facts.

**A** The all-surpassing holiness of the Roman Church arises :

1. from the fact that by her doctrine, by her worship, and by her laws she offers to all the *means* of holiness;
2. from the fact that it gains the *effects* or results of sanctity among *individual* members of the Church, some of whom have practiced virtue to an heroic degree (the Saints and the Blessed); and among its *organizations or societies*, for example, in the Catholic priesthood whose members are devoted to perpetual celibacy, in the religious orders where many pursue perfection either in an active or contemplative life; also, in *society* to which it proclaims ceaselessly the natural and the Christian virtues. It is true certainly that all Catholics are not holy; but good Catholics are good because they follow the Church's orders' the bad are bad because they spurn her precepts.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 787-795.

**B** The *fruitfulness* of the Roman Church is evident in all the works of social charity which it has begun and which it supports : it provides many means for the education of children and of the youth; it has a mother's interest in the needs of the poor, in the care of the ill; and it tries to improve the unfortunate conditions of the workers.

##### 238 II. The Argument.

*From the facts thus far explained it is apparent that the Roman Church has been divinely aided. This is evident :*

**A** *From the nature of holiness.* Sanctity is difficult; it is attained only by many continuous strivings. In order that one individual may reach this state, he must have divine help. Who can estimate what is needed for the great multitude seeking perfection in the Roman Church? And what should be said of the assistance given to the martyrs and to the saints in their performance of heroic acts? It should be concluded that the Church which produces so many and such great fruits of holiness receives its fruitfulness from God Himself. The *miracles* which have always been performed in the Roman Church, even in our time, give further proof to this conclusion.

**B** *This is evident from a comparison between the Roman Church and non-Catholic societies.*

We agree that there are among the Greeks and the Protestants some who are endowed with outstanding virtue. But from the time at which the schism became an accomplished fact the Greek Church has been graced with few saints. Among the Protestants no one remains in our memory whose sanctity was universally acknowledged. In fact, there is no organization which shows this supernatural mark. Therefore among these people Christianity produces few results of virtue.

Thus we may reason : the true Church of Christ is that which brings forth the fruits of holiness; through holiness the action of the Holy Spirit is clearly manifested. For



Christ established a Church in order that through it men might be sanctified and might attain eternal life. *But* the Roman Church stands out above other Christian societies in its extraordinary sanctity and its inexhausted fruitfulness. *Therefore* the Roman Church is the true Church of Christ.

#### CONCLUSION OF APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY :

Outside the Church there is no salvation <sup>1</sup>.

239 From the tract, *Christ the Divine Legate*, we came to the conclusion that for salvation it is necessary to accept Christ; from the tract, *The Church of Christ*, we have learned that the Catholic Church alone preaches the doctrine of Christ. Logically it follows : *Outside the Church there is no salvation*.

240 In order to understand this conclusion correctly we must distinguish between what is necessary according to a necessity of means and what is necessary according to a necessity of precept.

The necessity for belonging to the Church is not only a necessity of precept but also a necessity of means, for Pius IX declared : " On the ground of Faith it is to be firmly held that outside the Apostolic Roman Church none can achieve salvation. This is the only ark of salvation. He who does not enter into it, will perish in the flood : " . The comparison with the Ark, the means of salvation from death at the time of the Flood, plainly shows the necessity as a necessity of means.

Necessity of means, however, is not an absolute necessity, but a hypothetical one. In certain particular circumstances, for example, in the case of invincible ignorance or of incapability, actual membership in the Church can be supplied by the desire for this membership. It is not necessary that this be explicitly present; it can be included in a willingness

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 802-808.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1647.

and readiness to fulfill the will of God. In this way those who are outside the Catholic Church can achieve salvation. That souls who, in innocent ignorance, do not know the true Church of Christ, but who are, nevertheless, ready to bow to the demands of the divine Will, are not to be cast out, springs from Divine Justice and from the doctrine of God's general will of salvation : this is clearly proved in Scripture <sup>1</sup>.

Therefore :

241 **A** *Whoever culpably remains outside the Church to the end of life cannot be saved*; he is culpable who does not seek the truth when he is in serious doubt, and, a fortiori, he is culpable who *knowingly* and *willingly* does not enter the Church when he recognizes it as true.

*Proof :*

1. *From the words of Christ* — Christ commanded all, under the penalty of damnation, to receive His doctrine, His laws, and His sacraments;
2. From the teaching of Peter and of Paul;
3. From the testimony of early Christianity : St. Ignatius, St. Irenaeus, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine;
4. *From the Roman Pontiffs and from general councils*, namely the Fourth Lateran Council and the Council of Florence.

242 **B** Whoever inculpably remains outside the Church can be saved provided he belong to the Church through faith and charity, or through perfect contrition <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *I Timothy*, II, 4.

<sup>2</sup> In regard to this subject Pius IX wrote : " On the grounds of Faith it must be firmly held that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can attain salvation; this is the one ark of salvation; he who does not enter into it, will perish in the flood. In the same way, however, it must be accepted as certain that those who labor in invincible ignorance of the true religion



Scripture teaches that many Gentiles, for example, Job and the Niniuites, were saved. Besides, every adult can elicit an act of perfect charity and so can acquire habitual grace. This is required for salvation and this is sufficient.

At this point we reach the end of Apologetics; what follows refers to Dogmatic Theology.

## TRACT IV

THE CONSTITUTION  
OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

243 Thus far we have proved that the Roman Church alone is the Church which was actually founded by Christ. The next topic for consideration is an accurate study of the *essence* and *authority* of the Church and then of the Church's relations with civil society. We shall explain, therefore :

1. *the innermost constitution of the Church ;*
2. *the authority of the Church ;*
3. *the relations between Church and State.*

## CHAPTER I

THE INNERMOST CONSTITUTION OF  
THE CHURCH OR THE RELATIONS  
BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

*Between the Church and Christ* there are *intimate* and *mystical* relations; these we shall explain briefly in order to destroy the prejudices of Protestants and to increase the reverence of Catholics toward their Church.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 8, a. 2-6; Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Satis cognitum* (June 29, 1898); Leo XIII, Encyclical *Divinum illud munus*, (May 9, 1897); Pius XII Encyclical, *Mystici corporis Christi*, June 29, 1943; D. GRÉA, *De l'Église et de sa divine constitution*.

are not for this reason guilty in the eyes of the Lord ". From the allocution *Singulari quadam*, December 9, 1854; *D. B.*, 1647. In the Encyclical *Quando conficiamur merore*, August 10, 1863, the same Pontiff wrote : " Since God... out of His overwhelming goodness and mercy, will not permit anyone to be punished in eternal suffering who is not found guilty of voluntary crimes ". *D. B.*, 1677. Refer to *Syllabus*, propositions 16, 17, and 18; *D. B.*, 1716, 1717, 1718. Pius XII, Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.



244. A First Thesis : *The Church is the mystical body*<sup>1</sup> of Christ which the Holy Spirit animates. This thesis is a matter of divine faith from the teaching of St. Paul.

I. *The Church is the mystical body of Christ.* This doctrine Christ Himself introduced to St. Paul at the moment of his conversion. And Paul proclaimed it in his epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Ephesians, and to the Colossians<sup>2</sup>.

The faithful are in a real and mystical manner members of the body of which Christ is the head; they live by the same spiritual life as Christ.

245. 2. *Christ is the head of this body.* St. Paul states : "And he hath made him head over all the Church, which is His body"<sup>3</sup>. Truly Christ considers Himself in relation to the Church as the head to the body. As the head in relation to the members of the body, so Christ :

- a. joins to Himself in the closest bond all the members of the Church;
- b. protects them likewise;
- c. infuses into them spiritual impulses and a spiritual life.

3. *The Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church.* The renewal of our hearts through grace is appropriately attributed to the Holy Spirit. This renewal is the work of the Holy Trinity and is imparted to us through the mediation of the hierarchy and the sacraments<sup>4</sup>. So in the Nicene Creed, the Holy Spirit is called *Vivificans*, life-giving.

<sup>1</sup> DUPERAY, *Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après S. Paul*; ANGER, *L'Eglise, corps mystique du Christ*; A. TANQUERAY, *Notre incorporation au Christ, Desclee*; MERSON, *Le corps mystique du Christ*; *La Théologie du Corps mystique*.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, XII, 4-5; St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, XII, 12-31; St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, I, 22-23; II, 19-22; IV, 1-16; V, 22-23; St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, I, 17-20.

<sup>3</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, I, 22;

<sup>4</sup> "What the soul is for the body of man, that the Holy Spirit is for the body of Christ, that is, the Church". (St. Augustine, Sermon 267).

## 246 Logical Conclusions from this Doctrine.

Since the Church is the body of Christ, there is no salvation outside the Church; the Church is supernatural, essentially one, universal and holy. Also, the dogma of the Communion of Saints becomes clearer in the light of this truth.

247. B Second Thesis : *The Church is the spouse of Christ, and also our Mother* — in an analogous sense. This thesis is certain.

I. From the teaching of St. Paul and of St. John<sup>1</sup> we learn that the Church is the *spouse of Christ* because Christ loved the Church and united it to Himself in order that He might bring forth spiritual sons and daughters from it. St. Paul compares Christian matrimony to the union of Christ with the Church by reason of subordination<sup>2</sup>, of love<sup>3</sup>, and of fruitfulness<sup>4</sup>.

2. Hence, the Church is *our mother* whom we must love with a child's devotion.

## CHAPTER II

## THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

248. Christ established the Church in order that man might gain salvation through it. To obtain this goal the Church must enjoy a threefold authority or power :

1. the *power to teach* (a teaching magisterium)
2. the *power to sanctify* (holy orders)
3. the *power to rule* (government)

<sup>1</sup> Apocalypse XXI, 1-6; XXII, 17; Gospel according to St. John XIX, 34-35.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians V, 24.

<sup>3</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians V, 25-27.

<sup>4</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians V, 30.



In the Tract on Orders we shall speak about the power of Orders. At this time we consider only the teaching magisterium and the governing power of the Church for the purpose of determining *what its ambit or realm is, how it employs its powers, and who its subjects are.*

## ARTICLE I

## THE OBJECT OF THE POWER OR AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

I. THE OBJECT OF THE DOCTRINAL  
MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

249 **State of the Question :** This magisterium comprises all the rights which are necessary for teaching revelation and for guarding and defending the deposit of faith : for example, the power of defining infallibly, of setting up schools, of prohibiting certain books<sup>2</sup>.

250 **Thesis :** *The direct object of the infallibility of the Church includes all the religious truths and each individual truth which are formally contained in the sources of revelation; the indirect object embraces all those things which are required in order that the deposit of faith may be preserved entire.* The first part of this thesis is de fide; the second part is certain.

251 **I. Explanation and proof of thesis.** The Church was given infallibility for the purpose of protecting Christ's teaching. And the object of this infallibility is either *direct* or *indirect* (Refer to thesis.)

a. It is a matter of faith that *the Church is infallible in defining revealed truths* (section 199). It is certain that it is *infallible also in regard to truths that are closely joined to revealed truths.* Otherwise the prerogative of infallibility

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 818-826.

<sup>2</sup> Code of Canon Law, can. 1322-1408.

would be purposeless and ineffectual since the Church would not be able to preserve, to defend, and to set forth the deposit of faith.

b. There is a *vast distinction* between the direct object of infallibility and the indirect object : if a truth formally revealed is defined by an infallible authority, it is the object of *divine and of Catholic faith* because this truth is believed on the authority of God Who is revealing. When infallible power is exercised in respect to truths *connected* with revelation, truths of this kind are the object of *ecclesiastical faith* only.

252 2. **The direct object of infallibility.** This object is to define what has been revealed, to decide on the words of the definition, to establish the canon of Scripture, to condemn heresy, etc.

253 3. **The indirect object of infallibility.** This comprises all that is intimately united with what has been revealed.

*The Church is infallible :*

a. *In regard to truths of the natural order connected with dogma, which are necessary for protecting the deposit of faith; for example, the existence of God<sup>1</sup>.*

b. *The Church is infallible in regard to theological conclusions. (This is certain.) A theological conclusion is one which is certainly and manifestly deduced from two premises, one of which is formally revealed and the other is known naturally. It is necessary that the Church be infallible in regard to these theological conclusions in order to preserve the deposit of faith. If false theological conclusions are propagated, dogma is endangered because of the logical connection which the mind naturally perceives between the principles and the conclusions deduced from these principles. Whether theological conclusions are the object of divine faith we shall consider later in section 326.*

<sup>1</sup> Syllabus, prop. II; D. B., 1711; Vatican Council, D. B., 1798.



254 c. *The Church is infallible when it condemns a certain proposition with some doctrinal censure.* A doctrinal censure is "a qualification or restriction which indicates that a proposition is opposed, in some way, to faith or morals". It is *de fide* that the Church is infallible when she specifies that a doctrine is heretical; it is *certain* that the Church is infallible when she states that a doctrine approaches heresy, or that a doctrine errs in a matter of faith, or that it is false. All this is apparent from the consensus of theologians, and from the practice of the Church since its earliest days. The Church always made judgments against false propositions and also imposed upon the faithful the obligation of adhering to these judgments. Many assert that in all doctrinal censures the Church is infallible<sup>1</sup>.

255 d. The Church is infallible in regard to *dogmatic facts*. A *dogmatic fact* is one which is so much connected with a doctrine of the Church that knowledge of it is necessary in order to understand the doctrine and to preserve it safely.

Dogmatic facts can be *threefold*: historical, doctrinal and hagiographical. Thus, dogmatic facts are the legitimacy of the *Holy Pontiff*, the *ecumenical (universal) nature of a Council*.

That the Church is infallible in regard to dogmatic facts is certain. For if the Church could make a mistake concerning the authority of the Holy Pontiff or of a Council, then there would always be grounds for doubting whether their decisions were infallible and accordingly for rejecting these decisions. So, too, for the question of whether a certain book contains orthodox teaching or heretical doctrine. Theologians commonly teach that the Church can infallibly determine what sense or meaning the words of a book convey once the context has been considered<sup>2</sup>; also whether this sense is

<sup>1</sup> QUILLIET, a. *Censures doctrinales*, in D. T.

<sup>2</sup> When propositions are condemned according to the meaning intended by the author, the condemnation results not from the subjective meaning which the author probably had in mind, but from the natural and obvious sense or meaning, as it is taken from the book itself after everything has been duly considered.

orthodox or not. Otherwise, the Church would not be able to prevent heretics from spreading their errors and from avoiding condemnation. The heretics could say that the meaning of the book has not been correctly understood. Thus *Clement XI* declared "the sense (or meaning) conveyed by the five afore-said propositions of Jansenius' book is condemned; this sense, as is evident, must be rejected and censured as heretical by all Christ's faithful not only by word of mouth but also in the heart<sup>1</sup>.

256 e. The Church is infallible in regard to *moral precepts* since general laws for the universal Church cannot be in opposition to the natural or positive divine law, for the Church has received the obligation of leading souls to salvation. Therefore, it can enjoin nothing which has not been approved by God.

f. For a similar reason the Church is infallible in the matter of giving *definitive approbation to a religious Order*.

g. The Church is infallible in regard to *canonization of saints*, but not to beatification. This opinion is true and common: truly the Church cannot make a mistake in matters which concern a profession of faith and morals, when she is making known a definitive judgment and is imposing a precept on the faithful.

## II. THE OBJECT OF THE POWER TO RULE \*

257 Thesis: *The power to rule, given by Christ to the Church, includes legislative, judiciary, and coactive (compulsive) power.* This thesis is certain.

*Legislative* power is the right to put into effect decrees and orders for the common good of the Church; these bind the faithful in conscience; *judiciary* power is the right to form judgments concerning the actions of the faithful and then to pass sentence on these actions; the *coactive* (compulsive) power is the right to employ physical force (material or spiritual) in order to urge on the execution of the laws or of the sentences.

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 1350.

\* *Major Synopsis*, n. 827-838.



*Proof of this thesis:*

1. *Proof from Christ's Words:* Christ gave to Peter and to the Apostles the power to feed the flock, to loose and to bind on earth<sup>1</sup>.

2. *Proof from the Practice of the Apostles:* The best interpreters of the Master's words, they made laws<sup>2</sup>, they pronounced judgments, and they used compulsive authority<sup>3</sup>.

3. *Proof from the Practice of the Church:* It is general knowledge that the Church, that is, the Roman Pontiffs and the Bishops (particularly when gathered together at Councils) has issued canons or laws which bind the consciences of the faithful, has published *judicial decisions* and has pronounced *punishments* against refractory members.

This power the Council of Trent and the Roman Pontiffs, Benedict XIV, Pius VI, Pius IX, Leo XIII and others have claimed for the Church.

258 4. *Proof from the Nature of the Church:* The Church is a real society, indeed it is judiciary and complete: it has, therefore, in itself, the necessary means for gaining its purpose; thus it possesses the right to impose as obligations those means that are suitable to its end, the right to judge and to punish the violators of laws, so that its lawgiving power may not become useless and empty.

## ARTICLE II. THE EXERCISE OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER

Christ conferred the threefold power in the Church on the College of Bishops and on their Head, the Roman Pontiff. We shall consider, therefore:

1. the exercise of pontifical power,
2. the exercise of episcopal authority.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XVIII, 18, XXVIII, 19.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XXI, 15-18.

<sup>3</sup> Acts of the Apostles XV, 29; First Epistle to Timothy, III, 2; 9-12.

<sup>4</sup> First Epistle to Timothy, I, 20; First Epistle to the Corinthians, V, 16.

## I. THE EXERCISE OF PONTIFICAL POWER

We are concerned here with the power to teach and to rule; the power of sanctifying the faithful we shall pass over.

A. The power to teach<sup>1</sup>

259 In a threefold manner the Roman Pontiff fulfills the right and the duty to spread the doctrine of Christ among all people, and to preserve this doctrine pure and entire.

1. *By solemn definitions.* These definitions are irrefragable and demand the full agreement that the mind gives to Catholic faith. We should realize that the *Vatican Council* has stated that pontifical infallibility is just as manifest as is the infallibility of the Church.

2. *By a merely ecclesiastical magisterium:* by setting forth truths without the intention of defining them, for example, by approving of catechisms and other books for the instruction of the faithful, by answering various questions through decretal letters, etc.

260 3. *By the Roman Congregations*<sup>2</sup>. The Holy See exercises its magisterium through certain Congregations, in particular, through the *Holy Office*.

The decrees of the Congregations have *more or less value* and power according as they are approved by the Holy Pontiff:

a. *in solemn manner* — thence they become acts of the Holy Pontiff and may become infallible<sup>3</sup>; however, most decrees of this kind are not infallible because very often the intention of defining the matter in question is lacking, or one of the necessary conditions (explained previously in section 222) is lacking.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to CHOUVET, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du St. Siège*. — *Major Synopsis*, n. 840-848.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session IV, chap. 4; D. E., 1839.

<sup>3</sup> *Code of Common Law*, can. 242-264.



b. or in common *ordinary manner* — then the decrees remain acts of the Congregation and cannot be infallible.

The *assent* which is due to infallible decrees is at least of *ecclesiastical faith* because it has as its formal motive the authority of the infallible magisterium. In regard to decrees that are not infallible an *internal* and *religious* assent is demanded which although not absolutely certain is prudential and morally certain<sup>1</sup>. Both obedience and prudence demands this agreement.

## B. The Holy Pontiff's power to rule<sup>2</sup>

### 1° NATURE AND QUALITIES OF THIS POWER

**261 Errors :** Some *Gallicans*, the *Synod of Pistoia* and, in our times, those *Anglicans* who call themselves Catholics, have affirmed that the Roman Pontiff has the *duty and office of examination or of direction only*, but that he has power to do nothing in the regular occurrences of any diocese outside the diocese of Rome — unless the Bishops are a mediating party. The *Modernists* give only the power of direction to the Roman Pontiff.

**Thesis :** *The Roman Pontiff has the full and supreme power of jurisdiction throughout the universal Church, even in disciplinary manners; and, in truth, a power that is also ordinary*

<sup>1</sup> Such were the decrees of Pius V, *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, in opposition to Baius, and of Innocent X, *Cum occasione*, against Jansenius.

<sup>2</sup> Pius IX made this declaration to the Archbishop of Munich : " when we are treating of that submissiveness which binds all Catholics in conscience it is necessary that they submit themselves... to the decisions which are brought forth by the Pontifical Congregations as pertaining to doctrine ". *Densinger-Banmeiert*, 1684. — Likewise Pius X in *Motu proprio Præstantia* : " All universally are duty bound in conscience to submit to the judgments of the Pontifical Council de Re Bibeat, whether to those judgments which thus far have been sent out or to those which hereafter will be published, and, in like manner, to the decrees of Sacred Congregations which pertain to doctrine and which have been approved by the Pontiff; further, they cannot avoid the mark of disobedience or of rashness nor can they be freed, therefore, from serious fault, they who in any way, by words or by writings, oppose these judgments; such ones, in addition, are guilty of scandal ".

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 849-859.

and immediate. This thesis is *de fide* from the Vatican Council : " If anyone shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction but not *full and supreme power of jurisdiction* over the Universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or assert that he (the Roman Pontiff) possesses merely the principal parts and not all the fullness of this supreme power, or that this power which he enjoys is not *ordinary* and *immediate*, both over each and all the Churches and over each and all the pastors and the faithful; let him be anathema<sup>1</sup>."

This jurisdiction is *universal*, that is, it reaches throughout the entire Church, because such jurisdiction was given to Blessed Peter, and the Roman Pontiff is the legitimate successor of Peter.

This jurisdiction is *full and supreme*. This fact is deduced from the bestowal of the keys and from the power of feeding the lambs and the sheep.

This jurisdiction is *ordinary*, that is, it is bound to the office (it goes with the office); it is *immediate*, or it can be exercised everywhere by the Roman Pontiff himself.

### 2° THE EXERCISE OF THIS POWER

**262 a. Object of this power.** The Roman Pontiffs can :

1. Make laws for the entire Church and for particular Churches without the agreement of the Bishops; they can explain their own laws, those of their predecessors and of ecumenical Councils; they can change them, they can repeal them; they can dispense from them; they can abrogate episcopal laws and dispense from them;

2. The Roman Pontiffs can summon ecclesiastical causes to their tribunal, they can reserve more important cases for themselves, they can acknowledge appeals from the entire

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session IV, chap. 4; *D. B.*, 1831.



world and make definitive judgments from which one may not appeal;

3. The Roman Pontiffs can appoint Bishops or even depose them;

4. They can send their legates into all parts of the Catholic world.

b. *Manner of exercising this power*

The Roman Pontiff cannot by himself carry on effectually his ordinary and immediate jurisdiction throughout the Universal Church: he employs, therefore, the help of Cardinals and of Prelates living at Rome; to these united in various *Congregations* he entrusts the exercising of his jurisdiction. The Roman Curia, as it is described in the Code of Canon Law, includes:

1. *Eleven Congregations*, namely, the Congregation of the Holy Office, the Congregation of the Consistory, the Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments, the Congregation of the Council, the Congregation for the Affairs of Religious, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the Congregation of Sacred Rites, the Congregation of the Ceremonies, the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, the Congregation for the Oriental Church.

2. *Three Tribunals*, the Sacred Penitentiary, the Holy Roman Rota, and the Apostolic Signatura.

3. *Five Offices*, the Apostolic Chancery, the Apostolic Dataria, the Apostolic Camera, the Secretariate of State, the Secretariate of Briefs to Princes and of Latin Letters.

263 **Corollaries:**

1. The power over the universal Church is given immediately by God to the Roman Pontiff once he is elected and accepts the office; this power comes to an end at the time of his death or of his resignation.

2. The civil dominion or rule of the *Roman Pontiff* is entirely proper in order that as Supreme Shepherd he may be and may be seen to be free and independent from all other civil societies in governing the Church. From the seventh century until the year 1871 the Supreme Pontiffs carried on a civil rule. And once again, during the reign of Pius XI this civil

sovereignty of the Holy See was recognized by the government of Italy at the time of the *Lateran* agreement, which was begun on February 11, 1929 and ratified on June 7.

II. THE EXERCISE OF EPISCOPAL POWER

A. *The Power of Bishops considered singly*<sup>1</sup>

1. *General principles.* — At this point we are speaking only of the power of *jurisdiction* which embraces the right to teach and the right to rule. Bishops rule their own diocese only; the *Vatican Council*<sup>2</sup> states: "Bishops, as true pastors, feed and govern each his own flock that has been assigned to him." Every bishop, nevertheless, has *ordinary* power over all, both the faithful and the priests, abiding within the limits of his diocese.

2. *The power to teach.* — Bishops feed their flocks *by teaching*, by watching out for their protection and for their instruction in Christian doctrine; by condemning errors, by forbidding evil books or journals<sup>3</sup>. Individual bishops are not infallible, but they must be regarded as authoritative teachers and judges of the faith, and it must be presumed that they are delivering true doctrine until it is proved otherwise. If doubts should arise about their faith, they are to be judged by the Holy Pontiff.

3. *The power to rule.* — Bishops govern the faithful and the priests of their own territory in the internal forum and in the external forum: they make laws relating to matters of faith, of worship, and of discipline; they pass judgment in the first instance and punish the transgressors by means of canonical penalties. In all circumstances they must observe the general laws of the Church and must act in dependence on the Holy Pontiff.

<sup>1</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, can. 320-349; *Major Synopsis*, n. 861-872.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session IV, chap. 3; *D. B.*, 1828.

<sup>3</sup> On the subject of doctrinal power of the Bishop read Pius X's Encyclical, *Pascendi*, September 8, 1907, from section 50 to the end, *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, XL 639-650.



B. *The power of the bishops considered as a body, but spread through the world*

**265 Thesis :** *The Bishops, dispersed throughout the world, but with the Roman Pontiff forming a moral body, are infallible when they propose Catholic doctrine.*

*Proof of this thesis :*

1. *Proof from Scripture*, (Gospel according to St. Matthew XXVIII, 18-20). Divine assistance was promised to the College of the Apostles and to their successors, namely, the Body of Bishops, when, spread through the universe, they are teaching all nations.

2. *Proof from Tradition*. Among the *Fathers* the sign of error was separation from the teaching which was handed down in the universal Church through the succession of Bishops; in the *Councils* that faith which was held by the pastors spread through the world was regarded as the foundation for definitions.

3. *Proof from reason*. If the corporate Body of Bishops dispersed throughout the universe could spread harmful errors, then the faithful would be grievously injured; for, far removed from the Center of unity, they would easily be led into mistakes and deceptions.

C *The power of the bishops united in Council*<sup>1</sup>.

**266 Introductory observations.** A council is the *legitimate assemblage of the Pastors of the Church for the purpose of making judgments or handing down decisions in regard to ecclesiastical doctrine or discipline*<sup>2</sup>. A council is :

I. *provincial*, when the Bishops of one province gather together;

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 873-881.

<sup>2</sup> *FORGET*, in *D. T.*, a. *Conciles*.

2. *plenary*<sup>1</sup> when the Ordinaries (Bishops or Archbishops) of many ecclesiastical provinces assemble, with permission having been obtained from the Holy Pontiff, who appoints his own Legate for the purpose of calling the Council together and of presiding over it;

3. *general or ecumenical*, when the universal Church is represented at it, with the approval of the Holy Pontiff<sup>2</sup>.

**267 A Conditions Required for an Ecumenical Council.** In order that a *Council may be ecumenical in all ways*, it is required :

I. in the matter of the *assembling*, that the Bishops come together *by order of the Roman Pontiff*, who alone has power over all other Bishops, and who alone, consequently, can command them to gather together.

Those *who must be called* to the Council because they have the right of decisive vote are :

- a. Cardinals, even though they are not Bishops;
- b. Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops in residence, even though they have not been consecrated;
- c. Abbots or Prelates *nullius*;
- d. An Abbot Primate, Abbots Superiors of the Monastic Congregations, and Supreme Moderators of Exempted Religious, but not of other religious, unless the decree of assembling permits or requires it.

Titular Bishops called to the Council possess a deliberative vote unless it be expressly decreed otherwise in the convocation. Theologians and those skilled in a knowledge of the sacred canons who have been invited to the Council have no vote unless a consultative vote<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, can. 281-292.

<sup>2</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, can. 222-229.

<sup>3</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, can. 223.



2. In the matter of the *assembling* it is required that the Roman Pontiff himself, or through delegates, *preside* over the sessions, because it is his responsibility to determine and to regulate the matters that are to be discussed and the order that is to be observed, because it is his privilege to transfer the Council, to suspend it, to dissolve it. It is not required that all the Bishops of the Catholic world be present at the same time, it is sufficient that the entire Church (in a moral sense) be represented. It is not necessary that all the Bishops be in unanimous agreement: if they are not in accord, that group of the Bishops, even if it be smaller, will be infallible which adheres to the Holy Pontiff, since he cannot err.

3. In regard to *confirmation*, it is required that the Holy Pontiff approve of the decrees of the Council because they do not possess the definitive force of binding unless they have been confirmed by the Pope and promulgated by his order. This confirmation the Pope may give in various ways: either by accepting and promulgating the decrees given to him (this is an instance of *subsequent* confirmation), or by stating his opinion in the Council when he personally is presiding over it (this is *concomitant* or *concurrent* confirmation); on the other hand, it may be given by sending legates to whom instructions are given concerning matters which should be defined: then, if the legates conform to the instructions they have received and the council is carried on accordingly, the decisions of the council are estimated as confirmed (this is *antecedent* confirmation; some think that it is sufficient).

Some of these conditions, for example, the regular (according to rule) convocation and the number of bishops, can be supplied sometimes through the subsequent approbation of the Pontiff.

## 268 B The Power of an Ecumenical Council.

I. *An ecumenical council is infallible in defining a doctrine concerning faith or morals.* This thesis is *de fide* because

it is proposed by the universal and ordinary magisterium (teaching authority) of the Church<sup>1</sup>.

2. The question arises — *is such a Council above the Pope?* The Council without the Supreme Pontiff is certainly inferior since it does not enjoy infallibility. The Council with the Pontiff is not superior to the Pope since the Pope by himself possesses the same jurisdiction as the Council with the Pope. Thus, the Supreme Pontiff can modify the disciplinary decrees of the Council just as he can modify his own decrees; an appeal from a decision of the Supreme Pontiff to a general Council has been deservedly condemned on many occasions.

### C The Usefulness of an Ecumenical Council.

General councils are not absolutely necessary, but are, nevertheless, of great benefit.

1. They offer and they show a greater *human* power, being a gathering of holy and learned men whose testimony can more effectually convince minds than can the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff alone.

2. They offer a means through which the Roman Pontiff may investigate revealed doctrine and may seek out the opinions of the Bishops concerning the best ways of correcting abuses or of furthering virtue. From this we must not conclude that the Bishops united in Council are only counsellors to the Pope; they are true judges who, by the power of jurisdiction given to them both in cases of faith and in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, in establishing laws and in passing judgments and inflicting penalties, have a decisive vote and, therefore, as they sign the decrees of the councils, are defining Catholic doctrine.

### ARTICLE III. MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH<sup>2</sup>

After this statement concerning ecclesiastical power the logical question is: *who are subject to this power,*

<sup>1</sup> *Code of Canon Law*, can. 227-229.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 883-901.



or *who are members of this Church*. A subsequent question is: *what are the duties and rights of these members?*

## I. WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH

**269 Thesis:** *In order to be a member of the Church baptism is required and is sufficient, together with the bond of unity of faith and of Catholic communion.* This thesis is de fide.

In canon 87 the conditions of membership in the Church are prescribed thus: "By Baptism man is established in the Church of Christ as a person with all the rights and duties of Christians, unless some impediment which obstructs the bond of communion with the Church or a censure which has been imposed by the Church is presenting an obstacle to the rights which the person possesses".<sup>1</sup>

**A** In order that one may *actually* be a member of the Church, he must be marked with the *valid baptism of water*. It is obvious from Scripture and from an unanimous Tradition that through baptism men become citizens of the Church, worthy of receiving the other sacraments, and become partakers of the other benefits of the Catholic society. Therefore, he who does not have the character of baptism remains outside the Church, but he who has been validly baptized is in the bosom of the Church unless he has been separated from it by some external act — in such a case, however, he remains subject to the Church in the matter of *duties*.

**B** In order that an adult may be in the *full* membership of the Church, he must, after receiving baptism, profess in an *exterior* manner the *Catholic faith* under the rule of the ecclesiastical magisterium which Christ established as the

<sup>1</sup> In the *Encyclical Mystici Corporis*, Pius XII stated: "Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by the legitimate authority." *D. B.*, 2286.

foundation of Catholic society; so, all will be excluded from the Church who have lost their way in the matter of the faith.

**C** Likewise, in order that an adult be in the full membership of the Church, *he must be subject exteriorly to the rule of legitimate Pastors* and, in a particular way, to the rule of the Roman Pontiff who has been constituted the Head of the Body of the Church; thus, those who refuse to accept his authority are to be regarded as heathens and publicans. Also the full member must preserve exteriorly a canonical communion with the visible society which Christ instituted: for those are classified as outside the *Body Social* whom the coercive power of the Church cuts off as guilty of grave offense<sup>1</sup>.

**270** *It is false to state that all the just and only the just or predestined are members of the Church.*

That such a claim is false is evident:

1. from the words relating to the *hierarchical constitution of the Church*;
2. from the *words of Christ* who compares the Church to a threshing floor which will be cleansed<sup>2</sup>, to a net, gathering together every kind of fishes<sup>3</sup>, to a field in which was sown cockle<sup>4</sup>; to a marriage feast into which a certain man entered, not having on a wedding garment<sup>5</sup>, to ten virgins, five of whom being foolish are excluded from the kingdom<sup>6</sup>. From these parables we infer that not the just alone are members of the Church; and we conclude this also from the words of St. Matthew XVIII, 15, that: "If thy brother

<sup>1</sup> This is apparent from what has previously been stated in regard to the institution of the Church, and from the invariable manner of acting on the part of the Fathers towards heretics, schismatics, and those excommunicated. The adult who lacks one or another of the conditions mentioned above can be called imperfectly only a member of the Church, although he has been baptized.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, III, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XIII, 47-50.

<sup>4</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XIII, 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXII, 2-14.

<sup>6</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXV, 1-13.



shall offend against thee... ", from the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians: "It is absolutely heard that there is fornication among you..."<sup>1</sup> The Fathers have unanimously taught likewise.

The following propositions are condemned:

"One only is the holy universal Church which is the entire gathering of the predestined". "What is the Church but the assemblage of God's sons dwelling in His bosom".<sup>2</sup>

#### 271 Applications of the thesis (269)

1. *Infidels* are not *actually* members of the Church since they are joined to it by no external bond: but *potentially* they are, since they can receive the faith and be baptized.

2. *Catechumens not yet baptized* are not *actually* members of the Church, but *in voto* and *inchoatively* they are, since they are being united to it by true faith.

3. *Heretics, at least as far as the obligations of the Church are concerned*, are members.

All theologians teach that *publicly known heretics*, that is, those who belong to a heterodox sect through public profession, or those who refuse the infallible teaching authority of the Church, are excluded from the body of the Church, even if their heresy is *only material* heresy. Are *occult* heretics also excluded, who by an internal act only are separated from the Catholic faith, or who by external acts manifest their heresy, but not by a public profession? The more common opinion holds that occult heretics are always in the Church's bosom because they preserve an external union with the *body social* through a profession of faith and through obedience to their legitimate Pastors. All agree that *infamis* who are validly baptized among heretics are truly and perfectly members of the Church until they become notorious heretics by public adherence to heresy.

4. Almost the same is to be stated in regard to *schismatics*, well known or occult, as has been said concerning heretics.

5. The same holds true for *apostates*.

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, V, 1.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 627.

<sup>3</sup> D. B., 1423.

6. In regard to the *excommunicated*, some are *vitandi* (to be avoided); others are *tolerati* (tolerated). No one is vitandus unless by name he has been excommunicated by the Holy See, unless the excommunication has been publicly announced and unless the decree or judgement it is expressly stated that this one must be shunned. The vitandi are certainly excluded from the Church, because they are separated from the participation in Christian society until, after doing penance, they are brought back into the bosom of the Church. According to the more common opinion the *tolerati* are not expelled from the fold of the Church, but they are deprived of the benefit and the use of certain common goods without entirely losing the bond of communion.

7. *Sinners* who have lost the state of grace by mortal sin remain truly members of the Church, for they are nevertheless united to the Church, because of their baptism, by the three-fold external bond of faith, of obedience and of canonical communion.

## II. DUTIES AND PREROGATIVES OF MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH

272 1. *Duties*. Four duties in particular proceed from what has been said about membership in the Church: *reverence*, *obedience*, *love*, and *active cooperation* with the Church's ministers. This "participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church", under the name, *Catholic Action*, Pope Pius XI, promoted with great success<sup>1</sup>.

2. *The prerogatives*. The laity, through Baptism members of Christ and of the Church, through Confirmation witnesses to and soldiers of Christ and of the Church, are called to Catholic Action; through this they work along with the hierarchy for raising up the Body of Christ in the world, carrying on their own proper apostolic work<sup>2</sup> under their own responsibility, at no time, however, independent of the hierarchy.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to P. DABIN, *Essai de synthèse sur l'Action Catholique*; GUERRY, *Action Catholique*; MGR. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Lettre pastorale sur l'action des laïcs*, 1930; TIERCHEN, *L'action Catholique*.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to sections 1029, 1030, 1032. — In the first years of Christianity, the Christians gave collective testimony of Christ.



**B** Nevertheless, civil power and ecclesiastical power *are to be distinguished*, because they are ordained for different ends. The civil power directly promotes the common temporal good; it determines and protects the political, social, and private rights of the citizens. Indirectly it fosters good morals and religion since without these temporal happiness cannot be attained. The *ecclesiastical* power pursues the salvation of souls. "Whatever among human affairs is sacred in any way, whatever pertains to the salvation of souls and to the worship of God, whether by its nature it is thus, or whether, on the other hand, it is understood thus on account of the cause to which it is related, all rests in the power and in the judgment of the Church".

**C** Each is supreme of its kind.

**D** Neither the Church should be separated from the State, nor should the State be separated from the Church, but each society must be *united* to the other *in a friendly covenant*, because the end of each is the perfection of the same men; this perfection the State directly promotes in temporal affairs, and the Church directly promotes in spiritual matters. In order to preserve this concord a manner of acting is called for and demanded by which the rights of each society may remain unviolated.

## II. THE UNION OF CHURCH AND OF STATE IN CATHOLIC TERRITORIES

**275** We call a region Catholic when *most* of its inhabitants are Catholic and when its *government is carried on according to Catholic principles*.

**A** *The Rights of the State.*

**I.** The State has the right to be free and unimpeded to carry on its own affairs, to choose its form of government,

<sup>1</sup> Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Immortale Dei*.

## CHAPTER III

# RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE STATE<sup>1</sup>

## 273 Erroneous Ideas and Opinions

**1.** Some contend that the Church is subject to the State, and that, therefore, it may not exercise its rights without the agreement of the secular Prince. *Many political figures* of today are of this opinion, holding that the State is the source of all rights. The *Gallicans* and *Josephists*, while admitting the independence of the Church in spiritual matters alone, attributed to the civil power the right of supreme dominion over ecclesiastical goods, the right of examination over matters of ecclesiastical discipline, etc...

**2.** On the contrary, some theologians and canonists have taught that the State is to be directly subordinated to the Church in temporal affairs, and that civil magistrates are only the vicars of the Supreme Pontiff.

**3.** Others wish that the Church were separated from the State, according to the dictum: *A Free Church in a Free State*. Very closely allied to this error is the *Liberal Catholic* who maintains that the Church can only ask for liberty from the State, and that all forms of worship of themselves ought to enjoy equal rights in a State.

## I. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

**274 A** All authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical, *comes from God*, and therefore each one is sacred and must be revered by all.

<sup>1</sup> GREGORY XVI, Encyclical, *Mirari Vos*, August 15, 1832; Pius IX, *Quanta Cura*, Dec. 8, 1864; Leo XIII, *Diuturnum*, June 20, 1881; *Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885; *Libertas*, June 20, 1888. — *Major Synopsis*, n. 902-922.



to make laws, provided that these things do not oppose divine law or the good of the Church.

#### B *The Duties of the Catholic State.*

1. *The State may not detach itself from religion, but must promote it because social worship is due to God and must be given to Him by the State.* Furthermore, the State must foster morality, but morality cannot be gained without religion.

2. The State is bound to acknowledge *revealed* religion to defend it and to support it. For actually there does exist a revealed religion and this alone God orders all men to accept.

3. The State must defend true Christianity or *Catholicism*. De facto, only the Catholic Church has been established by God for teaching and for sanctifying men.

From a union between the State and the Church, Ecclesiastical freedoms or immunities, privileges granted to divine worship or to the churches, possess a civil force: for civil laws by their authorization confirm ecclesiastical laws. The legitimacy of this will be evident provided one believes that the Catholic Church is the only true Church.

#### 276 C *The Rights of the Church.*

The Church exercises its authority in entirely spiritual affairs, and in those matters which, of themselves temporal, are nevertheless bound to a spiritual good or are necessary for a spiritual end.

#### D *Duties of the Church.*

The Church must help the civil society in those things which are necessary for its (the civil society's) end by fostering public probity, by promoting peace and serenity; by offering it help on special occasions, for example, at the time of war. Ecclesiastical history shows that the Church has always fulfilled these duties, even by giving up her own possessions.

### III. RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH WITH A NON-CATHOLIC STATE

277 A *Relations with a Christian State which is non-Catholic.* — *Per se* a Christian State has the same duties towards the Church as a Catholic State has; but *de facto* the Church cannot obtain from an heretical State all that it has a right to. Still it can demand that Catholics, living in an heretical or schismatic State, be free in professing their religion so that the judiciary personality of the ecclesiastical Society may be recognized.

B *Relations with the indifferent State.* When a State is no more solicitous for one religion than for another, it should, according to its own principles, consider the Church as a legitimate society, it should undertake nothing in opposition to the Church, but it should protect, defend, and support the Church.

C *Relations with the infidel State.* — If this State were to impede the preaching and propagation of the Catholic religion, it would be acting contrary to reason and to the rights of nature.

### IV. MANNER OF ACTING AS FAR AS MODERN FREEDOMS ARE CONCERNED<sup>1</sup>

#### 1° FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

278 1. *Freedom of thought is legitimately given to us.* We have the right of embracing all truth, of admitting nothing except that which in some way is clear to us, either intrinsically or extrinsically, of choosing among free beliefs the belief which we desire.

2. *But absolute freedom of thought in moral matters cannot be granted to us because we have no right to error.* Indeed

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 923-931.



we can make errors, and, because of our good faith, we can be excused, but the right to choose error at our whim and to maintain error, to speak objectively, is repugnant to reason. Likewise, we have no right to reject truth which is apparent to us, intrinsically or extrinsically; on the contrary, we must be devoted to the truth whether we know it in a natural or in a supernatural way.

3. The civil or the ecclesiastical authority makes no judgment concerning the exercise of freedom of thinking, provided opinions are not outwardly expressed. As long as our internal thoughts remain in the internal forum, we are bound to render an account of them to no one but to God.

## 2° FREEDOM OF SPEECH

279 1. *Freedom of speech* also is given to us as long as we speak things that are true and are harmful to no one.

2. But *absolute freedom* to make all thoughts public cannot be given, for there is no right to teach error.

3. When errors are expressed publicly, the social power, either civil or ecclesiastical, has the right and the obligation to repress these errors in as much as the social good demands.

## 3° FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE AND OF WORSHIP

### 280 1. Principles.

a. *True freedom of conscience is given to us, namely, the right to embrace and to profess the true religion according to the laws laid upon us by God or by an authority set up by God.*

b. But *absolute freedom of conscience must be rejected*, that is, the right to choose a religion which is more pleasing, or the right to decide on a religion according to the sole light of the individual's reason.

c. When a religion is concerned with *internal acts* only, God alone is the judge in this matter.

d. When religion is manifested by *external acts* and, in a special manner, by a cult or a rite, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities have the right and duty to prohibit those acts which are harmful to the social good.

### 281 2. Corollaries.

From these foregoing principles we can deduce what manner of acting should exist between the Church and the State in regard to freedom of conscience and of worship:

#### a. *Manner of the Church's Acting.*

1) The Church teaches that no one can be forced to profess a religion which he does not acknowledge to be true.

2) The Church has the right and duty of leading her children to their supernatural end and so she has the right and duty to use the means by which hindrances or impediments may be removed. Therefore, in order to protect the faithful she may repel those in her own midst who would spread corruption or error, in whatever way she judges expedient, even to calling upon the civil power for help. Consequently the error of Catholic Liberals is deservedly condemned, because they contend that full liberty is to be given to everyone and that error is to be repressed only by an exposition of truth.

#### b. *Manner of the State's Acting.*

1) *In thesis form* we must admit:

a) That the State can recognize the divinity of the Christian religion and can adopt it as the fundamental law of its constitution.

b) That the State is not bound to suppress every error, for the State is not qualified in matters of religion, but it should curb whatever can injure the good of society.



2. *Hypothetically*, that is, if we posit the fact that the good of society demands that the various kinds of divine worship enjoy the same serenity as the true religion, then what today is called freedom of conscience and of worship can be tolerated.

Therefore, the Roman Pontiffs do not absolutely condemn these freedoms; but they do forbid that these liberties be considered as *rights* which must be granted to error or to false religion.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE ENTIRE TRACT

The Nature and Superiority of the Church

#### 282 A *Nature of the Church.*

From what has been stated the Church can be described thus: *the society of way-faring men under the teaching authority and government of legitimate pastors, and of the Roman Pontiff in particular, united by a profession of the same Christian faith and by communion in the same sacraments, for the purpose of attaining eternal salvation.*

#### B *Superiority of the Church.*

Its superiority is deduced for these reasons:

1. Its *origin* is celestial and divine.
2. Its *continuance* is permanent even unto the end of the world;
3. Its *breadth* is extended to all nations;
4. It possesses an admirable *hierarchical constitution*, in which unity and variety, authority and liberty are manifest.
5. Its fruits or effects, *justice and sanctity*, are abundant.

Therefore, we must say: *I believe in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.*

#### TRACT V

### THE SOURCES OF REVELATION

283 Thus far we have proved that the Church has been instituted by Christ as a *living, authentic, and infallible interpreter of revealed truth*. Thence it follows that the *proximate rule of faith* is the *infallible authority of the Church*. The question to be asked now is this: *from what sources is the deposit of Revelation drawn which the Church proposes?* According to the *Councils of Trent and of the Vatican*<sup>2</sup>, Revelation is contained:

1. in *written books*,
2. in *tradition* not written.

Therefore we have a twofold source of revelation: *Scripture and Tradition*. Tradition is first in time and in extent. We shall, accordingly discuss it first.

#### ARTICLE I. TRADITION<sup>3</sup>

284 Tradition (from the words *trans*, across or over, and *do*, give) is the handing down or the handing over of something; in this instance we are concerned with the handing down

<sup>1</sup> We shall speak more appropriately of the sources which are especially theological in sections 398 and following where the topic under discussion is theology as a science.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 2, D. B., 1787; refer to 783.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to FRANZELIN, *De Traditionibus et Scriptura*; BAINVILLE, *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione*; BOSSUET, *Défense de la Tradition et des SS. Pères. Major Synopsis*, n. 936-952.



of some doctrine. Tradition can be either *human* or *divine*; our discussion now centers about the *divine* tradition of revealed doctrine.

*In a strict sense Tradition is a revealed doctrine pertaining to faith or morals, which is not referred to in the Sacred Scriptures, but which through legitimate Pastors of the Church has been infallibly transmitted from age to age.*

The *object* of Tradition is solely the teaching which has been made known supernaturally by God to the human race; the *means* or *organ* of Tradition is the infallible teaching authority of the legitimate Pastors of the Church. This tradition, consequently, we must distinguish from traditions which are human only, even though they be ecclesiastical or apostolic.

#### Division.

1. By reason of the *author* tradition is divine :

a. *dominical*, that is, set forth by Christ Himself;  
b. *divine-apostolic*, that is, made known by the Apostles, with the Holy Spirit revealing. This is to be distinguished from *tradition which is entirely apostolic or from ecclesiastical tradition.*

2. *In relation to Scripture* tradition can be :

a. *inherent*, when the revealed teaching handed down by the ecclesiastical teaching authority is already clearly contained in Scripture;  
b. *explanatory*, when the doctrine handed down by the teaching authority more clearly explains matters which are presented somewhat obscurely in Scripture;  
c. *entirely oral*, when the doctrine handed down by the teaching authority is not at all found in the inspired books.

We pass now to the topics, *existence* of Tradition and the *organs* of Tradition.

#### I. EXISTENCE OF DIVINE TRADITION

285 **Thesis :** *Divine Tradition, preserved and explained by the authentic teaching authority of the Church, is a source of revelation, distinct from Scripture and infallible.* This thesis is de fide from the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican.

It is in opposition to the *Protestants*, who teach that the one rule of faith is Sacred Scripture, and contrary to the *Modernists*, who affirm that Tradition is the collective knowledge and consciousness of the faithful which the *Church teaching* is bound to confirm and ratify<sup>1</sup>.

The meaning of the thesis is this : revealed teaching is to be sought after not only in Scripture, but also in those things which the infallible magisterium of the Church's legitimate Pastors have taught. This thesis proceeds logically from what was stated regarding the infallible magisterium of the Church (sections 199, 221 and following).

#### A Proof from Scripture.

1. *Christ* wrote no book but He taught orally; He did not command the Apostles to write, but He did order them to teach by word of mouth. Not all of the *Apostles* produced writings, but all of them preached because they were persuaded that Christian teaching would be preserved and spread through the oral teaching authority of the properly constituted Pastors — or through Tradition. Also, from the promises of Christ that medium of preserving doctrine was infallible. (Refer to Section 199 and following).

2. Even with all the inspired books, the oral magisterium of the Apostles and of their successors remains as a source of Revelation; for in his Epistles, and particularly in his *Pastoral* Epistles, Paul often spoke of those matters which he taught by the spoken word and these he ordered to be

<sup>1</sup> Decree *Lamentabili*, D. E., 2006.



preserved as a depositum, and to be instructed faithfully to others who would be capable of teaching still others.

This fact is confirmed from the *nature of Scripture* (refer to section 175); Scripture is not a complete rule of faith; it is not easily attainable by all; nor is it suitable for settling controversies.

Christ, therefore, had to provide another source of Revelation — divine Tradition.

#### B Proof from Early Christianity.

The *Apostolic Fathers*, for example, *St. Ignatius* and *St. Polycarp*, ceaselessly exhorted complete devotion to the tradition of the Apostles; while at first this was handed down by word of mouth, they deemed it necessary to record this tradition of the Apostles in writing also, in order to transmit it more safely to posterity. Writing in opposition to heresies, *St. Irenaeus* set up the ancient teaching against new notions; this ancient teaching was preserved by the legitimately constituted pastors in the churches which were in agreement with the Church of Rome. *St. Stephen* of Rome, in his controversy about baptism, reproved the newness of the African practice, and ordered that there should be no innovation, nothing but what had been handed down.

In the Councils the chief argument which the Fathers used against the heresiarchs was the novelty of their doctrine which was opposed to the ancient tradition. Thus it was at the Council of *Nicea*, against the Arians; at the Council of *Ephesus*, against the Nestorians; at the Council of *Chalcedon*, against the Eutychians. Therefore, the Council of *Trent*, rightly defined: "Perceiving that this truth and doctrine are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions..., the Synod accepts and venerates with equal piety and reverence both all the books of the Old Testament and of the New Testament, since one God is the author of both, and also the traditions themselves, having to do with faith and

<sup>1</sup> Council of Trent, session IV, D. B., 783.

*moralis, as dictated orally by Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and conserved in the Catholic Church with uninterrupted continuity*".

So, too, decreed the *Vatican Council* (Session III, Chap. 2).

**286 Conclusion :** The Church teaches and has always taught that there is a divine Tradition, that it is the sum of truths which, having been divinely revealed to the Apostles, have been handed down without error through the genuine magisterium of Pastors.

Indeed, Tradition is more extensive than Scripture, an embraces truths which are not at all contained in Scripture or are contained there only obscurely; also Tradition is more essential to the Church than is Sacred Scripture, for revealed truth at first was handed down orally by the Apostles, it was always proclaimed orally, always and everywhere it is to be proclaimed thus since the Church is primarily the guardian and herald of revealed truth and is therefore through her tradition the interpreter of Scripture itself.

Consequently, the principal source of Revelation is Tradition

#### II. THE ORGANS OF TRADITION<sup>1</sup>

The organs (instruments) of Tradition are the various voices which express and describe the Catholic belief, namely, the *Supreme Pontiff*, the *bishops*, and the *faithful*. According to the *Vatican Council*, the teaching authority of the Church is carried on in a twofold manner: "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, which are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed".

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 953-981.

<sup>2</sup> Vatican Council, session III, chap. 3, D. B., 1792.



## A THE SOLEMN MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH

287 *Magisterium* is called *solemn* (it is seldom exercised) when certain forms are employed which make a stronger impression and awaken more attention.

Solemn Magisterium includes :

1. *dogmatic definitions* of Roman Pontiffs, of Ecumenical Councils, or even of particular councils which have been approved in solemn form by the Supreme Pontiffs, or have been accepted by the universal Church;
2. *symbols* or *professions of faith*, issued by the Church or genuinely approved by the Church;
3. *theological censures*, contrary to *heretical* propositions or *anti-faith* propositions. Of these we shall speak at some length in the tract on Faith (section 331).

## I. Dogmatic Definitions

288 *Principle.* All those things must be held *de fide* which directly and immediately are proposed as matters which have to be believed. The reason is : these definitions are infallible. But, in these definitions, what is proposed that must be held as a matter of faith?

a. *Not* to be held *de fide* are those matters which do not pertain to faith or morals, nor assertions made in previous assemblages or sessions of the council, nor the motives or reasons for the definition, nor the philosophical, theological, or biblical arguments.

But, if the Pontiff or the Council authoritatively declares the sense or meaning of some text of Scripture, then this declaration is infallible and all must accept it<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In the Decree *Lamentabili*, proposition 4<sup>a</sup> was condemned : " Even by dogmatic definitions the Church's magisterium cannot determine the genuine sense of the Sacred Scriptures ". D. B., 2004.

b. Although definitions are very often found in *canons*, nevertheless sometimes the Synods have handed down the dogmatic definition in the *chapters* which precede the *canons* (for example, the Council of Trent in the decree concerning justification).

c. No fixed formula is required in proclaiming a definition. It is sufficient that the words used should convey the meaning that a doctrine is revealed, is to be considered *de fide*... or that its contrary is heretical. Further, it is necessary that the defined truth be set forth *clearly* and *certainly*.

d. In order that we may *correctly understand* the definition, we should learn :

1. *what the condemned heretics taught* and what error of theirs has been rejected;
2. *what the Fathers wished to define.* This will be evident from the definition itself and from the acts of the Council;
3. *in what sense the words used in the definition are to be understood.* This can be made clear from the ordinary use of the words at the time of the council, from the previous discussions, from the interpretation prevailing among theologians, and especially from the authoritative interpretation of the Church, if one has been given.

## 2. Symbols and Professions of Faith

289 a. A *symbol* (creed) may be defined as a *simple and brief summa of the truths of faith, which the Church proposes to the faithful as a sign (mark) of Christian profession.* There are three principal Symbols or Creeds :

1. *The Symbol of the Apostles or the Apostles' Creed*; its doctrine<sup>1</sup> is certainly apostolic. A revision or summary of this was made at Rome it seems at a later date; and then

<sup>1</sup> In the Decree *Lamentabili*, proposition 62<sup>a</sup> is condemned : " The chief articles of the Apostles' Creed did not have the same sense for the Christians of the first ages as they have for the Christians of our times ". D. B., 2062.



various additions<sup>1</sup> were approved by the authority of the universal Church.

2. *The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed or Symbol* — This was brought forth first by the Council of Nicaea in 325 in opposition to Arius; afterwards it was made complete by the Council of Constantinople in 381 against Macedonius; it was accepted by the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. The insertion of the word *Filioque* was made in the ninth century.

3. *The Athanasian Creed or Symbol* — The author of this is unknown. It was approved by the Church as a formula of faith; it was proposed to the faithful and was given a place in the Breviary.

b. *A profession of faith is a fuller explanation of certain articles of faith in opposition to more recent errors.* A particularly distinguished one is the *Tridentine* or *Pianine* <sup>2</sup> *Profession* prescribed by Pius IV in 1564. Similar to this is the oath assigned by St Pius X in 1910, *Motu proprio Sacrorum Antistitum* <sup>3</sup>.

For distinguishing what is to be accepted as a matter of faith in *Symbols* and in *Professions*, we must follow the rules, previously explained, relating to dogmatic definitions.

#### B THE ORDINARY AND UNIVERSAL MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH <sup>4</sup>.

The *ordinary* and *universal* magisterium is that which is carried on daily through the continuous preaching of the Church among all peoples. It includes:

I. The preaching and proclamations of the Corporate Body of Bishops,

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 1-40.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 994. From the decree of the *Congregation of the Council*, January 20, 1877, there must be added to this profession these words: "and handed down, defined, and proclaimed by the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican, especially in regard to the primacy and the infallible magisterium of the Roman Pontiff. D. B., 1000.

<sup>3</sup> D. B., 2145-2147.

<sup>4</sup> VACANT, *Le magistère ordinaire de l'Eglise et ses organes*.

2. universal custom or practice associated with dogma,
3. the consensus or agreement of the Fathers and of the Theologians,
4. the common or general understanding of the faithful <sup>1</sup>.

#### 1. *The Morally Unanimous Preaching (Teaching) of the Bishops*

290 Bishops teach the flock entrusted and subject to them by means of catechisms, by synodal directives, mandates, and in public sermons. If it is evident from these documents that some doctrine is being set forth *universally* as an object of faith, then nothing else is required for this doctrine to be accepted *de fide*. Bishops spread throughout the world, but with the Roman Pontiff forming one Corporate Body, are infallible when declaring a teaching on faith or morals.

#### 2. *Practice of the Church Associated with Dogma*

291 Among the customs and practices which have been closely joined to dogma we mention especially the *public rites* used in the solemn celebration of the sacrifice, or in the administration of the sacraments; also the *formulas of prayers* and various feasts or offices instituted by the Church; or sacred practices which have been associated with doctrine.

For a *practice of the Church to become a criterion of faith* there are two requirements:

- a. that the *practice be necessarily connected with the dogmatic truth*; for in imposing a practice or custom, the Church by that very fact orders that dogmas connected with this practice must be adhered to;
- b. that a custom of this kind be *universal* or approved at least tacitly by infallible authority; for only the universal Church enjoys infallibility. Therefore, a custom or practice

<sup>1</sup> We should note that the words: *Fathers, theologians, and the faithful* refer to the *Church Hearing*, not to the *Church Teaching*.



of one particular Church produces only a probable argument for revealed truth. The *Roman Liturgy*, approved in a special manner by the Supreme Pontiffs, cannot contain errors in dogma. Historical mistakes can creep in, and, as a matter of fact, they have slipped into the *legends* in the Breviary, as the best critics admit. But this fact is easily understood because the special lessons of the Second Nocturns were written at a time when apocryphal works were being spread abroad. Nevertheless, these lessons should not be despised because many points contained in them are true and are suitable for fostering piety and goodness.

### 3. *The Agreement of the Fathers and of the Theologians*

#### a. *The Authority of the Fathers*

292 1. **Who are the Fathers?** The Fathers are those men, distinguished for their sanctity and their doctrine, who in the first centuries made the Church renowned by their writings, and who received full approbation from the Church, at least in an implicit manner. In order to recognize these men, we should look for four marks or signs: renowned and orthodox teaching, holiness of life, antiquity, and the approbation of the Church. Among the ecclesiastical writers some have been adorned with the title, *Doctor of the Church*, because they have surpassed others with their superior knowledge. Of these eight are the *major* Doctors of the Church, the others are called the *minor* Doctors.

#### 293 2. **Rules concerning the Authority of the Fathers.**

a. *Introductory notes.* In order to make a study of the teaching of the Fathers, we must pay attention to the *laws of historical criticism*. We may consider the Fathers either as *private doctors* or as witnesses to the Church or to the *faith*.

1) They are regarded as *private doctors* when they reason and present their arguments in the manner of the philosophers, when they make use of analogies or comparisons, or propose

their own opinion in such a way that they do not exclude the contrary opinion.

2) They speak as *witnesses to the Church* when they teach that a doctrine has been revealed, or has been accepted by the universal Church, or that a doctrine must be so held that it cannot be denied without the loss of faith or cannot be called into doubt. Similarly they speak as witnesses to the faith when they assert that a contrary opinion is heretical or opposed to the word of God.

If they speak as *private doctors*, their authority is only as great as is their knowledge or as is the force of their arguments; but if they speak as *witnesses for the Church*, they manifest not their own mind, but the faith of the infallible Church.

#### b. *Rules to be followed:*

1) *The morally unanimous agreement of the Fathers declaring that a doctrine is de fide is a certain argument of divine Tradition.* Three conditions are necessary that an argument be considered certain: that it relate to a doctrine pertaining to *faith or morals*; that the testimony be free of doubt, that it be firm and that the Fathers declare positively that the doctrine is a *doctrine of the Church*; that the agreement of the Fathers be not mathematically but *morally unanimous*. For in this way the faith or belief of the universal Church can be certainly known. With these conditions posited, it can be said that the Fathers record the teaching of the universal Church. But the Church is infallible in teaching Christ's doctrine.

Further, in order that an argument may be regarded as completely certain, the *moral unanimity of the Fathers of one age* is required and is sufficient<sup>1</sup>. The Church at all times is indefectible and so in no age can it be guilty of error.

<sup>1</sup> In this case the argument has force only for Catholics who admit the infallibility of the Church; but when the Fathers of different times and from different places agree on some dogma, then we have an apologetical argument for non-Catholics since it is evident from this argument that our faith is the same as the faith of the Apostles.



2) *The testimony of one Father or of many Fathers in matters of faith and of morals is a probable argument, the force of which increases as the number and authority of the Fathers increase.*

3) *When the Fathers disagree, then their authority offers no firm argument; rather it proves that the matter on hand has not been explicitly defined; for if a matter had been clearly defined, then the Fathers could not have defended the contrary opinion without being condemned by the Church as heretics. If the disagreement is manifest, we must confess that certain Fathers have erred: for as individuals they are fallible. But if their words are doubtful, they must be explained by referring to subject matter which is clearer. In every case their words must be treated with respect; we must not attribute error to them because they have had no knowledge of the more explicit definitions of a following age.*

#### b. *The Authority of Theologians*

294 After the Patristic age *Theologians* arranged in logical order the doctrines contained in Scripture and in Tradition and they explained these doctrines with the help of philosophical reasoning. These theologians can be considered as *witnesses to the faith* or as *private doctors*. They should not be esteemed lightly no matter what the Protestants, Modernists or other adversaries alleged against them.

In regard to their authority the following rules should be admitted:

1. *When theologians unanimously teach that something is not only true but also that it must be accepted in Catholic faith, such consensus on their part presents a certain argument;*
2. *If all proclaim some doctrine in regard to faith and morals as true or certain, it is rash to reject this doctrine;*
3. *If there is a division of opinion among the different schools, even if the theologians of one school hold their opinion as certain or as very close to faith, no obligation exists of accepting such an opinion.*

#### 4. *The Common Understanding of the Faithful*

295 Revealed doctrine can be discovered not only among the Pastors and other leaders who teach with the Pastors, but also among *the faithful who with a common or general understanding profess a unanimous faith.*

In order that this common understanding be a criterion of revelation, it must be:

- a. certain and clear,
- b. unanimous,
- c. concerned with important matters of faith and of morals.

The fact that the general agreement of the faithful is then a criterion of revelation is proved:

a. *From the indefectibility of the Church.* We have already stated that the Church cannot fail. But the Church would be failing in essentials if she were a society of erring souls. Therefore.

b. *From the Fathers.* For example, St. Augustine, in refuting the Pelagians, proved the existence of original sin in little children and the need, therefore, of baptism for these, from the common understanding of the faithful. This he regarded as a very strong argument of faith.

296 Other pertinent notes on this subject are these:

a. This infallibility in *believing* is often-times called *passive* infallibility; it depends on *active* infallibility (in teaching) which should always direct it.

b. We should avoid the error of those who think that the Church teaching merely confirms the opinions of the Church learning<sup>1</sup>. For the Church teaching must pass judgment

<sup>1</sup> In the decree *Lamentabili* proposition 6<sup>a</sup> is condemned: "The Church learning and the Church teaching collaborate in such a way in defining truths that it remains for the Church teaching only to sanction the opinions of the Church learning". D. B., 2006.



on these opinions, approve them or condemn them, and in this way direct the faith of her subjects and turn them from error.

c. Therefore, the faithful in the Church are in no way the teachers, they do not define authoritatively, but they give their belief. The Teachers impart and define the truth which all believe. But God is able to employ the faithful to promote some devotion, for example, the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; but even in such an instance all proceeds under the authority of the Bishops — they alone are the authoritative judges and proclaimers of the faith.

#### ARTICLE II. SACRED SCRIPTURE

297 Sacred Scripture is the *written word of God*, or a collection of books which, *written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have God as an author*; and as such these books have been handed down to the Church. All Christians admit that the Sacred Scriptures are a source of Revelation. In order that the force of arguments taken from Scripture may be better understood, we shall consider two matters:

1. In what sense these books are inspired;
2. In what way we may use inspired books to explain the truths of faith. In other words we are interested in the two topics: *inspiration* and *interpretation* of the Scriptures.

#### I. INSPIRATION OF SACRED SCRIPTURE

298 **State of the Question.** All the canonical books are inspired. The question arises: what are the *nature* and *extent* of inspiration? This is a question not of right, but of *fact*; it must be answered not by reason alone, but by the authority of Scripture and of the Church.

299 **Erroneous Opinions.**

1. Through *overstatement* the Protestants of old fell into error, declaring that God mechanically dictated all the ideas and all the words.

2. But through *defect*:

- a. The *Liberal* Protestants have erred who admit only a vague inspiration such as is attributed to poets;
- b. Certain Catholics have been mistaken who say that inspiration is nothing more than the assistance of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of guarding against errors — or merely the subsequent approbation of a book written with human diligence wherefore God or the Church pronounces it free from error.

#### A. The Nature of Inspiration

#### 300 Catholic Doctrine.

1. The Councils of Florence and of Trent assert that God is the author of both Testaments; and the Vatican Council states the matter identically: "These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical, not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error, but because, *having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author* and have been delivered as such to the Church herself<sup>1</sup>."

2. For true inspiration, therefore, simple divine assistance is *not sufficient*, nor is subsequent approbation given by God or by the Church; so, too, merely personal inspiration which resembles poetic inspiration does not suffice. On the other hand, revelation properly so called or the manifestation of an unknown truth to the writer is *not required*; but everything contained in the sacred book, although not revealed as far as the author himself is concerned, is *truly revealed as far as we are concerned*, provided that God as the principal author of the book *makes those things his own* which the sacred writer is relating under divine influence. A fortiori, it is not required that the sacred author write in the

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 1787, Refer to Leo XIII, Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, Nov. 18, 1893; BENEDICT XV, Encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitis*, September 15, 1920; Pius XII, Encyclical *Divino Aflante*, September 30, 1943. A. DURAND, *Inerrance, Inspiration*, in D. A., vol. II, 752, 894; Supplement Dic. Bibl. COURTADE, a. *Inspiration et inerrance*, col. 482-559.



state of ecstasy. Also, it is not necessary that the inspired book was written by the author whose name it bears or to whom it is generally attributed.

301 3. According to the *Vatican Council* it is required and it suffices that these books, composed under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have God as their author. Therefore, there is a two-fold author of an inspired book:

a. the sacred writer who is the instrumental cause, not the mechanical cause; an intelligent and free cause. Inspiration does not exclude the particular or proper work of the writer — this fact is apparent from these references: *Second Book of Machabees*, II, 27; *Gospel according to St. Luke*, I, 3; *Gospel according to St. John*, XIX, 35 First Epistle of St. John, I.

b. God who is the principal efficient cause<sup>1</sup>.

*God and man come together* for the composition of a sacred book. First of all, God excites and moves the writer to write and he gives assistance to the writer. Secondly, God bestows on the one writing a supernatural light by means of which he correctly forms in his mind a concept of what God wishes to be written — with the result that his judgments are not just human judgments but are principally the judgments of God who is illuminating his mind. Thirdly, God gives assistance lest the writer omit something which God wishes to be recorded, lest he add something or fall into error.

Therefore the words are not necessarily dictated to the writer, but rather, under the influence of divine light words are selected by the writer, which correctly express the mind of God. The sacred books are entirely from God and entirely from man, in such a way, however, that man is the instrument of God, the principal author<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Decree, *Lamentabili*, proposition 9<sup>a</sup>: "They display excessive simplicity or ignorance who believe that God is really the author of the Sacred Scriptures". D. B., 2009.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 174, a. 2, ad 3; *De Veritate*, q. 12, a. 12.

## B. Inspiration and the Extension of Inerrancy

302 1. General Principle. Everything which was asserted in the original books has been inspired and is, therefore, formally true. This statement is de fide from the *Vatican Council*.

Inspiration, and hence inerrancy, do not extend only to matters of faith and of morals, but to everything that was affirmed in the original books, that is, to everything that the sacred author explicitly or implicitly reports as the word of God or makes his own. In the authentic places of Scripture there is no error, nor can error be found<sup>1</sup>. These propositions proceed from the supreme truthfulness of God who is the author of the sacred book.

## 303 2. Corollaries.

a. If the inspired author reports the sayings of others and rejects them or disapproves of them, it is evident that these are not true. If he praises them, they are true but only in the sense in which they are approved. If he relates words without approving or disapproving, then the Holy Spirit is only testifying that these words have been stated by others.

b. The Sacred Writers can even recount the words of documents without explicitly saying so; in such a case we have implicit citations. But as the *Biblical Commission* observed on February 13, 1905, implicit citations may not be permitted unless, "due regard being given to the mind and judgment of the Church, it can be proved by substantial arguments:

1. that the hagiographer is quoting the words of another or quoting documents;

2. that he does not approve these or make them his own so that rightfully it is not thought that he speaks in his own name". Therefore, they are mistaken who, in order to explain the obstacles that are set up in opposition to the truthfulness of Scripture, admit implicit citations so frequent that thereafter the historical truth of the sacred books seems to be wavering.

<sup>1</sup> In the decree *Lamentabili*, proposition 11<sup>a</sup> is condemned: "Divine inspiration does not extend to all of Sacred Scriptures so that it renders its parts, each and every one, free from every error". D. B., 2011.



Among the inspired books some are *historical*<sup>1</sup>, others *prophetical*, others *didactic* or *poetical*. There is error in none of them. But the poetical books should be understood according to the proper rules for poetry; the historical books, according to the laws of history, and similarly the other books. Among these there are various *literary classifications*<sup>2</sup>.

In the historical books *scientific* matters are sometimes described in a *popular manner* as these are *apparent to the senses*. Leo XIII explained this. Sometimes even *allegories* and *parables* and similar methods are used to explain some moral truth. These cannot be admitted unless they are supported by solid arguments and are approved by the mind of the Church<sup>3</sup>. But *Benedict XV* (previously quoted) solicitously advises against letting a rule about *scientific* matters be transferred to *historical* affairs: for history narrates things as they have taken place.

Even in the midst of these difficulties this principle should always remain unchanged: *there is absolutely no error in whatever the inspired author brings forth in his own name*, since God can never inspire error.

## II. THE USE OF SCRIPTURE AS A SOURCE OF REVELATION

From what has been said we may infer that only those things in Scripture are a source of Revelation which are *produced by the sacred author in his own name, in the sense intended by himself and by God*. That this sense may be disclosed, it is necessary to consider how Scripture should be interpreted.

<sup>1</sup> The Church has not defined what books are historical, but Catholic critics who search into this matter should bear in mind the *traditional meaning* of the Church. Refer to the *Biblical Commission*, June 30, 1909, *The Historical Character* of chap. 1-3, *Genesis*.

<sup>2</sup> Pius XII, *Encyclical, Divino afflante*, n. 35-38.

<sup>3</sup> This can be allowed only in a case "in which, the Church's meaning not being contradicted and its judgment being approved, it is proved by solid arguments that the hagiographer has wished to transmit not true and properly called history, but under the appearance and form of history, has wished to offer a parable, an allegory or some other meaning separated from the proper literal or historical meaning of the words". *Biblical Commission*, June 23, 1905.

<sup>4</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 1002-1017.

## A. The Senses of Scripture

1. *The Various Senses*. In general the sense of Scripture is that truth which the Holy Spirit immediately or mediately wished to be made manifest through the writer.

It is two-fold:

- a. *Literal* — the sense which the words immediately express. The literal sense is either *proper* when it arises from the words taken in their own natural signification; or the literal sense is *metaphorical* when it arises from the words taken figuratively — thus this is often called the figurative sense.
- b. *Spiritual* or *typical* or *mystical* sense, which is not supplied immediately by the letter, but by the persons or things which are so arranged by divine Providence that they indicate other things or persons.

This spiritual sense is three-fold:

1. *allegorical*, when it concerns those things which must be believed about Christ and the Church Militant;
2. *tropological*, when it considers morals;
3. *anagogic*, when it symbolizes heaven or things to be hoped for.

This sense (spiritual) is found in Scripture alone; it is not to be admitted unless first of all its existence is apparent from some other place in Scripture or from Tradition.

The *accommodated* or adapted sense is not a true sense of Scripture, for it consists in this, that the words of Scripture are used to express something other than what the sacred author expressed or represented.

2. *What sense may be a source of Revelation?*

305 In order that the sense be regarded as a certain source of Revelation it must be:

- a. the literal sense, positis ponendis;



b. *the spiritual sense* when that is certainly apparent. Since *its* spiritual sense is a true sense of Scripture intended by God, it can be employed in Theology; however, in controversy it should not be proposed unless the adversary admits and acknowledges it. It is obvious that the *accommodated* or *adapted* sense is in no way a source of Revelation.

### B. *The Laws of Interpretation*

Scripture is a human book and at the same time a divine book. Therefore it must be understood according to the grammatical-historical rules which are common to all books, and according to the Catholic rules which are special and particular to an inspired book.

306 1. *The grammatical-historical rules.* For a correct understanding of the author's mind a critically recognized text and an examination of and commentaries on the context of parallel places are most useful.

a. *A primigenial or primary text* should be diligently sought for, insofar as that is possible.

A theologian can safely make use of the *Vulgate version* as a genuine source of revelation<sup>1</sup> and can acquire the dogmas of faith from all the texts about the universal dogmatic application of which it is clear. But if a text is found in the Vulgate which is not present in a primary text or in other editions, or if it has a meaning entirely different from that in the original, the argument deduced from this will indeed be legitimate, but *additional*, not *biblical*. In places that are ambiguous or less accurate, the Vulgate can be made clear or can be improved by referring to a primigenial text or to the ancient versions.

b. *Context* must be carefully examined. In particular three points must be taken into consideration:

<sup>1</sup> "The most holy Synod... states and declares that this old and Vulgate edition which has been approved in the Church through continuing use of so many centuries, in public readings, disputations, proclamations, and expositions, is to be considered authoritative". *Council of Trent*, session IV, D. B., 78.

1. *the occasion* on which the author of the book, or the author of the discourse reported in the book, wrote or spoke, and the intention which he proposed for himself;

2. *the general argument* which the author intended to discuss;

3. *the nexus*, not only logical and grammatical but also psychological, of ideas and of words among themselves and with those which precede or follow.

c. *Parallel places* are those texts which found in other chapters of the same book or in another book, transmit the same doctrine either in the same words or in different words, and so mutually illustrate and explain one another.

d. *Commentaries*, professional explanations of the text.

### 307 2. *Catholic rules of interpretation.*

a. Because Sacred Scripture is a *divine book*, it is intrusted to the infallible magisterium of the Church for explanation. Therefore, "*in matters of faith and of morals appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Sacred Scriptures which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; and therefore it is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, nor, likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers*"<sup>1</sup>.

#### *Consequently:*

1. as often as the Church has defined the sense of a text, that sense must be accepted as true;

2. as often as the Fathers unanimously explain in the same way some biblical declaration as pertaining to a doctrine of faith or of morals, their interpretation must be followed;

3. outside of these cases, the opinion of the Fathers is to be regarded very seriously since in these matters they perform, as it were privately, the duty of doctors; but the Fathers' opinion does not obligate, especially in a matter which is entirely *scientific*; in such an instance they speak as *private doctors*, according to theories which were flourishing in their time;

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, D. B., 1788. Refer to *Council of Trent*, session IV, D. B., 786.



4. in the interpretation of Scripture an analogy to faith is to be pursued; and the sense which causes inspired authors to disagree among themselves or which is opposed to the Church's doctrine should be rejected.

b. In his Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, Leo XIII gave a two-fold rule:

1. the literal sense is to be retained unless necessity or a serious reason presents an obstacle;
2. the allegorical sense is not to be discarded when it depends on the literal sense and is supported by the authority of many.

#### CONCLUSION OF THE TRACT

308 1. If we establish a *comparison between Scripture and Tradition*, we see that:

- a. Each is the word of God; each is infallible; each is to be received with equal piety and respect.
- b. In as much as Scripture is a book which comes immediately from God through inspiration, and since through inspiration God becomes the principal author of the book, Scripture surpasses Tradition, the texts of which have man as an author, helped by divine assistance.
- c. Under other aspects Tradition far surpasses Scripture both in antiquity, and in amplitude, in usefulness and in necessity.

2. But if we establish a *comparison between the living Magisterium* on the one side, and *Scripture and Tradition* on the other side, the living Magisterium or the Episcopal Body now existing under the Roman Pontiff is the *proximate rule of faith*; this teaches us authoritatively the word of God. Scripture and Tradition, or the proclaiming of the Church in the ancient centuries, are the *remote rule of faith*, or the sources through which the word of God has been preserved and from which has been gathered all that the Church must propose to all.

Therefore, directed by the Church and possessed of the motives of credibility (refer to *Tracts on the Christian Religion* and on the *Church of Christ*), we are now in a position to approach the act of faith.

#### PART THE SECOND

### SPECIAL THEOLOGY

#### TRACT VI

### FAITH

#### First Section : Faith itself

Through *faith* we give our assent to the truths which have been revealed by God, and which are contained in Scripture and in Tradition.

309 A Among secular and sacred authors *faith* in general signifies acts of the intellect and of the will. As we view it at this time, it is the firm assent of the intellect because of the testimony of another. If the testimony is *human*, faith is called *human*; if the testimony is *divine*, the faith is called *divine faith*. This we shall now consider.

Divine faith can be viewed as an *act*, or as a *habit* or *virtue*.

a. The act of faith is the *supernatural assent by which the intellect, under the command of the will and the influence of*



*grace, firmly accepts revealed truths because of the authority of God who is revealing*<sup>1</sup>.

The act of faith, therefore differs :

1. from *religious sense*, which relies in a special way on imagination and sensibility;
2. from *historical certitude*, which is founded on human testimony;
3. from the *beatific vision*, wherein clearly and immediately we perceive the divine.

But since the intellect, through faith, assents to divine truths not because of intrinsic evidence, it is necessary that the intellect be favorably disposed *through the command of the will* which respectfully accepts the authority of God. For such a supernatural act the *flowing in of grace* is entirely required, that is, the influx of the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit interiorly moving the intellect and the will.

b. Faith as a *habit* is a *supernatural and a theological virtue which disposes the mind to assent firmly to all that God has revealed, because of divine authority*.

310 B Faith is divided into :

a. *faith simply or plainly divine*, when that which is believed has been revealed only by God;

<sup>1</sup> This definition is in accord with that which St. Thomas, in 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 2, a. 9, has left us; with that which the *Vatican Council* laid down in session III, chap. 3; and with that of Pius X in the formula of the oath against Modernism wherein it is declared : " faith is not a blind sense of religion which comes forth from the secret places of the subconscious, *morally formed* under an impulse of the heart and of a changing of the will; but it is the true assent of the intellect to a truth which has been extrinsically received from hearing, by which we believe that those things which have been said, have been testified to, have been revealed by a personal God, our Creator and our Lord, are true, on account of the authority of God, the greatest truth. Refer to D. B., 1789-2145. — St. Paul declares : " Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not ". *Epistle to the Hebrews*, XI, 1. — *Major Synopsis*, vol. II, n. 122-144.

b. *faith simply Catholic*, when what is believed has been revealed by God and has also been defined by the Church;

c. *faith formed or living*, which is united to charity, the form or model of the virtues and the life of the soul;

d. *faith formless or dead*, which exists without merit in sinners<sup>1</sup>.

A false idea of faith proposed by the *early Protestants* is : faith is confidence in divine mercy. A false notion of the *Rationalists* is this : faith is any rational knowledge which is naturally known (possessed) regarding God and divine things. The *Semi-Rationalists* (Günther) state : faith is an assent which is produced by arguments that are simply natural. The *Modernists* hold that faith is a blind sense of religion which had its origin in the need for the divine.

## CHAPTER I

### THE OBJECT OF FAITH

There is a two-fold object : the *material* object, namely that *which* is believed; the *formal* object, or that *by reason of which* it is believed. We shall discuss the formal object at this point because the mind may attain to the material object only through the formal object.

#### ARTICLE I. THE FORMAL OBJECT OF FAITH OR THE MOTIVE OF FAITH

The intellectual assent of faith is not a blind motion of the mind; rather, it depends on rational motives, namely, the *motive of faith* and the *motives of credibility*.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 1-7; SUAREZ, *Faith*, disput. 1, section 1; BULLOT, *The Infused Virtues*, 1905, p. 198-386; HARENT, in D. T. C., a. *Credence et Foi*.



### A The formal object or motive of faith

1. **Erroneous opinions.** The Semi-Rationalists teach that the motive for believing is the intrinsic evidence of things which is known from reason; according to the Modernists it is the evidence which arises from the conformity of things with the religious sense.

2. **Catholic Thesis:** *the motive or the formal object of faith is the authority of God Who reveals (or infallibility in knowing and truthfulness in speaking).* This thesis is de fide from the Vatican Council<sup>1</sup>: "If anyone shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral truths, and therefore that it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed *because of the authority of God, Who reveals it, let him be anathema*".

#### Proofs of Thesis.

a. *Proof from Scripture.* From Christ's and the Apostle's manner of acting: they always set forth the teaching which they were proclaiming as one which all had to believe because of the authority of God. Thus Christ spoke: "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent me"<sup>2</sup>. In the conversation with Nicodemus Christ confessed that He was handing down truths which were difficult to understand, which were, actually, apparently impossible to understand, but which had to be believed on the authority of a knowing and truthful witness, namely, Himself. "Amen, amen I say to you, that we speak what we know, and we testify what we have seen"<sup>3</sup>. But it is evident throughout the entire Gospel of St. John that the testimony of Christ is the testimony of God. Therefore, the Christian faith consists of this that we give assent to a truth because of the authority of God Who is bearing witness through Christ.

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 3; *D. B.*, 1811; *Major Synopsis*, n. 145-160.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, VII, 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, III, 11; refer to VIII, 26.

In his *Epistle to the Romans* St. Paul praises the faith of Abraham who believed as God spoke to him, in spite of the apparent impossibility of the situation<sup>1</sup>. St. Paul demands faith in his own preaching because of the authority of God.

### 312 b. Proof from Tradition.

1. *Apologists* have not set up a scientific proof of every Catholic truth; but they do show that the Christian religion has been revealed by God, and by reason of the *authority* of God it must be accepted.

2. In opposition to the Manicheans, who tried to prove all of their dogmas through rational demonstration, *St. Augustine* pointed out that in the matter of religion it is not improper to believe before one *understands* since faith rests on the testimony of God.

3. In the Middle Ages the theory of Abelard was rejected: he strove to construct a faith "*which the evidence of human reason produced and made compulsive*".

4. Finally, in the nineteenth century, the *Vatican Council*, contrary to the semi-Rationalists who were asserting that the motive of assent of faith was the scientific proof of Christian dogmas, defined that the motive of faith is the authority of God Who reveals.

### 313 3. Disputed Questions.

a. Is the fact of revelation, together with the authority of God, a partial motive of faith? The *Thomists* answer affirmatively because the one believing is moved to believe both by the authority of God and by the fact of revelation. The *Scotists* answer negatively, saying that the authority of God is the *one* formal object of faith, but that the fact of revelation is only a *condition sine qua non* of adherence.

314 b. *Is the Church's proposal of a revealed truth a partial motive of divine faith* More commonly this is denied. For

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, IV, 18-26.



such a proposal indicates only a revealed truth which the Church teaches not in her own name, but in the name of God; and therefore it indicates what must be believed because of the authority of God Who reveals.

Hence, *an act of divine faith can be elicited without a proposition (propositional) of the Church*. For, although the Church is the *ordinary* medium by which revealed truths are set forth, nevertheless, there are other means by which man can learn about the revelation of some truth. Further, from the contrary opinion it would follow that non-Catholics, remaining in good faith outside the Catholic Church, are deprived of all hope of salvation: this was condemned by Pius IX. (Refer to section 242, footnote.)

315 c. *Under what consideration* must the authority of God be recognized as the formal object of faith, whether by the light of reason or by the light of faith? The difficulty lies in this, that the act of faith is at the same time *rational* or *reasonable* and therefore knowable by reason, and *supernatural* and accordingly perceivable by the light of faith.

1) *J. de Lugo*<sup>1</sup> thinks that the motive of faith is indeed known by reason, but that this knowledge is supernatural because God by means of supernatural grace concurs in this. It follows from this, however, that knowledge of this motive is not *essentially* supernatural: for example, I believe in the Incarnation because I *know* that God is truthful and has revealed the Incarnation.

2) According to Billot<sup>2</sup>, Bainevel, and others, the motive of faith is known by the *light of reason*; but the intellect offers assent to the revealed truth, *not because of its clearness but because of the greatness and authority of Him Who reveals*. This assent is supernatural, not by reason of the material or formal object, but solely and singularly from the principle of grace which elevates the intellect to the supernatural order.

<sup>1</sup> *De fide*, disp. VII.

<sup>2</sup> *The infused virtues*, p. 73, 287 and following, ed. 1905.

3) According to the Thomists<sup>1</sup>, the motive of faith is known by the *light of faith*, for it is nothing other than the authority of God Who reveals and He is the *author of the supernatural order*. Thus faith is truly *supernatural quoad substantiam*, since it makes us sharers in the divine light. But faith is *reasonable* because the motives of credibility, through which it is certainly evident that God is truthful and has revealed, are known by reason. I believe, therefore, because I see in the light of the authority of God revealing that God has revealed that such a doctrine is true. So the motive of faith is at the same time that *by which* some revealed truths are believed, and it is also *that which* is believed, since at one and the same moment we believe the authority of God Who reveals, and a particular truth which He has revealed.

This opinion we accept as the more probable opinion; it is more in accord with the doctrine of the *Vatican Council* and is more adapted to explaining how the assent of faith can be stronger than the knowledge of the motives of credibility.

### 316 B The signs or motives of credibility<sup>2</sup>

The motives of credibility are the reasons upon which rests the judgment of credibility; by means of this judgment it is established that the Catholic doctrine is credible and must be believed because of the authority of God Who is revealing. These motives are certain signs, chiefly miracles and prophecies, which prove the divine origin of the Christian religion, without excluding, however, the internal helps of grace or the agreement of dogmas with reason. This agreement is helpful in the matter of giving assent. These motives differ from the *motive of faith*, previously explained, which is the *intrinsic* element in the act of faith; the signs of credibility pertain to the preamble or preface to faith and are *extrinsic* to faith.

In order that the assent of faith may be in agreement with reason, "God willed that to the interior help of the Holy

<sup>1</sup> GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *Theologia fundamentalis*, vol. 1, p. 458-514.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 161-173.



Spirit, there should be joined exterior proofs of His revelation, namely, divine facts and especially miracles and prophecies, which, as they manifestly display the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of His divine revelation and are adapted to the intelligence of all men<sup>1</sup>."

We shall now consider :

- 1° the credibility of revelation;
- 2° the certitude of credibility required for faith.

#### 1° THE CREDIBILITY OF REVELATION

**317 Thesis :** *Christian Revelation is surely credible from the external signs, especially the miracles and prophecies, which are most certain proofs of its divine origin and are adapted to the intelligence of all.* This thesis is de fide from the Vatican Council in opposition to the liberal Protestants and Modernists : "If anyone shall say that *divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs*, and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each, or by private inspiration, let him be anathema<sup>2</sup>."

This, however, does not deny that at certain times some men are moved to faith by an internal illumination.

#### Proof of thesis.

##### a. Proof from Scripture.

1. To John's messengers asking, "Art thou he who is to come or look we for another?" Jesus replied, "Going report to John what you have heard and seen : the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise, etc." From this we gather that the miracles of Christ are proofs of His divine mission.

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council, De Fide*, chap. 3; *D. B.*, 1790.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, can. 3, *de Fide*; *D. B.*, 1812.

2. In His disputation with the Pharisees Christ again brought forward the testimony of Moses and of the other prophets and the testimony of His Father, manifested through the works which He was accomplishing, as signs and proofs of His mission.

3. Of the Apostles it was said, "But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed", that is, through signs which accompanied their preaching. In order to prove that Christ was truly the Messiah and the Son of God, the Apostles themselves appealed to His *miracles and prophecies*. Therefore there are given motives of credibility *not exclusively internal* but also external, sufficient for believing.

#### 318 b. Proof from Tradition.

1. *The Apologists and the Fathers*, both Greek and Latin, made use of the testimony of prophecy and of miracles in order to prove the divinity of the Christian religion.

2. *Theologians* declare that faith is in accord with reason because of the *clearness of the signs* which have been produced in favor of faith : "The faithful would not believe unless he saw that these things must be believed either because of the clearness of the proofs or because of a similar reason<sup>1</sup>."

3. The *Church* confirmed this doctrine through her own magisterium.

a. This fact is evident from the canons of the *Vatican Council* wherein the following are condemned :

- 1) Liberal Protestants who say "*divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs*, and, therefore, men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each or by private inspiration" (canon 3).
- 2) Rationalists who assert "*miracles can never be known with certainty, and the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved by them*" (canon 4).

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 2, a. 4, ad 2.



At the same Council it was stated that God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of His revelation, namely, divine facts and especially miracles and prophecies...<sup>1</sup>

b. The fact is evident also from the *formula of the oath* prescribed by *Pius X* in which divine facts and especially miracles and prophecies are declared to be "*most certain proofs that the Christian religion has had a divine origin...*" and is most especially adapted to the intelligence of all men even of our time<sup>2</sup>."

2° THE CERTITUDE WHICH IS REQUIRED  
IN THE JUDGEMENT OF CREDIBILITY

319 A This certitude should be *true*, that is, it should *exclude all prudent doubt*.

This following proposition was condemned in 1679 by *Innocent XI*: "The assent of faith which is supernatural and useful for salvation can be based on only a probable knowledge of the fact of revelation, and even on a fear that God might not have spoken<sup>3</sup>". Likewise, the decree *Lamennabli* rejected the following: "The assent of faith ultimately rests on a mass of probabilities". (Proposition 25)<sup>4</sup>.

B This certitude can be *absolute* or *relative*.

I. *Absolute* certitude depends on motives so valid that they are sufficient for and satisfying to the intellect of everyone. This certitude is called *scientific* when the motives of credibility are critically examined; it is called ordinary or common (vulgar) when the motives are scanned less thoughtfully.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1812, 1830, 1790; refer to Vacant, *Constitut. des C. des Vaticen*, vol. II, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 2145.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 1171.

<sup>4</sup> *D. B.*, 2025.

2. *Relative* certitude rests on motives sufficient for excluding a doubt that is prudent for a special kind of intellect: for example, the authority of parents and of pastors.

320 *Is the relative certitude of the motives of credibility sufficient?*

Many modern scholars answer affirmatively. For in the Old Testament and in the New Testament (*Malachias*, II, 7; *Deuteronomy*, XXXII, 7; *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXIII, 2-3), revealed truths such as are handed down by parents and by the priests are accepted and have to be accepted.

Furthermore, the authority of parents and of priests offer only *relative* certitude. Besides, for believing with reason in the judgment of credibility, that certitude suffices which *actually* excludes prudent doubt. *But* relative certitude excludes such doubt, and further, it can be made so much stronger by good will and by grace that it will prevent doubts in the future<sup>1</sup>.

If relative certitude were not sufficient, the greater number of men could not elicit an act of faith, and so could not attain salvation.

But *actually* and practically, priests, in explaining the catechism to children, will do their best to set forth those motives of credibility which can give absolute certainty, such as the miracle of Christ's resurrection and that of the spread and stability of the invincible Church. At the same time they will advise their parishioners and pupils to have recourse to proper authorities when difficulties arise.

ARTICLE II. THE MATERIAL OBJECT OF FAITH<sup>2</sup>

321 **Prefatory Notes.** From the fact that the motive of faith is the authority of God Who reveals, it follows that the material object of faith, that which is to be believed, is all those things

<sup>1</sup> "He who believes has sufficient motive for believing: for he is persuaded by the authority of divine doctrine which has been confirmed by miracles, and, *more than that*, by the interior impulse of God inviting and urging him; wherefore not lightly does he believe". *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 2, a. 9, ad 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 1, a. 1-2; *Major Synopsis*, n. 174-209.



and those things alone which have been divinely revealed; further, the material object includes whatever has been revealed, or whatever is properly called divine, or whatever contributes to a *better knowledge and love of God*. These clearly show the divine life in God, one and three, in Christ and in men.

In the material object of faith we distinguish :

1. the *primary* object, God as the supernatural end;
2. the *secondary* object, the truths concerning faith and morals, which truths direct us to this end;
3. the *accidental* object which is revealed only concomitantly.

#### I. WHAT IS THE MATERIAL OBJECT OF FAITH

In order that a truth may be the object of faith, it must be made known through revelation *properly called*. *Immediate* revelation is sufficient, for the Church infallible points out revealed truths. But since some revealed truths are *formally* revealed, and others are *virtually* revealed, and others are proposed *by the Church to be believed*, we shall now consider :

1. *formally* revealed truths,
2. *virtually* revealed truths,
3. the object of *divine-Catholic faith*,
4. *private revelations*.

#### 10 TRUTHS FORMALLY REVEALED

323 A truth *formally* revealed or revealed *in se* is one which God has made clear *directly in its own proper concept and terms* — either explicitly or implicitly :

*explicitly*, in direct or equivalent terms. For example, the divinity of the Word is revealed in this text : " In the beginning

was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God<sup>1</sup>."

*implicitly* when the truth is *included in what has been explicitly revealed*. (A part is included in the whole, the particular is contained in the universal.) To demonstrate — when it is revealed that "The Word was made flesh", it is implicitly or inclusively revealed that Christ had a body and a soul.

B *General Principle* — *Everything to which assent is given only because of the authority of God revealing is the material object of faith.*

#### 324 C Applications of Principle.

1. It is certain that *all truths formally — explicitly revealed are the object of divine faith*. Most obviously they are contained in the testimony of God revealing and consequently are believed because of His authority.

2. Likewise it is certain that *truths formally — implicitly (inclusively) revealed are the object of faith*. For these truths fall within the testimony of God revealing. Who discloses them as *far as the sense or meaning is concerned* since *they are contained in others which are actually revealed*. The following are examples of a truth implicitly revealed :

- a. If two terms are correlatives and one is revealed, then, by that very fact the other is revealed.
- b. If one of two contradictory statements has been revealed, by that fact the other is condemned, and vice versa.
- c. If we posit the explicit revelation of the *actual whole*, then its essential parts are implicitly revealed.
- d. If the *potential whole* has been explicitly revealed, then the parts which are essentially included in it are implicitly revealed.
- e. From the fact that God explicitly reveals two propositions, for example, that the Apostles received the

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John I, 1.



Holy Spirit and that Peter is one of the Apostles, He reveals implicitly this conclusion, that Peter received the Holy Spirit.

f. Today theologians commonly admit that a particular proposition contained in a universal is the object of faith and provided some other contingent fact serves as an intermediate and provided this contingent fact is *absolutely certain*.

For example, as soon as the fact of the canonical election of Pius XII became certain, it was then de fide that Pius XII is infallible, because it is a revealed dogma that every Supreme Pontiff rightly elected possesses infallibility.

#### 2° TRUTHS VIRTUALLY REVEALED

**325 A** A virtually revealed truth or a *theological conclusion*, strictly taken, is a *proposition certainly and manifestly deduced through a true process from two premises, one of which is formally revealed and the other is naturally known and not otherwise formally revealed*. Examples of theological conclusions are these propositions: Christ at no time was without efficacious grace; Christ was impeccable.

**326 B** Are theological conclusions the object of faith? This is controverted. Along with several Thomists and many theologians of all schools we admit as more probable that *conclusions properly and certainly theological are not the object of faith*. For the object of divine faith is that which is certainly revealed by God and which is accepted and admitted only because of the authority of God Who reveals. But theological conclusions:

1. are logically united to what has been revealed, however, at the same time they are really distinct from what has been revealed; otherwise it is in no way evident from the fact that God reveals a principle that He wishes to reveal also a conclusion.

2. theological conclusions are not believed only because of the authority of God but they are believed solely because of the natural clearness of one of the premises and of the consequence of the syllogism.

C. Hence less probable seems:

1. the opinion of *Melchior Cano*, of *Vega*, and of others who hold that a theological conclusion is the object of faith. For whatever they say, such a proposition has not been *properly* and *sufficiently* revealed and, as a result, cannot be accepted solely on the authority of God;

2. Also, less probable is the opinion of *Suarez* and of *De Lugo*, according to whom theological conclusions are the object of faith when they are proposed and defined by the Church<sup>1</sup>.

a. God confirms with His authority whatever the Church defines; this he does through the privilege of *assistance*, but not of *inspiration*;

b. what the Church defines is infallibly true but not, for that reason, revealed; indeed the Church possesses infallibility even in defining truths connected with the faith, and these truths are only the object of *ecclesiastical* faith;

c. the Church would be establishing new dogmas if through a definition she were to make de fide what was not previously the object of divine faith.

#### 328

#### Conclusions

a. There is no strict obligation to believe as *the object of divine faith* theological conclusions which have not been defined by the Church.

b. Occasionally a truth which at first had been regarded as virtually revealed is later declared by the Church to be formally-implicitly revealed; in such a case this truth becomes *the object of divine faith*, and must be believed as de fide.

#### 329 3° THE MATERIAL OBJECT OF DIVINE - CATHOLIC FAITH

A Two conditions are necessary and sufficient in order that a truth be the object of *divine - Catholic faith*, or, simply, of *Catholic faith*:

<sup>1</sup> It appears that Suarez and DeLugo have not accurately distinguished between a theological conclusion properly called and a truth which has been implicitly but formally defined. Actually such a distinction is very difficult to make before the definition of the Church.



1. that this truth be formally contained in the written or transmitted word of God,

2. that it be set forth by the Church as revealed, either in solemn form or through the ordinary magisterium. These are the words of the *Vatican Council*<sup>1</sup>: "Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a *solemn judgment*, or by her *ordinary* and *universal magisterium*, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed".

We have already explained in section 287 and following what is to be understood by the terms *solemn judgment* and *ordinary magisterium*.

### 330 B Propositions contrary to Catholic Faith and Theological Censures.

1. A theological censure, which is directly attached to *doctrines*, is a *judgment* or a *decision* by which the mark of perverseness and of maliciousness is indelibly stamped on a certain doctrine, showing the doctrine to be heretical or in some way harmful to faith.

2. A theological censure can be *doctrinal* or *judicial*. A *doctrinal* censure was once employed frequently and most advantageously by the sacred faculties of Universities<sup>2</sup> under the direction of the ecclesiastical magisterium; but it had the force of a judgment only such as was brought forward by experts. A judicial censure must be advanced by the legitimate authority: either by the Bishops in their own dioceses, or by the Roman Pontiff or by an Ecumenical Council for the Universal Church. But the Roman Pontiff can impose censures either *ex cathedra* or *not ex cathedra*, by himself or through the Roman Congregations. (Refer to section 260, on *The Church*.)

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1792.

<sup>2</sup> It is forbidden, however, for private theologians to impose or impress any censure on opinions which are freely defended in the Schools.

### 331 C Particular Censures.

Some censures are concerned with the *doctrine itself*; others regard the *manner* in which the propositions are expressed; others consider the *effects* which they can produce.

1. In regard to the doctrine itself they are classified thus:

a. A *heretical* proposition; resembling this is the proposition *proximate to heresy* and the proposition *savoring of heresy*;

b. An *erroneous* proposition; similar to this is the proposition *proximate to error* and the proposition *savoring of error*;

c. A *temerarious* proposition, *positively* or *negatively*.

2. As regards the manner in which the propositions are expressed they are considered *equivocal*, *ambiguous*, *pre-*sumptuous**, *captious*, *suspect*, etc.; but in particular, a proposition *badly expressed* or *offensive to pious ears*, that is, *offensive to religious feeling*.

3. In the matter of evil effects, they are listed as *scandalous*, *schismatic* which can be *heretical-schismatic*, *seditious*, and *not safe*<sup>1</sup>.

#### 4° PRIVATE REVELATIONS

332 *Private* revelations are directed to private persons for their benefit or for the benefit of others; they may be for the good of the whole Church.

A *Private revelations* can be the *object of divine faith*. This is commonly taught in opposition to the opinions of the Salaman-ticens. For these revelations can be believed because of the authority of God revealing; speaking to one man He is equally all-knowing and truthful as He is when He reveals to all.

B *Private revelations* should be believed by those to whom they occur, or by those for whom they take place, provided they are certainly established; they can be believed by those to whom they are directed, provided they are set forth by satisfactory arguments.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1501 ff.



C. In order to make prudent judgements about particular private revelations, we should pay attention to the rules regarding the discerning of spirits, especially:

1. on the part of the *object* — do the revelations conform to the doctrine of the Church or do they transmit something erroneous and trifling?
2. on the part of the *person* — is the person well or ill, is he inclined to hysteria, has he good judgment, does he possess humility and obedience?
3. on the part of the *effects* — do the revelations disturb the soul, or do they foster peace of soul and Christian virtues?

D. The assent of Catholic faith should not be given, and cannot be given to private revelations which have been approved by the Church, but only the assent of human faith should be offered in accordance with the rules of prudence. The Church's approbation of these revelations signifies only that they may be promulgated, for the instruction of the faithful, as piously credible according to the laws of prudence and according to the authority of the evidence which supports them. Preachers should be careful not to propose these revelations as the object of Catholic faith.<sup>1</sup>

## II. THE NATURE OR FORCE OF DOGMAS\*

### 333 A Introductory Notes.

1. *The idea of dogma.* The word *dogma* has many meanings, in particular: a firm opinion, a decree or a law, all Christian truths, all truths formally revealed; and, in a strict sense, the truths of divine — Catholic faith. *Dogmatic formulas* are the expression of revealed doctrine through scientific terms.

2. *Errors concerning the nature and evolution of dogmas.* All *Modernists* are in agreement on this point: professing agnosticism and immanentism, they deny the intellectual force of dogmas and, at the same time, they maintain an indefinite evolution of dogmas. They differ, however, in that some are symbolists and others are pragmatists.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to A. POULAIN, S. J., *Des grâces d'oraison*, chap. XXIII.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to BENEDICT XIV, *De canon sanct.*, L. II, c. 32, n. 11; Pius X, *Encyclical Pascendi*.

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 210-225.

334 a. According to the *Symbolists* (Loisy, Tyrrel), dogma is nothing more than a human idea about divine things, containing a three-fold element: religious, intellectual, and authoritative. Dogma represents divine things only in a symbolic manner. Consequently, *dogmatic formulas* are not unchangeable, they must always follow the evolution in religious life. As a matter of fact, it is apparent from the history of dogmas that they have been substantially changed.

b. According to the *Pragmatists* (E. LeRoy), under dogmatic formulas objective realities lie hidden which, because of the possibility of becoming involved in anthropomorphism, should not be defined, but should rather be understood in the order of *action*. Thus, there is a *double sense* to be distinguished in every dogma: a *negative* sense by which errors are condemned and false methods of explaining Catholic doctrine are precluded; and a *positive* sense which is not to be perceived in the order of knowledge, but is to be understood in the order of action, since it imposes on us a *manner of feeling, of thinking, and of acting*. So, the dogma of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist *denies* that this presence, is merely symbolical or figurative, and, more than that, it *affirms* that the faithful should conduct themselves in relation to a consecrated Host as they would to Christ Himself made visible.

335 B Catholic Thesis. *Catholic dogmas are truths which must be believed, by which divine things are expressed as they are in themselves, at least analogically, but not symbolically or practically only: they are, therefore, the extrinsic norm of believing.*

1. *Explanation of thesis.* — Among the truths to be believed some are historical facts which are accepted univocally, for example the fact that Christ died; others are to be understood in a metaphorical sense, for example, the statement that Christ sits at the right hand of the Father; others are divine mysteries: The Incarnation — and must be comprehended analogically, but not symbolically or practically only. *The Vatican Council states:* "Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith... attains by a gift from God some, and that a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries; partly from the analogy of those things which it naturally knows..."; and thus the Catholic doctrine stands in the middle between the two extremes of anthropomorphism and agnosticism<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Session III, chap. 4; D. B., 1796.

<sup>2</sup> Read meditatively *Summa theologiae*, I p., q. 13.



336 2. *Proof of Thesis.*a. *Proof from Scripture.*

1) Christ says: "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared him". "Going in to the whole world", says Christ to the Apostles, "preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned". Therefore, Christ has revealed the truths which are to be believed, which express divine things and to which we must give intellectual assent.

2) The same thought is expressed in the *preaching of the Apostles* and especially in the *preaching of St. Paul*<sup>2</sup>. They hand down certain historical facts (for instance, the Resurrection) and certain doctrines both speculative and practical, as objects of faith which are necessary for salvation.

b. *Proof from Tradition.*

1) *From the teaching of the Fathers.* They taught that the faithful are bound *sub gravi* to adhere firmly to the dogmas of Christ and of the Apostles.

2. *From the condemnation of heretics.* These were cast out from the Church, many times not because they acted contrariwise but because they contradicted the *traditional sense* by denying the divinity of the Word, the divine maternity of Mary, etc.

3. From the way dogmatic formulas are *prepared* and *proclaimed*: thus, for expressing the perfect equality between the Son and the Father, the Church sought a word and then finally selected a word, namely, *ὁμοούσιος*; to this word so great a positive sense and meaning have been attributed that thereafter it is the norm not only of acting, but also it is primarily the norm of thinking and of believing.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 18; Gospel according to St. Mark, XVI, 15-16.

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the Romans, VI, 17; First Epistle to the Corinthians, II, 6; III, 2; XIII, 12; Second Epistle to the Corinthians, X, 5; Epistle to the Ephesians, II, 2; Epistle to the Colossians, I, 10; II, 4; III, 16; etc.

337 C Refutation of Symbolism and of Pragmatism The proof of the preceding thesis indirectly repudiates both systems. They are directly disproved by authority and by reason.

1. *By the Authority of the Holy See.* In the decree, *Lamentabili, the Holy Office* condemned *Symbolism*: "The dogmas which the Church holds out as revealed are not truths which have fallen from heaven. They are a kind of interpretation of religious facts which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort"; the pragmatic interpretation of dogmas is declared reprobate in these words: "The dogmas of the Faith are to be held only according to their practical sense, that is, as preceptive norms of conduct but not as norms of believing". In addition, both opinions were condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi* and in the profession of faith which must be made by order of Pius X<sup>3</sup>.

2. *By Theological Reason.* The symbolic and practical interpretation of dogmas rests on a false philosophical foundation of agnosticism and of immanentism, of relative truth and of the origin of religious truths from a certain intuitive sense; such an interpretation cannot be in agreement with the teaching of the Church: it is repugnant to the ideas and the concepts of Catholic faith, of revelation, of the power of the Church to teach infallibly. Also, *Symbolism* very illogically preserves the Christian ethic while rejecting its foundation, objective revealed truths. *Pragmatism* is no more successful in solving the modern-day difficulties which oppose dogma.

III. THE INCREASE OF DOGMAS<sup>1</sup>

339 A Introductory notes. We must distinguish two epochs: the first, from the time of Adam to the age of Christ and of the Apostles inclusively; the second, from the time of the

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 2022. — <sup>2</sup> D. B., 2026.

<sup>3</sup> D. B., 2087 and following, 2145.

<sup>4</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 226-252.



Apostles, that is, from the death of St. John the last of the Apostles, to our days.

1. *In the first epoch the articles of faith increased simply, or, new truths were successively revealed; in addition to this quantitative increase, there was also taking place a qualitative increase relating to the truths already revealed — these were being manifested more clearly and more explicitly. Thus —*

a. From the beginning the existence of God, the author of the supernatural order, and His special Providence in relation to man's salvation were revealed to Adam in his state of innocence and of guiltlessness.

b. During the centuries from Adam to Moses the promise of a Redeemer was somewhat obscurely repeated over and over to the Patriarchs while precepts and rites were imposed upon them for the purpose of preserving monotheism and of prefiguring some of the mysteries which were to be revealed later.

c. Through Moses and the prophets clearer ideas about God and His attributes, about the Redemption and the kingdom of the promised Messiah prevailed.

d. Finally, the Christian revelation completed the Mosaic revelation in a wonderful manner by showing God as the Father redeeming us from the slavery of sin through the Incarnate and unceasingly sanctifying us through the Holy Spirit.

For all this it can be said that all the dogmas are contained in the two truths revealed from the beginning: *divine being truly epitomizes, as it were, and implicitly states all the mysteries of divine essence and of divine life; and in divine and supernatural Providence all is included that God dispenses for the salvation of man.*

2. *In the second epoch, namely, from the end of the Apostolic Age, dogmas in one respect immutable, remain unchangeable, in another respect they take on a growth or progress.*

### 340 B The Stability of Dogmas.

*Thesis: The public revelation of God was so completed in the Apostolic Age that neither a new economy nor a new public revelation is to be looked for. This thesis is de fide from the universal preaching of the Church. It stands opposed to Montanists, the Manicheans, the Fraticelli and the Preachers*

*of the eternal gospel in the Middle Ages; it contradicts the Anabaptists and the Irvingites among Protestants.*

### Proof of Thesis.

#### 1. Proof from Scripture:

a. *No new economy is to be established, for in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the New Testament is compared to the Old Testament as a perfect and completed testament to an imperfect and incomplete one;<sup>1</sup> the kingdom is called firm, immovable, faultless.<sup>2</sup> Further, the priesthood of the New Law is not to be revoked,<sup>3</sup> nor the form of the religion in which it has been established.*

b. *New public revelations are not to be looked for.*

1. All that was to be revealed has been made known to the Apostles. "The Spirit of truth will teach you all truth... He will teach you all things."<sup>4</sup>

2. The Apostles are the *guardians* and *expounders* only of the dogmas which have already been revealed. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you... O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust."<sup>5</sup>

#### 341 2. Proof from Tradition.

a. In the first centuries of the Church it was distinctly believed that nothing could be added to the doctrine which had been handed down by the Apostles. This is evident from the testimony of St. Clement of Rome, of St. Ignatius, of St. Polycarp, and especially of St. Irenaeus. He states: "It is not necessary thus far to search among others for the truth which it is so easy to accept from the Church, since

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, VIII, 7, 13.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, XII, 27-28.

<sup>3</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, VII, 11 and following.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XVI, 12-13; XIV, 26.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXVIII, 20. St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, VI, 20. St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, I, 13.



the Apostles, like a rich man in a storehouse, have most abundantly gathered together in the Church all those things which belong to the truth<sup>1</sup>.

b. It was always the *practice of the Church* never to appeal to new revelations in order to condemn a heresy or to define a dogma, but rather to examine what was contained in Scripture or in Apostolic Tradition on the matter in question.

c. The *Vatican Council* very clearly and expressly stated: "For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that by His assistance they might *inviolably keep and faithfully* expound the revelation or *deposit of faith delivered* through the Apostles<sup>2</sup>."

### C The Progress of Dogma.

**Errors.** — Many of the *early Protestants* denied all progress, even any accidental progress, of dogmas. On the other hand, the *Semi-Rationalists*, under the leadership of *Günther*, admit such progress that, through the help of the sciences and of philosophy, another sense of dogmas can be understood, different from that which the ancient Church defined. The *Modernists* go further with their theory of the continuous evolution of dogmas.

#### 1° THE NATURE OF DOGMATIC PROGRESS

343 **Thesis I:** *Progress of dogmas does not consist in this, that some other sense of meaning is to be attributed to them which is different from the sense understood by the Church.* This thesis is de fide from the *Vatican Council*: "If any one shall assert it to be possible that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to doctrines propounded by the Church different from that which the Church has understood and understands, let him be anathema<sup>3</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> *Adversus Hæreses*, Book III, chap. 2-4; Book IV, chap. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1836.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 1818.

344 Very justly has the *Vatican Council* solemnly condemned the Güntherian theory which:

1. conceives the divine depositum as a philosophical doctrine which is to be completed and perfected by human ingenuity;

2. transfers ecclesiastical magisterium from Bishops to philosophers and, in this way, overthrows the hierarchical order which Christ instituted;

3. subjects faith to reason;

4. destroys the infallible authority of the Church and the substantial immutability of dogma.

Those *Rationalists* and *Modernists* should be particularly careful who, under the pretext of progress and of criticism, wish to understand dogmas according to a sense which is loftier and more profound than that which the Church has thus far understood.

345 **Thesis II:** *Genuine progress of dogmas consists in this only, that a clearer and richer explanation of revealed doctrine is given.* This thesis is certain from the *Vatican Council*: "Let the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and all times, increase and flourish in abundance and vigor; but simply in its own proper kind, that is to say, in one and the same doctrine, one and the same sense, one and the same judgment<sup>1</sup>."

To be sure, divine revelation, handed down in its totality by the Apostles, was not so entirely and explicitly made clear that no new definitions can be expected in order to explain this revelation; for:

1. In the sources of revelation certain truths are contained obscurely only and implicitly. This God most wisely ordained so that men might be induced to devoting their minds more intensively to revelation with the hope of discovering new aspects hidden in the depths of the Christian depositum.

2. But the Church has the right to define clearly and explicitly those things which are obscure and implicit; this duty she has exercised from the first century. (Tract on *The Church*, notes 251 and ff.)

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1800.



Thus :

- a. In the course of time she enlarged the rule of *faith* imposed upon the catechumens;
- b. In councils, especially in Ecumenical councils, she defined more clearly, in new formulas, the consubstantiality of the Word, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, etc. Actually, if in important dogmas there has been some increase, should not even a greater increase be expected in those truths of faiths which are the conclusions and inferences of the fundamental dogmas, for example, in the subject of the cult of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints, etc.?

According to all, dogmas increase at least :

- a. *Through a lucid and scientific setting forth* of dogmas which formerly were indeed believed *explicitly*, but in an *obscure* and popular or common manner. Thus, the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity was at first indistinctly handed down under this general formula : " I believe in God the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit " ; then the Church successively defined that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, that the Holy Spirit is to be adored together with the Father and the Son, that the Son proceeds from the Father through the way of generation, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, etc.
- b. Dogmas increase through the *explicit setting forth* of those which are contained only implicitly in the sources of revelation : this is obviously a major progress, namely, progress from implicit faith to explicit faith in regard to truths which are not explicitly to be believed from the necessity of salvation. So, from the fact that in Christ there is a twofold nature, divine and human, the conclusion follows that there is likewise in Him a twofold will.
- c. Dogmas increase through the *skillful and doctrinal setting forth* of those which have been taught in *passing* or

*practically* only : this progress, very similar to the preceding, applies only to secondary truths which it is not necessary to believe explicitly. Thus, the validity of baptism administered by heretics was not expressly handed down from the beginning, but, when the controversy over this matter arose between St. Cyprian and St. Stephen, the subject was then explicitly defined.

There is some dispute as to whether or not progress can take place *by defining truths which have been only virtually revealed*, so that these truths can be believed and must be believed from divine faith. This controversy has already been considered in section 326 and ff.

347 This progress occurs through the cooperation of God and of men.

- a. The *primary efficient* cause is the Holy Spirit by means of the assistance He gives; the *secondary efficient* cause is the Church teaching through her magisterium, ordinary or solemn.
- b. The *disposing* causes, offering cooperation which is only ministerial and preparatory, are the Fathers, the theologians, and the faithful.
- c. The *instrumental* cause is reason enlightened by faith.
- d. The *occasional* causes are the heresies which, by their rise, (according to St. Augustine) bring it about that the truths of faith " are examined more diligently, and are understood more clearly, and are preached more earnestly " <sup>1</sup>.
- e. The *final* causes are the glory of God and the sanctification of souls.

<sup>1</sup> *The City of God*, I. XVI, C. II, n. 1; *P. L.*, XLI, 477; refer to *The Gift of Perseverance*, C. XX, n. 53, *P. L.*, XLV, 1026.



# I. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES GRACE CONCUR WITH FAITH

**350 State of the Question.** According to the Pelagians man without grace can elicit salutary acts of faith; according to the Semi-Pelagians, man can effect at least the beginning of faith; according to the Semi-Rationalists, man can give the assent of faith just as he offers the other assents of science. But the Church teaches that grace is required for the beginning of faith and for faith itself.

**351 A Thesis:** *For the act of faith, indeed for the beginning of faith and for the desire or disposition to believe, the grace of illumination and of inspiration is required.* This thesis is de fide from the Council of Trent and from the Vatican Council. The Council of Trent decreed<sup>1</sup>: "If anyone should say that without the predisposing inspiration of the Holy Ghost and without His help, man can believe... as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be bestowed upon him, let him be anathema". The Vatican Council<sup>2</sup> affirmed that even when it does not work through charity faith is a supernatural virtue and is therefore a gift of God.

## I. Proof of Thesis.

a. *Proof from Scripture.* Christ asserted that divine aid was required for faith: "No man can come to me (believe in me) except the Father, who hath sent me draw him"<sup>3</sup>. Likewise St. Paul has spoken: "For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God"<sup>4</sup>. He further declares that man is incapable of eliciting a salutary thought.

<sup>1</sup> Council of Trent, session VI, can. 3, *D. B.*, 813.

<sup>2</sup> Vatican Council, session III, chap. 3, can. 5, *D. B.*, 1791 and 1814.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, VI, 44.

<sup>4</sup> St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, II, 8.

## CHAPTER II

# THE ACT OF FAITH

After a brief analysis of faith we shall state the three principles which produce the act of faith and the ultimate resolution of the act of faith.

**348 An analysis of faith.** Various elements are necessary for the preparation and production of faith:

1. Five elements are required for its preparation: three for the judgment of credibility — the revelation of truth, the setting forth of revelation, and the motives of credibility; two for the judgment of credibility — moral dispositions and the help of God.

2. Five elements are required in the production of the act of faith: on the one hand, the formal object and the material object; on the other hand, grace, the will and the intellect.

## ARTICLE I. THE CAUSES WHICH PROXIMATELY OR DIRECTLY PRODUCE THE ACT OF FAITH<sup>1</sup>

**349** St. Thomas described the act of faith in these words: "To believe is an act of the intellect giving assent to a divine truth because of the command of the will moved by God through grace"<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the immediate and simultaneous cause of the act of faith is threefold: grace, the will and the intellect.

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 259-300.

<sup>2</sup> Summa theologiae, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 2, a. 9.



### 352 b. *Proof from Tradition.*

1. Opposing the Pelagians, *St. Augustine*<sup>1</sup> wrote, unfolding *St. Paul's* teaching: "Just as no one of himself is sufficient for beginning or accomplishing any good work... so no one of himself is sufficient either to begin or to perfect faith".

2. Contrary to the Semi-Pelagians, who declared that at least the beginning of faith and the pious disposition to believe were naturally within us, the *Second Synod of Orange* defined that this beginning of faith is a *gift of God*, Who first of all inspires in us faith and love for Himself<sup>2</sup>. This decree *The Council of Trent* and *The Vatican Council*<sup>3</sup> reaffirmed.

### 3. *Proof from Theological Reasoning.*

Grace is necessary for every supernatural act, and especially for one that is difficult. But the act of faith is *supernatural* and, apart from its supernatural nature, it is difficult because it opposes our passions.

### 353 B The Manner in Which Grace Concurrency in the Act of Faith.

1. Internal grace is not *absolutely* and *per se* required for the certain and speculative judgment of *credibility* and of *credence*. Grace properly supernatural is necessary either in order that a practical judgment of *credence* be elicited and in order that the will command assent (these constitute the pious desire to believe), or in order that the act of saving faith come into being.

354 2. This necessary grace is not only *medicinal*, but it is also *elevans* (internal supernatural), making us capable of a supernatural act. Since the act of faith is the beginning of divine life in us, it is properly and peculiarly supernatural.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gift of Perseverance*, n. 49-50, P. L., XLV, 1024-1025.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 178.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to *D. B.*, 813, 1791.

3. After the act of faith God gives His help through grace so that faith may be preserved, increased, and united to charity.

## II. TO WHAT DEGREE DOES THE WILL CONCUR IN THE MATTER OF FAITH

355 A Thesis: *Although the Act of faith is elicited by the intellect, it comes into being through the command of the free and well-disposed will.* This thesis opposes the opinion of the *Fideists* who over-exalt the function of the will in the act of faith; it contradicts the opinion of the *Semi-Rationalists* who deny the work of the will altogether.

It is de fide, according to the *Councils of Trent* and of the *Vatican* and in opposition to the *Protestants* and the *followers of Hermes*, that the act of faith is free.

### 356 1. Proof of Thesis.

a. *Proof from Scripture.* Scripture shows that good will and free consent are required for faith. In his Gospel *St. John* impresses this truth upon us, accusing the Jews of not believing because they do not seek God's glory, because they are not of God but of the devil, their father, because they have not charity within them — in short, because they lack the good will which is necessary for faith<sup>1</sup>.

So, too, in the Gospel according to *St. Mark* and in the writings of *St. Paul* the act of faith is of precept, it is praised, it receives a reward: infidelity merits punishment. But all this supposes that the act of faith is free.

### 357 b. Proof from Tradition.

1. *Proof from the Testimony of the Fathers.*

*St. Irenaeus*<sup>2</sup> states, "Force does not come from God. Not only in works, but also in faith has the Lord preserved

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to *St. John*, V, 31-44, VII, 16-18; VIII, 42-47, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Contra haereses*, I. IV, C 37, n. 1, 5; P. G., 1099, 1102.



man's choice, and judgment as free and within man's own power, for the Lord has said: *According to thy faith be it done unto thee*.<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine<sup>2</sup> has enunciated the same idea more briefly: "One cannot believe unless he wills to believe". Consequently the proposition of *de Mirandula* was condemned because it maintained that it was not within the power of man as he pleases to believe that an article of faith is true.<sup>3</sup>

2. The *Councils* have defined in the matter of the freedom of faith The *Council* of Trent<sup>4</sup>, in opposing the teaching of the Protestants, declared: "They (the adults) are disposed to that justice when, aroused and aided by divine grace, receiving faith by hearing, they are moved freely toward God". The *Vatican Council*<sup>5</sup>, contrary to Hermes, claimed that faith is "a work appertaining to salvation, by which man yields voluntary obedience to God Himself, by assenting to and cooperating with His grace, which he is able to resist"; and defined: "If anyone shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not a free act, but is inevitably produced by the argument of human reason... let him be anathema".

358 3. *Proof from Reason.* By reason we demonstrate how the freedom of faith is conciliated with the evidence of credibility.

The Act of Faith is free not only in regard to the exercise of it, since we can turn our mind away from the object which is to be believed, but also in regard to specification (being specific), since we possess the ability to posit a contrary act, to doubt or to deny: this fact theologians explain in different ways.

a. According to *de Lugo*, the act of faith is free in as much as divine revelation, even though morally certain, is not apparent: it does not remove all doubt.

b. According to L. Billot, the act of faith is free because we assent to revealed truths not because of the clearness of the testimony, but because of the very authority of God to which we are submitted freely.

<sup>1</sup> On St. John tr. XXVI, C VI, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 797.

<sup>3</sup> Session VI, chap. 6; D. B., 798.

<sup>4</sup> Session III, chap. 3, can. 5, On Faith; D. B., 1791, 1814.

c. According to the *Thomists*, the act of faith is free because revealed truth to which we assent is not intrinsically evident, and thus in the act of faith the understanding "is not satisfied, in so far as it depends on itself alone," wherefore "in the one believing an impulse can arise contrary to what he most firmly holds".

359 B The Manner in Which The Will Cooperates in the Act of Faith.

The Will cooperates not only in the first act of faith, but also:

1. in the remote preparation for faith, since a right will, by subduing pride, pleasure and temporal cares, disposes the mind to loving, seeking, and embracing truth.

2. in the premises to faith in as much as it directs the intellect to consider the reasons by which God's existence and authority, and also the fact of revelation may be known for certain; in as much as it then moves the intellect to assent to these truths:

3. in progress to faith since it turns the mind away from reasons for doubting, and leads it into a captivity and a reasonable service of faith;

4. in the very act of faith, it moves the intellect to believe because of the moral dignity of God revealing. Who has every right to be trusted;

5. After the act of faith, the will concurs in preserving and increasing faith, and turns the mind away from reasons for doubting.

360 At this point we shall explain:

1. Why many do not believe even though the motives of credibility are sufficiently proposed to them. The reason, is that their will, caught in the snares of pride and of the passions, neglects, rejects, and stands in fear of divine things.

2. Why everyone does not possess an equal or similar faith. Sometimes the faith becomes dulled and listless in considering and studying the motives of credibility and the mysteries of faith.

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas, *De Veritate*, q. 14, a. 1.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, X, 5; St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, XII, 1.

<sup>3</sup> In 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 6, a. 4, St. Thomas rightly observes: "A man's faith may be described as being greater, in one way, on the part of his intellect, on account of its greater certitude and firmness, and, in another way, on the part of his will, on account of his greater promptitude, devotion, or confidence".



### III. THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE INTELLECT ELICITS THE ACT OF FAITH<sup>1</sup>

361 **A Thesis** : *Since faith is an assent to revealed truths, it is properly elicited by the intellect.* This thesis is certain and is proximate to faith; according to many it is de fide from the *Vatican Council* and from the profession of faith prescribed by *Pius X*.

#### 362 1. Proofs of Thesis.

##### a. *Proof from Scripture.*

From *Scripture* by faith we believe and we know, we see and we understand. Thus the word "to believe" is equivalent to the words "to know" and "to see"; very often these three words are used interchangeably.

363 **b. Proof from Tradition.** 1. The Fathers speak of faith as if it were an act of intellectual cognition; so also do the Theologians, who agree with *St. Thomas* that: "To believe... is immediately an act of the intellect because the object of this act is truth which properly pertains to the intellect". (Refer to section 349.)

2. The *Vatican Council* takes it for granted that this teaching has been universally accepted: it distinguishes a two-fold order of cognition, natural order and a supernatural order, that is, faith and reason; it declares that to God revealing the full service of the intellect and of the will is to be given by faith; it defines that faith is a supernatural virtue by which "we believe that what has been revealed is true".

In the *Profession of Faith* prescribed by *Pius X* it is explicitly stated, in opposition to the Modernists, that "faith is not a blind sense of religion breaking forth from the hidden places

<sup>1</sup> By stating that faith is an act of the intellect elicited under the command of the will, we abstract from the philosophical question of whether the different faculties are distinguished from one another and from the essence of the soul, and of how they are distinct; but we assert that faith is truly an act of cognition.

of the subconscious..., but it is the true assent of the intellect to the truth which has been extrinsically received from hearing". This declaration is put forth as something which must be held as most certain and which has been defined by the unerring magisterium of the Church<sup>1</sup>.

#### 364 **B The Manner in Which the Intellect Cooperates with Faith.**

With grace preceding and with the will commanding,

1. the intellect very carefully considers the signs of credibility, the fact of revelation, and the authority of God and then forms a judgment of credibility and of credentia;
2. the intellect gives a firm assent to revealed truths;
3. later the intellect seeks a greater understanding of revealed matters.

#### IV. THE PRACTICAL PROGRESSION TO FAITH

365 **A** This practical progression to faith is different according to the different kinds of education and of personality; also, according to the varying graces of God. At this time we note the usual or ordinary progression to faith, and the unusual or extraordinary.

1. In the usual or ordinary progression we distinguish the scientific way and the way of children or of the uneducated. In the scientific progression he who is being instructed is first of all properly disposed; then he must acknowledge the existence and authority of God, the fact of revelation, and next the speculative and practical judgment of credibility and of credentia; and finally he believes revealed truths, in particular, the infallible authority of the Church. Children and the uneducated very often come to the faith through the way of authority.

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 2145.



2. Some are led to the faith in an *extraordinary* way, in fact, at times even a miraculous way<sup>1</sup>.

### 366 B The Way to Attract Unbelievers to the Faith.

1. *Before any conversation* about the faith one should pray fervently, act gently and patiently, learn what the unbeliever admits and what he denies;
2. *During the actual discussions* we should try to eliminate the origins of unbelief, that is, the passions, the emotions; we must prepare the way for demonstration by impressing on the unbeliever general principles regarding the insufficiency of reason by showing him how many truths are accepted from authority; we must set forth the motives of credibility which are better adapted to the unbeliever;
3. *After the discussion* we should point out the need of prayer and examine carefully the sincerity of his belief.

#### ARTICLE II. CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE FINAL ANALYSIS OR RESOLUTION OF FAITH

367 **State of the Question.** The resolution of the act of faith into its final motive is called *the ultimate resolution of faith*. All agree that the *proper* motive of faith is the authority of God Who reveals. But there has been some question as to whether this motive is the *ultimate* motive, or whether there may be another motive through which in the act of faith we can reach the very authority of God revealing. To anyone who asks me why I believe that Christ is God, I reply: *I believe because of the authority of God Who has revealed this truth*. But if, in addition, I am asked whence I know that God is worthy of faith and that He has revealed the divinity of Christ, I respond: this I know from the arguments or

<sup>1</sup> Refer to BAUNARD, *La Foi et ses victoires*. A. CROISIER, *Les conversions* Paris, 1910; LÖWENGARD, *La splendeur catholique*, Paris, 1910; A. VON RUVILLE, *Retour à la Sainte Eglise*, 1911.

the motives of credibility. Is faith, therefore, ultimately to be resolved into human arguments, as, for instance, into intrinsic supports to the very act of believing? If this is so, the act of faith does not appear to be objectively supernatural, nor does it offer greater certitude than the human arguments of credibility.

To this difficulty we can reply that the motives of credibility are only the preamble to faith and the condition or situation that leads the way to faith, but that they are not the constitutive element of faith. However, it remains to be explained more fully how faith, which depends on motives of credibility known by reason, can be *supernatural* and also *more firm* than the motives themselves. Theologians respond in different ways:

368 A Suarez says that the believer, *in the very act of faith*:

1. does not direct his attention to the arguments of credibility which he has previously weighed carefully;
2. but together with the material object, he apprehends through faith both the authority of God and the fact of revelation: for example I believe that Christ is God because I believe that God has revealed this truth, and I believe that God has revealed this truth because of this trusted revelation of God. For by explicitly revealing a certain mystery, God implicitly reveals that He is speaking truly and that He is revealing;
3. Otherwise, Suarez states, the virtue of faith would not rest on a supernatural motive, nor would it be supernatural.

369 B Lugo rejects the theory of Suarez as one that is *laboring in a vicious circle*; he proposes this way. In the act of faith we recognize both the authority of God and the fact of revelation, not through faith nor through discursive discussion and examination, but *immediately* and through grace: in this way we can explain how the act of faith is at the same time supernatural and apart from a vicious circle. For example, I believe the divinity of Christ because God has revealed it and because God's revelation is infallible. However, it can hardly be claimed that Lugo protects the supernatural quality of faith; in his theory it is not *objectively* supernatural. Furthermore, he gratuitously posits, that divine truthfulness and the fact of revelation are known immediately. So, too, the assent of faith appears to be an act of knowledge, for it is based on the conclusion of a syllogism, formal or virtual.



370 C According to *Pesch*, *Bainvel*, and *L. Billot* the ultimate motive of the act of faith is the *authority* of God who reveals, but in no way is it the *knowledge* of this authority. Wherefore the *manner* in which the authority of God has previously become known has no bearing in this matter. However, the authority of God revealing offers greater certitude than any other medium of knowing and further the act of faith is supernatural since it proceeds from faculties which have been supernaturally elevated. If, therefore, you ask why I believe in the Trinity, I answer: I believe because God, Who has revealed the Trinity, is completely worthy of belief. Such an answer is adequate. For if you then ask whence I have known that God has revealed the Trinity and is worthy of belief, I reply that it is no longer the motive of faith which is in question but only the motives of credibility which are the preamble to faith.

371 D According to many *Thomists* the final *formal* and *intrinsic* resolution of the act of faith rests on the *authority* of God revealing in as much as it is *that by which* other revealed truths are believed and *that which is believed*, since at the same instant we assent to the authority of God revealing and to a particular truth which He reveals. Thus the motive of faith is *entirely supernatural*. Nevertheless, in order that assent of faith may be prudently given, we must possess as an antecedent condition the *judgment of credibility* by means of which we declare that this or that truth can be believed, in as much as it has been revealed. And thus our faith is reasonable.

#### ARTICLE III. THE PROPERTIES OF THE ACT OF FAITH<sup>1</sup>

372 From what has been said about the object and the production of the act of faith we can infer its *properties*: the properties of *being certain*, of *being not evident*, of *being free*, and of *being supernatural*. Because we have already discussed the last two qualities in sections 335, 367 and following, we shall speak of the first two properties only.

##### I. THE CERTITUDE OF FAITH

373 A *Our faith is certain, or our faith excludes all doubt concerning the truth of the object believed.* This is so because

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 301-312.

it rests entirely on the authority of God and His infallible testimony.

374 B The question arises: Is faith *more certain* than natural science? In answer we must show that there are four points to be distinguished in the matter of certitude.

1. *clearness* or the excellence of evidence proportionate to the mind,
2. *exclusion of doubt*,
3. *infallibility* — security or sureness of continuous union with objective truth,
4. *firmness or constancy* of adherence.

375 In enlarging on these four considerations:

1. Under the aspect of *clearness* and of evidence, faith is an inferior knowledge in relation to us, although revealed matters shine out with the greatest intelligibility and truth in regard to themselves. Certain principles of natural science are intrinsically evident to all.

376 2. In regard to the matter of the *exclusion of doubt*, faith is not more certain than all natural knowledge: for there are certain natural truths which are so certain that we cannot have doubt concerning them, for example, the fact that good is to be loved; on the other hand, truths of faith, although most certain *quoad se*, do not exclude the *possibility of doubt*, because of their obscurity.

377 3. Under the aspect of *infallibility*, faith is more certain than all natural knowledge: natural knowledge is subject to error while:

- a. *what is false* can never be near or subject to faith.
1. because faith is an intellectual virtue and thus is incompatible with error. All virtue inclines to good, but the good of intellectual virtue is the true;



2. because the formal object of faith is divine truthfulness which cannot move us to accept error;

b. *what has not been revealed can never be a part of faith*, even though it is, in other respects, true:

1. because faith cannot not be related or referred back to its own proper object;

2. because divine *revelation* is the partial formal object of faith which can move only to accepting *what has been revealed*. Wherefore he who believes what is erroneous or what is not revealed believes thus by reason of a faith which is *human only* and not theological<sup>1</sup>.

378 4. In this matter of *adherence*, faith is more firm and more certain than all natural knowledge. "We are bound to yield to God revealing the full obedience of our intelligence and of our will", according to the *Vatican Council*, which adds the reason:

"the faith which they (Catholics) profess rests on the *most firm* foundation<sup>2</sup>". Indeed our faith rests on the testimony of God Himself; but "if we receive the testimony of men, *the testimony of God is greater*"<sup>3</sup>, wherefore we should believe "with all our heart"<sup>4</sup>. In other words faith ought to be *estimatively* or *appreciatively* the greatest assent since we place a higher value on the authority of God than on every other motive of assent. Therefore no certitude can truly withstand the certitude of faith; there can be no conflict between faith and reason unless it be *some false appearance of conflict* due principally "either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the inventions of opinion having been taken for the verdicts of reason"<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> But he who denies a proposition which he thinks has been revealed, although it may not be revealed, is "*affecting*" heretical, because he is striving against the authority of God, or the *formal object* of faith.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 3, *D. B.*, 1789, 1794.

<sup>3</sup> *First Epistle of St. John*, V, 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, VIII, 37.

<sup>5</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 4, *D. B.*, 1797.

## 379 II. THE OBSCURITY OF FAITH

A Theologians are in agreement in stating that:

1. faith is obscure (not evident) by *reason of motive* — the authority of God revealing does not explain the intrinsic reason of the matter revealed;

2. faith cannot exist with the beatific vision — for the blessed most clearly behold God and divine things;

3. the obscurity of faith is compatible with the perfect evidence and clearness concerning the fact of revelation, such as it was with the Blessed Virgin — for evidence of this kind does not manifest the internal truth of the thing revealed;

4. faith is *generally* obscure by *reason of its object* because the principal revealed truths are mysteries which are entirely beyond the grasp of reason.

380 B Theologians are at *variance*, however, as to whether the (material) *object of faith* is *necessarily obscure*, or, in other words, whether truths, which are known by natural intrinsic and perfect evidence as the existence of God, for example, can at the same time be the object of faith. There are two opinions.

1. *St. Thomas*<sup>1</sup> and his school, and some of the principal *Scotists* teach that one cannot make an act of faith at the same time as one makes an act of manifest knowledge concerning one and the same object under the same aspect. They maintain this because:

a. according to *St. Paul* faith is "the argument (or certain knowledge) of things that are not apparent"<sup>2</sup>;

b. the act of faith is free (section 355) where as *we are forced* to give assent to a truth that is evident.

381 We should *note*, however: first, that what one knows through natural evidence can be believed by another who is less informed,

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 1, a. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews*, XI, 1.



or could have been previously believed by the first person when he was uninformed; secondly, that what one is aware of obscurely rather than manifestly through knowledge, one can at the same time believe through divine faith; and thirdly, that what is known with persuasive evidence is confirmed, nevertheless, by divine authority, upon which authority the mind in this particular case does not depend because of faith properly so called.

382 2. But *Suarez*, along with many theologians, especially those of modern times, teaches that one can make an act of faith, at the same time as he makes an act of knowledge, about the same object. For:

- a. *St. Paul* says: "he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and is a rewarder to them that seek him", these truths are evident naturally;
- b. in the Symbols and in the decrees of the *Vatican Council* truths of this kind which are to be believed are set forth in the same manner as those which are above and beyond reason<sup>1</sup>;
- c. no repugnance is apparent in the fact that man assents to an evident truth both because of its intrinsic clearness and because of the authority of God.

## CHAPTER III

## THE HABIT OF FAITH

Under this heading we shall discuss the *Infusion of Faith* and the *Subject of Faith*.

ARTICLE I. THE INFUSION OF THE HABIT OF FAITH<sup>2</sup>

383 A The actual infusion of the habit of faith. The virtue of faith is infused in justification at the same time with habitual grace and the other virtues. This is certain from the *Council*

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews*, XI, 6.

<sup>2</sup> The Roman Church believes and confesses that the true God is one... *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. I, D. B., 1782.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologica* 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 4 and 6.

of *Trent*. "Man through Jesus Christ, in whom he is ingrafted, receives in that justification, together with the remission of sins all these infused at the same time, namely faith, hope and charity<sup>1</sup>". In regard to adults, this has been evident, since the twelfth century, from the unanimous consensus of theologians; in regard to children, it has been evident since the explicit declaration of the *Council of Vienne* (1311). Further, *reason* argues for it. In the natural order God gives to man, in addition to his nature, faculties which dispose him immediately to act. Likewise, in the supernatural order, it is appropriate that God, in addition to habitual grace, infuse virtues, the proximate principles of salutary acts; among these faith is eminent.

## 384 B The Nature of Faith.

1. Faith is the first beginning of the supernatural life in the soul.
2. *Lifeless* faith:
  - a. differs from formed or living faith, for it is not joined to charity which is the extrinsic and accidental form of living faith;
  - b. it is a true virtue;
  - c. it is not a perfect virtue since it does not produce meritorious acts;
  - d. it is a virtue of the same species as formed faith.

## 385 3. In comparison to the other virtues, faith:

- a. is *per se* first in the order of generation because the knowledge of a supernatural end through faith is prior to the intention and election of the same end through other virtues;
- b. in the order of dignity faith is inferior to charity.

<sup>1</sup> Session VI, chap. 7, D. B., 800.



ARTICLE II. THE SUBJECT OF FAITH <sup>1</sup>

The question to be answered at this point is : In whom does faith abide, among *the living* or among *the dead*.

**386 A In regard to men who are still wayfarers.** No one doubts that the habit of faith is present in *the just* and that these can elicit acts of faith, since "without faith it is impossible to please God". Likewise it is not be controverted that the *infidels* lack the habit of faith. A question quite naturally arises which revolves about *sinners* and about *heretics*.

**387 1. The habit of faith can remain in sinners, or, in other words, faith is not lost by the loss of charity and of sanctifying grace.**

a. It is de fide from the *Council of Trent*, "If anyone says that with the loss of grace through sin faith is also lost with it, or that the faith which remains is not a true faith, though it is not a living one, let him be anathema".

**388 b. St. Paul and St. James** clearly suppose this : "If I should have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing"; "What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works?"

To be sure, Charity is not the *intrinsic* form of faith, but only the *extrinsic* form, so that faith can really exist without being united to charity and without working through charity.

c. Besides, habits are not weakened or destroyed except through contrary acts which do away with their formal object. But sin (unless it be the sin of heresy) is indeed of itself contrary to charity, but it is not contrary to faith since it does not oppose God's truthfulness.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>ae</sup>, q. 5 and 6. *Major Synopsis*, n. 320-330.

<sup>2</sup> St. Paul's *Epistle to the Hebrews*, XI 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Council of Trent*, session VI, can. 28, D. B., 838.

<sup>4</sup> St. Paul's *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XIII, 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Epistle of St. James*, II, 14.

**389 2. The habit of faith is destroyed by the formal sin of heresy, but not by the material sin of heresy.**

a. The first part of this statement is obvious :

- 1) from *Scripture* — Hymeneus and Alexander, because of their denial of one article of faith, namely the resurrection of the body, "have made shipwreck concerning the faith", or they have lost the faith,
- 2) from the *Council of Trent* which states that the faith is lost through infidelity,
- 3) from *reason* : whoever knowingly denies one revealed truth, by that very fact rejects the authority of God revealing, and so is able to believe nothing from this authority.

**390 b. The second part of this statement (389) is evident :**

- 1) from the unanimous agreement of theologians, for example, of Suarez<sup>2</sup> who declares that our statement is *certain* and *beyond controversy*;
- 2) from *theological reasoning* : it is not fitting that faith be destroyed unless through a *deliberate* and *obstinate* fault, which is opposed to the actual motive of faith; but material heresy is not a mortal sin since it is incurred unknowingly and not deliberately; nor does it in any way deny the authority of God revealing.

**391 3. Corollaries :**

- a. The *omission alone*, even if culpable, of the act of faith does not take away faith, because it is not directly opposed to the formal object or motive of faith;
- b. no one can separate himself from the true faith once received and from the Church *without some fault*, at least

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's *First Epistle to Timothy*, I, 19; refer to St. Paul's *Second Epistle to Timothy*, II, 17; IV, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Council of Trent*, session VI, chap. 15, D. B., 808. Under the name of *infidelity* is signified every sin against faith.

<sup>3</sup> *De Gratia*, I, XI, c. 7, n. 3-4.



the fault of *imprudence*<sup>1</sup>; but this fault is not always a mortal sin, and it is not always against faith; therefore it does not necessarily expel the habit of faith. The *Vatican Council* has declared that those "who have received the faith under the magisterium of the Church can never have any just cause for changing or doubting that faith"<sup>2</sup>. But from the exposition of the theory of some authors which was proposed to the Fathers of the Council, it is clear that this opinion of some older theologians was not condemned, namely: "*per accidens* and in certain definite circumstances, the conscience of an uneducated Catholic can be so much drawn into invincible error that he may embrace some heterodox sect without a formal sin against faith; in this hypothesis he would not lose the faith"<sup>3</sup>.

### 392 B In regard to those who are in termino.

1. *The Angels and the Blessed do not evoke an act of faith properly called*, not at least in regard to those things which are clearly beheld in the Word. This is certain:

a. from the text of *St. Paul*<sup>4</sup> in which it is shown that faith, as something not perfect, is to be done away through the beatific vision: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away... we see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face".

b. *from theological reasoning*: The Angels and the Blessed in heaven do not need anything further to believe because of the authority of God which they see most clearly in the divine essence.

393 2. *The Souls detained in Purgatory retain the habit of faith and they can make use of acts of faith*, although *not meritorious* acts of faith: they do not as yet enjoy the beatific

<sup>1</sup> So, he is guilty of imprudence:

1. Who, instructed only slightly in religion, does not hesitate to mingle frequently with non-Catholics and to listen to them;

2. Who reads magazines and books which attack the faith, and does not have recourse to a well-informed priest when doubts arise contrary to faith.

<sup>3</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 3, *D. B.*, 1794.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to VACANT, *Études théol. sur les Constit. du C. du Vatican*, t. II, n. 731-737.

<sup>5</sup> *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XIII, 9, 10, 12.

vision and hence they continue to possess the habit of faith. However, the acts of faith which they elicit are not meritorious because the time of meriting is confined within the limits of living in the world.

394 3. *Devils and the damned cannot evoke an act of faith properly called* or supernatural because they are incapable of actual grace and of devout desires and inclinations. They believe, nevertheless, and tremble, as *St. James* declares<sup>1</sup>, compelled by the clear evidence of the credibility of God's mysteries.

### Second Section: Theology or the science of faith

395 After a few introductory notes concerning the *relationship between theology and faith*, we shall inquire into the *sources* of theology and the *method* of theology.

#### *The relationship between theology and faith*

396 *Theology* is a supernatural science which, by means of revelation and of reason, treats of God and of creatures in so far as they are related to God.

a. It is a *true science*, possessing:

1. *certain principles*, that is, revealed truths;

2. *a scientific method*, which is at the same time analytical and *synthetical*;

3. *conclusions* deduced and reduced to perfect unity by reason of a material object, of a formal object, and of an end.

b. The *character* of this science is *per se natural*: for theology is learned by means of man's efforts; by reason of its object, of its enlightening excellence, and of adherence to it, theology is also virtually *supernatural*.

397 c. *Theology differs from faith*: in the matter of origin, of excellence, of object, of motive and of the manner in which the object is attained.

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle of St. James*, II, 19.



religion, consequently, the truth of the Catholic Church; philosophy contributes considerably to a demonstration of these points.

## CHAPTER I

## THE SOURCES WHICH THEOLOGY EMPLOYS<sup>1</sup>

398 Theology makes use of two sources of Revelation in a very particular way (section 283 and following), namely, *Tradition* and *Scripture*: for therein we find the dogmas which the theologians must explain and prove. But since it deduces conclusions from revealed truths, and by various analogies illustrates these conclusions, with the help of *philosophy*, of *history*, and of the *natural sciences*, there are three subsidiary sources of theology: *philosophy*, *history* and *certain natural sciences*.

### I. THE USE OF PHILOSOPHY IN THEOLOGY

399 *Philosophy* is distinguished from theology by reason of its object and principle.

a. *Philosophy* is of great value to the theologians; this is evident from the authority of St. Paul and of the Fathers who made use of philosophy in explaining dogma.

b. *In a four-fold way it is of service to theology*:

I. *It demonstrates the fundamentals of faith*: faith supposes three things, namely, the existence and truthfulness of God, the necessity of some religion, and the truth of the Christian

400 2. *Philosophy offers some understanding of mysteries.*

a. *by setting forth more distinctly revealed truths* with the help of the laws of criticism and of hermeneutics, for example, the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and of Transubstantiation;

b. *by illustrating the mysteries through analogies* taken from natural things;

c. *by comparing and integrating the mysteries* in relation to one another, for example, the mystery of the Trinity and the mystery of the Incarnation.

3. *Philosophy defends divinely handed down truths* against adversaries: this it can do very well by showing that opposing theories are false or, at any rate, not essential.

401 4. *Philosophy gives theology the nature and genius of true science*; actually:

a. Under the direction of philosophy we prove dogmas by arguments of authority explained in their own full force;

b. With the help of Logic we can deduce many conclusions not only from revealed principles but also from natural principles;

c. By means of Logic and of Ontology, we coordinate these conclusions and we collect them into one body, as it were;

d. Aided by the light of faith, reason discovers the agreement between revealed dogmas and the principles of sound philosophy; as a result our faith has been better explained.

402 The Rules Governing the Use of Philosophy in the Study of Theology.

I. In order that philosophy may be in a position to produce these effects, it must be employed:

a. *prudently*, in order to avoid examining matters greater than itself and judging by itself truths of the supernatural order,

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 339-359.



in order to avoid regarding unknown matters as known, and uncertainties as certainties, to avoid ascribing too much importance to obscure, difficult, and unnecessary matters;

b. *rightly*, or according to the rule of faith and the rule of continuing principles of common sense and of traditional metaphysics, according to the rules of logic.

Under these conditions there will be no real dissension between faith and reason. It at times there *seems* to be a contradiction, this arises either from the *fault of theologians* who regard something as a matter of faith when it is not so, as in the well known case of Galileo, or from the *fault of philosophers* or scientists who present *mere hypotheses* as indubitable facts and inductions.

403 This manner of philosophizing wisely is acquired:

a. by reading over the works of St. Thomas Aquinas who "by his accurate discussions and by the appropriateness of his language is so outstanding that it would seem that he has left to posterity a quality to imitate, that he has deprived posterity of the power to surpass him";<sup>1</sup>

b. by carefully accepting "whatever has been wisely stated, whatever has been profitably discovered and thought out";

c. at the same time by avoiding every philosophical system which defends *agnosticism*, *phenomenism* or *subjectivism*: for these systems destroy the foundations of faith as well as of reason.

## II. THE USE OF HISTORY IN THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY

404 History is the scientific explanation of past events. It benefits the theologian by bringing forward facts pertaining to religion, or facts that are profane but which are associated with religion, all of which facts contribute to proving or more clearly explaining the Catholic religion.

A *Profane History* is useful:

1. for proving the need of religion (section 18 and following);
2. for showing the credibility of the Christian religion:
  - a. by confirming and making clear the facts related by the sacred authors;

<sup>1</sup> LEO XIII, *Apostolic Letters on St. Thomas Aquinas Patron of Studies* August 4, 1880.

<sup>2</sup> Encyclical, *Eterni Patris*, éd. Desclée, p. 112.

b. by the addition of the new historical arguments;

c. by comparing the Christian religion with other religions which flourished in the world or which are living even in our day;

3. for confirming certain Christian dogmas, for example, the fall of our first parents, the necessity of sacrifice and of the Redemption.

405 B *Church History* is of much greater benefit in as much as it shows us what the Church was like in various times and describes the origin of the Christian religion, its diffusion, its power in restoring civil society, its indefectibility in overcoming persecution, the progress of its dogmas, the causes, the increase and the destruction of heresies, the customs and practices of the faithful — from these, certain or, at least probable, arguments can be deduced concerning particular dogmas of faith. However, the rules of the art of criticism must be carefully obeyed in order that genuine documents may be distinguished from apocryphal ones, and in order that the various testimonies of historians may be compared and their authority be considered.

At this point we shall speak of a few documents in particular.

406 1. In treating of the *Acts of the Martyrs*, which should be read in a critical edition<sup>1</sup>, the Martyrs are to be rightfully regarded as *witnesses to the faith* in giving their responses to their judges.

407 2. On the subject of *Sacred Archaeology* or the science of ancient things or of old memorials (records) with reference to sacred things<sup>2</sup>, we should bear in mind that all these records or memorials (buildings, sculptured or painted images, mobilia and materials (utensils), coins and inscriptions) often make a more vivid impression on souls than do the written books because they bring before their eyes the religious life of the ancient Christians, and thus the faith of these Christians. Nevertheless, it is necessary, for a better understanding of these memorials, to examine

<sup>1</sup> Refer to VACANT, *Dict. de théol., Actes des Martyrs*; H. LECLERCQ, in *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.* t. I, p. 373 and following.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to H. LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne*; DOM CARROT, *Dict. d'archéologie chrétienne*.



most of them and, also, to read what the Fathers have written about them<sup>1</sup>.

408 3. *The History of dogmas* — The History of dogmas contributes much to an understanding of theology. For there is a certain progress in the explanation of the truths of faith (sections 384) since truths which at first were set forth implicitly and obscurely are manifested more explicitly and eloquently in the passing of time, on the occasion of heresies or through the application of philosophy to theology. Thus, it is most advantageous to know this historical progress in order to understand better the explanation of a dogma, and in order to refute more convincingly the Rationalists, who maintain that Catholic dogmas, in the manner of human systems, have come forth naturally and increased; to refute also the Protestants who assert that many of our dogmas are rashly enlarged corruptions of apostolic doctrine.

409 4. *Concerning the History of heresies* — Heretics can be wittedness to a belief in the Church in two ways: *first*, in regard to the dogmas which they *attached*—if they have been expelled from the bosom of the Church because of some doctrine, by that very fact we possess the irrefutable argument of the faith which at that time was commonly accepted; *secondly*, in regard to the dogmas which the heretics retained — if, after their separation from the Church we find heretics believing articles of faith which are accepted by Catholics, then we possess a certain argument for that ancient faith and belief which were flourishing in the Church before the heretics were expelled from it.

### III. THE USE OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES IN THEOLOGY

410 Three of the natural sciences are especially useful to the theologian: *geology*, which is concerned with the origin and antiquity of the world; *biology*, in as much as it describes the origin, the evolution, and the nature of life; *anthropology*, which treats, in a very special way, of those matters which are related to man.

<sup>1</sup> For example, the inscriptions which are found in the Catacombs, after having been gathered and considered and corroborated by the testimony of the Fathers, clearly show that from the first centuries the Saints were invoked by the faithful, that prayers were offered for the dead, and that, consequently, a belief in the existence of Purgatory already existed.

Truly, not only are our cognitive powers sharpened and improved by the study and employment of these sciences, but also *certain dogmas of faith* can be demonstrated by means of these sciences, for example, the creation of matter, the unity of the human race; in these sciences, also, we find comparisons and analogies which can illustrate dogmas: for example, the doctrine of the life of grace receives some clarification from those matters which *Biology* propounds concerning natural life; too, the attacks of natural philosophers against Catholic doctrine these natural sciences help to check.

411 But that theology may correctly and forcefully make use of these natural sciences, these rules should be observed:

1. In matters *entirely scientific* the sciences may employ their own proper principles and their own proper method.

2. But in matters which are *essentially connected with some dogma*, for example, if the unity of the human species is being considered, which the Catholic doctrine about original sin necessarily posits, then the theologian has the right of adducing arguments from Scripture and from Tradition because the Church is infallible in matters of this nature.

Nor should a scientific *hypothesis* which is *purely probable* be preferred to a truth of the *Catholic faith*. In the matter of *scientific difficulties* which are put forward by the opposition, it is expedient, indeed, to solve these in a scientific manner, provided there are at hand truly solid arguments. But if these are wanting and because of this the problem can not be properly decided at the moment, it is better, indeed, to advance no reason than to put forward a poor or worthless reason, or a false one.

3. While the theologian *adapts scientific theories to the interpretation of the Scriptures*, he must be careful lest he associate dogmas of faith so closely with these theories that the dogmas become jeopardized if the scientific theories are rejected.



to the accepted meaning at the time of the definition and according to the discussions and decisions of the Council Fathers and of the later theologians.

B To *prove* dogma the authority of the Church is required, proposing the dogma as divinely revealed by means of her solemn or ordinary magisterium. But since the Church does not set before us matters which must be believed unless they are contained in the *written word of God* or in *Tradition*, these must be brought forward and considered as evidences and proofs from Scripture or from Tradition<sup>1</sup>.

414 1. In regard to *biblical* arguments — as many texts as possible should be brought forward, in chronological order, so that the progress of revelation may be apparent; texts should be produced which contain the thesis in its literal sense<sup>2</sup> or in a *typical sense which has been corroborated elsewhere*.

415 2. In regard to *arguments from Tradition* — Here we must carefully distinguish between documents which individually are *irreformable*, such as the Symbols of faith and the definitions of Ecumenical Councils or of the Pontiffs, and those documents which, taken singly, are *subject to error*, such as the decrees of particular Councils or the testimony of the Fathers. In the case of the first documents, one clear testimony or evidence is sufficient for the thesis to be de fide; however, in the case of the second documents, those of the Fathers or of theologians, the evidences must be so many and of such a nature that it becomes certainly apparent that this matter in hand is a truth which has been universally believed in the Church.

An argument from Tradition can be set forth in a two fold manner, namely, by the *descending* way, that is, by showing the evidences or testimony from the first centuries up until the time at which the subject was defined by the Church; and the *way of regression or of going back*, also called the *way of prescription*, that is, by going back from the definition to former ages.

a. It is profitable to use the *descending way* as often as the testimony of the first centuries is sufficient for establishing the thesis in opposition to the adversaries. Thus it is obvious how, on the occasion of heresies, the Fathers and the Councils gave

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless it can happen that a certain revealed truth may be contained only in the *practice* or in the *mind* of the Church.

<sup>2</sup> Thus *Summa theologiae*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 84, a. 1, 2.

## CHAPTER II

### THE THEOLOGICAL METHOD<sup>1</sup>

412 The method to be followed in theology is that which we have called the *positive-scholastic* (section 2); in this method the positive and historical explanation of dogmas is harmoniously united to the scholastic discussion of these dogmas. To understand this method better, we must have some knowledge of the following:

1. The explanation and demonstration of *Catholic dogmas*;
2. *Theological conclusions* which have been deduced from revealed truths;
3. *The systems* devised by theologians for solving the more difficult questions.

#### 413 1. The Manner of Explaining and of Proving Catholic Dogmas.

A A truth of the Catholic faith must be explained according to the *most recent definitions of the Church*: for since there is some progress in understanding dogmas, naturally the clearer and fuller explanation is to be found in the most recent definitions.

In order to understand these definitions correctly, it is important to know the errors which stand in opposition, and to consult the words of the adversaries and the acts of the Councils; it is necessary, too, that the sense of the words be determined according

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 360-374.



more explicit explanations of the Catholic faith, and in this way a growth in doctrine is delineated. Similarly, confirmations from the *geographical order* should be offered so that they may be manifest as the professions of faith of the many Churches, African, Syrian, Alexandrian, Roman, etc., or of the various schools — and thus the professions of faith of the *Universal Church*. It should be noted that a theologian may use testimony or proofs not only to demonstrate that something is *de fide*, but also to confirm and illustrate the dogmas of our religion which are well established: while the testimony of the Fathers may be insufficient for fully setting down dogmas as certain, nevertheless it does show, in opposition to the opinion of the Protestants, that these evidences or testimonies are not recently invented corruptions. Furthermore, in the works of the Fathers can be found many comparisons, analogies, and reasons which are of help in explaining dogmas more brilliantly and which, therefore, contribute to the better instruction and edification of the faithful.

b. The way of *regression* or of *prescription* proceeds more briefly and more forcefully, especially in the case of documents of the first centuries which are so obscure that they become clear and certain only by the evidences or testimony of a subsequent age. For when the Church over many centuries has possessed a certain dogma which was universally believed, then it can be correctly inferred that such a dogma was truly spread abroad by Christ Himself, to this extent that corruption of it is morally impossible.

## 416 II. The Method to be Followed in Regard to Theological Conclusions.

A The truths of the Catholic faith, once explained and proved, are, as it were, the *principles* from which theological conclusions are elicited: to educe these and to set them in logical order is the special work of theology which theology must not neglect.

For:

1. It is not *natural* for man to remain satisfied with only an explanation of dogmas, but rather to endeavor to extract the conclusions from these dogmas by means of analysis and of deduction.

2. The *Fathers* and the *School men* were outstanding in this matter; many of them were most diligent in deducing theological conclusions and thereby made a contribution to the Catholic faith;

3. Once theological conclusions have been logically drawn and logically coordinated, revealed dogmas are much better understood, for these dogmas are not just the scattered members of a body, but they form one body of doctrine.

## 417 B The Rules Which are to be followed in the matter of theological conclusions.

1. Revealed truths must be regarded as *unshaken principles*; they are like one of the premises of a syllogism, the other premise of which will be some truth which has been perceived by natural reason.

For a conclusion to be *certain* it is necessary:

- a. That the proposition which is naturally known be certain;
- b. That the *elation* itself, by reason of which the conclusion is drawn, be genuine and in accord with the rules of logic.

418 2. It is not sufficient merely to elicit these theological conclusions; *it is necessary to explain them accurately*:

- a. By attentively reading the works of the Fathers and of the Doctors, and by bringing together those explanations which are united among themselves and with other revealed truths by some common principle of relationship;
- b. By making use of the principles of Christian philosophy, ancient and modern.

419 3. Finally, it is necessary to arrange the various conclusions and also the truths of faith so logically that they constitute *one body of doctrine*.

## 420 III. The Method to be Followed in Explaining Systems.

In addition to fixed or certain conclusions there are, also, *systems* or schools which are diverse and sometimes opposed to one another — for example, Thomism and Molinism.

Actually these came into existence from the imperfection of our mind, which does not adequately comprehend the whole



truth, especially where divine matters are involved, and which desires to know many, many things. *A two-fold excess* is to be avoided here :

**A** The excess of those who, after briefly explaining the truths of the Catholic faith and fixed conclusions, spend the greatest amount of time in the study of systems. Many theologians in the 14th and 15th centuries so busied themselves;

**B** The excess of others, who, judging all systems as useless, ignore them completely or spend less time than is right in explaining them.

421 The particular systems of schools should, therefore, be explained *accurately, although briefly* :

1. In this way we shall better understand how far *Catholic truth* extends, also what is certain, what is controverted;

2. *Errors will be avoided* more effectively : for example, Thomism, opposed by the Molinists, more safely evades Jansenism; likewise Molinism, assailed by the Thomists, is more securely protected from Pelagianism;

3. *We gain a clearer knowledge of dogmas* : for example, by considering the arguments of the Thomists and of the Molinists we obtain a more accurate idea about the supreme dominion of God and His supreme and universal causality, and about the exercise of human liberty.

## TRACT VII

## ONE GOD

*I believe in God.*

We have finished with the preambles to faith and have explained the act of faith. Consequently our next topic is the existence, the nature and the operations (workings) of God<sup>1</sup>.

## CHAPTER I

## THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

We shall discuss :

1. The demonstrability of God's existence;
2. The arguments by means of which God's existence is proved;
3. The divine names.

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III; *D. B.*, 1782 and following, 1801 and following. *Summa theologiae* I, q. 1-16; *Contra Gentiles*, book 1; R. GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *Dieu, son existence et sa nature*.



I. THE DEMONSTRABILITY OF GOD'S EXISTENCE<sup>1</sup>

## 422 Errors.

1. Some think that God's existence needs no proof: thus St. Anselm, Descartes, and the Ontologists. Others, on the other hand, teach that this existence cannot be proved by reason: among these are the *Empiricists*, *Kant*, the *Modernists* and the *Traditionalists*.

2. The *Empiricists* profess that our knowledge is limited to phenomena and that it cannot rise up to ontological cause, God. Similarly teach the *Positivists* and the *Agnostics*.

423 3. *Kant*, indeed, maintains that the principle of causality is necessary, but he claims this necessity from the constitution of our mind; and thus, along with the *Empiricists*, he denies to his principle and likewise to all concepts all ontological force. For this reason the metaphysical proof for the existence of God is a mere illusion. However, the existence of God is proved, but it is proved by a moral argument: without God, he states, there would exist no moral obligation, nor could virtue be rewarded by perfect happiness in another life. Therefore, the existence of God is posited and required as the foundation of morals, and we admit His existence the more firmly, the more correctly we live.<sup>2</sup>

424 4. According to the *Modernists*, who philosophize after the manner of the *Empiricists* and also of *Kant*, the human reason, incapable of going beyond phenomena, cannot rise up from creatures to recognizing the existence of God: wherefore, God is not the object of science, but of feeling (sentiment) only, and so does not exist, adds the *Modernist entirely* as the philosopher, unless in the soul of the one believing.<sup>3</sup> Truly the *believing* *Modernist* admits that God exists even *in Himself*, independently of the soul that feels and affirms; and of this existence he declares himself most certain from individual experience, from the heart's intuition through which the reality of God is immediately arrived at.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 391-404.

<sup>2</sup> *Dict. Apol.*, 976-977.

<sup>3</sup> MONTAGNE, O. P., *L'idée de Dieu et la psychologie du subconscient*, in *Revue thomiste*, 1912, p. 289 and following

But those who exclusively use the method of immanence deny to reason all power of reaching God; whence they despise as mere dialectical subtleties the arguments of the Scholastics and of traditional philosophy, such as are expounded by *Plato*, by *St. Thomas* and by *Leibnitz*.

425 5. The *stricter Traditionalists* or *Fideists* contended that knowledge of supra-sensible truths and, in particular, of the existence of God is founded immediately on social authority and ultimately on divine revelation: thus *Lamennais* and *Baunain*.<sup>1</sup>

But the *more moderate Traditionalists* said that social magistrum is a required condition for receiving, first of all, a clear and certain knowledge of God's existence, but that afterwards this truth can be proved by reason alone — thus *Ventura*, *Bonnetty*,<sup>2</sup> *Ubaghs*, *Laforest*.<sup>3</sup>

## Thesis I

426 The existence of God is not a truth which of itself we know, but it is a truth which needs proof. This fact is certain from philosophical arguments; it can be proved from theology.

A The Holy Office declared that the ontological teaching concerning the immediate knowledge of God cannot be safely taught, and condemned Rosmini's error relative to the immediate manifestation of God in creatures.<sup>4</sup> The Encyclical *Pascendi* condemned the assertion of the *Modernists* that God's existence is immediately perceived by means of a religious sense.<sup>5</sup>

B The arguments of *St. Anselm*, and of *Descartes* are not conclusive. In the first, the transition from the ideal order to the real order is illogical, and the second theory falsely presumes that the idea of an infinite God is innate in us.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1622, 1617.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1649, 1651.

<sup>3</sup> *D. T. C.*, under the heading *God*, IV, 808-809.

<sup>4</sup> *D. B.*, 1659, 1891-1895.

<sup>5</sup> *D. B.*, 2081-2082.



427 C Ontologism, contending that in this life the human mind can naturally see God by direct vision, *cannot be admitted* — it is opposed to Scripture, to Tradition, and to experience :

I. To Scripture :

a. Scripture shows God an immortal and *invisible* King who dwells in light *inaccessible*, whom no man *has seen*, whom *no one can see*<sup>1</sup>. But these words are general and exclude vision not only through the eyes, but also through the intellect; the reason for this statement is the very eminence of divine nature which is completely inaccessible to all men.

b. Scripture also states that only God beholds Himself, so that no one can know Him as He is in Himself unless through supernatural revelation : "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him"<sup>2</sup> ; in these words the natural sight of God is excluded.

2. *Ontologism is opposed to tradition* : From the declaration of the *Holy Office* (September 18, 1861) the following ontological proposition cannot be taught or held : "The immediate knowledge of God, at least habitual knowledge, is so essential to the human intellect that without this knowledge nothing can be known : indeed it is intellectual light itself"<sup>3</sup>.

3. *Ontologism is opposed to reason* : knowledge is according to the manner of the one knowing; but man is a spirit united to a material body. Therefore, he is not only naturally incapable of knowing God as He is in Himself, he is even unequal to contemplating a pure created spirit in its own nature. For the rest, every creature, even the most perfect, is naturally incapable of knowing the divine essence immediately which is the subsisting esse itself : a creature essentially is a coalescing of essence and of esse which are really distinct. Wherefore, Ontologism is very dangerous because it can lead to naturalism and to pantheism.

<sup>1</sup> *First Epistle to Timothy*, I, 17; VI, 15-16.

<sup>2</sup> *St. John*, I, 18; refer to *St. John*, VI, 46; to *St. Matthew*, XI, 27.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 1659; refer to 1891 and the following where the condemned propositions of Rosmini are found.

Second Thesis

428 *The existence of God can certainly be known and proved by the natural light of human reason through those things which have been made*. This thesis is de fide according to the *Vatican Council*<sup>1</sup> : "If anyone shall say that the One true God, our Creator and Lord, *cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason* through created things, let him be anathema". Furthermore in the *Oath* prescribed by Pius X, September 1, 1910, there is this declaration that God "can of a certainty be known and moreover can be demonstrated even".

A *The Book of Wisdom*<sup>2</sup> states that they are vain, that is fatuous, (Greek, *μωροί*), who have no knowledge of God and who could not understand him, that is His existence, from His works.

429 B *St. Paul*<sup>3</sup> similarly teaches that the Gentiles, who were lacking the light of revelation, recognized and acknowledged God from those things which have been made (*natural and deductive knowledge*) : "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity : so that they are inexcusable because, when they knew God, they have not glorified him as God".

The definition of the *Vatican Council* is directed against those who claim that God's existence is proved by no firm arguments, and that, therefore, God's existence is not known with certainty. This definition *directly* affects not only the *Empiricists*, the *Kantians*, and the *Modernists*, but also the *Fideists*, who have taught that certitude about God's existence can be had only through faith<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 1806.

<sup>2</sup> *Book of Wisdom*, XIII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, I, 19-21.

<sup>4</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 2, a. 1.



430 *Natural and analogical knowledge of God.* — In our present life God is known *indirectly* and *analogically* in the *threefold way of causality, of removal and of excellence.*

A *God is known:*

1. *Indirectly*, that is, not in Himself and not through Himself, but *in* creatures (creation) and *from* creatures;
2. *Analogically*, that is, through the ideas which bring Him before us neither univocally nor equivocally, but according to positive approximation or proportion.

B *This knowledge of God is attained in a threefold manner or way:*

1. *The way of causality* — by nature there is implanted in us that quality whereby, when we see a certain effect, we begin to investigate its cause. Therefore, on beholding the world, we conclude that there is some *first cause* which has created it; furthermore, from our knowledge of the perfections which creatures possess we are able to know something about *the nature and perfection of the cause* from which creatures' perfections proceed, just as from examining a picture we rightly draw conclusions about some of the painter's qualities<sup>1</sup>.
2. *The way of removal*, of exclusion, of negation, since by force of the principle, *the Cause is more powerful than the effect*, we remove all the imperfections of creatures from God; and thus we say that God is *infinite*, or that He is determined by no limits; that He is *simple* that is, that He excludes all composition and change<sup>2</sup>, etc. In these negations are included the truest perfections.
3. *The way of excellence* — Whatever perfection is in creatures, indeed, whatever is *absolute* perfection, this we attribute *in a more eminent degree*, to the Creator as to the *First Cause* and thence to *Pure Act*; thus, for instance, because in creatures there is essence, wisdom and power,

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, I, 20; *Book of Wisdom* XIII, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *The Epistle of St. James*, I, 17.

we affirm that God is super-essence, super-wisdom and omnipotent. We affirm, further, that in God are all the perfections which the concept of a First Cause demands.

*Let us realize* that these three ways of knowing God should be used together so that we may know as well as possible not only His existence but also His essence and His perfection.

#### 431 C In what sense do we know God analogically?

1. The ideas and concepts which are applied to God are *transcendental*, not indeed in the Kantian sense<sup>1</sup>, but in the scholastic sense. To be sure, a certain idea is transcendental without ceasing for that reason to be objective, (as Kant incorrectly maintained), when it transcends the limits not only of a determined species but also of any genus or class, even of the supreme genus, and thus is found proportionally only in any genus.

There are only six transcendentals properly so called: *being, thing, one, something, good and true*. But, besides, there are metaphysical concepts namely of *cause, of the intellect, of the will*, which, while not transcendentals properly (since they are not found in all classes), are defined, nevertheless, through an immediate relation to one of the transcendentals: cause in respect to being of which it is the author or the effecter, the intellect in respect to the true which it knows, the will in respect to the good which it desires. These ideas, thus considered, *participate* in the transcendence of being, of the true, of the good, and thus can be applied to Him who transcends all creation. For why would the notion of being, which of itself includes no limit, not be applied to a being which is free from all potentiality, and consequently why would the notion of intellect not be applied to an intellect which is made equal to, and is identified with, this most actual and real being? Thus, in turn, in regard to the remaining ideas which are absolutely or respectively transcendental.

<sup>1</sup> According to Kant seeking or inquiring is transcendental which is directed not toward objects but toward our manner of knowing these objects (*Critique de la raison pure*, Introduction, 2, 7).



432 1. *But how can these ideas be applied to God?* Not univocally indeed, since God is not in the same genus as is man; and *not merely equivocally*, but *analogically*, in as much as that proportion exists by which one is related to another as to the principal. Transcendental notions or ideas are in God absolutely, formally-eminently. Therefore, our knowledge of God is not adequate nor is it merely negative; but it is inadequate, positive and formal<sup>1</sup>.

## II. ARGUMENTS WHICH PROVE THE EXISTENCE OF GOD<sup>2</sup>

433 Among the many arguments some are called *physical*, others *moral*, and others *metaphysical*.

The first are taken from concrete facts which are observed in the world; they are taken especially from *the order* which is apparent in the world and which denotes an author who possesses the greatest prudence; and they are taken from *the beginning of life* which cannot be ascribed to the forces of nature alone but are ascribed to a supreme vital principle which we call God. By these arguments we prove that God exists as a Being relatively supreme, distinct from the world and having sway over it; but not as a being infinitely perfect unless we add the metaphysical proofs.

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas, I, q. 12, a. 12; *Contra Gentiles*, Book III, c. 49; in I Sent, dist. 35 q. 1, a. 1. From this we understand that the Agnostics are completely deceived when they state that the First Cause cannot be known by us; he cannot be comprehended indeed, or perfectly and adequately understood; but from what has been said and from what is to be said it is manifest that the First Cause can be known in such a way that it can be distinguished from any other being, and that it is perceptible, that it is *supremely intelligent*, and that it possesses in an eminent degree whatever perfection shines out in creatures — You will find a confutation of Agnosticism in *Essays on Theism*, G. W. WARD; *Agnosticism and Religion*, G. J. LUCAS, Baltimore, 1893; *D. A., a. Agnosticisme, A. d'Alès*.

<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas, I, q. 2, a. 3; *Contra Gentiles*, Book I, c. 13, 15, 16, 44; Book II, c. 15; Book III, c. 44; *De Veritate*, q. 52, a. 2; *De Potentia*, q. 3, a. 5; *Compendium theologicum*, c. 3; *Physic.* Book VII, lect. 2; book VIII, lect. 9 and following; *Metaphys.*, book XII, lect. 5 and following; R. GARRIGOU-LA GRANGE in *D. A., Dieu; Major Synopsis*, 405-413.

The second arguments, the *moral* arguments, are taken either from the *consensus of all people* who acknowledge and worship a Supreme Being, or from the necessity of the *moral law* which supposes a supreme legislator to whom all men are subject; we have used these proofs for demonstrating the need of religion (sections 17-29).

However, arguments of this kind need to be made complete by *metaphysical* proofs in order to have scientific force. These proofs we shall enlarge upon briefly<sup>1</sup>.

The metaphysical arguments (third classification), according to St. Thomas, are selected from the things of the world viewed in a five fold way: from *moveable* things we ascend to the *first immoveable Mover*; from *efficient causes* we ascend to the *first efficient Cause*; from *contingent beings*, to a *necessary Being*; from things *more or less perfect* we ascend to a *Being supremely perfect*; from things *ordered to a supreme Order or Director*.

## FIRST ARGUMENT THE ARGUMENT FROM MOTION<sup>2</sup>

434 Motion is either a change in space, or any passing from power to act, in the corporeal and in the spiritual<sup>3</sup>. Whence, it is certain that some things in this world are moved. But this motion supposes a first immoveable mover; for all that is moved is moved by another; and further, it is not possible to proceed into infinity in the matter of those moving and of those moved; Therefore, there is a first immoveable mover.

### PROOF, by parts

a. It is certain that some things are moved: from experience it is obvious that there are motions, not only local (of place or of space), but also *qualitative* motions, such as motion or movement to health to knowledge, to virtue, and *quantitative* motions,

<sup>1</sup> It is apparent to one considering this matter attentively that these physical and moral arguments fall back on the metaphysical arguments.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to St. THOMAS, *Physic.*, book II, lect. 1 and 2; book VIII, lect. 9, 12, 13, 23.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to St. THOMAS, *Prima Primæ*, q. 9, a. 4; q. 79, a. 4; q. 82, a. 4; q. 105, a. 5.



such as the motion of growth in plants and in animals, and substantial motions, such as generation and corruption of bodies.

b. *All that is moved is moved by another.* This is evident to anyone who thinks about the nature of motion or the nature of becoming. For:

1. motion is the successive union of diverse things: for example, what is here, afterwards is there (local motion), white becomes black, the intellect that knows nothing gradually acquires knowledge (qualitative motion). But motion of this kind does not possess within itself its own reason of being: otherwise elements, of themselves different, would be at the same time something of themselves one, and so the principle of identity would be destroyed.

2. Since motion is the passing or transition of a thing from potency to act, it demands an extrinsic reason of being by which this is put into action and determined or limited. For it is repugnant that one and the same thing at the same under the same respect be in potency as it is in act, or that it be the thing moved and the thing moving. Thus, if it is set in motion, it is set in motion by another.

c. *It is not possible to proceed into infinity in the matter of those moving and of those moved;* or, in other words, it is not possible to go back into infinity through a series of movers which are actually and essentially subordinate. It is repugnant for motion to have its own sufficient reason in a series, even an infinite series of movers which themselves were being moved. For if all movers receive an influx or impouring which they transmit, so that the mover is giving only the motion which it has received, then there never is motion. Thus a clock, even with an infinite number of wheels, will not be moved without a machine which causes motion.

d. Therefore, we must reach a first mover immovable because of that immovability of act which does not demand becoming because it already is—or we must arrive at the mover who acts through himself and who is consequently through himself, who is pure act and *Esse* or *Existence* itself.

#### SECOND ARGUMENT THE ARGUMENT FROM THE ORDER OF EFFICIENT CAUSES<sup>1</sup>

435 *In the world we find efficient causes each in turn subordinate to one another, for example, all the subordinate cosmic influences*

<sup>1</sup> Refer to St. Thomas, I, q. 104, a. 1 and 2, wherein this argument is given an excellent explanation.

which are necessary for the production and conservation of a plant, of an animal, such as generation, chemical activity of air and of food. *But such causes suppose a first uncaused cause.* For on the one hand, it is impossible that a cause of this kind be efficient of itself because it would then be prior to itself; on the other hand a series of such causes is insufficient either in a straight line or in a circular line.

For in a *straight* line, even extended into infinity, a first cause is required which is uncaused; in efficient causes in order, the first is the cause of the middle and the middle is the cause of the last, so much so that if the first cause should be removed, by that very fact the intermediary causes and effects are removed.

But in the hypothesis of a *circular* line, two beings would be mutually cause and effect to each other at the same time. For example, take a circle consisting of four beings, *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*; *a* immediately produces *b*; *b* generates *c*, and *c* generates *d*; therefore *a* remotely produces *d*; further, *d* would generate *a* in this circle, and then *d* at the same time would be generating *a* and would be generated by *a*: this is contradictory. Therefore the minor premise stands.

Consequently, outside of a series of efficient causes, a *first cause* must be admitted which has no cause—or *the uncaused cause* must be admitted. But the cause that is uncaused by that very fact has its *esse* or existence through itself, is Existence itself and pure act: this is rightly God.

#### THIRD ARGUMENT THE ARGUMENT FROM THE EXISTENCE OF CONTINGENT BEINGS

436 *We find in things certain qualities which are contingent, that is, which can be or not be.* a. According to science, there was a time in which there were not in this world rational creatures, animals or plants, a time in which heavenly bodies did not exist such as they now are but only in a nebulous state; b. Further, every day living things cease to be, and hence there are many beings which can be or not be, or can be in this or in another mode.



*But these contingent beings, which do not have in themselves sufficient reason for their own existence, presuppose a necessary being which exists of itself, But :*

1. This necessary being is not a collection of contingent beings, because a multiplication of contingent beings, into infinity even, leaves them in their own contingency;
2. This necessary being is not an intrinsic law of contingent beings because the law itself is also contingent and presupposes a legislator;
3. This necessary being is not a certain becoming which is connected with phenomena, as *Bergson* and *Le Roy* wish, since *the becoming*, as something imperfect, does not have within itself the reason for *the esse* or the act of existence by which it is perfected. — But this necessary being is a Being separated from contingency, of its very nature necessary, existing by itself and going to exist forever : this we call God<sup>1</sup>.

#### FOURTH ARGUMENT THE ARGUMENT FROM THE GRADES OF PERFECTION IN BEINGS

Here we are considering perfections which beings take on more or less : for example, *truth, goodness*. *In things we find something more or less good, true, and noble*. Thus in a different degree a stone, a tree, a horse, a man have the quality of *goodness*; thus through various grades of excellence *life* grows in a plant, in a beast, in a man.

*But these various grades of perfections prove the existence of some being who is supremely perfect, from whom imperfect beings receive their own limited degree of perfection.*

For we use the words *more* and *less* to refer to various things in so far as they approach, in different ways, to something which is supremely perfect; for example, that which is only partially good we call thus because it is a limited participation in supreme goodness. Therefore, because it is less or inferior in sharing in a certain perfection, it has this perfection from another. But this other either is of infinite perfection, or not. If it is of infinite

<sup>1</sup> GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, in *D. A.*, a. *God*, col. 1042-1043.

perfection, then we have proved our point: but if it is not of infinite perfection, this other, enjoying limited perfection, has received its goodness from another, and so it goes successively even until we reach a Being infinitely perfect, which imparts various grades of perfection to others. Therefore a *Being supremely and infinitely perfect* exists<sup>1</sup>.

#### FIFTH ARGUMENT THE ARGUMENT FROM THE DIRECTOR OR DESIGNER OF THINGS

437 If we now look at the order in the world, we see *that natural bodies, which lack knowledge, work for an end or purpose. But this cannot happen unless they are directed by some supreme intellect which is distinct from the world, and which rightly is called God*.

In the world various sciences demonstrate the clearest ordering of means to an end. If we carefully consider any living thing, we observe the greatest knowledge or wisdom : in the evolution of the egg which virtually contains the whole organism, or in the organs which are most fittingly adapted to the many functions according to the diverse species of living things. All of this shines forth brilliantly in the case of man; in his eyes for seeing, in his hands for touching and for practicing the many arts, in his feet for walking, etc.

438 *Proof of the minor in the syllogism (437). But this ordered disposition of means to an end is an argument for the existence of a being who is over and above this world and who is supremely intelligent.* For this ordering proceeds either by chance, or from nature, or from a being who is above the world and who is supremely intelligent. But the first two possibilities are contradictions :

1. *the first* because it cannot happen by chance that elements lacking knowledge should nearly always be directed toward an end and should attain this end by proportionate means;

<sup>1</sup> This proof St. Thomas applies to the intellect (I, q. 79, a. 4); to truth (*Contra Gentiles*, book II, c. 84); to what is good (I-II, q. 2, a. 7, 8); to the natural law (I-II, q. 91, a. 2). The force of this argument lies in this that the more or less perfect, as something mixed with potentiality does not have in itself the reason for its own existence, but *finally* and necessarily has this reason for existence in another who is supremely and infinitely perfect. But if this other, this first one, were himself in potentiality mixed, even to the smallest degree, then he would have necessarily someone first, above and beyond himself — this would be a contradiction. For it is inconsistent that there be potentiality without an act which *can* move it into action.



2. *the second* is repugnant : under the name of *nature* are designated :

a. either the entire aggregate of beings which lack intellect; but it is impossible that things, *of themselves diverse* and inert, be directed *of themselves to a unity* of order in an habitual and stable manner;

b. or an intelligent cause which is within this world, namely man; but it is impossible that man be the cause of the order of the universe because many beings were already in existence and in order before man came into existence, and because man has scarcely any knowledge of the order and intimate structure of the parts of a flea and of a gnat — as *St. Augustine* states very well<sup>1</sup>;

It remains as a fact, therefore, that there is a Being, outside and above the world, supremely intelligent, who directs other beings toward their end<sup>2</sup>.

#### 439 *In regard to Atheists :*

1. There cannot be, unless by chance for a brief time, *theoretical negative* Atheists, that is, men who invincibly and unculpably have no knowledge of God, because those who are *upright of heart* easily enough recognize and acknowledge that some Supreme Being exists.

2. There can be, at least for a time, men who are *theoretical positive* Atheists, that is, men whose reason, deformed by sophisms, denies or doubts that there is a God.

3. But sad experience often enough teaches that there are *practical* Atheists, namely those who have no concern about glorifying and serving God.

### III. THE DIVINE NAMES

440 We shall discuss briefly the names which are used in Scripture, in the Old and in the New Testaments, to designate God.

<sup>1</sup> *Enarrat. in Psalm.* 148, n. 10; *P. L.*, XXXVII, 1944.

<sup>2</sup> In a *simpler* form these arguments are found in Monsabré and others. We have explained them in a *more scientific manner* in order that they may be better examined and understood, and in order that priests may more easily teach them to others, even to the educated.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 13.

#### A In the Old Testament.

1. *El* — sometimes, but rarely, used in the plural form, *Elim*, it is predicated of the *one* and *true God*<sup>1</sup>, and of the *false deities*<sup>2</sup> and analogically of *angels* and *perchance of magistrates*, in as much as they share divine authority<sup>3</sup>. Probably it means "*he who is powerful*".

According to many *Eloah* signifies the same; in the plural form, *Elohim*, it often designates the true God. *El* — *Elyôn* has the same significance as *the Most High*; *El-Shaddai* indicates The Omnipotent.

2. *Jahweh* or *Yahweh* (formerly the name was *Jehovah*) having its derivation from the simple form of the root *hawab*, it signifies him who *causes to be perpetually*; or, according to some, *esse itself*, in keeping with the words addressed to Moses: "*I am who am*"<sup>4</sup>. This is the name which is proper to God and which is incommunicable, which is never predicated of creatures.

3. *Yahweh elohé Sabaoth*, which in the Vulgate is translated the *Lord of hosts*, means God, the Lord of the camps of Israel and, in the time of the Prophets, the Lord of heavenly bodies and of angels; therefore it means the Omnipotent.

4. *Adonai*, or Lord, imports the supreme dominion of God.

441 Thus God is shown as *powerful* and *steadfast*, the *Most High*, in the unity of essence enjoying *manifold power and virtue*, *Omnipotent Being simply*, and the *cause* of other beings, the *Lord* who rules the world, who presides over the *hosts*, who governs *heavenly bodies* and who has *angels* as His assistants. The theology of the Jews, consequently, completely transcends the pagan mythologies.

B In the New Testament God is shown particularly as a *Father* towards men; and also as *King*, as *Alpha* and *Omega*, the beginning and end of all things, endowed with the attributes already revealed in the Old Testament.

<sup>1</sup> *Deuteronomy*, IV, 39. — <sup>2</sup> *Exodus*, XXII, 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Exodus*, XXII, 8, *Psalm*, VIII, 6, *XCVI*, 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Exodus*, III, 14-15.



defining Himself: "I am who am"<sup>1</sup> as if He were saying: "I am He whose essence is esse or *Existence*".

2. The *Fathers* and *theologians* agree that the name (Who is) is proper to God because it was given by God Himself and because it better designates the divine essence.

#### 444 3. Reason proves this thesis:

a. Actually by deducing the attributes of God from the subsistens esse.

From the very fact that He is subsistens Esse:

1. God is *entirely simple*: because He is form itself and indeed most formal form, or esse, He contains no potentiality; but composite parts are something material and therefore potentially relative to the whole;

2. He is *universally perfect*: because He is self-subsistent Existence and contains within Himself the total perfection of being, and consequently contains all perfections.

3. He is the *summum bonum* simply and singly not only in some class or order of things: for all being is good so far as it is in act and is complete; but God is *Absolute Being* or esse itself and the cumulus or sum of all perfections; and thus in turn concerning infinity, immutability, eternity, unity, intelligence, omnipotence, beatitude. (Refer to *Major Synopsis* n. 423.)

#### 445 b. By showing that other systems are inadequate.

1. The divine essence does not consist in:

a. *Infinity*, radical or actual (contrary to the Scotists and the Nominalists); for infinity is the mode of a being already constituted;

b. Nor in *freedom*, for that presupposes that what understands and is understood exists;

*Exodus*, III, 14.

## CHAPTER II

# THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

After proving the existence of God, we must next examine God's nature or essence, and His properties or attributes.

## ARTICLE I. GOD'S NATURE OR ESSENCE

442 A The Catholic Teaching on the nature of God. The *Vatican Council* explains it thus: The Church "believes and confesses that there is one true and living God... Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfection; who, as being one, sole, absolutely simple and immutable spiritual substance, is to be declared as really and essentially distinct from the world".

The Council condemns all forms of pantheism: of emanation, of evolution, of determination of undetermined being<sup>2</sup>.

Pius X reproached the symbolism and the immanentism of the Modernists who were denying the personality of God or changing it.

#### 443 B The Scholastic Doctrine on what constitutes the divine essence.

*Thesis*: The divine essence is made up of that which is subsistens esse itself.

1. From *Scripture* this is inferred wherein God is shown giving to Himself the name *Yahweh* (Who is), and further

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, chap. 1, D. B., 1782; *Major Synopsis*, 418-428.

<sup>2</sup> *Vatican Council*, session III, can. 4, D. B., 1804.



c. Nor in *substantial and actual infinite intellectuality* (contrary to Suarez<sup>1</sup>), because intellectuality is not perceived first in God, but is apprehended as a property proceeding from essence; also, it is not the reason of the other attributes.

446 **Corollary.** From what has been stated we conclude that *pantheism is incompatible*: from God who is purest and simplest act nothing can properly emanate forth to outside; and in God, eternally and essentially the most perfect possible, no evolution can be found.

#### ARTICLE II. THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES

##### I. THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD IN GENERAL

###### 447 I. The Concept and Kinds of attributes.

The attributes of God are *perfections which are perceived to follow the divine essence*. They can be divided in a threefold manner:

- a. Into *negative* attributes, through which imperfections are removed from God; for example, simplicity, immensity, etc.; and into *affirmative* or *positive* attributes, by means of which perfections are predicated of God; for example, wisdom, love, etc.
- b. Into *absolute* attributes, which are appropriate to God or belong to God as He is looked at in Himself; for example, simplicity and eternity; and into *relative* attributes which imply a reference or relation between Himself and other beings; examples, creation, providence, etc;
- c. Into *quiescent* attributes, which express the manner in which God is, as infinity, eternity; and into *active* which show His manner of working.

###### 448 2. God's attributes Distinguished from His Essence and also Distinguished among Themselves.

<sup>1</sup> SUAREZ, *De Deo Uno*, I, 3.

*Gilbert Porretanus*, who died in 1154, and the *Abbot Joachim*, who died in 1202, said this distinction is a real distinction. Porretanus was condemned by the *Council of Rheims*, in 1148, and Joachim by the *Fourth Council of Lateran* in 1215. The Scotists affirm that the divine attributes are *formally* distinguished from essence and among themselves. Against these the following statement is laid down:

a. *It is certain that the divine attributes really differ neither from the essence nor among themselves.* For:

1. In the *Sacred Writings* the divine essence and the divine attributes are mutually predicated in the abstract of one another: "I Wisdom dwell in counsel"; "God is light... God is charity"; "I am the way, the truth and the life". But if there were a real distinction between divine essence and divine attributes, they could not be predicated of one another reciprocally; nor could they be made to be the same.

2. *Blessed Eugene III*, at the Council of Rheims, condemned the error of *Gilbert* in these words: "We believe and we confess that the simple nature of divinity is God, and that

<sup>1</sup> A *real* distinction is that which exists between one thing and another; it is divided into *real major* which is present between substance and substance, or between substance and accident or between accidents of the same substance, and *real minor*, which exists between a thing and its mode, for example, between a line and the curve of the same line. A *logical* distinction is that which exists among various concepts of the same thing: if the fundamentum or foundation is in the thing itself for the purpose of distinguishing those different concepts, the distinction will be *virtual* or a distinction of *reason* reasoned; thus, for example the human soul, although *one really*, can be called three fold *virtually* since it truly is at the same time rational, sensitive and vegetative; but if there is no fundamentum in re, the distinction is *merely logical*, or a distinction of *reason*, such as, for example, exists between man and rational animal: for really there is no difference between man and rational animal. These points are commonly admitted; but *Scotus* thought out another distinction which he calls *formal from the nature of the thing*, as it were, something between a real distinction and a distinction of reason: so, according to him "*thisness*" (the principle of individuation, of individual existence) is distinguished from matter, from form, from the compositum just as "another positive entity", "the ultimate reality of being". Refer to GONZALEZ, *History of Philosophy*, vol. II, p. 266-267.

<sup>2</sup> *Proverbs*, VIII, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *First Epistle of St. John*, I, 3; IV, 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, XIV, 6.

<sup>5</sup> LABBE, *Councils*, vol. 10, p. 1108.



it cannot be denied in any Catholic sense that *Divinity* is *God*, and *God* is *Divinity*.

449 b. *It is commonly maintained that the divine attributes are virtually distinguished from the divine essence and are virtually distinguished among themselves.* In the *Scriptures* God is shown adorned with diverse attributes, actually with attributes which are, as it were, opposite: He is called just and merciful, forgiving and punishing<sup>1</sup> etc. This can be explained only through admitting some distinction. However, this distinction is not *real*, as we have already shown; it is not *nominal*, as *Ockham* and *Gregory Ariminensis* claimed, because the divine names make known *diverse reasons* and thence without cause are considered to be synonyms. The distinction, therefore, is a distinction of *reason* *reasoned* or a *virtual* distinction, or a distinction induced by our reason with a fundamentum in re. Because of its infinity the divine nature possesses all the perfections which are found separately in creatures.

It is true that the *Scotists* admit a distinction between the divine essence and the divine attributes; this distinction which they call *formal from the nature of the thing*, is not real, nor is it a distinction of reason alone. If we consider the subject seriously, it becomes sufficiently evident that this distinction is nothing other than a *virtual* distinction.

## II. THE SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

450 These are six in number: *simplicity*, *immutability*, *eternity*, *immensity*, *infinity*, *unity*; by means of these the imperfections of *composition*, of *change*, of *time*, of *measurement of limitation*, of *plurality* are removed from God<sup>2</sup>.

### *The Simplicity of God*

451 a. *Concept of simplicity*. — Simplicity is opposed to composition. However, there are three kinds of composition:

<sup>1</sup> *Jeremias*, XXXII, 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, 429-454.

*physical*, *metaphysical* and *logical*. Consequently there are three kinds of simplicity: *physical* simplicity — this excludes that composition which arises from quantitative parts which are really distinct, as in a stone made up of various minute particles; *metaphysical* simplicity, excluding that composition both of material things and of immaterial things which results from a real distinction between potency and act, between substance and accidents, between essence and existence; *logical* simplicity — this excludes that composition which arises, for example, from a proximate genus and a specific difference (difference in species).

452 b. *Erroneous ideas*: The *Anthropomorphites*, who attribute a human form to God, denied the simplicity of God; so, too, have the *Pantheists*; and the *Immanentists*, who do not sufficiently distinguish God from a thinking subject.

453 c. *Thesis*: *God is a substance altogether simple and immune from every kind of composition.* This thesis is *de fide* from the *Vatican Council*: "Who as being one, sole, *absolutely simple* and immutable spiritual substance".

*Proof from Scripture.* — In Scripture God is shown as:

a. *Incorporeal*. He cannot be represented by images: "To whom then have you likened God? Or what image will you make for him?" "Being therefore the offspring of God, we must not suppose the divinity to be like unto gold, or silver, or stone, the graving of art and device of man".

b. *Entirely spiritual*: "God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth".

c. So simple and spiritual that in Him there is no composition of essence and attributes; creatures, indeed are spoken of as having life, wisdom, but God is *wisdom*

<sup>1</sup> *Isaias*, XL, 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, XVII, 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, IV, 24.



*itself, life itself, truth itself, light itself, love itself*<sup>1</sup>. St. Augustine summarizes this in these words: "Therefore God is called simple because what He has, this He is"<sup>2</sup>.

#### 454 Proof from Reason<sup>3</sup>.

a. In God there is no physical composition, for physical composition is found in matter, or in bodies, or in component parts. But God is not matter because matter is pure potency while God is pure act. Nor is God a body, since body likewise includes potency, for example, because of its divisibility. Nor is God part of a composite, as, let us say, the soul of the world, for God is the efficient cause of all things (section 435): moreover, an efficient cause cannot be at the same time the formal intrinsic cause of its own effect.

b. In God there is no metaphysical composition:

1. Of act and potency, for God is pure act without an admixture of any defect and of potency;

2. Of substance and accidents, for through His essence God is complete perfection and thus He cannot be a partaker in further perfection through accidents;

3. Of essence and existence, for where existence and essence differ, essence is prepared for existence just as potency in which existence is received. But in the divine essence there is no potentiality.

c. In God there is no logical composition, or, in other words, God is not in any genus,

1. Neither directly as species which are included in a genus; for in those things which are contained in a certain genus there is found a genus, which is a certain potency, and a specific difference, which is like an act, adding something to the genus. But in God there neither is nor can there be conceived composition of act and potency.

<sup>1</sup> Proverbs, I, 20; Gospel according to St. John, I, 4, 8-9, XIV, 6; First Epistle of St. John, IV, 8.

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine, City of God, book XI, c. 10, n. 1; P. L., XLI, 325.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Summa theologiae, I p., q. 3; Contra Gentiles, book I, cc. 16-27.

2. Nor indirectly, as principles which are reduced to some genus, for the principle which is reduced to a certain genus, does not extend itself beyond that genus — whereas God transcends all genres.

#### 2. The Immutability of God

455 a. Concept: Immutability is opposed to change; but change is the passing from one state of being to another, as from potency to act. This is the Catholic doctrine: God is immutable not only *quoad substantiam*, as to substance, but also as to knowledge and volition, in as much as God is not able to know or determine anything new because He has known and decided all things from all eternity. This Catholic teaching opposes the Stoics, Hegel and Renan, who have claimed that a perfect being is not in act, but in becoming<sup>1</sup>; it opposes the Socinians who claimed that God is changeable in His decrees.

456 b. Thesis: God is entirely immutable. This thesis is deduced from the Vatican Council: "Who as being an immutable substance".

#### 1. Proof from Scripture.

a. From the words in which all change is denied of God: "I am the Lord and I change not"<sup>2</sup>; "With whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration"<sup>3</sup>.

b. From those places where any change of counsel is denied: "He will not be moved to repentance; for he is not a man that he should repent"<sup>4</sup>.

#### 457 2. Proof from Reason<sup>5</sup>.

a. Everything that changes is in potency to the state which is acquired, and by its own motion it acquires

<sup>1</sup> RENAN, *Averroès*, Préf., p. VII.

<sup>2</sup> Malachias, III, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Epistle of St. James, I, 17.

<sup>4</sup> First Book of Kings, XV, 29.

<sup>5</sup> St. THOMAS, I, q. 9, a. 1.



something new. But in God there is no potentiality because He is pure act; there is no possibility of acquiring something since He is infinitely perfect. Therefore God does not change.

b. An intelligent being does not change his will unless motives, unknown before, are presented to his mind. But from all eternity God knows all things perfectly with a unique intelligence. Therefore He also decides all things with one immovable will, even their change. For although unmoved and immoveably willing, God can will the changes in creatures. Thus it is evident that prayer is not useless. Because God foresees our prayers from eternity, He can direct events according to our petitions.

### 3. The Eternity of God

#### 458 a. Concept.

1. In a broad sense the word *eternal* is often used to mean duration of time which had a beginning but which will have no ending; in this sense the joys of the just are called eternal.

2. In a strict sense eternity is defined by Boetius<sup>1</sup> thus: "*The perennial, interminable, perfect possession of life in its fullest totality, always without beginning and without end*".

The word *interminable* is used because eternity has neither beginning nor end. The words *fullest totality* mean that without succession or change eternity endures. It is called *the perfect possession* for this reason: God lives in one perpetual instant, at the same time He delights in His whole life.

459 b. Thesis: *God is truly and perfectly eternal. The Vatican Council* has declared this thesis a matter of faith: "The Church believes and confesses that God is... *eternal, immense...*"

1. *Proof from Scripture.*

a. "I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, says the Lord God, Who is and Who was and Who is to

<sup>1</sup> *De Consolat. philosoph.*, book V, p. 6.

come<sup>1</sup>"; in these words it is pointed out that God lacks a beginning and an end.

b. "Before the mountains were made or the earth and the world was formed, from eternity and to eternity thou art God<sup>2</sup>".

"But thou art always the selfsame, and thy years shall not change<sup>3</sup>". In these words it is stated that the eternity of God lacks succession.

#### 2. *Proof from Reason*<sup>4</sup>.

God's eternity necessarily flows from His highest and greatest perfection and unchangeableness; for what is infinitely perfect, pure act, and therefore immutable, can acquire or lose absolutely nothing; again, He would acquire something by beginning or by existing successively, He would lose something by ceasing to be. Therefore, God is perfectly eternal.

### 4. The immensity and ubiquity of God

460 a. Concept. *Immensity* is the attribute by force of which God can be present in all things and in all places, even non-existing things and places. *Ubiquity* is *this very presence* in all existing things. In God we distinguish a three fold ubiquity:

1. By reason of *knowledge*, since He knows everything;
2. By reason of *power*, since He acts in all beings;
3. By reason of *substance*, since He is substantially present in all things; not *circumscriptively*, in the manner of bodies; nor *definitively*, like the Angels who, although they are entirely in any part of a place, nevertheless are contained in place; but in a certain indescribable manner since God is

<sup>1</sup> *The Apocalypse*, I, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Psalms LXXXIX*, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Psalms CII*, 26-28 refer to *Second Epistle of St. Peter*, III, 8; *Gospel according to St. John*, VIII, 58; *First Epistle to Timothy*, VI, 16.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to *St. Thomas*, I, q. 10, a. 2; *Contra Gentiles*, book I, c. 15.



entirely everywhere, wholly in every place, and wholly without place since He is not contained or held in place.

4. Besides, from His overwhelming perfection God is able to be present in all possible things.

461 b. Thesis: God is perfectly immense, and present in all things through His knowledge, His power and His essence. It is *de fide* from The Vatican Council that God is immense; but the manner of His presence is determined with certainty by Scripture and reason.

1. Proof from Scripture.

a. By means of His knowledge God is present in everything: "Neither is there any creature invisible in his sight: but all things are naked and open to his eyes<sup>1</sup>";

b. By means of His power God is present in everything: "She reacheth therefore from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly" "...upholding all things by the word of his power<sup>2</sup>";

c. By means of His essence: "He is not far from everyone of us; for in him we live and move and are<sup>3</sup>"; He is not circumscribed or inclosed by created things: "If heaven and the heavens of heavens do not contain thee, how much less this house, which I have built<sup>4</sup>?"

462 2. Proof from Reason.

As the first cause and the most universal cause of all becoming and of all being or esse, God acts in all things for the purpose of producing them, conserving them and ruling them. But He cannot act where He is not present. Therefore God is present in all things through His essence also.

<sup>1</sup> Epistle to the Hebrews: IV, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Wisdom, VIII, 1; St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, 1, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XVII, 27.

<sup>4</sup> II Paralipomenon, VI, 18.

This does not favor Pantheism, as certain Rationalists contend; for the divine substance, although everywhere present, is in reality distinct from all created substances; nor is He properly contained in these, but rather He contains them — as St. Thomas correctly states<sup>1</sup>.

5. The Infinity of God

463 a. The Concept. The infinite, in general, is that which lacks limits. It can be distinguished in a two-fold manner:

The absolutely infinite, or by reason of being, that which is infinite in all ways;

The infinite in a certain class, or that which contains all the perfection possible in that class or genus.

God is absolutely infinite, in fact He embraces all fullness of being, and so all perfections but in different ways.

There are two kinds of perfections:

Simple perfections, which have no imperfection joined to them and which it is better to have rather than not to have — for example, wisdom, goodness, justice; Mixed perfections or perfections *secundum quid*, which have some imperfection and which are set against greater perfection — as, for example, the power of reasoning, which is a perfection in man, but which in itself is much more imperfect than the power of understanding things by one intuition.

God possesses simple perfections *formally*, that is, according to their own proper concept (analogically, however); He also possesses mixed perfections *eminently*, that is, not with the imperfections which are joined to mixed perfections, but in a superior way.

464 b. Thesis: God is infinitely perfect — God possesses all perfections to an infinite degree. This thesis is *de fide* according to The Vatican Council, declaring that God is "infinite in intellect and will and in every perfection".

<sup>1</sup> Summa theologiae, I, 8, a. 1, ad 2.



### 1. *Proof from Scripture.*

a. *From God's words to Moses*: "I am who am"; the Fathers and theologians assert that these words mean that God is simply esse, Existence itself, Absolute Being or that God has the fullness of being<sup>1</sup>.

b. From texts which extol the greatness of God to such a degree that He has no limits: "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised and of his greatness there is no end".

c. From the words which assert that He *alone* is powerful, just, eternal: "The Blessed and *only* Mighty... who only hath immortality".

These words show that these perfections belong only to God through antonomasia.

### 465 2. *Proof from Reason.*

a. That is simply and absolutely infinite which is limited is no way by anything extrinsic or intrinsic. But God is not limited by anything extrinsic because He is an absolutely independent first cause; nor is He limited by anything intrinsic since, being the first cause, He has within Himself no potentiality which would reasonably involve a consideration for a higher cause.

b. Furthermore, since He is Existence itself, Absolute Being in act, He has all perfections with no defect or limitation<sup>2</sup>.

### 6. *The unity or unicity of God*

466 a. **Concept.** The word *one* is defined thus: that which is *undivided in itself and divided or separated from every other*.

<sup>1</sup> Those who say that these words directly signify God is the Cause of all being can deduce such a conclusion: for God cannot cause whatever exists unless He has within Himself the fullness of being.

<sup>2</sup> *Psalm* CXLIV, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *First Epistle to Timothy*, VI, 15-16; refer to *Machabees*, I, 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 4, a. 2; refer to q. 7, a. 1-2; *Contra Gentiles*, book I, c. 43.

God is one both *intrinsically*, because His simplicity excludes all division; and *extrinsically*, because He excludes any other like to Him or because He is single or unique. The Polytheists and the Dualists deny the last statement.

467 b. **Thesis**: *God is one or God is unique or alone in His most perfect unity.* This thesis the *Vatican Council* made a matter of faith: "God Who, as being one, sole... substance".

### 1. *Proof from Scripture.*

In the Old Testament God always proclaims Himself to be the sole God: "See ye that I alone am, and there is no other God besides me". Wherefore, monotheism is a fundamental dogma of the Jewish and of the Christian religions.

### 468 2. *Proof from Tradition.*

All the symbols and many of the Councils acknowledge and declare the unicity of God.

### 3. *Proof from Reason.*

a. From the *simplicity* of God: "That which makes common essence individual or distinctive, cannot be shared by many... But the divine essence is individuated by itself because in God there is nothing other than essence and what it is".

b. From the *infinity* of God: "If there were several gods, it would be necessary for them to be different: something therefore would be proper to one which would not be proper to another", and consequently neither would be infinite.

<sup>1</sup> *Deuteronomy*, XXXII, 39; *Isaias*, XLIII, 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Compendium theologicæ*, c. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 11, a. 3.



## THE DIVINE OPERATIONS OR WORKINGS

### 469 Introductory Notes concerning God's Operations and Life.

#### I. Concepts.

a. A working is either immanent, when its terminus or end remains and continues within the agent itself; or *transient* when it produces an external effect. Within God there are operations *ad intra* (toward within): for example, knowledge, volition; and operations *ad extra* (toward without): for example, creation, concursus, redemption.

b. In *actu primo* life is the intrinsic and substantial principle by force of which a being moves itself; in *actu secundo* it is a vital immanent working by which certain beings move themselves. There are three grades of life: of plants, of animals, of beings endowed with intellect and will.

#### 470 2. God's Life.

*God is truly and supremely living, in fact, He is life itself and the source of all life.* This is de fide from the *Vatican Council*: "The Church believes... that there is one true and living God<sup>1</sup>".

<sup>1</sup> *The Vatican Council*, session III, chap. I; *D. B.*, 1782, *Summa theologica*, I, q. 18.

a. *Scripture* states: "I live forever<sup>1</sup>". Peter proclaims Christ the Son of the *living God*<sup>2</sup>; St. John teaches that all things live in God<sup>3</sup>.

471 b. *Reason* argues thus: To live is to move oneself. But God has within Himself the principle of His own operation. This He has in the most perfect manner because He is absolutely independent of another and He is pure act.

Actually God is *His own life* just as He is His own *Existence* or *esse*: He has life which is not shared in; He has life absolutely and simply. Therefore He is *the source of all life*, for a living creature receives from God its living which is its *existence* or *esse*, and is directed and tends toward the living God.

#### ARTICLE I. GOD'S KNOWLEDGE<sup>4</sup>

472 In *God there is most perfect knowledge*: for God is infinitely perfect, God is the wisest Ordainer and Director of the world; also, He is in the highest degree of the immaterial and of the actual (of immateriality and of actuality). Moreover, a being is as cognoscitive as it is immaterial, for knowledge is perfected in as much as the form of what is known is in the one knowing. But the more immaterial a certain substance, the more easily it can receive within itself the form of another thing.

#### A. The Object of Divine Knowledge

473 The object of this knowledge or knowing is twofold: the *primary* object, that is, God Himself; and the *secondary* object, that is, things outside God.

I. **God Knows and Comprehends Himself fully.** "The things that are of God no man knoweth but the spirit of God<sup>5</sup>".

<sup>1</sup> *Deuteronomy*, XXXII, 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XVI, 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, I, 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 459-482.

<sup>5</sup> *I Corinthians*, II, 10-11.



a. Since God possesses the highest degree of intellectuality, He understands without any potentiality, or He is pure act in the order of understanding. So in Him the understanding intellect and the thing understood and cognition or exercise of the intellect are one and the same. Therefore, God knows Himself in the most intimate manner possible.

b. Besides, the proportionate and proper object of the divine intellect is, to be sure, God Himself; but He knows Himself to such a degree as He is knowable, and therefore He comprehends Himself perfectly<sup>1</sup>.

#### 474 2. God Knows the Other Things apart from Himself, either Existing, or Possible, or Future Conditioned.

a. *God knows other things outside Himself.*

For since God knows Himself perfectly, He knows His own power perfectly; and "since divine power extends to all other things because it is the first effective cause of all beings, it is necessary that God know other things outside Himself". Also, God's esse or existence is identical with His understanding; therefore whatever things preexist in Him as in a first cause are from eternity and have been comprehended by Him.

475 b. *God knows all things, even future free acts.* This is definite according to the *Vatican Council*: "All things are... open to His eyes, even those which are yet to be by the free action of creatures".

1) *Scripture* asserts in a general way that God's knowledge is universal: "The Lord knoweth all knowledge"<sup>2</sup>. *Scripture* states that He knows all the actions of creatures, indeed the most secret thoughts: "The Lord searcheth all hearts and understandeth all the thoughts of minds"<sup>3</sup>. *Scripture* shows

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 14, a. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 14, a. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ecclesiasticus*, XIII, 19; *Hebrews*, IV, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *I Paralipomenon*, XXVIII, 9.

that God knows all future things, whether necessary or free: "Behold O Lord, thou hast known all things, the last and those of old; thou hast understood my thoughts afar off... and thou hast foreseen all my ways"<sup>1</sup>. *Scripture* proves that God knows even what is possible, for it says: "He calleth those things that are not as those that are"<sup>2</sup>.

#### 476 2. Proof from Reason.

God cannot know Himself perfectly unless He knows also all those things to which His power extends, that is, all beings, existing or possible; for His power does extend to all things.

Thus we see that many of the pagans, among them *Cicero*, that certain heretics like *Marcion* and the *Socinians*, and that numerous modern day *Rationalists* have erred in denying pre-knowledge of future things to God in order that they might the better preserve human freedom.

477 c. *God infallibly knows the conditioned future free actions and things, that is, those things which would have been under a certain condition, but which will not be because of the lack of the condition.* This is the common and the certain opinion.

##### 1. Proof from Scripture.

a. From the words of Christ: "If in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes"<sup>3</sup>;

b. From the assurance God gave to David that he would be handed over to Saul by the men of Ceila if he were to remain in their city<sup>4</sup>.

2. *Proof from Reason.* God knows whatever is true and whatever has a reason for being. But future conditioned things in themselves are something true and do have a reason for being. Therefore God knows these things and, since His knowledge is perfect, He foreknows these things not conjecturally, but infallibly.

<sup>1</sup> Psalm CXXXVIII, 3-5.

<sup>2</sup> *Romans*, IV, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XI, 21.

<sup>4</sup> *First Book of Kings*, XXIII, 11 and following.



## 478 3. Reconciling Divine Foreknowledge with Human Freedom.

The following facts should be carefully considered :

- a. The difficulty revolves about *the manner* in which both truths exist or stand; it is true that ignorance in regard to the manner does not remove certitude concerning the fact;
- b. God would be deceived if actions which He foresees to be future free actions were not freely carried through;
- c. Divine knowledge, as something entirely gathered together in the immutable point of eternity, holds itself in relation to all future things, whether necessary or free, as our vision in regard to things present; but our vision does not remove the contingency of those things which are seen, just as our memory does not force facts to be which have gone by<sup>1</sup>;
- d. What God foresees will indeed *infallibly*, that is *certainly*, come to pass, but not *always necessarily*; for necessity is taken from the order in relation to proximate causes, not from the order relative to the first Cause.

B. *The Divine Ideas and Qualities of Divine Knowledge*

479 1. **Divine Ideas** \*. In the divine mind there is knowledge which is concerned with the proper species and the proper individual reasons of each creature by means of which each creature participates in the divine essence. But such knowledge or such ideas are exemplars or images of the things which God carries on. These ideas are *many*, not on the part of the divine intellect, which in one intuitive apprehension perfectly beholds itself and all other things apart from itself; but rather on the part of those objects which are understood by God.

480 2. **The Qualities of Divine Knowledge.**

On the part of God, His knowledge is :

- a. *Universal*, that is, it includes everything.
- b. *One* and *most simple*, in as much as God knows Himself by *one unique act* which continues unchangeable, and in His

<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine, *Free Will*, book III, c. 4.  
<sup>\*</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 15.

own essence He knows the essences of all and whatever can happen to them : for in God being or esse is the same as knowing or understanding : but the divine esse or divine being is one and simple.

c. God's knowledge is *intuitive* because by an act of unique intuition He perceives all things fully without any discursion or reasoning which would introduce a double imperfection, namely succession and progress in knowing.

d. This knowledge is *independent*, that is, it needs no external thing through which it might gain its knowledge — it is the knowledge of Him who is the efficient cause of all things.

e. God's knowledge is *infallible*, because the divine intelligence is God Himself and at the same time the cause and the measure of everything and of every truth and thence the essentially adequate representation of the divine essence and of all created things.

f. God's knowledge is *efficacious* in as much as it is the cause of things through the intermediation of the will which carries out what has been perceived in the mind.

A consideration of this divine knowledge affords *consolation to the good* and *dismay to the evil*.

*Corollary on God's Wisdom*

481 1. **Concept.** Divine wisdom is the supreme love of order through which God purposes ends which correspond to the perfection of His nature and through which He attains these ends by the best means. Wisdom, therefore, presupposes *knowledge* which knows perfectly what is good and what are the best means for attaining this end; it presupposes *will* which is directed toward good, and *power* because it is concerned with things to be done.

482 2. **Thesis :** *God is infinitely wise in all His ways and in all His works.* This thesis is certain.

a. *Proof from Scripture :* In the Sacred Books it oftentimes is said that God has done all things in wisdom, in fact, that



His wisdom is infinite: "How great are Thy works, O Lord! Thou has made all things in wisdom... and of His wisdom there is no number..."<sup>1</sup> O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!<sup>2</sup>

#### 483 b. Proof from Reason.

- 1) The most beautiful order and the best adaptation of means to an end which can be discerned in the world proclaim a wise ordainer, just as a well-constructed house demonstrates a wise architect.
- 2) Further, perfect wisdom is found where there is supreme intelligence joined with the greatest will and power of performing. But these three God possesses. (Refer to further development of this topic.)

#### C. Kinds of divine knowledge and the medium of divine knowledge

484 As regards the object known, divine knowledge is distinguished in a manifold way;

1. Speculative knowledge or knowing, which contemplates things, and practical knowledge, which, since it is joined with the will, is the cause of things;
2. Knowledge of approbation or approbative knowledge, when it has joined to it an act of the will of complacency, and knowledge of disapprobation or of reprobation, if joined to it there is an act of dissatisfaction or of aversion.
3. However, in the schools they make a division which is taken from the medium in which God perceives things that are distinct from Himself. The medium in quo is that, the cognition of which leads to the cognition of another<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Psalm CIII, 24; Psalm CXLVI, 5; Refer to Proverbs, III, 10 and following, Wisdom, VII-VIII; Ecclesi, XXIV.

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the Romans, XI, 33.

<sup>3</sup> At this point we must distinguish from the medium quo: that which is conceived as integrating and perfecting the elicitive principle of cognition or the intellect. In us the medium quo is the species intelligibilis; in God it is the divine essence itself.

485 a. In this matter the Thomists distinguish a two fold knowledge in God:

1. Knowledge of simple intelligence through which God sees all the essences of things possible in His own essence;
2. The knowledge of vision by which God knows all things existing whether they are present, or past, or future, not precisely in His own essence, but in the free ordinance of His will, since from eternity He decided to bring into act certain possible things rather than others. If the question is asked: How are sins foreseen? we answer that these are known not in an approbative decree, but in a permissive decree as God from eternity determined in such or such a case to withhold help on account of just causes or to deny the help by which sin would be avoided. In the matter of conditioned future acts or things, the Thomists say they are known in decrees subjectively absolute and objectively conditioned. For example, from eternity God wills that the people of Tyre be converted if the Gospel be preached to them; that decree is subjectively absolute. "I wish the people of Tyre to be converted," but it is conditioned on the part of the object "by positing the fact that the Gospel be preached to them".

486 The Molinists object that freedom is destroyed by these decrees. The Thomists reply: whatever God decides from eternity, certainly indeed and infallibly comes to pass, but not necessarily<sup>1</sup>. In addition it should be noted that it is not of the essence of a second cause, even of a free second cause, to act independently of a first cause: for every creature completely and always depends on a first cause as regards esse, and therefore as regards agere (acting) also.

487 b. According to the Molinists, in addition to knowledge of simple intelligence and of vision, another kind of knowledge must be admitted concerning conditioned future acts: this is called scientia media. As the name implies, it stands in the middle between the scientia simplicis intelligentiae and the scientia visionis. Its object lies between the mere possible and the absolutely future. Indeed the Molinists teach that future free actions are not known in the divine decrees, but in themselves, in their own objective truth. Thus from two contradictory propositions, for example, "If Peter were placed in these circumstances, he would sin"; and "If Peter were placed in these circumstances, he would not sin", one is determinately true and the other is determinately false. But God can know whatever is determinately true.

<sup>1</sup> St. THOMAS, I, q. 19, a. 8.



The *Thomists* answer that the *Molinists* evidently digress from the question; for the question is not *whether* God knows future actions, absolute or conditioned, but *in what medium* does God know them. The following argument will help to answer the question: God knows future free actions or things in themselves, or in the created will, or in the divine essence or in His decrees; but He does not know future actions in themselves because God does not gain His knowledge extrinsically; He does not know them in the created will which is of itself undetermined, nor does He know future actions in His own essence which only shows things as possible and does this by considering them separately from existence. Therefore it stands that God knows all future things, just as He knows all the past and all the present, in the objectively manifold decree of His will. The *scientia media* is consequently superfluous.

#### ARTICLE II. THE DIVINE WILL<sup>1</sup>

488 Scripture bears witness that *in God there is will*: "Thy will be done"; and reason deduces this from the divine intellect: for will follows the intellect. In God will and volition do not differ really from His essence or His intellect.

##### A. The object of the divine will

The object of the divine will is twofold: the *primary* object, that is, the divine essence and divine goodness; the *secondary* object, that is, creatures.

#### 489 I. The Primary Object.

a. God wills Himself in the first place as *His end*: for He knows His goodness as the *greatest good in itself* and *because of itself*;

b. God wills Himself *necessarily*, because His infinite goodness is an object adequate and perfectly proportioned to His will and therefore His goodness necessarily determines His will to willing.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 19; *Major Synopsis*, 484-508.

#### 490 2. The Secondary Object.

##### a. In general.

1) *God wills and loves other things apart from Himself*, for He has made all things and loves them.

2) God wills and loves other things *because of Himself or for His own glory*. God wills all things in their appointed way; creatures, however, as sharers in the divine goodness, must be directed and put in order toward God;

3) God wills and loves other things *freely*: for those things which are for an end or purpose we will not from necessity unless they be the means necessary for the end. But creatures are not the means necessary for the end, God, since the goodness of God is absolutely perfect and completely self-sufficient without creatures.

##### 491 b. The Secondary Object in Relation to Evil.

1) *Gods intends no evil per se*, because the will can seek only real or apparent good.

2) *God intends no physical evil unless per accidens*. That is sought after *per accidens* which is desired not because of itself but because of something else to which it is joined. God reasonably wills physical evil so that greater physical or moral good will result from such evil. "Good things and evil, life and death... are from God<sup>1</sup>".

492 3. *God does not intend moral evil*, but He *permits it only*. This is de fide from The Council of Trent<sup>2</sup>. "If anyone says that... the works which are evil as well as those that are good God produces, not permissively only but also *proprie* and *per se*, so that the treason of Judas is no less His own proper work than the vocation of St. Paul, let him be anathema".

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesiasticus*, XI, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Session VI, c. 6.



a. *Scripture* expressly declares :

1) God hates and abominates sin : " Because thou art not a God that wiltest iniquity <sup>1</sup> " ;

2) God tempts no one : " Let no man, when he is tempted, say that he is tempted by God. For God is not a tempter of evils, and he tempteth no man <sup>2</sup> " .

3) In fact, God cannot look upon iniquity, but punishes it with eternal punishments : " Thy eyes are too pure to behold evil, and thou canst not look on iniquity <sup>3</sup> " . " Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God <sup>4</sup> " ?

b. God *permits* sins, that is, He wills not to prevent them because from sins permitted many good things proceed : thus, on the part of *God*, the manifestation of patience, of mercy, of justice, etc. ; on the part of *man*, the exercise of patience, of humility, of contrition, etc.

B. *The qualities of the divine will*

I THE FREEDOM OF GOD

493 a. **The Concept.** *Freedom* is *immunity from external and internal necessity*, and we define it as *the power of choosing from among many*. But God is not free in regard to His own goodness and in His workings within Himself, for He wills and loves Himself necessarily.

494 b. **Thesis** : God is free in all His works outside Himself. The *Vatican Council* <sup>1</sup> has declared this as *de fide* in regard to creation : " If anyone says... that God created, not by His will, free from all necessity, but by a necessity equal to the necessity whereby He loves Himself, A. S. " .

<sup>1</sup> *Psalm*, V, 5, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *St. James*, I, 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Habacuc*, I, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *I Corinthians*, VI, 9.

<sup>5</sup> *D. B.*, 1805.

1. *Proof from Scripture.*

Of His *natural* works it is said : " Whatsoever the Lord pleased He hath done in heaven, in earth, in the sea, and in all the depths... <sup>1</sup> " But of His *supernatural* works : " All these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to everyone according as he will... <sup>2</sup> " It is inferred that God is *not bound to choose the best*, especially from the fact that the Incarnation, which is the best work of God, was freely decided upon. (This will be shown later.)

495 2. *Proof from Reason.* Because the divine will is directed by wisdom, it wills not necessarily but freely those things which are not necessary to it. But none of those things which are external to God is necessary to Him, since none of them increases His perfection. Therefore, God freely wills other things external to Himself <sup>3</sup>.

It is obvious, therefore, that *Abelard* (1116), *Wyclif* (1375), and *Calvin* (1536), have erred in teaching that God could do only those things which He did ; that *Leibnitz* and the *Optimists* were in error in contending that God is free in the sense that He can create or not, but, once we posit the fact that He wishes to create, that He is bound to choose the best ; outstandingly in error are the *Rationalists*, for example, *Cousin*, *Saisset*, who maintain that creation was necessary.

496 c. **Reconciling God's Freedom with His Unchangeableness.**

The problem herein is this : whatever is in God is *immutable* and necessary ; and nevertheless a free divine act is in a certain way contingent because it can be or not be. How are these ideas compossible?

497 1. The *Scotists* and some others admit a twofold act in God, one essential and necessary, by which He wills and loves Himself, but the other, accidental and free, by which He wills and loves creatures. In this manner they explain freedom. But in order to preserve His immutability they say that not every change is excluded from it, but only the change by which God would be

<sup>1</sup> *Psalm CXXXIV*, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, XII, 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 19, a. 13.



worse or better; now truly a free act, by means of which He creates or loves creatures, makes Him neither worse nor better. This system or explanation is more commonly than not rejected because it supposes accidental modes in God; such a supposition is repugnant to God's most perfect simplicity.

498 2. The *Thomists*, however, along with the greater number of theologians, teach that there is *one* act in God, which, because of His infinite perfection, can be at the same time necessary and free: necessary as it is terminated at the divine esse; free as it is terminated at creatures. In this way they preserve God's immutability. But His freedom they explain in this way. In a free act there are three constituents: the subject willing, the thing willed, and the relation between both; now in order that a certain thing be freely produced, it is sufficient that the relation between the subject and the thing willed be free. But thus it is when God wills creatures: for although the act of volition as viewed in God is necessary, the relation which He has to the thing willed is not necessary, since the thing is of itself contingent and can exist or not exist<sup>1</sup>.

## 2° THE SANCTITY OF GOD

499 a. **Concept of Sanctity.** Sanctity, oftentimes called justice in the Sacred Writings, is an immunity from all moral evil, and conformity with the supreme rule of morals. Since God is a law to Himself, divine sanctity is well called the unchangeable will to act in accord with His perfections.

500 b. **Thesis:** *God is infinitely and substantially holy.* This thesis is certain. *Proof from Scripture.*

God is proclaimed as *free from all moral evil*: "God is faithful and without any iniquity, he is just and right"; "Thy eyes are too pure to behold (with approbation) evil: and thou canst not look on iniquity".

We were commanded to imitate His sanctity: "Be holy because I am holy...".

<sup>1</sup> Refer to BILLUANT, *De Deo*, disp. VII, a. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Deuteronomy*, XXXII, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Habacuc*, I, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Leviticus*, XI, 44.

## 501 *Proof from Reason.*

Sanctity consists of a union with the *Good* through affection and of conformity of the will with the supreme rule of morals. But through His cognition, His will, and His essence God is identified with the Supreme Good, and further His will cannot separate itself from the rule of morals which is not distinguished from the divine will itself.

Therefore, God is essentially holy.

## 502 c. **The Moral Perfections of God.**

Sanctity or holiness is, as it were, the aggregate of all perfections or of moral virtues. Virtues are *theological* or *moral*. Among the moral virtues some include imperfection in their concept; but others do not. Of the theological virtues only charity is found in God. Of the moral virtues, certain ones which import no imperfection are metaphorically attributed to God because of a similarity of effect — for example, justice.

## 503 d. **The Charity or Love or Mercy of God<sup>1</sup>.**

*God is Charity or love and He loves creatures, especially mankind, with a merciful and efficacious love.* This is de fide from the ordinary magisterium of the Church.

### *Proof from Scripture.*

In a general way God is said to love all creatures, and to bestow good things on all of them: "Thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made..."<sup>2</sup> "The eyes of all hope in thee, O Lord; and thou givest them meat in due season"<sup>3</sup>.

God is shown as the best *father*: "Is not he thy father, that hath possessed thee, and made thee, and created thee?"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 20, 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Wisdom*, XI, 25.

<sup>3</sup> *Psalms CXLIV*, 15-16.

<sup>4</sup> *Deuteronomy*, XXXII, 6.



He is oftentimes called *merciful, clement, patient, long-suffering*, and innumerable examples of His mercy are reported: "As a father hath compassion on his children, so hath the Lord compassion on them that fear him"; "O the Lord God, merciful and gracious, patient and of much compassion...<sup>1</sup>".

This fact is obvious from the parable of the Good Shepherd, from Christ's manner of acting with the *Samaritan woman*<sup>2</sup>, *Magdalen*<sup>3</sup> with *Zacchaeus*<sup>4</sup>, with the *thief* on the cross<sup>5</sup> etc; it is especially obvious from the fact that God "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us"<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, "God is love"<sup>7</sup>.

**504 Proof from Reason.** God is the *Greatest Good*. But the good diffuses or spreads itself, or it naturally tends to communicating itself. God, therefore, naturally inclines to communicating His perfections to others.

Also, *mercy* is attributed to God according to its *effect*, but not according to a state of intense emotion or suffering: indeed it is not proper to God to be sad, because He is incapable of suffering; but it is fitting for God to acknowledge (and to bear) this mercy, because He is good<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Isaias*, LXIII, 16; XLIX, 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Psalm CII*, 13; *Exodus*, XXXIV, 6; *Psalm CXXIX*, 7; *Wisdom*, IX, 24;

Refer to *Psalm CII*, and *CXXV*, in their entirety; *Isaias*, LV, 7;

*Exech.* XXXIII, 11; *Joch.* II, 12-13; *St. Matthew*, V, 45; *St. Luke*, V, 31;

*Romans*, II, 4, *II Peter*, III, 9; *II Corinthians*, I, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, IV.

<sup>4</sup> *Gospel according to St. Luke*, VII, 37 and following.

<sup>5</sup> *Gospel according to St. Luke*, XIX, 2 and following.

<sup>6</sup> *Gospel according to St. Luke*, XXIII, 42.

<sup>7</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, VIII, 32 — all of these qualities Contenson brings together very beautifully: "God sends forth His blessings, not sparingly but effusively: what is great, He gives His blessings to all; what is greater, He gives them to those who are unworthy; what is greatest, He gives them to those who are ungrateful; what is even greater than that, He gives to those who are unwilling; what is divine, after His gifts He gives Himself, He gives His Son, He gives the kiss of His heart, the Holy Spirit. Divine love and mercy can go no further". (Theolog. mentis et cordis, book I, dis. 3, c. 2, spec. 3).

<sup>8</sup> *Epistle of St. John*, IV, 16.

<sup>9</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 21, a. 3.

### 3° THE JUSTICE OF GOD

**505 a. The Concept of Justice.** Strictly understood<sup>1</sup>, justice is a virtue which inclines the will to render to each one what is his due. It is twofold, *commutative*, by which the individual gives to the individual what is strictly due to him for something received or taken; and *distributive*, by which the Director of a community gives out duties and charges, rewards or punishments, according to merit or desert. *Commutative* justice cannot be attributed to God because He can receive nothing from us which is not already, to the greatest extent possible, His own: "Who hath first given to him, and recompense shall be made him"<sup>2</sup>?

**506 b. Thesis:** *We must agree that distributive justice, remunerative or vindicatory, belongs to God. This thesis is certain.*

*Proof from Scripture.* In a general manner Scripture declares that God is just: "Thou art just, O Lord, and thy judgment is right...<sup>3</sup>" "Thou art just, O Lord, and all thy judgments are just, and all thy ways mercy, and truth, and judgment"<sup>4</sup>.

In a special way Scripture affirms that in God there is *remunerative* justice: "As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord the just judge will render to me in that day"<sup>5</sup>. "Scripture also affirms that there is also *vindicatory* justice in God: "Revenge is mine: I will repay..."<sup>6</sup>.

**507 Proof from Reason.**

Because the divine will is most holy, it essentially loves good and despises evil. But in God to love is to will and to do

<sup>1</sup> Taken in a broad sense, justice is a complexus of all virtues and thus it is not distinguished from sanctity.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XI, 35.

<sup>3</sup> *Psalm CXVIII*, 137.

<sup>4</sup> *Tobias*, III, 2.

<sup>5</sup> *II Epistle to Timothy*, IV, 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XII, 19; Refer to *Psalm V*, 7; *Epistle to the Romans*, I, 18; *Second Epistle of Peter*, II, 4.



good, but to hate is to withdraw grace and to inflict punishment. Therefore God rewards the good and punishes the evil<sup>1</sup>.

### C. The divisions of the divine will

508 1. *Virtually*, or according to our manner of understanding (section 449), the divine will is divided into the will of *good pleasure* and the will of *expression*: the *first* is will properly called or interior volition; the *second* is only the exterior sign of the divine will, metaphorically called the will.

Five signs of this kind are commonly enumerated: it instructs, it forbids, it permits, it advises, it executes<sup>2</sup>.

509 2. The will of *good pleasure* is divided into *antecedent* will and *consequent* will; but theologians do not explain this division in the same way:

According to the *Thomists*, the will is called *antecedent* because it is directed toward an object considered with relation to itself and with no relation to circumstances; the will is called *consequent* when it is directed to an object considered with all circumstances. Thus, for example, a judge *antecedently* wills every man to live, but *consequently* he wills to hang a murderer. Similarly God wills *antecedently* to save all mankind, but *consequently* he wills that certain beings be damned because of their sins<sup>3</sup>. According to the *Molinists*, the *antecedent* will is that by which God, antecedently to the absolute foreseeing of the good or bad use of liberty, decides to do something; *consequent* will is that by which God wills something consequently to the absolute foreseeing of the good or bad use of free choice<sup>4</sup>.

510 3. The will of God is *conditioned* if its execution depends on some condition; it is *absolute* if its execution depends on no condition. However, whatever God wills simply, absolutely, and consequently, is always fulfilled. But what God wills antecedently or conditionally, sometimes may not happen; for example: "I *desired* to cleanse thee, and

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 21, a. 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 19, a. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to BILLUAT, *De Deo*, dis. VII, a. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to St. AUGUSTINE, *De Deo Uno*, part. IV, a. 6.

*thou art not cleansed...*" "How often would I have gathered together thy children... and *thou wouldst not*"<sup>1</sup>. Wherefore the will of God can be divided into *efficacious* and *inefficacious*.

## ARTICLE III. PROVIDENCE AND PREDESTINATION<sup>2</sup>

### I. PROVIDENCE

511 A **Concept**. Providence is the *ordinating of things to their proper end through the appropriate means for attaining that end*. Wherefore, Providence is formally an act of the intellect, whose duty it is to *foresee* and think out the end and the means proportionate to the end; but Providence supposes also an act of the will because it imports an intention of end and of means. However, the carrying out in time of things foreseen from eternity St. Thomas calls *divine direction or government*<sup>3</sup>.

The existence of divine Providence was impugned by the *Epicureans* who fashioned God as indifferent and uninterested in creatures; by the *Stoics* who thought that He had a care for the higher and grander things, but not for the small and unimportant; by many *Deists* or *Rationalists* who claim that the world is directed by natural laws without any intervention of God; and also by the *Pessimists*, like *Schopenhauer* and *Hartmann*, who contend that the world, as it is, is absolutely evil.

512 B **Thesis**: *God has a care for all things, even the most trivial, and directs these things to their determined end*. This thesis is de fide from the *Vatican Council*: "God *protects and governs by His Providence* all things which He hath made, reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly"<sup>4</sup>.

### 1. Proof from Scripture.

Scripture states that God has a care for all things: "She reacheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things

<sup>1</sup> *Esaiel*, XXIV, 13; *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXIII, 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, 509-549.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 22, a. 1, ad 2.

<sup>4</sup> Session III, chap. I, D. B., 1784 (1033).



sweetly". "There is no other God than you who have a care for all things"; that He is interested even in the smallest: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father"? Scripture declares that God is concerned also with those things which seem to be fortuitous: "Lots are cast into the lap, but they are disposed of by the Lord". Further, Scripture shows that God is especially interested in man, his temporal and his spiritual concerns: "Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on... For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you...". Also, the same Providence extends itself to free acts through which men proceed toward their end: "Just as the divisions of the waters, so the heart of a king in the hand of the Lord". Events also are directed by God, indeed to such a degree that they contribute to the salvation of the elect: "You thought evil against me, but God turned it into good... For all things are for your sakes, that the grace abounding through many, may abound in thanksgiving unto the glory of God".

## 2. Proof from reason.

Providence imports two things: the assigning of an end and of the means for attaining that end. But these two are proper to and in harmony with a supreme Deity; for since every agent acts because of an end, God, in creating the various beings, ordained these for a determined end; because He wills the end, He wills also the means; therefore God has determined the means suitable to attaining the end to such a degree that He directs creatures to their end and has a concern for all.

<sup>1</sup> Wisdom, VIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, X, 29; refer to VI, 25 and following.

<sup>3</sup> Proverbs, XVI, 33.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, VI, 25 and following; X, 29 and following.

<sup>5</sup> Proverbs, XVI, 9; XX, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Genesis, I, 20; II Corinthians, IV, 15; refer to I Corinthians, III, 22-23.

<sup>7</sup> Summa theologica, I, q. 22, a. 1-2.

## 513 C Solution of Difficulties.

Difficulties are taken especially from the existence of evils in the physical order and in the moral order; from the *unequal*, or, as is actually stated, the *unjust distribution of goods*. However, these difficulties do not obstruct Providence.

### 1. Physical evils we explain thus:

a. The physical order, inferior to the moral order, must be subordinated to it, and accordingly physical evils can be intended per accidents by a universal foreseer provided the physical evils contribute to the universal good and to the glory of God. But such is the case, for, as St. Thomas<sup>1</sup> says: "If all evils were prevented, many goods things would be absent throughout the world".

b. When we take into consideration the fact of original sin, we understand physical evils more easily; we understand that:

- 1) They are a sequel to sin, and so are to be ascribed to our first parents, not to God;
- 2) They are a justly imposed punishment for actual sins;
- 3) They offer an opportunity to satisfy for sin, to gain merit, and to cultivate virtue. Thus, physical evils are beneficial to the good of a higher order.

514 2. We reason in this way in regard to *moral evil*: moral evil would be a hindrance and an obstruction to divine Providence in so much as there were no reason present for permitting it. But *there is a reason for permitting sin*:

a. On the part of God, for His independence demands that He cannot be impeded by the evil of creatures from creating what is possible and useful;

b. On the part of the creature for "just as the perfection of the universe requires that there should be not only incorruptible beings, but also corruptible beings, so the perfection of the universe requires that there should be some which can fail in goodness, and thence it follows that these sometimes do fail".

515 3. The *unequal distribution of goods* in itself does not obstruct divine Providence, because for the perfection of the universe

<sup>1</sup> Summa theologica, I, q. 22, a. 2, ad 2.

<sup>2</sup> Summa theologica, I, q. 48, a. 2.



it is required that some creatures be more perfect than others. But the objection is offered that very often holy people are afflicted with calamities while the unholy flourish in the midst of honors and of riches. In answer, we state that good things do not always fall to the impious, nor do misfortunes always befall the good, but very often good and bad things indiscriminately happen to good and evil people.<sup>1</sup>

Let us admit, however, that the just are much more afflicted than are the unjust. God's reason for so acting we explain in this way: on the one hand, there is no bad person who has not done something good, and it is fitting that God grant them a temporal reward because they are to be excluded from eternal blessedness; on the other hand, there is scarcely any just person who has not sinned, and it is proper that these suffer for a time in order that they may the more quickly attain eternal happiness.

Furthermore, it should be noted that temporal goods are not man's supreme good, and that it is not necessary or befitting that, in this world, virtue always be rewarded and that vice be punished lest perhaps we be enticed to virtue solely in the hope of some remuneration.

## II. PREDESTINATION AND REPROBATION

### 516 A *Concept of Predestination and of Reprobation.*

I. *Predestination*, in the strict sense, is the act by which God destines certain men to attain salvation<sup>2</sup>. It includes two acts, one, of the *intellect*, by which God disposes and ordains the salvation of certain people, and the other, of the will, by which He wills them to be saved. *Predestination* can be divided in a twofold manner; one is *complete* or *adequate* and embraces the entire series of graces leading to salvation, and salvation itself; the other kind of predestination is *incomplete* or *inadequate* — this refers either to single graces or to a series of graces apart from glory, or to glory considered separately; consequently this is called *predestination to faith*, *to justification* or *grace*, *to glory*. Oftentimes predestination in the Sacred Writings is called *purpose*, *election*, and the predestined are called *the elect*, *the chosen*, *the saved*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, V, 45.

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine, *Gift of Perseverance*, c. 14, n. 35; P. L., XLV, 1014.

<sup>3</sup> *Epistle to the Ephesians*, I, 1-11; to the Romans, XI, 5-7; I to Thessalonians, I, 4; I Peter, I, 4.

2. *Reprobation* is an act of the divine mind by which God foresees that some will be evil and He decides to exclude them as such from eternal glory.

517 B *It is certain that predestination both to grace and to glory exists, in fact, it is a matter of divine faith.*

I. In *Scripture* it is said, in regard to predestination to grace: "Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ<sup>1</sup>", that is to grace by which we are made the adopted sons of God. In regard to predestination to glory *Scripture* states: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world<sup>2</sup>". Of both kinds of predestination *Scripture* records: "Whom he foreknew he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son... and whom he predestinated, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified<sup>3</sup>".

2. God does nothing in time which he has not preordained from eternity. But in time He saved certain ones before others. Therefore these He has pre-chosen from eternity.

C. The *extension* and the *cause* of predestination have been very much discussed topics. In order to separate what is certain from what is uncertain, we shall, first of all, justify the Catholic doctrine in opposition to the Protestants and the Jansenists; and then we shall explain the outstanding theological systems.

### I. The Catholic Doctrine concerning the Saving Will of God

#### 518 a. Errors.

The *Predestinarians*, with their leader, *Lucidus*, who was condemned at the Council of Arles in 474, *Gotschalk*, condemned at the Council of Mainz in 848 and at the Council of Quierzy

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle to the Ephesians*, I, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXV, 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, VIII, 29-30.



in 849, taught that God does not wish all men to be saved, and that Christ died for the predestined only.

Calvin revived this same error. His disciples we can divide into two groups: The *Antilapsarians* or the *Supralapsarians* maintained that, even before the Fall of the first man was foreseen, some had been destined for life eternal, but others for everlasting punishment, for this reason alone that God wishes to manifest both His mercy and His justice.

The *Postlapsarians* taught that, only after the Fall of Adam was foreseen, God destined some men to eternal blessedness, but others, as a punishment for original sin, to hell. The *Jansenists* taught that before the Fall was considered, God sincerely willed the salvation of all, but that after the Fall was foreseen, He willed truly and sincerely the salvation of the elect only; and that He had prepared efficacious graces for these alone.

**519 b. Thesis:** *By the antecedent, true and sincere resolve of His will God wills the salvation of all men, even after the Fall has been foreseen; He does not destine any one to eternal punishments before their sins or demerits are foreseen*<sup>1</sup>. It is of faith that God sincerely wills the salvation of some persons at least who are not predestinated, we should rather say, of all the faithful. For the proposition of Jansenius asserting that "it is Semipelagianism to say that Christ died for absolutely all men", understood in the sense that *Christ has died for the salvation of the predestinated only*, was condemned as *heretical*<sup>2</sup>.

All the faithful are bound to profess the Symbol in which it is stated: "Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven"; therefore it is de fide that Christ died for all the faithful, and accordingly that God sincerely desires their salvation.

*It is certain and proximate to faith that God sincerely wills the salvation of all adults, even of the infidels.*

It is commonly held that God sincerely wills even the salvation of infants who die before they can be baptized.

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the works mentioned in the *Major Synopsis*, refer to L. CAPÉLAN, *Le Problème du salut des infidèles*, *Essai théologique*, 1912, p. 32-35, and *Essai historique*.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 1096.

## 520 I. *Proof of thesis from Scripture.*

Even after original sin God loves all creatures and has pity on them: "But thou hast mercy upon all because thou canst do all things and overlookest the sins of men for the sake of repentance. For thou lovest all things that are, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made..."<sup>1</sup> But God would not love all, nor would He have mercy on all if He had decided from eternity that some would be saved, but that others would be damned, before their sins were foreseen.

St. Paul<sup>2</sup> speaks particularly in regard to the faithful: "We hope in the living God who is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful".

Concerning the infidels St. Paul<sup>3</sup> says: "I desire, therefore, first of all that supplications, prayers... be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in high station... For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth". In this text St. Paul desires that prayers be made for all because Christ gave Himself as a redemption for all; and so fallen man is included. But from the context it is apparent that this word "all" includes the infidels also, because the second verse mentions the kings and the magistrates of that time who were still infidels.

The decision of Christ at the last judgment manifestly supposes that the reprobate are to be condemned only because of their evils works, but not because of the good pleasure of God or because of original sin. For thus Christ will address them: "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire... for I was hungry and you gave me not to eat, etc..."

## 521 2. *Proof of Thesis from Tradition.*

The Second Council of Orange and the Council of Arles give very open support to our thesis<sup>4</sup>. So also do the Greek

<sup>1</sup> Wisdom, XI, 24-27; XII, 19.

<sup>2</sup> First Epistle to Timothy, IV, 10.

<sup>3</sup> First Epistle to Timothy, II, 1-6.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXV, 41 and following.

<sup>5</sup> D. B., 200.



Fathers and also the Latin Fathers<sup>1</sup>, with St. Augustine, the babblings of the Protestants and of the Jansenists in regard to Augustine notwithstanding.

Very openly the Holy Doctor has written in his work *De Spiritu et Littera* (412): "God *wills all men to be saved* and to come to a knowledge of the truth; but not in such a way as to deprive them of free will, through the good or bad use of which they most justly are to be judged."<sup>2</sup> Similar quotations are to be found in other works of St. Augustine. If, therefore, there may be doubtful passages, these should be explained with the help of passages which are clear.

#### 522 *Proof of Thesis from Theological Reasoning.*

a. *Direct* — God certainly has given to all the command to accept the faith and the sacraments, which are the means to a supernatural end. But it is repugnant that God has commanded the means to the end without an arrangement or ordinance to the end. Therefore, God has ordained all men to this end, that is, He truly *wills* the salvation of all men.

b. *Indirect* — The system of the *Supralapsarians* is manifestly opposed to the divine attributes: to *goodness*, because it is cruel to give up to eternal punishments some creatures before their sins are foreseen; to *wisdom*, which intends punishments only for chastising sin; to *sanctity*, because, in predestinating certain ones to hell, God should predestinate these same ones to sin — and in this way God becomes the author of sin; and finally to *justice*, for although God is not bound to destine creatures to a supernatural end, nevertheless, if de facto He assigns them a supernatural end, He owes it to Himself to grant the supernatural means necessary to attaining this end.

c. This argument opposes the *Infralapsarians* also. For if God, after the coming of original sin, *wills* to save only certain members of the poor human race, where is His Wisdom?

<sup>1</sup> Journal, n. 125 and following *Ind. theol.*

<sup>2</sup> Chap. 33, n. 58; Journal 1735.

On the one hand, man still remains destined for a supernatural end, and on the other hand, because of a fault which is not personally his but is the sin of the head of mankind, he is incapable of attaining this end. Where is God's goodness? Since He is able most easily to make available to all the means necessary for salvation, and since de facto He has instituted the means of redemption which can of itself benefit all mankind, how could His goodness positively and directly hold back many from this means of redemption? Where is His love? In this hypothesis God actually loves certain ones in selecting them, but the others he freely holds in contempt. With the Psalmist, therefore, we conclude: "As a father hath compassion on his children, so hath the Lord compassion on them that fear him; for he knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust"<sup>1</sup>.

#### II. *The Theological Systems Relative to Predestination*

523 *State of the Question.* To begin we should know wherein all Catholic theologians agree:

1. Predestination to first grace takes place before the foreseeing of all merit because this grace can in no way be merited.

2. Predestination to final grace or to final perseverance does not fall under *merit de condigno*.

3. Predestination viewed as *adequate* or *complete*, in as much as it includes the entire series of graces, from the first grace even to glory, is gratuitous and therefore takes place or happens before foreseen merits; for the supernatural order is superior to the forces and exigencies of nature, and accordingly destination to it is in no way due.

We are, therefore, particularly concerned with the question concerning *predestination to glory strictly understood*. All agree that glory in the order of execution (cooperation of the free will with grace) is conferred because of merits; but we want to know whether God from eternity decided to give glory to the elect *after* or *before* their supernatural merits were foreseen.

524 The Molinists maintain that there is predestination of adults to glory *after foreseen merits*; and to make their thoughts clearer they propose an order of divine decrees.

<sup>1</sup> Psalm CII, 13-14.



1. God wishes, even with original sin taken as a fact, by an antecedent true and sincere will, that all men be saved, and He prepares for them means which are remotely or proximately sufficient for salvation.

2. From a special predilection for some He destines graces with which He foresees, by means of scientia media (middle knowledge), that they will be in accord and agreement.

3. With the knowledge of vision (scientia visionis), He foresees that these will live morally and that they will die in the state of grace and, following their foreseen merits, He predestinates these to glory.

4. Likewise He foresees that others will die in mortal sin; and following their foreseen demerits, sentences them to punishment.

In order to support this concept :

1. They present many texts from Scripture and, first of all, the words with which Christ will console the elect at the final judgment : " Come, ye blessed of my Father; possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat, etc. ".

2. They contend that as a result of the opposite opinion exhortations lose their force, that listlessness and carelessness about salvation are introduced.

525 But the *Thomists*, the *Augustinians*, the *Congruists* and many *Scotists* contend that predestination to glory takes place *before merits are foreseen*, although positive reprobation may follow the foreseeing of merits. They usually draw up the divine decrees thus :

1. God by an antecedent will, true and sincere, ordains all rational creatures to eternal happiness, even with original sin presupposed, and for all these creatures He prepares graces which are really sufficient.

2. But certain creatures He chooses before others, and these He wishes to save by an absolute and efficacious decree.

3. For these also He prepares graces of *themselves* efficacious, by means of which they infallibly, although freely, conduct themselves well and are saved.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXV, 34 and following.

4. Foreseeing, in His own decrees, that the elect will perform good works and will persevere to the end, He decides in the order of execution, *in ordine executionis* (refer to 523), to bestow glory on them as a reward.

5. But since at the same time He foresees in His decrees, that others will die in the state of mortal sin, He destines these for eternal punishments.

The proof of this opinion is taken in particular from St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, chapters 8, 9, and 11; in these, considering the proposition concerning gratuitous predestination, St. Paul explains it, *proves* it, and *defends* it against those opposing :

a. He defines it as a *proposal* or *purpose* of God, a *proposui* according to the *election* of God<sup>1</sup> according to the *election* of grace, that is, gratuitous, for " if by grace it is not now by works : other wise grace is no more grace " ;<sup>2</sup> He explains how in those of this kind who are called all things work together unto good : " That to them that love God, all things work together unto good, to such as, according to his purpose, are called to be saints " ;<sup>3</sup> He declares that from such a purpose flows an efficacious vocation, justification and glory : " Whom he predestinated, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified " ;<sup>4</sup>

b. Then, asking why so few of the Israelites believe in Christ, he replies that not all have been efficaciously predestinated, but that some only were chosen by God before others; this gratuitous choosing he illustrates with various examples<sup>5</sup>. Finally he answers and solves the objections against gratuitous predestination, in the manner of the Thomists, both by means of a general principle : " O Man, who art thou that repliest against God? " ;<sup>6</sup> and by the example of a potter who from the same clay makes one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, all these are nothing more than the actual thesis of the Thomists : for they suppose that God chooses us for glory by his own good will, that all good things, even our merits, flow from this election. Whoever acts prudently and ordinately intends the end before the means. But God acts prudently and ordinately, and furthermore merits are the means, glory is the end. Therefore He intends the glory before the means.

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XI, 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XI, 5-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, VIII, 28.

<sup>4</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, VIII, 30.

<sup>5</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XI, 6-18.

<sup>6</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, IX, 20.

<sup>7</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, IX, 21.



### Conclusion

526 The mystery of divine predilection toward the elect remains in both explanations: for *gratuitously* God chooses the predestinated in *ordine executionis* first for final perseverance in grace and then for the attainment of glory. After this has been attentively considered, there seems to be no difficulty in establishing the eternal *intention* of Providence first, the election to glory, secondly and in the order to glory, election to grace and to a persevering obedience and service in grace; actually the opinion of the Thomists seems to surpass the opinion of the Molinists in this, that it sets up in God a plan which is more ordered and regulated.

It remains for the Thomists and the Molinists to exclaim with St. Paul: "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments and how unsearchable his ways! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?" Two facts can certainly be gathered from Scripture, namely, that our salvation is both in the hand of God and in the hand of our own counsel or planning. Surely God will not fail us; on the contrary, He will impart to us graces, not only sufficient but also abundant. It is necessary, therefore, for us to make our vocation and our election certain through good works.

### 527 The Number of the Predestined.

1. The number is great according to the following quotation: After this I saw a great multitude, which no man could number of all nations, and tribes and people, and tongues, standing before the throne and in sight of the Lamb.<sup>1</sup> What this number is, we do not know.

2. It is commonly asserted that the elect are fewer than the reprobate, if the *entire human race* is referred to; but the texts of Scripture from which this is inferred do not appear to have demonstrative force: "Many are called but

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle to the Romans*, XI, 33-34.

<sup>2</sup> *Apocalypse*, VII, 9.

few are chosen.<sup>1</sup> "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat."<sup>2</sup> One fact beyond a doubt is this, that no one will be damned unless knowingly and willingly through his own fault.

3. In the matter of *Catholics* alone, it is commonly held, with *Suarez*, that more, even of the adults, will be saved rather than condemned, because of the saving will of God, because of the sanctity of the Church, the parable of the banquet at which one only was found without a wedding garment.

528 4. As to the question of all *Christians*, whether Catholics or schismatics or heretics, many claim that the number of the damned will be greater than the number of the elect, because they are deprived of the means which in ordinary providence are necessary for salvation. To some others a contrary opinion seems more probable.

5. Among the *non-Christian* sects the chosen will not be lacking: indeed the *Jews* and the *Mohammedans* can believe in God, the *supernatural rewarder*; they can, with the help of God, elicit an act of perfect contrition.<sup>3</sup> But the *pagans* who have preserved no vestiges of revelation can be led to the faith by *internal revelation* and by other means known to God, if they have guarded and obeyed the precepts of the natural law. This will be enlarged upon in the *Tract on Grace*.

<sup>1</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, XXII, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, VII, 13, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Lugo taught this (*De fide*, disp. XII, sect. 5, n. 50-51): "If there were Turks or Mohammedans who were in invincible error concerning Christ and His Divinity, by that fact it is not impossible for them to believe with truly supernatural faith in one God the supernatural rewarder: this they believe not because of arguments that have been chosen from natural created things, but they possess this dogma from tradition. This tradition has come forward from the true Church of the faithful and has reached even to these people, although other errors have been mingled into their sect. From such faith as theirs they could proceed sometimes to an act of perfect contrition."



## 529 Signs of Predestination.

The certain predestination of any man can be known only through a special revelation. However, there are *probable* signs which can serve as the basis for great hope within us. These signs are everything that leads to eternal life: a conscience that fears danger<sup>1</sup> contempt for the world;<sup>2</sup> patience in adversity;<sup>3</sup> zeal for the salvation of souls;<sup>4</sup> the practice of the beatitudes;<sup>5</sup> special devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and to the Blessed Virgin;<sup>6</sup> frequent and fervent Communion.<sup>7</sup>

ARTICLE IV. THE OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD<sup>8</sup>

530 A Concept. Active power is the principle for producing something; passive power is the principle for receiving something. In God there is no passive power which would involve imperfection. However, active power is a true perfection and so it exists in God to an infinite degree — *operatio* follows *esse*. To be sure, God is *omnipotent*, or God can do all things which are absolutely possible, that is, whatever has or can have the ratio *entis*, but not what involves contradiction.

531 B Thesis: God is *omnipotent* or God can do whatever is not impossible. This thesis is de fide from the various Symbols and from the Vatican Council which confesses: "There is one true and living God, Creator of heaven and earth, Almighty (omnipotent)".

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesi.*, XXI, 2.<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, XIX, 29.<sup>3</sup> *Romans*, VIII, 17.<sup>4</sup> *St. James*, V, 20.<sup>5</sup> *St. Matthew*, V, 3-10.<sup>6</sup> *Romans*, VIII, 35-39.<sup>7</sup> *St. John*, VI, 54-55.<sup>8</sup> *Major Synopsis*, 550-554.*Proof of thesis from Scripture.*

In the Old Testament there are more than seventy references in which God is called *Shaddai*, that is, omnipotent. For example, "I am the almighty God<sup>1</sup>".

In the Old and New Testament it is shown that God can do all things, so that nothing is difficult or impossible to Him, and no one can resist His will: "Whatsoever the Lord pleased he hath done in heaven in earth, in the sea, and in all the deeps...<sup>2</sup>" "Is there anything hard to God<sup>3</sup>?" "No word shall be impossible with God<sup>4</sup>".

532 *Proof of Thesis from Reason.*

A being is able to do as much as its nature permits it: *operatio* follows *esse*. But God is essentially infinite being or *esse* itself. Therefore He can do whatever has a *ratio entis* — or God is almighty.

## 533 Corollaries.

I. The power of God is infinite by reason of itself because it is the divine essence itself. It is infinite by reason of its *action* and its *mode of acting* because it is entirely independent, it needs no instrument, no matter, and instantly and immediately at one word, it can produce all things: "He spoke, and they were made, he commanded and they were created<sup>5</sup>".

The power of God is infinite by reason of its *object* because it can bring forth other things, more and more excellent, without end, because the divine *esse* is capable of being shared in ad infinitum.

534 2. A consideration of the divine power produces in us very strongly two dispositions: *First, humble submission*

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, XVII, 1.<sup>2</sup> *Psalms*, CXXXIV, 6.<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, XVIII, 14.<sup>4</sup> *St. Luke*, I, 37.<sup>5</sup> *Psalms*, XXXII, 9.



to God as to one who holds over us the supreme right and supreme power: "Be you humbled under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in the time of visitation<sup>1</sup>".

*Secondly, trust in God*: for if the Almighty supports us, why should we fear? For no evil can be put upon us unless he gives assent; nor will he give assent unless that will be profitable to us for eternal life: "To them that love God all things work together unto good<sup>2</sup>".

#### THE CONCLUSION OF THE TRACT

The beatitude or happiness of God

535 Beatitude or happiness is a *state perfect in the aggregate of all good*<sup>3</sup>. According to the *Vatican Council*<sup>4</sup> God in Himself and of Himself is most blessed and happy because He knows Himself and loves Himself infinitely. His beatitude eminently contains all other beatitude. His beatitude happiness, for in as much as He is Infinite Truth and the Supreme Good, He satisfies the intellect and the will of man. Therefore, let us contemplate God and love Him with all our powers.

<sup>1</sup> *I Peter*, V, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Romans*, VIII, 28 — Refer to *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 25.

<sup>3</sup> *De consol. phil.*, book III, pros. 2; *P. L.*, LXIII, 724.

<sup>4</sup> *D. B.*, 1782.

#### TRACT VIII

### THE TRIUNE GOD

*I believe in God, the Father Almighty... and in Jesus Christ His only Son, Our Lord... I believe in the Holy Spirit.*

536 We must pass now from a study of the one God to a discussion of the *Triune God* — or a discussion of the ineffable mystery of the *Most Holy Trinity*.

First of all we shall enlarge on the concept of this mystery; then we shall speak of the mystery of the *Most Holy Trinity* as it is *explained from the sources of Revelation* and as it is *more fully set forth with the help of philosophy*.

#### THE CONCEPT OF THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY<sup>1</sup>

537 The Catholic belief concerning the Holy Trinity was summarized by the *Fourth Lateran Council* (1215) in these words:<sup>2</sup>

"Firmly we believe and simply we confess that there is *one sole true God*... the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit: *indeed there are three persons*, but *one essence, substance or nature* which is entirely simple: The Father from no one, the Son from the Father alone, and the Holy Spirit equally from both... *consubstantial and coequal* and *coömnipotent* and *coeternal*... We believe and confess with Peter the Lombard that there exists *one certain greatest reality*, incomprehensible

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 566-578.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 428, 432.



indeed and ineffable, which is truly the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, three persons together, and individually anyone of them: and therefore in God *there is the Trinity only, not quaternity*: because *anyone* of the three persons is *that reality*, namely the divine substance, the divine essence, or the divine nature".

This definition Pope Eugenius IV made complete, regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit, in the decree of union with the Greeks (1439); the Council of Florence<sup>1</sup> gave approval to this in these words;

"We define that this truth of faith is to be believed by all Christians... that the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Spirit has His essence and His subsisting esse or being *from the Father together with the Son*, and that He proceeds from both eternally as from *one principle and one spiration*".

From these documents we can define the Holy Trinity: the mystery of *three persons really distinct in one and the same numerical substance, nature or essence, the second of which proceeds from the first through true generation, the third, however, proceeds from the first and the second, as from one principle, through spiration*; or more briefly: the mystery of *one God in three persons*.

538 It is advantageous to prepare the way for the explanation and demonstration of the Catholic doctrine by pointing out what should be understood by the substance of God, the nature, essence, and persons of God.

539 The words *essence, nature, substance, oftentimes* mean the same thing; it is called:

a. *essence* when it is viewed as the reason of being, that, namely, by which a thing is that which it is and is distinguished from every other thing: thus the essence of man is animality and at the same time rationality;

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 691.

b. *nature* in as much as it is the principle of operation, action, and of feeling, as, for instance, man's nature is composed of body and of soul by means of which man acts and feels or suffers;

c. *substance*, in as much as it is proper for it to exist *in itself* and not in another, and so it *supports* accidents, if there are any.

Wherefore essence, nature, and substance:

1. differ only virtually both in creatures and in God;

2. in God they signify one thing completely simple, subsisting to the fullest degree, without accidents; they signify that by which God is that which He is and works or acts.

540 Likewise *personality* is not entirely the same in God as in creatures:

a. *The idea of "person" in creatures.* Person can be defined thus: *a substance which is individual, complete, existing in its own right, and endowed with an intellect.*

The substance is called:

1. *individual or singular*, but not universal and abstract which, as such, is in the mind;

2. *complete*, not needing to be united to another substance in order to be fully and completely equal to eliciting its own inherent or connatural operations: we have an example of an incomplete substance in a separated soul;

3. *existing of its own right (autonomous)*, or subsisting in itself and for itself and incommunicably (through itself): to it are ultimately referred and properly ascribed all the operations (acts) which it elicits;

4. *endowed with an intellect*: by reason of this fact it differs from what is called a mere suppositum, and it is perceived more fully to exist of its own right because it (the substance) is mistress of its own acts through free will. Wherefore, what personality adds to nature is the office and function of subsisting *in se* and of acting *for itself*: nature is that *by which* one works

<sup>1</sup> Whether personality so precisely understood consists of something *negative* or of a *positive* element will be discussed more opportunely in the *Tract, The Incarnate Word* — *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 29, a. 3.



or acts, while a person is that *which* acts or works by means of nature.

*In making the distinction between nature and person reason alone perceives that this distinction is at least virtual, because (of itself) nature does not exist of its own right and a person is a principle which acts as the center of attributes. However, we know from revelation that there is a real difference between nature and person: in Christ there are two natures and only one person.*

b. *The concept of "person" in God.* God is truly a person<sup>1</sup>. Person is predicated of God *not in the same sense* as of creatures, but in an *analogous* sense and in a *more excellent* sense.

Among the divine persons a real distinction prevails which depends upon the *relations of origin*. In the divine persons, person is and means a *relation that is something subsistent*; for example, the Son is the relation of Sonship as something subsistent.

In section 583 we shall better understand how there are several persons in God and how the persons are established through the relations of *origin*.

#### CHAPTER I

### THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY IS PROVED FROM REVELATION

We are concerned first, with *the trinity of persons in the unity of nature*, secondly, with the *divine processions*, thirdly, with the *divine missions*.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 29.

#### PREPARATION FOR THE REVELATION OF THIS MYSTERY<sup>1</sup>

##### 541 I. *This mystery is represented in the Old Testament.*

A In the Old Testament a *certain plurality* in one God is suggested by the words of God Himself: before the creation of man — "Let us make man... to our likeness<sup>2</sup>"; as He reproves Adam for his prevarication: "Behold Adam is become as *one of us*<sup>3</sup>"; and as He upbraids the builders of the tower of Babel for their pride: "Come ye, therefore, let us go down and there confound their tongue<sup>4</sup>". More that this, however, a *certain trinity* is pointed out: in the formula of blessing in *Numbers* wherein the name of Jahweh<sup>5</sup> is three times repeated; in the threefold appellation, "Holy, Holy, Holy", in *Isaiah*<sup>6</sup>; in the theophany in the vale of Mambre. "The Lord appeared" to Abraham, and the Scriptures immediately add: "when he had lifted up his eyes, there appeared to him three men standing near him; and as soon as he saw them, he ran to meet them from the door of his tent, and adored down to the ground<sup>7</sup>". The Roman Breviary comments upon this passage in this way: "He saw three, and he adored one<sup>8</sup>". In these words and in these theophanies a certain trinity in the divine persons is suggested, but not so plainly that the Jews were able to recognize it therein.

542 B The Trinity, furthermore, is *foreshadowed* in the Old Testament. On the one hand, the Jews professed a perfect monotheism; and on the other hand, the books of the Old Testament speak of a second person who is called the *Messiah, Wisdom*; they also speak of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, 580-596.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, I, 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, III, 22.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, XI, 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Numbers*, VI, 23-26.

<sup>6</sup> *Isaiah*, VI, 1-9.

<sup>7</sup> *Genesis*, XVIII.

<sup>8</sup> *Roman Breviary*, Quinquagesima responsory 2.



1. The *Messiah* is announced by the Prophets; He is called Emmanuel (God with us); to Him are attributed eternal origin, supreme power, and other divine attributes which are in perfect accord with The Incarnate Word. *Wisdom of God* is presented in the Old Testament in such a way that it can probably be inferred that *Wisdom* is some divine person.

a. In *Proverbs*, that *Wisdom* may more efficaciously attract men, it relates its own own qualities and its eternal origin: "I wisdom dwell in counsel, and am present in learned thoughts. By me kings reign... I love them that love me... With me are riches and glory... The Lord *possessed* me in the beginning of his ways, before he made anything from the beginning: I was set up *from eternity*... The depths were not as yet and I was already *conceived*... before the hills I was brought forth... when he balanced the foundations of the earth, I was with him *forming all things*..."<sup>1</sup>

b. In the book of *Wisdom*<sup>2</sup>, he is shown as the *spirit*, a certain emanation of the brightness of the omnipotent God, the radiance of eternal light, mirror without defilement of the majesty of God, and image of his goodness; He can do all things and in Himself He can renew all things; He sets all things in order delightfully; He is the teacher of God's knowledge and the elector (chooser) and author or artificer (τεχνίτης) of His works; He led the first man out of his crime and He directed the chosen people with His omnipotent and fatherly providence: all of these achievements taken together intimate<sup>3</sup> not obviously but very *probably* a person distinct from God, but equal to Him.

<sup>1</sup> *Proverbs*, VIII, 1-36; refer to *Ecc.*, XXIV.

<sup>2</sup> *Wisdom*, I, 6; VII, 22; IX, 17; VII, 25-26, VII, 1-6; X-XI. Refer to *Wisdom*, IX, 1; XVIII, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to U. LEBRETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*, p. 118: "Ce n'est point à dire que toute la Trinité soit là. Seule la Sagesse se distingue de Dieu, et encore n'a-t-elle pas tout le relief d'une personnalité vivante... Cependant c'est bien dans ce livre que nous trouvons le pressentiment le plus net du dogme chrétien, et bientôt l'interprétation authentique de l'épître aux Hébreux y fera apparaître en pleine lumière cette théologie du Verbe que nous n'avons pu y distinguer qu'obscurément."

543 2. The *Spirit* of God is frequently called by name in the Old Testament and is shown as the principle of life by whom the face of the earth is renewed, the distributor of heavenly gifts...<sup>1</sup> But His personal distinction from God can hardly be inferred from these texts.

**Conclusion.** All of these quotations and references in relation to *Wisdom*, to the *Messiah* and to the *Holy Spirit* appear to us as the various elements which, taken together and coordinated, excellently disposed the mind for a fuller disclosure of the mystery of the Holy Trinity; the Jews, however did not fully understand these references.

544 II. In the rabbinical teaching of the Jews, in the time of Christ, the truths concerning *Wisdom* and the *Messiah* as set forth in the sacred books were obscured and beclouded by false notions.

The *Judaean-Hellenic* doctrine in regard to God and the Logos, which was taught among the Stoics and the Neoplatonists did not admit a real trinity. Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, born approximately in the year 20 B. C., admitted a certain Word or Logos which is the exemplar of things created by God; but from his assertions we can rightfully infer that the Logos is not a person, but a certain divine power.

#### ARTICLE I. THE TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE UNITY OF NATURE<sup>2</sup>

545 **Errors.** Some taught one person in God regarded under a three fold aspect or mode — this is *modalism*; others held an inequality of persons and profess *subordinationism* and

<sup>1</sup> *Isaias*, XI, 2-3; LXI, 1; *Second book of Kings*, XXIII, 2; *Osee*, IX, 7; *Ezechiel*, XI, 19; XXXVI, 26. St. Thomas says: "But afterwards in the time of grace the mystery of the Trinity was revealed by the very Son of God". (<sup>2a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 174, a. 6). — Refer to G. LEBRETON, *Les Origines du dogme de la Trinité*.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, 597-643.



*Arianism*; still others established such a distinction among persons that it can be then inferred that there are three gods—these fall into *tritheism*.

Among the more modern, the *Rationalists*, *Pantheists* and *Theosophists*, while retaining the name of the Trinity, teach a certain incongruous kind of modalism.

The *Modernists* affirm that the dogma of the trinity was foreign to the mind of Christ and was made up by the Christians under the influence of Judæo-Hellenistic theories through the first four centuries.

**Catholic thesis.** *In God there are three persons really distinct from one another, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in numerically one and the same nature. This thesis is de fide from the symbols and from the Fourth Lateran Council.*

#### I. THIS THESIS IS PROVED FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Among the texts which we shall mention some refer to the three persons *together*; but others refer to *one* or *another* person only.

#### A Testimony Which Relates to the Three Persons Together

546 1. In the Synoptic Gospels we shall list two particular references.

a. *In the baptism of Christ a real distinction among the three persons is apparent not only from the different names by which they are designated, but also from the operations, clearly distinct, which they accomplish; the Father speaks from heaven: "And behold a voice from heaven saying: this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"; but the Son is baptized by John and came out of the water: "And Jesus being baptized forthwith came out of the water";*

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, III, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, III, 16.

and lastly, the *Holy Spirit* is distinguished from the other two, for, while the Father is speaking from heaven, He (the Holy Spirit) descends upon Christ under the bodily form of a dove: "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, as a dove upon him"; it is evident, therefore, that *those three* are not one person, but *three persons really distinct*.

In addition, these three persons are *consubstantial*: the Father and the Son have the same nature; the Holy Spirit renders the same solemn testimony about Christ as the Father does, because He possesses the same dignity or essence.

b. *In the formula of Baptism the mystery of the Holy Trinity is clearly proclaimed. About to ascend into heaven, Christ spoke to the Apostles in these words: "Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; certainly the Father is someone other than the Son and similarly the Holy Ghost must be distinguished from the Father and the Son; also, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are united by one and the same nature: for to be baptized in the name of some one is to be devoted to religious worship, and this is due to God alone, as is evident from St. Paul's teaching in regard to baptism. Furthermore, a man must be baptized in the name of the three persons; but baptism brings about the remission of sins and at the same time an infusion of grace—these are effected by God alone. Therefore, the three persons have the divine nature, or they are consubstantial.*

#### 547 2. In the Epistles of the Apostles.

St. Paul attributes grace to the three persons together: "The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all"; St. Peter writes similarly in his *First Epistle*, I, 1-2.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Luke, III, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, XXVIII, 19.

<sup>3</sup> Second Epistle to the Corinthians, XII, 13; Refer to *Ephesians*, IV, 4-5.



548 3. In St. John's writing the trinity of the persons and their equality are manifestly established.

a. In the *promise of the Holy Spirit* made by Christ at the Last Supper: "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you *another* Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever..." "But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things." From this text the three are regarded as distinct persons: the Father who sends the Spirit, the Son who asks the Father that the Spirit be sent, the Spirit who is sent by the Father in the name of the Son, *other* than the Son. From the context the consubstantiality of the three persons is manifest: Christ said: "He that seeth *me*, seeth the Father also." "I and the Father are *one*." But the Spirit proceeds from the Father, He is the source of all truths, and hence He is equal to the Father.

b. In the *First Epistle of St. John*, V, 7 — dogmatic authenticity of this cannot be denied or mistrusted in so far as it is found in the authentic or official documents of the Church.

#### B Testimony Which Relates to One or Another Person

549 1. In regard to God the Father: all who admit Scripture to be sacred acknowledge that the Father is a divine person who is called the Father of Christ and of the Word in the proper and strict sense.

#### 2. In regard to God the Son or the Word.

a. In the *Synoptic Gospels* Christ is shown as a person distinct from the Father, equal to Him as one who produces divine works. He remits sins, He is the supreme legislator, He will judge men, He has known the Father perfectly. We shall consider the Divinity of the Word in more detail in the Tract on *The Incarnate Word*.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XIV, 16, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XIV, 9-11.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, X, 30.

b. The *Apostles* teach the divinity of Christ: in the *Epistle to the Romans* St. Paul calls Christ God<sup>1</sup>; in the *Epistle to the Philippians* he declares that Christ is equal to God<sup>2</sup>.

550 c. In the *Gospel according to St. John* the divinity of the Word or of Christ is openly proclaimed.

a. In the prologue<sup>3</sup> the following two affirmations are made: first, there is a *distinction* between the Word and the Father, for it is stated, "The Word was *with* God"; no one is correctly said to be *with himself*; also that word is made clear somewhat later (18) in these words: "The only begotten Son who is *in the bosom* of the Father, He hath declared him"; from these words it is obviously gathered that the Word is really distinct from the Father because between the Father and the Son, between the bosom of the Father and Him who is in the bosom of the Father, it is necessary to admit a real distinction; secondly, *His perfect equality with the Father* is affirmed, for the Word is called God: "And the Word was God": in these words, without any doubt, the Word (*ὁ λόγος*) is the *subject*, and God is the *predicate* — this is apparent both from the context of the language and from the article *ὁ* which precedes *λόγος*; furthermore, the word *God* retains its own proper meaning, and this is apparent from the parallelism: "The Word was with God and the Word was God".

b. John corroborates the divinity of the Word *throughout the entire Gospel*. Christ indeed received all things from the Father, but by reason of that He does all the things which the Father performs: "The Father loveth the Son, and he hath given all things into his hand... For what things soever he doth, these the Son also doth in like manner". Thus, just as the Father enjoys the power of raising the dead and of judging men: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead,

<sup>1</sup> Epistle to the Romans, IX, 5-7.

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the Philippians, II, 5-11.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 1-5.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to St. John, III, 35; V, 19.



and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom he will. For neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son<sup>1</sup>. Nor is there any reason to wonder; for He is of the same nature as is the Father: "I and the Father are one"<sup>2</sup>.

### 551 3. In regard to the Holy Spirit.

a. In the *Synoptic Gospels* the Holy Spirit is shown as distinct from the Father and from the Son, and coequal to them, since to Him are attributed divine works, especially prophecy and sanctification.

b. The *Apostles* very often make mention of the Holy Spirit as a person distinct and divine. *A distinct personality* is manifest in those places where properties and operations are ascribed to the Spirit which give proof of no mere attribute but of a true suppositum. To Him there is ascribed *intellect*: "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God"<sup>3</sup>; to Him are assigned *will* and operation: "But all these things one and the same Spirit *worketh*, dividing to every one according as *he will*"<sup>4</sup>; to Him also are assigned special operations: "The Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas"<sup>5</sup>. "Wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God"<sup>6</sup>.

The Holy Spirit is *truly God* and hence equal to the Father and to the Son; for He is called *God*: St. Peter clearly asserts that to lie to the Holy Spirit is the same as to lie to God: "Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Ghost? ... Thou hast not lied to men, but to God"<sup>7</sup>. Omniscience in regard to divine things is attributed to the Holy Ghost: "The Spirit searcheth all things (that is, He perfectly comprehends all things), yea,

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, V, 21-22.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. John, X, 30.

<sup>3</sup> First Epistle to the Corinthians, II, 10.

<sup>4</sup> First Epistle to the Corinthians, XII, 11.

<sup>5</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XIII, 2.

<sup>6</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XX, 28; refer to Acts, XIX, 2; to Romans, VIII, 26.

<sup>7</sup> Acts of the Apostles, V, 3-4.

the deep things of God"<sup>1</sup>. To the Holy Spirit is assigned the work of *regeneration*, of *justification*, and of *sanctification*, which is proper to God, namely, true deification: "You are washed, you are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God"<sup>2</sup>. To the Holy Spirit is due the cult of *latría*; indeed from St. Paul<sup>3</sup> we know that our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit: "Know you not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost who is in you"? But a temple is built to God alone. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is God: this conclusion is deduced by St. Paul when he adds to the words just quoted: "Glorify and bear God in your body".

c. In the *Gospel according to St. John* the Holy Spirit is spoken of on the occasion of Christ's baptism and of Christian baptism<sup>4</sup>; and very explicitly he is referred to at the Last Supper and proclaimed by Christ as a person distinct from the Father and from the Son, equal to them, and proceeding from them. Refer to section 548.

From this testimony in the New Testament we can rightfully infer that God is indeed *one*, but that He is at the same time *three*, Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

## II. THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY AS IRREFUTABLY PROVED FROM TRADITION

552 Contrary to the *Unitarians*, the *Liberals*, and the *Modernists* we state that from the beginning the Church preached this mystery, not in *scientific* terminology, but in a *simple* and *popular* manner, by teaching that there is *one* God, but that at the same time God is three persons. Our discussion will be divided into three divisions according to time:

### I. The Ante-Nicæan Period,

<sup>1</sup> First Epistle to the Corinthians, II, 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 19.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 33; III, 15.



2. The Post-Nicaean Period to the Sixth Century,
3. From the Sixth Century to the Twentieth Century.

#### A Ante-Nicaean Testimony

553 We must carefully distinguish between the documents which refer to the faith of the Church and those documents which combine philosophical theories along with the faith. While the faith is explained in a plain and direct manner in the first centuries, the substance of the mystery is rightly shown in the following centuries; however, at times obscure and ambiguous phrasings occur; in fact even accidental errors occur in a way of reconciling this dogma with philosophical doctrines.

Belief in the Holy Trinity we find :

#### 554 1. In the practice of the Church :

a. *In the manner of conferring baptism.* Baptism was bestowed by means of a triple immersion and under the distinct invocation of three divine persons<sup>1</sup>.

b. *In the many symbols.* By the second century a *rule of faith* is mentioned which the catechumens had to profess before they were baptized. According to *Irenaeus*<sup>2</sup> this rule primarily included belief in the Trinity, that is, belief "in one God, the Father almighty, who made heaven and earth and the sea and all the things which are in them; and in Jesus Christ the only Son of God who became incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit who proclaimed the dispositions of God through the prophets".

<sup>1</sup> In the *Didache*, VII, 1-3, edited by Funk, t. I, p. 16, we read: "In regard to baptism, baptize thus: after you have said all the things which precede, baptize in living water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost... Pour water on the head three times in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost". Similarly states *Tertullian*, *Adv. Prax.*, c. 26, P. L., II, 190: "Not once, but three times, we are baptized according to the single and individual names, with reference to the individual persons".

<sup>2</sup> *Contra Iheres*, book I, c. 10, n. 1, P. G., VII, 549.

c. *In the doxologies.* That these doxologies were in use from the first Christian times is evident from the acts of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, St. John's disciple, who exclaimed over a funeral pyre: "Lord omnipotent God, Father of our beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ... I praise you... I glorify you through the eternal and celestial Pontiff, Jesus Christ, your beloved Son, through whom (I give) to you together with Him and the Holy Spirit, glory both now and throughout the future ages. Amen<sup>1</sup>".

In addition to the *minor* Doxology or the *Gloria Patri*, the *major Doxology* or the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* was recited in the Church at the beginning of the second century; in this doxology a belief in the Trinity is made manifest at greater length.

#### 555 2. In the teaching of the Ante-Nicaean Fathers; among these are the Apostolic Fathers, Apologists and controversialists, and the Fathers of the third century.

a. *Apostolic Fathers* — St. Clement of Rome asserts that the Father is the creator of all, the Father and author of resurrection, almighty and immeasurable<sup>2</sup>; that the Son is loftier than the angels, is the splendor of divine majesty, nay more, that He is also God;<sup>3</sup> that the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophets<sup>4</sup>; and so, in allotting different operations to each, St. Clement very sedulously distinguishes three termini in God.

St. Ignatius *Martyr* teaches identically: "Prepared unto the edifice of God the Father, borne unto the heights through the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, making use of the Holy Spirit as the rope<sup>5</sup>"; "Be eager to be confirmed in the doctrines of the Lord... in the Son and Father and in the Spirit<sup>6</sup>".

The testimony of St. Polycarp we have already related in section 554.

<sup>1</sup> *Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, n. 14; edited by Funk, p. 330-332.

<sup>2</sup> *Cor.*, XXIV, XXVI-XXVIII.

<sup>3</sup> *Cor.*, XXXVI. According to the reading of the oldest codex which Harnack himself accepted, Christ is called God. II, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Cor.*, VIII, 1; XLV, 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ephes.*, IX, 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Magnes*, XIII, 1.



b. *The Apologists and Controversialists*, as witnesses to the faith certainly refer to this dogma; but when they, as *philosophers*, wish to reconcile this dogma with Platonic or Stoic teaching, they sometimes employ equivocal or less correct words. Among the apologists St. Justin and Athenagoras affirm the unity of essence and three persons in God. So also, among the controversialists St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, opposing the Gnostics, very lucidly recognizes the unity of God, and at the same time acknowledges that there are three termini in God: *The Father*, creator of heaven and of earth; the *Son*, born from eternity of the Father through whom all things have been made; the *Holy Spirit*, eternal, who concurs in the creation of man and who has spoken through the prophets<sup>1</sup>.

c. *During the third century, in the West*, St. Hippolytus and Tertullian wrote against the Monarchianism of Noetus and Praxeas; and in opposition to the Modalism of Sabellius, Novatian, the disciple of Tertullian wrote. *In the East Origen and St. Dionysius of Alexandria* opposed Sabellianism and Unitarianism.

We should bear in mind that the Holy Pontiffs have forcefully opposed these errors. Thus, Pope St. Dionysius, in his condemnation of the Modalists and at the same time of the Subordinationists, wrote:

"Therefore the wonderful and divine unity must not be separated into three divinities, nor must the dignity and supreme greatness of the Lord be lessened by any mention of making"<sup>2</sup>.

556 Therefore it cannot be said that the Ante-Nicene Fathers had no knowledge of the Holy Trinity, or that they corrupted it in essentials: it is obvious also from the fact that, in the time of the Arian controversy, they appealed to the faith and belief of the anterior Father. St. Athanasius says: "O you, the new Jews, whom are you able to bring forward as the fathers of your affirmations? Indeed not one of the prudent and wise can you name".

<sup>1</sup> *Cont. haeres.*, I, 10; III, 9, 15, 25; IV, 9, 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistle in opposition to the Sabellians*; P. G., XXV, 462; D. B., 48-51.

<sup>3</sup> *The Decrees of the Nicene Synod*, 27; P. G., XXV, 465.

## B The Catholic Tradition from Nicene until the Sixth Century

557 1. **Arianism.** *The Arian heresy and the Council of Nicaea.* — In the year 325 the Council of Nicaea vindicated the real tradition in opposition to Arius; he contended that the Father alone was eternal and He alone was properly God; he claimed that the Word was the most excellent creature whom the Father had created not from His own substance but by His own will from nothing; he taught that the Holy Spirit was in like manner a creature, inferior not only to the Father but also to the Son.

After much discussion it was defined that the Word is *consubstantial*, *ὁμοούσιον*, to the Father, so that thus all equivocation would be done away with: "We believe in one God the Father Almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible. And in our one Lord *Jesus Christ Son of God, the only begotten born of the Father*, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, light of light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, *consubstantial (of one substance) with the Father*, in the Greek they say *homoousion*... And in the Holy Spirit..."

However the special defender of the *Nicene Creed* was St. Athanasius; his teaching in regard to the Trinity we can summarize briefly in this way:

1. *The Word*, deifying us or making us gods *through participation*, is God and the Son of God in truth and by nature. Since He is the *Son*, He is numerically distinguished from the Father and is of the same substance as the Father, in fact He is the very substance of the Father, *ὁμοούσιος*, consubstantial with the Father; wherefore the Word proceeds from the Father not through creation, but *through generation*. Moreover, the Father *necessarily* and at the same time *freely* begets or generates, just as necessarily and freely He wills and loves Himself; thus it follows that this generation is eternal because God has always been Father.

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 54.



2. Similarly, because the *Holy Spirit* through His indwelling vivifies us by a participation in the divine nature, the Holy Ghost is God through essence: this is confirmed by the fact that the Holy Spirit is numbered or reckoned along with the Father and the Son. So, the Holy Spirit is  $\theta\upsilon\omicron\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma$ , consubstantial with the Father and with the Son. Therefore nothing created can be found in the Trinity because the Trinity is in its entirety one God  $\delta\lambda\lambda\eta \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma 1$ .

558 2. **Macedonianism.** In approximately the year 360 many semi-Arians explicitly taught that the Holy Spirit was a creature, like to the angels, and the minister of God. These heretics were called *Pneumatomachi*, and *Macedonians*, because it was thought that *Macedonius* maintained this error (although this is not at all certain), or *Marathonians*, because they recognized as their leader *Marathonius* of Nicomedia.

At the *Fourth Council of Rome* in the year 380 St. Damasus defined Catholic truth as opposed to the Macedonians<sup>2</sup>: "If anyone does not say that the Holy Spirit is truly and properly from the Father, just as the Son is, that He is of divine substance and truly God, let him be anathema... If anyone does not say that there is one divinity, power, majesty, dominion, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit... let him be anathema..."

This the Second Oecumenical Council of Constantinople, in the year 381, confirmed, accepting and considering as valid these words which shortly before had been added to the Nicæan Symbol for the purpose of destroying the Macedonian errors: "And in the Holy Spirit, Lord and vivifying, proceeding from the Father, to be adored and glorified along with the Father and the Son..."

In this definition the word  $\theta\upsilon\omicron\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma$  is not made use of because it was the occasion of many disputations, but only those words are employed which are found in the Scriptures.

<sup>1</sup> *I ad Serap.*, 17. Refer to Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes*, II, p. 67-76, DE RÉGNON, *Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité*, Etudes XIII-XX; p. 74, 200, 300; Etudes XXI-XXVII.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 74 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 86.

The sense of the definition, nevertheless, in no way appears ambiguous.

### 559 3. Errors from the Sixth Century until the Twentieth Century.

In the sixth century *John Philopon*, in the eleventh century *Roscelinus*, and in the twelfth century *Abbot Joachim* taught that in God there are three natures as well as three persons. These errors the Councils of *Constantinople II*, of *Soissons* (1092) and of the *Lateran IV* (1215) condemned.

In the middle of the nineteenth century *Günther*, defining person as *nature conscious or aware of itself*, taught that there are in God three natures conscious of themselves, that is, the divine nature is trebled. This error Pius IX condemned in 1857.

#### ARTICLE II. THE DIVINE PROCESSIONS<sup>1</sup>

560 **State of the Question.** The Catholic teaching concerning the divine processions is contained in these words of the *Athanasian Creed*: "The Father was made by no one, nor was He created, nor begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made, nor created, nor begotten, but He proceeds<sup>2</sup>." It is a matter of faith, therefore, that the *Father* proceeds from *no one*, that the *Son* proceeds from the *Father* through generation, and that the *Holy Spirit* is from the *Father* and from the *Son* through simple procession.

561 It is necessary at this point, to explain what *procession* is — in general and in God.

1. Procession ( $\epsilon\kappa\pi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota$ ) in general is the origin of one from another: so, for example, light proceeds from the sun, the son proceeds from the father. It is distinguished in a two fold way:

a. *transient* or *ad extra* (toward the outside) when the terminus is produced outside the cause; for example, in human beings the son is a terminus outside the father;

*Major Synopsis*, n. 644-646. — <sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 39.



b. *immanent* or *ad intra* (toward inside) when the terminus remains within its principle, as thinking remains within the mind.

2. In God, likewise, a two-fold procession is distinguished :

a. procession *ad extra* by which creatures proceed from God as effect from cause;

b. procession *ad intra*, by which one person proceeds from another as what has been principled (*principiatum*) proceeds from the principle, and remains within the divine essence. Passively regarded, this procession can be defined as *the origin of one divine person from another or from two others through a communication of the one same nature; but actively considered, this procession is an immanent working or operation by which the divine life is communicated to a person who proceeds from another.*

**The Father proceeds from no one.** Scripture is entirely silent in regard to such procession. All tradition very clearly teaches that the Father is *ἀ-ἐνι-γεν-τος* or *ἀ-ἐν-νι-γεν-τος*, that is, neither created nor begotten. Consequently, in the *Decree for the Jacobites*, the *Council of Florence* proclaimed: "The Father, whatever He is or whatever He has, does not have it from another, but has it from Himself; and He is a beginning without a beginning<sup>1</sup>."

Also, divine processions are only according to immanent actions. But in God these actions are two only: to know and to will; according to these actions the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed.

We must now consider the *procession of the Son through generation* and the procession of the *Holy Spirit through spiration*.

#### A The Procession of the Son through generation

**562 First Thesis: The Second Person of the Holy Trinity proceeds from the First Person from all eternity through true generation.** This thesis is de fide from the Council of Nicaea, from which

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 704.

we have quoted in section 557 in opposition to the Arians and all others who claimed that the Word or Christ was called the Son of God in a broad sense or through adoption.

#### *Proof of thesis.*

1. *Proof from Scripture.* In Scripture the second person of the Holy Trinity is called simply the *Son of God*, *proper*, *true* and *only begotten*: of Him it is stated: "The Father loveth the Son and He hath given all things into his hand<sup>1</sup>." "You have received the Spirit of adoption of sons whereby we cry: Abba Father<sup>2</sup>." Whence the filiation of the Word greatly transcends our sonship: for while men are called the sons of adoption, the Word is called the Son without any addition; actually through Him filiation is communicated to men: "But as many received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God<sup>3</sup>." "He that spared not even his own Son..." "The Son of God is come... that we may know the true God, and may be in his true Son<sup>4</sup>"; "The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him..."<sup>5</sup>

2. *Proof from Tradition.* In addition to the symbols and the councils, which openly affirm this generation, the Fathers have proved that the Son is consubstantial with the Father from the fact that He is begotten by the Father from the substance of the Father. Thus *St. Augustine* says: "For it is said in relation to something, as the Father in relation to the Son and the Son in relation to the Father, which is not accident; because both the one is always Father, and the other is always Son."

"Wherefore, although to be the Father and to be the Son is different, yet their substance is not different; because they are so called, not according to substance, but according

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, III, 35.

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the Romans, VIII, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 12.

<sup>4</sup> Epistle to the Romans, VIII, 32; First Epistle of St. John, V, 20.

<sup>5</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 18.



to relation; this relation, however, is not accident, because it is not changeable<sup>1</sup>."

Hence we must reject the error of *Hardouin* and of *Berruyer* who taught that Christ is called the Son of God only because of the hypostatic union of his humanity with the second divine person. *Clement XIII* rejected this error.

**563 Second Thesis:** *The Word or the Son proceeds from the Father through intellectual generation or from the intellect of the Father.* This is theologically certain; it stands in opposition to *Durandus* who claimed that the Son proceeds from the nature of the Father.

This thesis is deduced as a *theological conclusion*:

1. From *Scripture* wherein He who is the Son is called the Word. But the immanent word is the offspring of the intellect.
2. This thesis is affirmed as a theological conclusion by the *Fathers* because the Son is called the Word, *Wisdom*, the Image of the Father. St. Basil writes: "Why the Word? In order that it may be clear that He has proceeded from the mind<sup>2</sup>."

3. From *theological reasoning*. The definition of generation is adequately substantiated in the procession of the Word from the Father.

a. *The Concept of generation.* Generation is the originating of something living from a living and united principle, into a likeness of nature.

Explanation of definition:

1. The origin of something living from something living: these words signify that the one generating and that which is generated must be endowed with life. Thus Adam made from the slime of the earth cannot be called generated because earth lacks life;

<sup>1</sup> *De Trinitate*, V, 4, 5; *P. L.*, XLII, 914.

<sup>2</sup> Homily on: "In the beginning was the Word," *P. G.*, XXXI, 475.

2. from a united principle, that is, the one generating must be united to the one generated through the active communication of its own proper substance or at least of a part of that substance; thus Eve, formed from Adam's rib, cannot be called his daughter because in this work or act Adam was passive.

3. Into a likeness of nature: herein two ideas are expressed, the one generated must be like the one generating through receiving the same nature, at least specifically, and further, generation of itself tends to producing this likeness.

b. *The Procession of the Word is true generation*<sup>1</sup>. For it is:

1. *The origin of something living* (of the Word who is God) from something living (that is, from the Father, true God);
2. *from a united principle*: for the procession of the Word is immanent and the Word is perfectly united to the Father through participation or communication of the numerically same essence;
3. *into a likeness of nature*: the Word proceeds by way of intellection: but intellection, of its nature, tends to producing a likeness of the thing known in the one knowing.

## B The Procession of the Holy Spirit

**564 Errors** — The Eunomians and the Macedonians denied that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; they were condemned and completely overthrown at the Council of Constantinople (381). Later *Theodoret* (434), the *Monothelites*, the *Iconoclasts* (in the eighth century), *Photius* (in the ninth century), *Michael Cerularius* (in the eleventh century), all of whom the schismatic Greeks still adhere to, opposed the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. Against these, first of all in Spain, and then in France and Germany, the particle *Filioque* was added to the Nicæan Symbol, and was accepted and approved of by the authority of the Roman Pontiffs.

**First Thesis:** *The Holy Spirit truly proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son, as from one principle and through a single spiration.* This thesis is de fide from the

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 27, a. 2.



*Second Council of Lyons* (1274): "We confess that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and from the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one principle, not through two spirations but through one single spiration".

These last words were added for the purpose of solving the difficulty of certain Greeks who rejected the formula from the Father and from the Son because they erroneously thought that thus two principles of the Holy Spirit were being established. Therefore the meaning of the thesis is that a double spirative force is not allowed but only one spiration, which is common to the Father and to the Son: for in giving origin to the Holy Spirit, the Father and the Son are not mutually opposing each other.

#### *Proof of thesis.*

1. *Proof from Scripture.* That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is expressed very often in very clear words. It remains, therefore, to prove, against opponents, that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son.

In many places in Scripture:

- a. The Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of Jesus Christ: "God hath sent the Spirit of his Son..." "The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not".
- b. He is said to have been sent by the Son as well as by the Father: "If I go", says Christ, "I will send him to you". When the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father".
- c. The Spirit is said to receive something from the Son: "He shall glorify me, because he shall receive of mine, and shall show it to you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine; therefore I said, that he shall receive of mine, and show it to you".

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Gospel according to St. John, XV, 26; to St. Matthew, X, 20.  
<sup>2</sup> Epistle to the Galatians, IV, 6; Refer to Epistle to the Romans, VIII, 9.  
<sup>3</sup> Acts of the Apostles, XVI, 7.  
<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XVI, 7; XV, 26.  
<sup>5</sup> St. John, XVI, 14.

But the Spirit cannot be called the Spirit of the Son, sent by the Son; he cannot be said to receive something from the Son, unless for this reason: He has His origin from the Son; for a divine person can receive nothing accidental from another.

#### 565 2. *Proof from Tradition.*

a. *From the Fathers.* Since our adversaries admit that the Latin Fathers have clearly taught this thesis, it will be sufficient to give a report on the testimony of the Greeks.

Thus St. Athanasius writes: "That kind of property which we know belongs to the Son in relation to the Father, this same kind of property we shall find the Holy Spirit possesses in relation to the Son"; and elsewhere<sup>1</sup> he calls the Son "the Source, the fountain of the Holy Spirit". St. Cyril of Alexandria<sup>2</sup> writes: "Because the Holy Spirit dwells within us makes us conformable to God, and because He proceeds from the Father and from the Son, it is manifest that He is essentially of the divine essence, proceeding in this essence and from this essence, just as the breath coming from the human mouth — although this example is poor and not worthy of so great a subject".

Many Greeks explain this doctrine in another way; they say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. This manner of speaking the Council of Florence authentically explained in this way, with the approval of the Greeks: "What the holy Doctors and Fathers say, namely that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, lends itself to this understanding, that this statement signifies that the Son also is, according to the Greeks, the cause, according to the Latins the principle of subsistence of the Holy Spirit, just as the Father also is. And because all things which are of the Father, the Father Himself gave to His only begotten Son in begetting Him, except actually being the Father, that very fact that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, the Son Himself possesses eternally from the Father, from whom also He has been begotten".

<sup>1</sup> Ad Serap., III, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The Incarnation, n. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoretus, assert. 34, P. G., LXXV, 585. We should realize that the Greek word πρὸς τὸν which is translated in Latin by the word proceeds (proceed), literally means oriatur (arise); wherefore the Greeks have imagined that the Spirit principally proceeds (ἐκπορεύεται) from the Father and secondarily arises (προσέρχεται) from the Son.

<sup>4</sup> D. B., 691.



b. *Proof from the Synods and from the Councils:*

1. *Before the schism of the Greeks.* In the fifth century, in the *profession of faith* which the African bishops delivered to King Hunneric, the following words are found: "We believe that the unbegotten Father, and the Son begotten of the Father, and the *Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and from the Son* are of one substance". The Synod of Alexandria approved of the epistle of St. Cyril which stated that the Spirit "proceeds from the Son and from God the Father". This epistle was praised by the Councils of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, and of Constantinople II.

2. *Councils held after the schism.* From the *Fourth Lateran Council* (1215), at which many Oriental Bishops and abbots were present<sup>1</sup> we have these words: "The Father from no one, but the Son from the Father alone, and the *Holy Spirit equally from both*"; the *Second Council of Lyons* already quoted; the *Council of Florence* where, with the approval of the Greeks, it was defined: "The Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and from the Son, and has His essence and His subsisting esse from the Father and at the same time from the Son, and *proceeds eternally from both as from one principle and through one spiration*"<sup>2</sup>.

**Corollary.** It was right that the particle "*Filioque*" was added to the Symbol because the Holy Spirit truly proceeds from the Son. At the *Council of Florence* both the Greeks and the Latins approved of this addition.

566 **Second Thesis:** *The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son from the divine will by an act of love.*

1. This is a *theological conclusion* which the Fathers and theologians commonly deduce from the various *names and operations* attributed to the *Holy Spirit*, from the fact that He is called *love, charity, gift* and that to Him are ascribed

<sup>1</sup> D. B., 428.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 691.

the works of *sanctification*: all of these considerations involve the will.

*Theological reason* supports this conclusion. For in the intellectual nature we find an act of the intellect and an act of the will; the will follows the intellect. Wherefore, if a procession according to the intellect is present in God, Whose nature is supremely immaterial and intellectual, it is no wonder, but rather it is entirely proper, that a *second* procession according to the will be present also. For although in God will and intellect are the same, nevertheless, because it is the manner of love that it proceeds only from a conception of the intellect, so in God Himself the procession of love occurs in due order as regards the procession of the Word; and thus in the divine persons<sup>1</sup> procession of love has a distinction of order from the procession of the Word.

567 2. *The procession of the Holy Spirit is not true generation.*

a. The *Athanasian Creed* states: "The Holy Spirit was not made by the Father and by the Son, nor was He created, nor begotten, but He proceeds"<sup>2</sup>.

b. So also the Fathers have written; for example, St. Basil<sup>3</sup> says: "We do not call the Holy Spirit unbegotten: we know one who is unbegotten — the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Nor do we say that the Holy Spirit is begotten: we have learned in the tradition of faith that one is the only-begotten"<sup>4</sup>.

c. *Theological reason* confirms the fact that the procession of the Holy Spirit is not true generation. For proceeding by an act of love, the Holy Spirit by the force of His origin is not like His own principle, or He does not proceed *in the manner of likeness or similitude*. Indeed He does receive the divine nature, but not through generation. But How he receives remains unknown to us; wherefore it is said only that He *proceeds*. His origin can be called *Spiration* because it is procession of the Spirit, says St. Thomas<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 27, a. 3.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 39.

<sup>3</sup> *Epist.*, 125, m. 3, JOURNAL, 917.

<sup>4</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 27, a. 4.



568 *There is no other procession in the divine persons than that of the Word and that of Love: no other procession is mentioned in Scripture or in Tradition. This fact can be inferred from what has already been stated:*

1. Since there are only three divine persons, only two can proceed. It is impossible for three to proceed because, if such were the case, either they would proceed from one another, or one would proceed from Himself - this would be incongruous.
2. In a nature which is entirely intellectual processions can be conceived only according to the intellect and according to the will, but in an intellectual and divine nature, which is infinitely perfect, only one procession of knowledge can be conceived, one procession of the will. To understand successively and discursively is unworthy of God and the completely simple unity of will follows the completely simple unity of intellect.
3. There is the objection that procession can take place according to potency and goodness: but it has no merit, for potency is the principle of acting with reference to another, goodness pertains to essence not to operation. Wherefore processions according to potency and goodness cannot be conceived in God<sup>1</sup>.

#### COROLLARIES RELATIVE TO THE THREE PERSONS

569 1. *The three divine persons are perfectly coequal. This is de fide according to the Athanasian Symbol: "And in this Trinity nothing before or after, nothing greater or less, but the three entire persons are coeternal and coequal to one another... Equal glory, Coeternal majesty"*<sup>2</sup>.

All of this follows from what has been said; for the individual persons are truly God, or the individual persons possess the entire divine nature. In fact, according to St. Augustine, each one of the divine persons has as much perfection as all three together have: "So great is the Father alone or so great is the Son alone, or so great is the Holy Spirit alone as is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit together".

Therefore, the individual persons and the whole Trinity are equally to be adored and to be honored with the same worship.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 27, a. 5.  
<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 39.

570 2. *A circuminsession in the divine persons must be admitted, that is, a mutual coexistence and co-dwelling of the divine persons among themselves — thus the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, and each is in the Holy Spirit, and likewise the Spirit is in the Father and in the Son. This is de fide from the Council of Florence<sup>1</sup>: "Because of this unity (of nature) the Father is entire in the Son, entire in the Holy Spirit: the Son is entire in the Father, entire in the Holy Spirit; the Spirit is entire in the Father, entire in the Son".*

This doctrine is stated directly in Scripture in relation to the Father and to the Son<sup>2</sup>: "Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me"? St. Paul implicitly teaches this in regard to the Holy Spirit when he teaches that the Holy Spirit is in God, just as the spirit of a man is in a man<sup>3</sup>.

This circuminsession arises:

- a. From the *consubstantiality* of the persons: for, as St. Thomas<sup>4</sup> rightly declares, "By His essence the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the Father, forasmuch as the Father is His own essence and communicates it to the Son, not by any change on His part. Hence it follows that, as the essence of the Father is in the Son, the Father Himself is in the Son".
- b. From the *origin* of the persons: for since the Son and the Spirit are *termini of immanent operations*, they remain necessarily in the principle from which they proceed.
- c. From the *relations* of the persons: for it is clear that "one of opposites is relatively in the other according to the intellect" (or logically).

571 *In God an operation ad extra is one and the same: it is common to the three persons.*

This is de fide from the *Athanasian Creed*: "Not three omnipotent (beings), but one omnipotent". Operations ad extra are

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 704.  
<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, XIV, 10; refer to X, 30, 38.  
<sup>3</sup> *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, II, 10-11.  
<sup>4</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 42, a. 5.



produced by divine omnipotence and divine nature which is one in God; therefore the operation of God ad extra is one also. Scripture attributes the same works, for example, creation and sanctification, both to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, in acting ad extra the divine Persons are not relatively opposed to one another.

#### ARTICLE III. THE DIVINE MISSIONS<sup>1</sup>

We shall consider: first, missions in general, secondly, an invisible mission, thirdly, a visible mission.

##### A Missions in General.

**572 1. Concept and species.** Mission, sending (from *mittere, to send*), is the going out of one being from another with a destination at some terminus. This definition contains three elements: a terminus from which, a terminus to which, a causal nexus or link between the two.

A mission is called *physical, moral, or substantial* according to how it happens or takes place — either through a physical impulse, or through a command or counsel, or through a certain origin.

**2. Mission among the Divine Persons<sup>2</sup>.** Such a mission can exist only:

- a. According to a procession of origin which implies equality between the one sent and the one sending;
- b. With a new mode of existing in the terminus, because the divine person who is sent does not begin to be where before he was not, so also he does not cease to be where he was. Wherefore a mission includes eternal procession and adds a temporal effect because of which the sent person exists in a new manner; however the entire newness exists on the part of the effect, because whatever is in God is eternal.

c. Therefore, in the divine persons a mission is defined thus: *the procession of one person from another or from others*

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, 667-677.

<sup>2</sup> Summa theologiae, I, q. 43, a. 1-8.

with a destination or purpose of some temporal effect or with a new manner of existing among creatures for their sanctification.

**573 3. Thesis:** *The Father cannot be sent, but the Son and the Spirit can be sent; on the other hand the Father and the Son can send, but the Holy Spirit cannot send.* This thesis is certain.

##### a. The Father cannot be sent.

1) In Scripture we do not read that He is sent, but only that He sends to us: "*We shall come to him and make our abode with him*"<sup>1</sup>.

2) St. Augustine<sup>2</sup> explains this: "The Father alone is referred to as not sent: because He alone does not have an author of whom He may be begotten or from whom He may proceed".

##### b. The Son and the Holy Spirit can be sent.

1) Of Himself the Son Says: "The Father who sent me"<sup>3</sup>; of the Holy Spirit the Son says: "The Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name"<sup>4</sup>.

2. The reason for this is that the Son and the Holy Spirit proceed from another person and therefore they can receive something from the other person.

##### c. The Father and the Son can send.

1) Of the Father it is said: "God sent His Son"<sup>5</sup>; of the Son it is said: "But if I go, I shall send him (the Holy Spirit) to you"<sup>6</sup>.

2) Those persons can send from whom another person proceeds, and to whom authority over another person belongs.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XIV, 23.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. Cont. Sermon. Arian., c. 4. Refer to St. Thomas in I Sent., dist. 15,

q. 2, d. unic.; I, q. 43, a. 4.

<sup>3</sup> St. John, VIII, 18.

<sup>4</sup> St. John, XIV, 26.

<sup>5</sup> Epistle to the Galatians, IV, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XVI, 7.



d. *The Holy Spirit cannot send.*

- 1) Nowhere in Scripture do we read that the Holy Spirit sends another divine person.
- 2) Besides, he alone can send from whom another divine person proceeds; but no person proceeds from the Holy Spirit.

B *An invisible mission*

An invisible mission is one which takes place in an internal way, without any exterior manifestation.

574 **Thesis:** *An invisible mission of the divine persons exists when sanctifying grace is infused into the soul.*

*Proof of thesis.*

1. *Proof from Scripture.* From Scripture it is evident that charity and sanctifying grace, which are inseparable, are essentially joined to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, in fact to the indwelling of the entire Trinity within us. Of the *sinner* we read: "For wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body subject to sins<sup>1</sup>". On the other hand it is said of the *just man*: "If anyone loves me... my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him<sup>2</sup>". And again: "Do you not know that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells within you...?" "The charity of God is in your hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us<sup>3</sup>". From these texts it is apparent that with grace and charity is given the Holy Spirit, and that consequently the Holy Spirit is possessed "because what is given to some one is possessed by him in some way<sup>4</sup>", so that *we may enjoy it* (the Holy Spirit) as a friend and a special protector. Perfect friendship includes the real and intimate presence of the

<sup>1</sup> *Wisdom*, I, 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, XIV, 23.

<sup>3</sup> *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, III, 16; *Epistle to the Romans*, V, 5.

<sup>4</sup> *St. Thomas*, in *I Sent.*, dist. 14, q. 2, a. 2.

friend and it is the nature of a friend to watch over his friend in a special manner and to protect him from enemies<sup>1</sup>.

But the Spirit does not come alone; the Father and the Son come with Him, the Father as one not sent, but the Son as sent by the Father alone.

2. *Proof from theological reasoning.* For a divine mission it is necessary that the divine person, who proceeds from another, exist in a new manner among creatures. But, through sanctifying grace God dwells in a new manner in the just, that is, as a friend whom we enjoy, a special protector, to be glorified by us. This new divine indwelling is *attributed to the Holy Spirit* through appropriation; it takes place through habitual grace only, but not through actual graces or graces gratis given.

C *A visible mission*

575 1. **Concept.** A *visible mission* is one which takes place with some external sensible effect or sign. For this there are three requirements: a visible sign, a new sign, regard for the sanctification of souls.

2. **Kinds.**

a. One kind is *substantially* visible, to wit, the mission of the Divine Word in the mystery of the Incarnation, in which the Son of God was substantially united to a visible human nature.

b. The other kind is *representatively* visible, as was the mission of the Holy Spirit manifesting Himself under sensible forms to which, however, He was not substantially united: for example,

1) at the Baptism of Christ, under the form of a *dove*<sup>2</sup>, for the purpose of showing the abundance of Christ's grace;

<sup>1</sup> *First Epistle of St. Peter*, V, 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, III, 16.



2) on Pentecost under the form of *tongues of fire*<sup>1</sup>, which were at the same time *representative* and *effective* because they gave internal grace<sup>2</sup>.

In the conferring of the Sacraments there is no visible mission of the Holy Spirit because no new or extraordinary sensible sign is used, but there is an invisible mission only in as much as habitual grace is bestowed through the Sacraments.

## CHAPTER II

## THE PHILOSOPHIC-THEOLOGICAL ELUCIDATION OF THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY<sup>3</sup>

We shall discuss at this point :

1. the knowability of this mystery,
2. philosophic-theological analogies and theories,
3. Conclusions that follow.

### I. THE KNOWABILITY OF THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY TRINITY

**576 Errors.** *Through excess* Abelard (1142), *Richard and Hugo of St. Victor* (1173), *Raymond Lull* (1315), *Gunther* (1803) were in error, teaching, in different ways, that the existence of the Holy Trinity could be known or proved by reason alone. *Through defect* the Rationalists are wrong,

<sup>1</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, II, 3.

<sup>2</sup> St. THOMAS, I, q. 43, a. 7, ad 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 678-730.

thinking that this mystery openly contradicts reason. In opposition to both groups we lay down this two-fold thesis.

**577 First thesis :** *The mystery of the Holy Trinity cannot be understood or demonstrated by reason alone.* This thesis is certain.

#### Proof of Thesis.

**A Proof from Scripture.** Scripture testifies that God alone is equal to knowing the Trinity: "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him". "No one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither doth anyone know the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal him"<sup>1</sup>.

#### B Proof from Tradition.

1. The Fathers very clearly go along with *Athanasius*, who declared: "O foolish people, bold and hasty in all things! Why do you not rather cease to examine so diligently the Trinity and just believe that it is, imitating the leader of the apostles in this regard, whose words are these: it is necessary first of all to believe God that it is..."<sup>2</sup>

2. *The Vatican Council* declared that there are certain mysteries which *can neither be understood nor demonstrated* by reason<sup>3</sup>. But all admit that the mystery of the Trinity is the most difficult and the loftiest of all. Therefore through reason it can neither be discovered nor demonstrated. Consequently, in 1887, the following proposition of *Rosmini* was condemned: "Once the mystery of the Holy Trinity has been revealed, its existence can be demonstrated by arguments which are wholly speculative, negative indeed and indirect, arguments of such a kind, nevertheless, that

<sup>1</sup> *Gospel according to St. John*, I, 18; according to *St. Matthew*, XI, 27.

<sup>2</sup> "If anyone shall say that in divine revelation there are no mysteries, truly and properly so called, but that all the doctrines of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles, by properly cultivated reason, let him be anathema". (of faith and Reason, canon 1).



through them this truth may be referred to philosophical discipline and knowledge, and may become a scientific proposition like many others<sup>1</sup>.

#### 578 C Proof from Reason

a. Every proof or demonstration is effected either a priori, or a simultaneo, or a posteriori. But the existence of the Holy Trinity cannot be demonstrated a priori, or through cause, because God has no cause; nor can it be demonstrated a simultaneo, or from the very notion of God which in us is based too much on analogy for us to infer from it that there are three persons in God; it cannot be demonstrated a posteriori, or through effects, because the effects produced by God are caused by His omnipotence, which is one and not three.

2. The insufficiency of the reasons offered by those who teach the contrary opinion confirms this thesis. Thus:

a. *Abelard*, by comparison and appropriation rather than by demonstration, conceived God not as a real Trinity of persons but as a nominal Trinity of attributes, namely of power, of wisdom, and of goodness<sup>2</sup>.

b. *Lull* rightly drew his conclusions from divine goodness: but the fact that divine goodness is fruitful within God Himself, is known through revelation alone<sup>3</sup>.

c. On purely rational grounds *Gunther* concluded from the existence of the word in the human intellect to the existence of the personal Word in the divine mind and in God that there are three subjects conscious of themselves; thus *tritheism* was introduced<sup>4</sup>.

d. Philosophizing in the manner of Kant, *Rosmini* brought forward a completely nominal Trinity — or *tritheism*<sup>5</sup>.

e. *Schell* reasoned from aseity, which he did not understand, and from it he inferred that there are three principles in God, but he could not prove that these are distinct, one from the other.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the decree of the Holy Office, Dec. 14, 1887. D. B., 1915 (1766).

<sup>2</sup> *ABELARD, Introduction to Theology*, book I, P. L., CLXXVIII, 989; book II, 1086; *Christian Theology*, book II, P. L., 1259-1261, 1278. D. B., 368. *Summa theologica*, I, q. 32, a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Articles of Faith*, chap. VII.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to PESCH, *De Deo Trino*, n. 494, 495.

<sup>5</sup> D. B., 1916.

579 Second Thesis: It cannot be shown that there is any contradiction in the dogma of the Holy Trinity when it is correctly set forth.

#### Proof.

A On the authority of scholars in philosophy and in the natural sciences, and notwithstanding the difficulties which they have carefully considered, these men have believed this dogma.

#### B From Reason.

1. Indeed there is an inconsistency in the mystery of the Holy Trinity if, in stating it, we include terms that contradict and exclude one another. But this need not be so. For we say that God is one in respect to nature and three in regard to persons. Certainly a being can be one under a certain aspect and multiple under another aspect. For example, there is in man a two fold substance, a spiritual substance or a soul, and a material substance or a body; nevertheless there is only one person. For contradiction, therefore, to be present in this Mystery, it would be necessary to prove that there is no distinction, not even virtual, between nature and person. This cannot be done.

2. Our second proof from reason rests on the fact that we can answer the outstanding objections to this thesis.

a. Things which are identical to a third are identical among themselves. But the three divine persons are one and identical with their essence. Therefore among themselves they are identical.

In replying to this objection we distinguish the major premise: things which are identical to a third in every respect are identical among themselves — this we grant; but things which are identical in one regard and different under another respect — this we deny. The three persons are identical with divine nature under one respect in as much as they equally possess the divine nature, but *virtually* they differ from it because they do not possess the divine nature in the same manner. For example, in actively generating, the Father gives that nature to the Son, the Son receives it. But between giving and receiving there is a real distinction.



b. It is further objected that the existence of three persons is an obstacle to divine simplicity. *St. Thomas* replies: "We must say that there is in the Son something which is common to the Father, namely, essence, and that there is something through which the Son is distinguished from the Father, that is, relation. Nevertheless there is no composition because relation is really (*secundum rem*) essence."

## II. ANALOGIES AND PHILOSOPHICAL EXPLANATIONS

**580 Comparisons and Analogies.** Analogies to the Holy Trinity we find:

- a. In the universality of creatures on whom the mark of the Trinity has been impressed;
- b. In men just as in the angels—in man the image of this mystery shows itself; *St. Augustine*, *St. Thomas*, and *Bossuet* have developed this idea. In the intellectual soul there are two immanent processions, namely the word which proceeds from the intellect, and love which proceeds from the will.

**581 Philosophical and Theological Explanations of the Dogma of the Holy Trinity.**

Both the Greek Fathers and the Latin Fathers have proposed these explanations.

### A The Theory of the Greek Fathers

The Greeks, eager to preserve the distinction of persons, in opposition to the Modalists have accurately defined the words *ὁὐτως* and *ὁμοῦτως*, and have taught that in God there are three hypostases which are mutually opposed: namely, the unbegotten Father who begets the Son; and through Him and at the same time with Him spirates the Spirit, communicating to both the entire divine nature.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 28, a. 3, ad 1.

They conceive *circuminsession* as a certain vital circle, proceeding from the Father into the Son and into the Spirit and, as it were, returning from the Spirit into the Son and into the Father.

*Works ad extra* are common to the three persons; thus the Father does these things *through* the Son and *in* the Spirit.

Like the Latins, the Greeks profess a trinity of persons, a unity of nature and among the persons real relations which proceed from their origin.

**582 B The Theological Explanation of the Latin Fathers**

Among the Latins we pay special attention to *St. Augustine* and to *St. Thomas*.

### I. *St. Augustine's Teaching.*

a. Considering God in as much as He is one, *St. Augustine* attributes to the Father unity. This unity is regarded absolutely and does not presuppose anything else. Thus it is proper to the Father to whom any other person is not presupposed. To the Son he attributes equality which denotes unity with regard to another. To the Holy Spirit he attributes concord or link which is the union of at least two (presupposed) <sup>1</sup>.

b. Looking upon God as the cause of things <sup>2</sup>, *St. Augustine* assigns to the Father power which possesses the reason of principle or principle without a principle. He assigns to the Son wisdom which bears a likeness to the Son in as much as He is the Word. To the Holy Spirit he assigns goodness, the object of love.

c. Viewing God from the viewpoint of his effects, he calls the Father *ex quo*, from whom, because the relation (habitude) of the efficient cause is proper to the Father as is also power. He calls the Son *per quem*, by whom, because the relation of the formal cause belongs to the Word, as does wisdom and art or knowledge. The Holy Spirit he names *in quo*, in whom,

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Doctrine*, book I, chap. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *The Trinity*, book VI, chap. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Symbols also attribute to the Father creation which is the proper work of omnipotence.



because the relation or habitude of one containing is proper to Love in this that in His goodness He preserves and governs things by guiding them to a fitting end<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. The Thomistic or Psychological Explanation.

583 The Angelic Doctor notes that, according to Catholic faith, there are in God two *immanent processions*, namely *the word* which proceeds from the intellect, and *love* which proceeds from the will. Then he shows that from these processions arise *four relations*, *three persons*, and therefore *three personal properties* and *five notions*.

### a. The Processions<sup>2</sup>. In God there is:

- 1) Procession through the intellect; from this the internal word comes forth. This is true generation.
- 2) Procession through the will. This is not generation.
- 3) In God are no processions besides these.

584 b. The Relations<sup>3</sup>. From the fact that there are two processions in God arise *four relations*: the relation of the Father to the Son or *Paternity*, the relation of the Son to the Father or *Filiation*, the relation of the Spirator to the Holy Spirit or *Active Spiration*, the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Spirator or *Passive Spiration* — also called *Procession*.

1) These relations are *not accidents* since in God there is nothing accidental. Nevertheless they are *realities* because God is truly the Father, truly the Son, truly the Holy Spirit; but they are realities existing by the very subsistence of the divine essence, so that divine relations are the divine substance itself.

2) These relations are *virtually distinguished* from the divine substance: for, in their own proper concept they do

<sup>1</sup> Refer to St. Thomas, I<sup>a</sup> p., q. 39, a. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 27, a. 1-5.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 28, a. 1-4.

not express divine substance but only references or relationships (to substance): wherefore there is room for a *real distinction* by which relations are set off *among themselves*. For Paternity, in as much as it is opposed to Filiation, is really distinguished from it. Active Spiration, since it is opposed to passive Spiration is really distinguished from it: that which produces is necessarily distinguished from that which is produced. But active Spiration, not opposed to Paternity and Filiation, is not really distinguished from them.

## 585 3. The Divine Persons<sup>1</sup>.

a. In God there are *three persons really distinct*. The name of person is appropriate to God. Because the opposite divine relations are subsisting in the divine nature, correctly, although analogously they have been called *persons* by the Fathers and by the Doctors. Boetius defines person thus: *an individual (incommunicable) substance endowed with reason*. Or, in other words, a person is something substantial, intellectual, indistinct in se and distinct from others. But each one of the opposite relations which are in God is something:

1) *Substantial*: it is repugnant that there be in God anything accidental or shared in. For since God through His essence is perfection, it is repugnant that He be a participator in further perfection through accidents.

2) *Intellectual*: whatever is in God is the divine nature, which is in the highest degree of immateriality and of intellectuality; moreover, divine relations are founded in the operations of the intellect and of the will.

3) *Undivided in itself*: in God there is one Paternity, one Filiation, one passive Spiration since there is one Father, one Son, one Holy Spirit.

4) *Distinct from others*: Paternity and Filiation, as they are opposite, are really distinct from each other; thus passive Spiration is distinguished from Paternity and from Filiation since both are identified with active Spiration.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 29 and 30.



b. *In God there are only three persons* because there are only three subsistent relations really distinct one from the other, namely: *Paternity* and *Filiation* which are immediately opposites to each other, and *Passive Spiration* which is opposite to *Paternity* and to *Filiation* by reason of *Active Spiration* with which they are identified. However, there can be no other distinction in God apart from a *relative* distinction, for an absolute distinction would be a *substantial* distinction and consequently would multiply Divinity or would imply polytheism. Whence the axiom: *In God all things are one where relative opposition does not prevent this.*

c. *The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son* by one spiration, in such a way that the Father and the Son are the one principle of the Holy Spirit<sup>1</sup>. For if the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Son, in no way could He be distinguished from the Son. Truly the divine persons are really distinguished from one another only through opposite relations. But opposite relations are found in the divine persons only as relations of *origin* since one person proceeds from another. Therefore the Holy Spirit is not really distinct from the Son unless He proceeds from the Son<sup>2</sup>.

### III. LOGICAL CONCLUSIONS

#### A *Properties of the Divine Persons.*

586 1. *Personal properties*<sup>3</sup> are those things by which the divine persons are constituted. They are three: *Paternity*, *Filiation* and *Passive Spiration*. *Active Spiration*, common to the Father and to the Son, is not, to speak strictly, a property.

<sup>1</sup> There are, nevertheless, two *spirations*, but not two *spirators* because as St. Thomas declared (q. 36, a. 4, ad 7), it seems better to say that because spirating is an adjective, and spirator a substantive, we can say that the Father and the Son are two spirations, but not two spirators, by reason of the one spiration. Refer to annotations IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX of Cajetan on this question; St. Francis Sales, *Traité de l'amour de Dieu*, book III, chap. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 36, a. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 40, a. 4.

2. *The notional acts*<sup>1</sup>. *Notional* or personal acts through which the divine persons who proceed are produced are two: *generation*, proper to the Father, through which the Son is produced; and *spiration*, common to the Father and to the Son, through which the Holy Spirit is produced. These acts we can call both necessary and voluntary.

587 3. *Notions*<sup>2</sup>. These notions are distinctive characteristics by means of which the divine persons are discerned and distinguished one from the other. There are five: two belonging to the Father, *Innascibility* and *Paternity*; one belonging to the Son, *Filiation*; one for the Holy Spirit, *Passive Spiration*; one a characteristic of the Father and of the Son together, *Active Spiration*.

**Conclusion.** "Therefore there are five notions in God: *innascibility*, *paternity*, *filiation*, *common spiration*, and *procession*. Of these only four are relations for *innascibility* is not a relation except by reduction. Four only are properties. For *common spiration* is not a property, because it belongs to two persons. Three are personal notions, that is, constituting persons, namely *paternity*, *filiation*, and *procession*. *Common spiration* and *innascibility* are called notions of persons, but not personal notions<sup>3</sup>".

#### B *Proper and Appropriated Names*<sup>4</sup>.

589 1. *Proper* names are those which belong to one person in such a way that they cannot be predicated of the others. *Appropriated* names are of themselves common to the three persons, but they are attributed to one before the others because of the similitude between a common attribute and a personal attribute.

2. a. The Father is *properly* called the *first principle* or the *source* or *fons* of the entire Trinity (but not the *cause* or *author* of the Son, because these words in the Latin language imply in the thing caused a diversity and dependence of

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 41, a. 1-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 32, a. 2-4.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 32, a. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 33-38.



nature), the *Unbegotten* and the *Innascible*, *Father* and *Genitor*. Through appropriation the Father is called *Omnipotent*, the *Creator*, *Eternal*.

b. The Son is *properly* called not only the Son but also the *Word*, the *Image*, because by force of origin He is perfectly like the Father, the *Splendor of glory*, and the *Figure of the substance* of the Father. Through appropriation the Son is called *Wisdom*.

c. The Third Person is *properly* called the *Holy Spirit*, *Love*, because He is the terminus of the love of the Father and of the Son, *Charity*, *Gift*, because love is the first and most excellent gift. Through appropriation the Third Person is called the *Paraclete* or consoler and *Advocate*, because through grace He consoles us and petitions for us with unspeakable groanings. All these are the works of love.

### C The Rules for Speaking Correctly about the Holy Trinity

590 Since the mystery of the Holy Trinity rests essentially on the *unity of nature* and on the *distinction of persons*, all must be avoided which would transgress either of these dogmas.

Wherefore :

1. Names signifying the divine essence substantively, as *God*, *Divinity*, *Omnipotence*, *Wisdom*, etc. are predicated of the three persons individually. The divine nature is one.

2. Names signifying the divine essence *adjectivally* are predicated *plurally* of the three persons because they refer to persons. Therefore we say there are three existing or three wise, or three eternal, and uncreated and immense whenever these terms are understood *adjectivally*. But if they are considered *substantively*, we say one uncreated, immense and eternal being — as in the *Athanasian Creed*<sup>1</sup>.

3. The words which express *notional* or proper operations of persons and their relations, must not be predicated of

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 39, a. 3.

essence (otherwise relative opposition and a real distinction would be implied), but must be predicated only of the person or of *God* (taken for the persons); for example, it may not be said that the essence generates, proceeds, etc.; rather it must be stated that God generates, the Son is generate, or begotten<sup>1</sup>.

4. Names expressing a distinction should be so carefully employed that they do not import a distinction of nature and any inequality of persons.

a. Thus the words three, trinity are to be used, but not, triplicity, triple, because these last words suppose that there are many natures.

b. We say : One (masculine) is the Father, one (masculine) is the Son, but not one (neuter), because the neuter gender designates nature.

c. It cannot be said : "The Father is *unus* with the Son", because the masculine gender commonly refers to person; truly the Father is not one person with the Son.

d. Expressions such as these must be shunned : "God is singular, alone, solitary", because such words exclude a plurality of persons.

e. It cannot be stated that there are three diverse persons, because diversity supposes a multiplication of nature.

f. Also it should not be stated that the persons are of like substance because likeness in this case implies a multiplicity of substance; on the contrary it should be said that the three persons are of one substance.

g. It is not proper to say that in God there are *three individuals*, because individuals designate a nature one in species, but diverse in number, whereas in God nature is one not only specifically, but also numerically.

<sup>1</sup> Some of the Fathers at times have spoken somewhat less accurately in this regard but they are to be understood with charity; for example, it is stated that wisdom begot wisdom, or if the Son is called wisdom from wisdom, the proposition should be explained in this way : the Father who is wisdom itself begot the Son, who, as God, is also wisdom itself. Refer to HUART, II. 261.



## CONCLUSION OF TRACT

Devotion to the Holy Trinity<sup>1</sup>

591 1. We should perpetually give glory to the Trinity: *Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost*. This glory is evinced especially in knowledge and in love: therefore, in order that we may truly imitate the Trinity in whose likeness we have been established, and in whose name we are baptized, we must constantly think of God, and regard Him with love. While we contemplate the perfect unity of the three persons, we should have before us Christ's prayer: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us." This unity we should imitate through the practice of fraternal charity. In order that we may be able to delight in the invisible mission of the divine persons, "let our fellowship be with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

2. In regard to the persons individually considered:

- a. Let us acknowledge God the Father by a confession of praise and by acts of thanksgiving, love, by zeal for the divine glory;
- b. Let us imitate the Son of God, Jesus Christ;
- c. Let us adore the Holy Spirit who fulfills various offices in the Church, and let us live in Him and from Him by holding on to charity.

And if through charity we are united to God, the three divine persons will come to us and they will make their abode within us: "God is charity, and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God and God in him."

<sup>1</sup> CONTENSON, *Theol. mentis*, I, III, d. II, c. I, spec. I; LABORDE, *Dévotion à la T. S. Trinité*; R. PLUS, *Dieu en nous*; TANQUERREY, *Précis de théol. ascét.*, 5<sup>e</sup> edit., n. 98-101.

<sup>2</sup> St. John, XVII, 21-22.

<sup>3</sup> Gospel according to St. John, I, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Gospel according to St. John, XIV, 23.

<sup>5</sup> First Epistle of St. John, IV, 16.

## TRACT IX

## GOD THE CREATOR

*I believe in God... the Creator of heaven and of earth.*

592 We proceed from an exposition of the interior life of God to a discussion of the divine operations *ad extra*, namely the production of creatures and their elevation to a supernatural state. We shall consider:

1. *Creatures that are not spiritual* — or the creation of the world;
2. *creatures that are wholly spiritual* — or the angels;
3. *creatures that are material and at the same time spiritual* — or man.

## CHAPTER I

## THE CREATION OF THE WORLD

Questions which are entirely philosophical we take for granted have already been solved elsewhere; at this time we are looking for what faith teaches:

1. *Concerning the origin of the world and the Mosaic cosmogony;*
2. *concerning the origin of life and of the various living species.*



ARTICLE I. THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY <sup>1</sup>

593 By way of introduction we note that according to an answer <sup>2</sup> of the *Commission De Re Biblica*:

1. The *literal historical sense* of the first three chapters of the Book of Genesis must by no means be excluded.
2. Nevertheless, not all the words nor individual words must be accepted necessarily in their literal sense when, for example, the discourses themselves are manifestly to be taken metaphorically or anthropomorphically — especially if the Fathers have understood these words metaphorically.
3. It was not the intention of the sacred writer, in the first chapter of Genesis, to teach in a *scientific manner* the intimate constitution of things and the complete order of creation, but rather to give to his nation the *popular conception*.
4. Finally, the word *yôm* (day) can be taken either in the literal sense for a natural day, or in the non-proper sense for a certain period of time.

Using these principles as our foundations, we shall explain:

1. What is *certainly* and *obviously* taught in Scripture concerning the *origin of the world*;
2. What can be freely disputed.

A *Dogmatic Truths Which Are Surely Contained  
in the First Chapter of Genesis* <sup>3</sup>

In four theses we shall make these truths manifest.

594 **First Thesis.** *All creatures, whether spiritual or material, or spiritual and at the same time material, were made by God*

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 66-74; PETAVIUS, *de sex aeternis opificiis*; H. PINARD in D. T. C., a. *Création*; GUIBERT et CHINCHOLE, *Les Origines*.  
<sup>2</sup> June 30, 1909, A. A. S., t. I, p. 567-569; D. B., 2121-2128.  
<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 741-750.

from nothing. This thesis is de fide from the *Creed*: I believe in God the creator of heaven and of earth; it is de fide also from the *Fourth Lateran Council* and from the *Vatican Council*, both of which we shall soon quote. This thesis stands in opposition to Pantheists, Dualists and idolaters.

595 I. Moses declares that the world and everything in it was created by God: "In the beginning God created *heaven and earth* <sup>1</sup>". These words according to biblical usage signify the whole universe of things; further, in verses 2 and 27 it is clearly stated that all things and individual things were made by God. In this matter we are concerned with creation from nothing:

a. This is proved from the *text*: the word *bara* (He created) in the forms *kal* and *niphal* is employed in Scripture only to refer to the proper working of God either natural or supernatural; hence it is most appropriate for designating production from nothing, an action entirely proper to God <sup>2</sup>.

b. This is confirmed:

1) From the *context*: Moses describes the first origin of things; but he is entirely silent concerning the preexisting matter of the world, in fact he excludes such matter, at least equivalently.

2) From *parallel places* these facts become much more certain:

a) The Prophets very often extol God's *creative power* such a way as to exclude all dualism and to make it apparent that God is the author of all things <sup>3</sup>.

b. The same teaching we find in the *Psalms*, wherein it is said that all things were made by the *simple word* of

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, I, 1.

<sup>2</sup> WELLHAUSEN, although a rationalist, very openly declares this (*Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israel*, Berlin, 1883, p. 321): "The book of Genesis uses a particular work in order to signify God's creative action alone".

<sup>3</sup> Amos, IV, 13; IX, 5-7; *Jeremias*, X, 12-17, LI, 15-20; *Isaias*, XL-LVI.



God<sup>1</sup>; in the *sapiential books* wherein it is stated that God made all things, even the abysses; in fact those things which seem evil to us (hail storms, famine, and death)<sup>2</sup>.

c. This doctrine is more clearly shown in the *Book of Machabees*: the mother of the Machabees, *full of wisdom*, addresses one of her sons thus: "I beseech thee, my son, look upon heaven and earth and all that is in them, and consider that God made them *out of nothing*<sup>3</sup>". So it is not to be wondered at that creation from nothing is a dogma of faith explicitly defined at the *Fourth Lateran Council* and at the *Vatican Council*: "He created *out of nothing* both the spiritual and the corporeal creature".

c. Creation from nothing is proved from reason: everything outside of God is produced by Him. But if God had produced the world from something previously supposed and established, everything outside of Him would not have been produced by God. Therefore God made all things from nothing.

**Second Thesis.** *The world was not created from eternity, but was created in time, or rather with time.* This thesis is de fide from the *Fourth Lateran Council*; it was confirmed by the *Vatican Council*: "From the beginning of time He created out of nothing both the spiritual and the corporeal creatures".

#### *Proof from Scripture*

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth"<sup>4</sup>; beginning must be understood as the beginning of time:

a. Such is the obvious meaning of this word; further, this meaning has nothing inconsistent about it; rather, it is confirmed from the parallel places; for

<sup>1</sup> *Psalms*, XXXII, 6, 9; CIII, 3; CXXXV, 5-10.

<sup>2</sup> *Proverbs*, VIII, 22-32; *Ecclesi.*, XXXIX, 30-39.

<sup>3</sup> *II Machabees*, VII, 28.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, I, 1.

b. this expression in the beginning, elsewhere<sup>1</sup> is translated through the words, *on the day*, an expression which certainly designates time;

c. Wherever creation is mentioned, such words are used as make it clear that the world had a beginning: "Before the mountains were made or the earth was formed..." "He chose us in him before the foundation of the world"<sup>2</sup>.

**596 Third Thesis.** *God alone is the immediate efficient cause of creation.* This is de fide from the ordinary magisterium of the Church.

#### *Proof from Scripture*

1. From the silence of the sacred writer who, while very often mentioning the angels as God's helpers in governing the world, is completely silent concerning their intervention in creating it.

2. From the places in Scripture where it is made evident that all instrumental causality is excluded: "Thou thyself, O Lord, alone, thou hast made heaven and the heaven of heavens, and all the host thereof". "I am the Lord, that make all things, that alone stretch out the heavens, that establish the earth, and there is none with me"<sup>3</sup>.

#### *Proof from Tradition*

The Fathers often declare that the world was not made by angels or by another creature, but by the Father through the Word; in this way they imply the divinity of the Word because the act of creating belongs to God. St. Augustine<sup>4</sup> writes: "No angel can create nature any more than he can

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Proverbs*, VIII, 22; *Ephesians*, I, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *II Esdras*, IX, 6; *Isaiah*, XLIV, 24.

<sup>4</sup> *De Genes. ad litteram*, book IX, c. 15, n. 26, 28, P. L., XXXIV, 403, 404.



create himself<sup>1</sup> ... alone... God is the Creator". And the *Fourth Lateran Council* declares: "God is one alone... He is the one beginning of the universe, the creator of all things".

597 There is some controversy as to whether creation could have taken place through a creature as the instrumental cause. It is commonly taught that no creature can be the instrument of creation; the proof of this statement, in the manner of St. Thomas, is as follows: an instrumental cause cannot be employed to do something unless through what is proper to itself it acts dispositively to that effect; thus an axe cannot be the instrumental cause for cutting or splitting unless in so far as it affords the opportunity for something to be cut because of its sharpness. But no creature can antecedently arrange or dispose *nothing* so that it may become *being*: for there is no medium between *nothing* and *being*. Therefore no creature can be assumed or taken as the instrumental cause of creation.

598 **Fourth Thesis.** *All creatures were created good by God.* This is de fide from the *Fourth Lateran Council*.<sup>2</sup> "The devil and the other demons by nature God created good, but of themselves they became evil."

The words in the first chapter of Genesis, which are often quoted, make this fact obvious<sup>3</sup>: "And God saw that it was good... God saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good". Moreover, God, the supreme good, cannot will evil.

However, it does not follow from this that the world which God created is the most perfect. For since God's goodness and power are infinite, they cannot be exhausted through a finite work; therefore, God could make other creatures who would be more perfect. Nevertheless, we can state that the world is *relatively* the best, in as much as God chose the best means to attain the end He had proposed to Himself in creating.

<sup>1</sup> Rightly, therefore, says St. Thomas: "According to the *Catholic faith* we maintain that God *immediately* created all spiritual substances and the matter of corporeal things: we consider it *heretical* to declare that something was created through an angel or through another creature". *De Pot.*, q. 2, a. 4.  
<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 428.  
<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 45, a. 5.

<sup>4</sup> *D. B.*, 428.  
<sup>5</sup> *Genesis*, I, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.

600 **Corollaries.** From what has been said it follows that:

1. *God alone is the efficient cause of all creatures*; He has brought them forth freely from nothingness by an act which is *common* to the three persons of the Trinity — in the Trinity all things are common unless the relation of origin makes it impossible.

2. *God is the exemplar cause of creatures* since He created them according to eternal ideas which He had in mind, in conformity with the verse: "Thou hast made all things in wisdom..."<sup>1</sup>

600 3. *The primary end of creatures is the manifesting and glorifying of God's goodness; the secondary end is the good of creatures.*

*In regard to the primary end* — The *Vatican Council* stated that God created "to manifest His perfection by the blessings which He bestows on creatures", and issued this definition: "If anyone shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God, let him be anathema".<sup>2</sup>

*Scripture* makes the primary end obvious; "The Lord hath made all things for himself".<sup>3</sup>

*Reason* argues in this way: Every agent acts for a purpose; otherwise from the act of the agent *this* would no more follow than *that*. Now, imperfect agents, in acting, intend to obtain something. Truly, therefore, it is not proper for the *first agent*, which is in all ways perfect, to act for the purpose of acquiring some good, but for communicating its perfection or a likeness of its goodness. Therefore, God created because of His extrinsic glory, and this consists precisely in the manifestation of His perfections.<sup>4</sup>

*In regard to the secondary end of creation*, that is, *the good of creatures* — God cannot intend His glory without at the same time willing the good of creatures, for these creatures

<sup>1</sup> *Psalms*, CIII, 24.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1783, 1805.

<sup>3</sup> *Proverbs*, XVI, 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 44, a. 4.



manifest their own glory in so far as they share in His perfections. Also, in giving glory to God, creatures attain their own perfection and happiness.

#### B The Order of Creation Described by Moses <sup>1</sup>

**601 Thesis:** In the first chapter of Genesis the intimate constitution of things and the complete order of creation are not described in a scientific manner; instead there is a popular — historical representation which was adapted and accommodated to the understanding of man at that time. This thesis is certain according to the reply of the Commission *De Re Biblica*.

1. The mosaic narration is *historical*, or it contains "the relating of things which really happened; these narratives correspond to objective reality and to historical truth".

All of this is manifest:

a. *From the obviously historical nature of Genesis:* if those matters which are told about the children of Adam, about Noah and his children, etc. are historical, as all acknowledge, why are those stories dismissed which consider the first origin of things?

b. *From the particular inter-relation of the first three chapters among themselves and their connection with the following chapters:* just as the first origins of the Jewish people are portrayed in the following chapters, so in the first chapters the origin of the entire human race and of the world itself is delineated. Likewise, if we compare the first chapters one with another, it will become sufficiently clear to us that in these chapters the successive creation of unformed mass is being described, later the production of diverse beings, the formation of the first man and of the first woman are spoken of; then follows the story of the command given to them, of their temptation and of their fall. Actually all of these subjects are co-joined just like historical facts.

c. *From the other places in Scripture* in which the facts related in the first chapter are likewise mentioned as historical: thus on many occasions the work of creation is accomplished by God<sup>2</sup> is spoken of in terms of great praise.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 751-763.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, XIV, 19; *Isaiah*, XLII, 5; XLV, 18; *Proverbs*, III, 19; VIII, 22; *Wisdom*, IX, 9; *Psalms*, XXXII, 9; CXLV, 5; *II Mac.*, VII, 28.

**602 2.** *However, this narrative is popular as well as historical;* but it is not scientific.

a. The sacred writer's intent is not the teaching of the physical sciences, but of the truths necessary for salvation. Consequently, he speaks of the origin and of the formation of the world in a popular manner:

1) He does not describe, therefore, in a scientific way the innermost constitution of visible things, for example, the nature of light or of the firmament, or of the heavens, geological strata, or biological laws.

2) Nor does he explain in detail the complete order of creation, but only those matters which are better known to the people, for this purpose that he may be able by means of this review to drive home more forcefully the fact that all things truly come from God.

3) He does not always follow a strictly chronological order thus when it is stated that light was made on the first day but that the lights were made on the fourth day, it may not be inferred from such a narration alone that light preceded the actual forming of the sun.

4) At times metaphorical or anthropomorphical discourses are employed in the manner of a dialogue for the purpose of describing something more vividly; for example, *God said: Be light made; and light was made*; these words cannot be taken literally.

#### 603 b. Proof of number 602.

1) St. Thomas thought that nothing certain could be deduced from Scripture in regard to the manner and order of creation and that Moses followed the common manner of speaking<sup>1</sup>.

2) *The Commission De Re Biblica*, June 30, 1909, taught that "in the first chapter of Genesis it was not the mind of the sacred writer... to teach the complete order of creation

<sup>1</sup> Refer to *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 70, a. 1, ad 3; *II Sent.*, d. XII, q. 1, a. 2.



in a scientific way, but rather to give to his people a popular knowledge... which was suited to the understanding and discernment of man<sup>1</sup>.

604 3. *In regard to the various disputed systems* we must realize that every system can be unrestrictedly defended which preserves the historical-popular sense of the first chapter and does not contradict proved facts. The various systems which Catholics have devised can be reduced to three: *the literal, the allegorical and the concordist*.

a. *The Literal* interprets the words of Moses literally and maintains that day in the Book of Genesis means a day of twenty-four hours. This system is usually rejected because it opposes certain positive facts of geology and of paleontology.

b. *The Allegorical or Idealistic* system is two-fold: first, there is that of *Philo*, of the *School of Alexandria* and of *St. Augustine*, which teaches that the entire world was created in one instant, but that Moses distinguished six days in order to establish a logical order in his description; then there is the system of some moderns believing either (along with *Michelis, Faye, Hummelauer*) that Moses sets forth in logical order six prophetic visions through which creation has been revealed, or (with *Clifford, Bishop of Clifton*) that the mosaic description is not an historical narration, but a *liturgical* poem dedicating the individual days of the week to the individual works of the Creator. However according to the *Commission De Re Biblica* these systems should be amended so as to admit that in these visions or poems there is to be found an *historical* description of God's works. For the rest, there is no objection to distinguishing logically, in the mosaic narrative, a three-fold work, namely, the work of *creation*, the work of *distinction*, and the work of *adornment* — St. Thomas was in favor of this distinction.

607 c. The system of the *Concordists* or *Periodists* acknowledges that six days signify six periods of undetermined duration, as philology permits and paleontology demands: thus, according to this theory, geological phases harmonize with the mosaic narrative, at least in regard to the main features. Such a system is not particularly probable: for it falsely supposes that Moses wished to teach the people the origin of things in a scientific way; furthermore the order of creation in this manner of understanding hardly fits in with geological facts.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, n. 2127.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 65.

### Conclusion

For solving difficulties it is sufficient to show that no discrepancy can be proved to exist between the historical-popular narration of Moses and the sciences which attempt to establish a chronological order of creation.

#### ARTICLE II. TRANSFORMISM<sup>1</sup>

608 **State of the Question.** Thus far we have treated of the origin of the world; now we are concerned with *the origin of living things*. *Absolute Transformism* claims that there is no first cause, that matter is eternal, that from its forces alone living things have sprung up by spontaneous generation so that thereafter through a successive transmutation they settle into diverse species. *Thus Huxley and Darwin*.

A *moderate* or mitigated *Transformism*, recognizing the existence of a supreme cause, maintains that any evolution cannot take place without the providence, direction, and approval of God, because He has infused into natural things the forces which bring about an evolution, because He has established laws which govern this evolution, and thus directs it by His power and wisdom to ends and purposes determined beforehand by his prescience.

609 Among those endorsing moderate transformism: *some* place limits on the forces of evolution, estimating that some determined transitions or progressions cannot take place through evolution, for example, a transition from inanimate matter to first living matter, from vegetative to animal life, from certain particular species to other particular species, from an animal body to a human body; and in these new productions they require the *special and immediate* intervention of God which they call "*creation*" in a broad sense, thus showing that God alone acts without any active concursus of secondary causes. *Others* concede that these transitions (except very often in the transition from non-living to living) take place through evolution, that is, through the active union of natural causes; but for this

<sup>1</sup> *PERIER, Le transformisme; ANANN, a. Transformisme in D. T. C., col. 1365-1396.*



they require the special or extraordinary intervention of God which they distinguish from the ordinary concursus of God, necessary for all evolution, because the effect produced exceeds the natural and ordinary forces of these causes and they act only as instrumental causes produced by divine power. Still others, more inclined to scientific experience than to metaphysical considerations, do not care whether these transitions can happen through the ordinary forces or laws of evolution or not; for, since neither the causes which produce evolution nor the laws which govern it are known by us, they think that we cannot discern which cases of evolution depend on the ordinary divine concursus, or which cases depend on the extraordinary. They do not wish "a priori" to impose such or such limits on the ordinary forces of evolution because future experiences may show them to be in error. Therefore they regard it as sufficient to attribute to the First Cause all that must be imputed to it.<sup>1</sup>

**610 First Thesis:** *Absolute Transformism which denies all Intervention of God, openly contradicts faith no less than it contradicts reason.*

*Faith* teaches that God has created all things and governs them.

Evolution must not be an expedient and easy way for denying the creation of the world by God, as the transformist materialists of the nineteenth century contended, and as many Catholics once feared. Actually, *if evolution be admitted, reason takes from it arguments demonstrating the existence of God* (Refer to the first and fifth arguments)<sup>2</sup>.

Evolution is an ascent to higher forms, the acquiring of greater vital perfection. It cannot happen that from the forces alone of something less, something greater arise (du "moins" à lui tout seul, ne peut sortir le "plus"). For the production of an absolutely greater and new perfection, pre-contained in no previous cause, is metaphysically impossible. Therefore, the more perfect forms of living things cannot ascend unless there exists a living Being supremely perfect in whom exist in a pre-eminent way all the perfections which will arise successively by force of evolution in the passing of time, from whom natural

<sup>1</sup> BERGOUNTOUX, *Harmonies du monde moderne. Esquisse d'une histoire de la vie. DE SAINT-SEINE, A la découverte de la vie.*

<sup>2</sup> Refer to GRISON, *Témoignage de l'univers*, p. 22-29, 96-110, 251-259, 265-266.

causes have received the forces of passing over to higher things, and without whose concurrence they cannot employ these forces: to this high degree the wonderful evolutionary force greatly explains the divine power; in no manner or form could this force be "a se".

Similarly the fortuitous evolution of species is unintelligible. In this (theory) the *directive intention* or *purpose* (plan) of evolution is manifest; the appearance of life itself in matter, the link of successive species originating according to an always increasingly complex order of one from another, and finally the very commencement of human cerebral activity, by force of the mathematical laws of probability governing matter, were highly improbable; that the wonderful progression should first of all free living things from aquatic conditions (life first appeared in the sea), then from cold (the transition to warm blood lest an animal become torpid in winter), and finally that it form the brain and judgment from reflections in such a way that the organism can be the store house of an intellect and of man's liberty, were highly improbable. And since this plan or purpose, by means of the forces of evolution naturally infused into living things, and by sure laws directing evolution (although wholly unknown by us), in the course of thousands and thousands of ages, is the order to action, a Supreme Intellect, the author of nature, must be necessarily maintained; long before the event both the ascending succession of living things and their terminus, man, are foreseen by this Intellect, and the forces and laws which progressively and marvellously carry on evolution to this terminus are set in order. This "telefinalism", the leading idea which directs the concept of vital evolution, offers a much better explanation of an intelligent and spiritual cause than does immediate and successive production of fixed species because it argues for a *Supreme wisdom as director*.

**611** It is known that *Pasteur* demonstrated by means of most celebrated proofs that *spontaneous generation*, that is a transition from non-living to living by means of natural forces, can never be perceived by observation. Relying on these facts, many Catholics concluded that spontaneous generation is summarily impossible and that the beginning of living things on earth necessarily postulates God as the creator of life. On the contrary, very much annoyed by these experimental proofs, atheists strove to show the possibility of spontaneous generation.

Today as a result of investigation there seem to be come changes in the state of this question. Some beings have been found, called in the French "virus filtrants", which are viewed as intermediaries between greater chemical molecules and smaller



bacteria, and which suggest that there is a possible transition from non-living to living<sup>1</sup>.

Therefore it is wiser not to rely on Pasteur's *scientific* experiences to prove that God is the creator of life, but from the transcendency<sup>2</sup> made clear by scientific declarations, of living things over non-living to demonstrate *metaphysically* that God is the first cause of this transition from non-living to living (either through Himself or through second causes).

**612 Second Thesis :** *Mitigated Transformism, which admits divine intervention, is not manifestly opposed to faith.*

1. The words of Genesis (I, II, 12, 21, 24, 25, 26) show indeed that there is some distinction among the species, caused by the divine will, but they do not evidently state that all species have been immediately created by God — thus the best of the modern expounders confess. *Corlay*<sup>3</sup> says: "Where as Darwinian transformism must be said to contradict the *obvious* sense of Scripture; *nevertheless* it need not be stated that it *openly opposes the sacred text*: truly Scripture is silent on the manner in which the earth produced that variety of species, whether immediately, or with the passage of time, or with absolute constancy of species, or with relative constancy only. Similarly, the words of Genesis: I, 10, 12, 20, 21, 24, in no way are opposed to spontaneous generation, in fact rather they intimate it, if they are taken in their obvious, literal sense.

2. The principle according to which scientific transformists interpret paleontological discoveries is the principle of *economy*; this was known by the Scholastics under the form: beings are not multiplied beyond necessity. Today it can be proposed under this form: the extraordinary and immediate intervention of God is not multiplied unnecessarily. This, far from taking anything away from God's power or wisdom, actually adds much to them — this was apparent likewise from the preceding thesis.

**613 3.** Some of the Fathers and almost all of the Scholastics *certainly* admitted the *spontaneous generation of living things*

<sup>1</sup> BERGOUNIUX, *Harmonies du monde moderne*, p. 82-85; — AYMAN, a. previously referred to in D. T. C., col. 1378.

<sup>2</sup> CORLAY, *De la matière à la vie*. CARLES, *Unité et vie*.

<sup>3</sup> CORLAY, *Spécilogé, dogmatique-biblicum*, vol. 1, p. 198.

and held as at least probable that certain species of living things received their origin from inferior species. Thus *St. Augustine* had his theory "rationum seminalium"<sup>1</sup>. Similarly wrote *St. Thomas*: "Species, also, that are new, if any such appear, existed beforehand in various active powers; so that animals, and perhaps even new species of animals, are produced by putrefaction by the power which the stars and elements received at the beginning..."<sup>2</sup>.

**Conclusion :** Transformism of itself does not exclude theism; nor does belief in God demand fixism.

## CHAPTER II

### THE ANGELS

We shall consider angels in *general*, *guardian angels* and the *bad angels*.

#### I. ANGELS IN GENERAL<sup>3</sup>

Under this heading we speak of the *concept* of angels, of their *existence*, of their *gifts*, of their *elevation* to grace and their *fall* therefrom, and of the *orders* of angels.

##### A Definition of Angels

**614** Angel (from the word ἄγγελος, messenger) is usually defined in theology thus: *a created substance, entirely spiritual, intellectual and subsistent*.

The substance is called :

a. *entirely spiritual*, that is, in no way ordained for informing a body; in this way an angel differs from all corporal creatures;

<sup>1</sup> De Genes. ad litt., book V, c. 5, n. 14; refer to c. 23, n. 45, etc., P. L., XXXIV, 326, 338.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 73, a. 1, ad 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 775-799.



- b. *intellectual* — in this way an angel is distinguished from men who acquire many truths by means of reasoning;
- c. *subsistent*, or endowed with a personality; thus an angel is a *complete substance* which by itself can carry on its own operations *in its own right*; it has *dominion* over its own actions.

### B The Existence of Angels

**615 Errors.** The existence of angels was once denied by the Epicureans and by the Sadducees; today it is denied by atheists, rationalists, also by liberal protestants who say that angels, mentioned in Scripture, are either good inspirations sent by God, or men sent by God to enlighten others.

Some of the ancient Fathers and theologians were in error in regard to the nature of angels, thinking that they were united to very fine bodies. In this matter they were led astray either by platonic philosophy or by certain texts of Scripture<sup>1</sup> which they did not correctly understand.

**616 Thesis:** *It is a matter of faith that angels or intellectual creatures distinct from God and superior to men exist; it is certain that angels are entirely spiritual.*

The Fourth Lateran Council<sup>2</sup> has given this definition "Who of His almighty power simultaneously from the beginning of time created out of nothing both the *spiritual* and the corporeal creature: to wit, the *angelical* and the *mundane*: and afterwards the human creature as partaking, in a sense, of both, consisting of spirit and of body". In this definition, confirmed by the *Vatican Council*<sup>3</sup>,

1. The existence of angels is defined as a matter of faith;
2. Angels are distinguished both from corporeal creatures and from man who is corporeal and spiritual; hence the spirituality of the angels is certainly implied;
3. Men were created *after* the Angels;
4. Whether the creation of the corporeal world and of the angelic world was contemporaneous is not apparent because

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, VI, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 428.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 1783.

the word *simul* can be equivalent to the word *aeque*, meaning equally or together.

### 617 Proof of Thesis.

#### I. Proof from Scripture.

##### a. In the Old Testament:

1) Before the *exile* angels are mentioned either by the actual name of angels<sup>1</sup> (מַלְאָכִים, mal'āk), or by the name of sons of God<sup>2</sup>; or of spirits<sup>3</sup>: they are shown as innumerable beyond a multitude<sup>4</sup>, created by God<sup>5</sup>, superior to men<sup>6</sup>, spiritual<sup>7</sup>, celestial<sup>8</sup>, standing religiously before the throne of God<sup>9</sup>; they are shown accomplishing the decrees of the omnipotent God<sup>10</sup>, announcing the will of God<sup>11</sup>, helping men<sup>12</sup>.

2) After the *exile*, according to all, testimony about the existence of angels is found in *Daniel*<sup>13</sup>, in *II Esdras*<sup>14</sup>, in *Tobias*<sup>15</sup>, in *Zacharias*<sup>16</sup>, in the *Machabees*<sup>17</sup>.

b. In the New Testament — the existence of angels is more frequently and more openly maintained herein. In the

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, XVI, 7, 9; XIX, 1, 15; XXI, 17; XXII, 11-15; XXIV, 7, 40; XXVIII, 12; XXXI, 11; XXXII, 1; XLVIII, 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Job*, I, 6; II, 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Psalms*, CI, 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, XXVIII, 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 1; *Exodus*, XX, 11.

<sup>6</sup> *Genesis*, XXI, 17; XXII, 11, XXIV, 7, 40; *Jud.*, VI, 12-21; *Psalms*, VIII, 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Num.*, XXII, 31; *Jud.*, VI, 21; XIII, 16, 20.

<sup>8</sup> *Genesis*, XXI, 17; XXII, 11; *Job*, I, 6; II, 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Job*, I, 6; II, 1; *Isaias*, VI, 3.

<sup>10</sup> *Genesis*, XVI, 7; XIX, 1; XXI, 17; XXII, 15; *Numbers*, XXII, 22; *Jud.*, II, 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Genesis*, XXII, 15; *Num.*, XXII, 35; *Jud.*, VI, 12.

<sup>12</sup> *Genesis*, XXIV, 7, 40; *Exodus*, XXIII, 20, 23; XXXII, 34; XXXIII, 21; *Genesis*, XLVII, 16; *Judith*, XIII, 20. From these references it is sufficiently

apparent that some Rationalists were completely in error when they maintained that the Jews in exile borrowed their doctrine about angels from the Persians.

<sup>13</sup> III, 57, 58, 95; VI, 10; VIII, 13; X, 13, 21, 51; XIV, 33.

<sup>14</sup> IX, 6.

<sup>15</sup> III, 25; XII, XV, 19, 20; XIII.

<sup>16</sup> I, 9.

<sup>17</sup> *II Mach.*, XI, 6.



*Gospels* an Angel appears to Zachary to foretell the birth of John, and to the Blessed Virgin to announce the mystery of the Incarnation<sup>1</sup>; and to Joseph<sup>2</sup> in order to teach him the miraculous conception of Christ and to tell him of Herod's death; Angels appear to the shepherds saying: "Glory to God in the highest<sup>3</sup>"; they minister to Christ after his temptation<sup>4</sup>. They appear many times to announce Christ's resurrection<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, according to Christ, there are more than twelve legions of angels in heaven<sup>6</sup>; the angels of little ones always see the face of the Father<sup>7</sup>; the angels will separate the wicked from among the just<sup>8</sup>; the children of the resurrection will be equal to the angels<sup>9</sup>.

In the *Acts of the Apostles* we see an Angel opening the doors of the prison for the Apostles during the night<sup>10</sup>; we see another angel speaking to the deacon Philip<sup>11</sup>; another freeing Peter<sup>12</sup>; one striking Herod<sup>13</sup>; and another angel standing by Paul at night in the sea<sup>14</sup>.

*St. Paul* relates very many things about the *orders* and *offices* of Angels, "whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers", in the Word, as the ideal, exemplary, eternal cause of all things, the angels were created<sup>15</sup> — the angels are spirits endowed with intellect, because they know and adore God; they are greatly inferior to the Son,<sup>16</sup> although they are ministers to the Supreme King, ministers to whom God has committed the carrying out of His works especially for those who will receive

<sup>1</sup> *St. Luke*, I, II, 26 and following.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, I, 20; II, 13, 19.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Luke*, II, 13.

<sup>4</sup> *St. Matthew*, IV, 11.

<sup>5</sup> *St. Matthew*, XXVIII; *St. Mark*, XVI; *St. Luke*, XXIV; *St. John*, XX, XXI.

<sup>6</sup> *St. Matthew*, XXVI, 53.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, XVIII, 10.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, XIII, 49; refer to XIII, 41; XXIV, 31.

<sup>9</sup> *St. Luke*, XX, 36.

<sup>10</sup> *Acts of the Apostles*, V, 19.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 26.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 7-15.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 23.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVII, 23.

<sup>15</sup> *Colossians*, I, 16.

<sup>16</sup> *Hebrews*, I, 4-7.

the inheritance of salvation<sup>1</sup>. But the evil angels blind the minds of unbelieving men that they may not perceive the light of the Gospel<sup>2</sup>; and in order to deceive men more easily Satan, the angel of darkness and of perversity, sometimes transforms himself into an angel of light and of sanctity<sup>3</sup>.

618 In the Scriptures the Angels are shown as:

a. *True substances*, but not mere abstractions of the mind. They liberate Lot from Sodom, taking him by the hand<sup>4</sup>; they have charge of men<sup>5</sup>; they adore God<sup>6</sup>; some of them sin and are thrust down into hell<sup>7</sup>.

b. *Inferior to God*, for they are created by God and are sent as His ministers or servants<sup>8</sup>.

c. *Superior to men*<sup>9</sup>.

d. *Entirely spiritual*. First, at no time does Scripture speak of the body of Angels; indeed it does assert that Angels have appeared in bodily form, but not that these Angels are naturally or personally united to a body<sup>10</sup>. Secondly, very often Angels are called spirits; but the word, *spirit*, when predicated of intellectual natures — and angels are so — always designates a substance which is entirely incorporeal. For example, "God is a spirit<sup>11</sup>"; but men, possessing bodies, are not called spirits until after death

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *II Corinthians*, IV, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, XIX, 16.

<sup>5</sup> *Psalms*, XC, 11-12.

<sup>6</sup> *Hebrews*, I, 6.

<sup>7</sup> *II Peter*, II, 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Hebrews*, I, 14; *Colossians*, I, 16.

<sup>9</sup> *Psalms*, VIII, 6; *II Peter*, II, 4.

<sup>10</sup> Thus the angel Raphael says to Tobias (Tobias, XII, 19): "I seemed indeed to eat and to drink with you, but I use an invisible meat and drink which cannot be seen by men". From this we may infer that Angels do not use the food of human beings, that they do not have a body naturally united to themselves, but only an apparent body. Refer to Dom Legeay, O. S. B., *L'Ange et les Théophanies d'après la doctrine des Pères*, in *Revue Thomiste*, X, 138 and following, 405 and following.

<sup>11</sup> *St. John*, IV, 24.



when they are separated from their bodies: "They supposed that they saw a *spirit* <sup>1</sup>."

### 619 2. *Proof from Tradition.*

Up until the seventh century nearly all the Fathers spoke about the Angels, but they spoke briefly; very often they were uncertain about the nature of the Angels and even made erroneous statements regarding them, errors which they took over from apocryphal and neo-platonic books.

a. According to all, Angels were created by God, endowed with an intellect and freedom.

b. But the absolute *spirituality* of Angels certain Fathers did not clearly maintain, especially because it was difficult for them to conceive a creature as real without having joined to it at the same time a body which was at least tenuous and ethereal. Thus *St. Justin*<sup>2</sup>; *Athenagoras*<sup>3</sup>; *St. Irenaeus*<sup>4</sup>; *Tertullian*<sup>5</sup>; *Clement of Alexandria*<sup>6</sup>; *St. Cyprian*<sup>7</sup>; *Lactantius*<sup>8</sup>; *St. Ambrose*<sup>9</sup> attribute to the Angels a certain ethereal, shining, celestial, spiritual body.

After the fourth century the Greek Fathers declared that angels are incorporeal, immaterial, and spiritual<sup>10</sup>. *St. Chrysostom* called the opinion absurd and blasphemous which declared that Angels had carnal intercourse<sup>11</sup>. Nevertheless, it is apparent from various texts that this spirituality, according to the estimation of the Greek Fathers, was only relative<sup>12</sup>. *Pseudo-*

<sup>1</sup> *St. Luke*, XXIV, 37-39.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol.*, II, 5, P. G., VI, 432.

<sup>3</sup> *Leg.*, 24, P. L., VI, 984.

<sup>4</sup> *Her.*, III, 20, 4, P. G., VII, 944.

<sup>5</sup> *Idol.*, IX, P. L., I, 671; *Cult. femin.*, I, 2, P. L., I, 1305.

<sup>6</sup> *Prod.*, III, 2, P. G., VIII, 576; *Strom.*, III, 7, P. G., VIII, 1161; V, 1, P. G., IX, 24.

<sup>7</sup> *De hab. Virg.*, 14, P. L., IV, 857.

<sup>8</sup> *Div. inst.*, II, 15, P. L., VI, 333.

<sup>9</sup> *De virg.*, I, 8, P. L., XVI, 203.

<sup>10</sup> DIDYMUS, *de Spiritu Sancto*, I, 5, 6, P. G., XXXIX, 1037; EUSEBIUS

CAESAR., *Dem., Evang.*, IV, I, P. G., XXII, 252; S. BASILIUS, *Hom. Quod*

*Deus non sit auctor mali*, 9, P. G., XXXI, 349. Refer to TIXERONT, *Hist. des dogmes*, t. II, p. 33.

<sup>11</sup> *In Genes. homil.* XXII, 2, P. G., LIII, 187.

<sup>12</sup> *In Genes. homil.* XXII, 2, P. G., LIII, 187.

*Dionysius supposes* rather than clearly affirms an absolute spirituality<sup>1</sup>.

### 620 3. *Proof from Reason.*

a. *From the order in the universe.* If we posit the existence of the angels, this order is better preserved: for then there are beings which are completely corporal, those which are corporal and at the same time spiritual, and finally beings which are entirely spiritual. But without the angels this ascending series of creatures is obviously broken.

b. Also, with the angels we have the best image in this world of the divine Intellect; and God receives greater glory through the angel's knowledge and superior praise<sup>2</sup>.

## C The Natural Gifts of the Angels

621 1. *The angels possess an intellect properly so called*: by means of this without discursion, through intuition they know themselves, they know God, the other angels and men, and future necessary things. But naturally they do not know future free events or the secrets of the heart<sup>3</sup>.

2. *Consequently, angels possess free will*: will follows the intellect; also angels were able to merit and demerit<sup>4</sup>.

3. *The angels are in place, not circumscriptively* in the manner of bodies, but *definitively*, so that they are entirely in every part of the place which they occupy just as our soul is entirely in every part of our body<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Hier.*, XV, P. G., III, 328-340.

<sup>2</sup> *Sensum theologiae*, I, q. 50, a. 1; *Contra Gentiles*, II, c. 46, 91; *De Malo*,

q. 6, a. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 54-59.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 59 and 60.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 52 and 53.



4. Angels naturally are superior in power to men. But how far their power extends we do not know; but since they are creatures, they can do nothing contrary to the absolute will of God.

## D The Grace of the Angels and Their Fall

622 1. *Angels were not created in supernatural blessedness or with the beatific vision, but as it were in the way to this terminus, provided with sanctifying grace and supernatural gifts*<sup>1</sup>. This is certain.

a. Proof of the first part of thesis: "To be established or confirmed in good is of the nature of beatitude. But the angels were not confirmed in good as soon as they were created; the fall of some of them shows this". This is indeed reasonable, for it is proper that no one who possesses free will be crowned unless he strive lawfully<sup>2</sup>.

b. Proof of second part of thesis: From those places where the angels are called the sons of God<sup>3</sup>, saints<sup>4</sup>, angels of light<sup>5</sup>; these statements denote the state of sanctifying grace; also from the texts in which the angels are described as enjoying the beatific vision.

623 However the time at which they were adorned with grace cannot be determined with certainty: "Although there are conflicting opinions on this point... yet it seems more probable and more in keeping with the sayings of holy men that they were created in sanctifying grace"<sup>6</sup>. Grace was bestowed on all the angels and the way and period of probation given to them were brief<sup>7</sup>.

624 2. *Some of the angels through their own fault committed sin and were assigned to eternal punishment*<sup>8</sup>.

a. The Fourth Lateran Council made this declaration concerning the first part of this thesis: "The devil and the other demons by nature were indeed created good, but by themselves they became

<sup>1</sup> Catech. Rom., P. I., a. I., n. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 62, a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *II Timothy*, II, 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Job*, XXXVIII, 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Daniel*, VIII, 13; *St. Mark*, VIII, 38.

<sup>6</sup> *II Corinthians*, XI, 14.

<sup>7</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 62, a. 3.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, I, q. 62, a. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Refer to F. Nau, *Démons*, in *D. A.*, I, 917 and following.

*evil*<sup>1</sup>. St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> explains very clearly how the angels were able to sin. "Sinning is nothing else than a deviation from that rectitude which an act ought to have; that act alone, the rule of which is the very will of the agent, can never fall short of rectitude... the divine will is the sole rule of God's act because it is not referred to any higher end. Thus only in the divine will can there be no sin; whereas there can be sin in the will of every creature".

625 Theologians inquire as to what kind of sin the angels committed. The common answer is that the first sin of the angels was pride; for Scripture states: "Never suffer pride to reign in thy mind, or in the words; for from it all perdition took its beginning... for pride is the beginning of all sin"<sup>3</sup>. A spiritual nature is attached only to spiritual things; and thus the devil sinned by seeking after spiritual things inordinately, or by being proud, namely by considering, by loving, and by wishing his own perfection without considering, loving and willing the supernatural rule or precept according to which, from the positive will of God, this perfection was to be pursued<sup>4</sup>.

But in what did this sin of pride consist? St. Thomas says that the devil sinned by striving to be as God, not indeed through equality, but through likeness<sup>5</sup> in an inordinate way: or "he desired as his last end of beatitude something which he could attain by virtue of his own nature, turning his appetite away from supernatural beatitude, which is attained by God's grace. Or if he desired as his last end that likeness of God which is bestowed by grace, he sought to have it by the power of his own nature; and not from divine assistance according to God's ordering"<sup>6</sup>.

Suarez<sup>7</sup> and others claim that the devil first sinned concerning the hypostatic union, either by seeking after it inordinately or by refusing to obey Christ revealed to him as the Lord.

626 b. After their sin the bad angels were assigned to eternal punishments: God did not spare the angels that sinned but delivered them, drawn down by internal ropes to the lower hell, unto

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 428.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 63, a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Tobias*, IV, 14; *Ecclesi.*, X, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 63, a. 2 and 3.

<sup>5</sup> The texts of Scripture (*Isaias*, XIV, 13-14; *Ezekiel*, XXVIII, 2) which many theologians bring forward to prove this point are understood literally not of the devil, but of the kings of Babylon and of Tyre.

<sup>6</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 63, a. 3.

<sup>7</sup> *De Angelis*, book VII, c. 13.



torments : ". The Fathers and theologians teach that it is more probable that a period of penance was not given to the fallen angels<sup>2</sup>.

From the perfection of the angels' intellect and will St. Thomas deduces that they could not recover. For all the things which the angels know, they understand in their own special manner or they apprehend intuitively and immovably as we apprehend first principles; but since the will follows the intellect the will in the angels chooses *immovably*.

### E The Orders of Angels

627 1. We gather that *there is a vast multitude of Angels*, both from the fact that Scripture represents them under the form of an army<sup>3</sup>, and from these following words and from others like them : "Thousands of thousands ministered to him and ten thousand times a hundred thousand stood before him<sup>4</sup>".

2. *How are the Angels drawn up and assigned?* According to Scripture the Angels certainly are not equal; they are divided into *nine orders*. Scripture and Tradition attribute various names and duties to them, and in this way proclaim a plurality of orders. The Church commonly teaches that there are nine orders because the sacred books list nine names of Angels which are not synonymous and which seem to denote diverse orders.

*Pseudo-Dionysius*<sup>5</sup> taught that all of the Angels are divided into *three hierarchies* which in turn are separated into *three orders* or *choruses* — thus there are *nine choirs of Angels*. The Fathers of the following age, in particular St. Gregory the Great<sup>6</sup> and nearly all the Scholastics, followed this order; as a result this teaching became the common teaching.

St. Thomas<sup>7</sup> explains the orders in this way : the *first* or *highest* hierarchy beholds the ideas of divine Providence in God Himself, the *second* in the universal causes, and the *third* in their application to particular effects.

The first hierarchy, which *contemplates God*, embraces the *Seraphim*, *Cherubim*, and *Thrones* : the *Seraphim* excel in what is the supreme excellence of all, in being united to God through charity; the *Cherubim* know the divine secrets supereminently;

<sup>2</sup> II Peter II, 4; refer to Jud. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 64, a. 2.

<sup>4</sup> III Kings, XXII, 19; St. Matthew, XXVI, 53; St. Luke, II, 13.

<sup>5</sup> *David*, VII, 10.

<sup>6</sup> *De celest. Hierarchia*, c. 6, 10.

<sup>7</sup> *Homil. 34 in Evang.*

<sup>8</sup> *Summa theologica*, I, q. 108, a. 6.

the *Thrones* are raised up so as to be the familiar recipients of God in themselves.

The second hierarchy, which is concerned with the *government of the world*, likewise consists of three orders : the *Dominations* appoint those things which are to be done; the *Virtues* give the power of carrying out what is to be done; the *Powers* order the means by which what has been commanded can be carried out.

The third hierarchy is engaged in the *execution of divine plans*. But in the carrying out of any action there are beginners and leaders — this belongs to the *Principalities*; there are others who simply execute what is to be done, and these are the *Angels*; others hold a middle place, and these are the *Archangels*.

## II. GUARDIAN ANGELS<sup>1</sup>

The good Angels assist God particularly in the custody of men. Consequently we shall consider :

- a. *The Existence of Guardian Angels*,
- b. *Their duties towards us*,
- c. *Our obligations towards them*.

### A The Existence of Guardian Angels

#### 1° IN RELATION TO INDIVIDUAL MEN

628 **Thesis :** *Holy Angels are appointed to the guardianship of men while they are wayfarers* (while they are on this earth). This thesis is certain; in fact, according to many, it is de fide in the light of the institution of the Feast of the Guardian Angels and the universal consensus of the Church.

#### Proof of Thesis

##### a. Proof from Scripture.

Scripture very plainly teaches that the good Angels are God's ministers in the matter of the salvation of men, without stating, however, that each man has a guardian angel.

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 800-810.



1. In the *Psalms*<sup>1</sup> it is said: "He hath given his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways;" but these words refer to all the just who trust in God, as is evident from the beginning of this psalm and from the common interpretation of the Fathers.

2. *Christ* warns that the children must not be scandalized because "Their Angels (that is those who watch over them) always see the face of my Father". However, this quotation refers to all children.

#### b. *Proof from Tradition.*

All the testimony of *Tradition* is summarized and confirmed so to speak, by the institution of the *Feast of the Most Holy Guardian Angels*, and especially by the collect of the Mass: "O God who in thine ineffable providence hast sent thy holy angels to watch over us".

#### c. *Proof from Reason.*

God is wont to govern the inferior through the superior; but Angels are superior to men; therefore God governs and protects men through Angels.

### 629 Corollaries.

#### 1. In regard to the number of Guardian Angels:

It is certain that *each of the faithful* just has his own Guardian Angel. This is implied in the texts quoted from Scripture and it is particularly apparent from the unanimous consensus of the Fathers and form the common understanding of the faithful. *St. Basil*<sup>4</sup> says: "That an Angel is present to every one of the faithful no one will deny".

The same assertion is commonly made in behalf of *sinners* and of *infidels*. Christ died for all, He merited the means for salvation for all; but in the present dispensation one of these means is angelic guardianship.

<sup>1</sup> *Psalms*, XC, 11-12.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, XVIII, 10; Refer to *Hebrews*, I, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 113, a. 1, 2; *Contra Gentiles*, III, c. 78, 79; *Catech. Roman.*, p. IV, c. 9, n. 4 and following.

<sup>4</sup> *Cont. Eunom.*, III, 1.

#### 2. In regard to the time of angelic protection:

It begins at the moment of birth, according to most in the maternal womb actually; it continues throughout life and ceases at death.

### 2° IN RELATION TO COMMUNITIES

630 a. The Doctors hold it as very probable that there is a special Guardian Angel for the *Church*, namely, St. Michael. Truly it does appear from Scripture that St. Michael was once instructed with the charge of the Synagogue<sup>1</sup>; but the Church succeeded the Synagogue. Also, the words and prayers in the office of St. Michael at least intimate that Archangel is the special protector of the Church.

b. It can also be stated with sufficient probability that special guardian angels have been set over individual *kingdoms* and nations, actually even over *communities* of some importance, for example, over particular churches, religious communities. As much is implied in various places in Scripture<sup>2</sup>.

### 631 B Duties of Guardian Angels towards Men

#### 1. In Regard to the Body:

a. The Guardian Angel turns away exterior harm from us, or he removes us from this harm: "The Angel that delivereth me from all evils"<sup>3</sup>.

b. He also helps us in worldly affairs which are related to our salvation — this is apparent from the example of Tobias<sup>4</sup>.

#### 2. In Regard to the Soul:

a. The Angels keep the devils at a distance<sup>5</sup>.

b. They offer holy thoughts to us<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Daniel*, X, 21; XII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Exodus*, XXIII, 20; *Deut.*, XXXII, 8; *Dan.*, X, 13; *Zach.*, I, 12; *Acts*, XVI, 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, XLVIII, 16; *Psalms*, XC, 11: refer to *Tobias*, VI, 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Tobias*, XII, 3 etc. — The entire book of Tobias should be read in order to find in it a graphic description of those things which Divine Providence offers to us through the mediating ministry of the Angels.

<sup>5</sup> *Tobias*, VIII, 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 16.



- c. They present our prayers and our good works to God and thus they bring to these greater efficacy<sup>1</sup>.
- d. At times they inflict curative<sup>2</sup> punishments: but vindictive punishments are generally inflicted by the bad angels.
- e. Finally, in the very moment of death, they aid us in a special way against final temptations, and they lead us to heaven or to purgatory<sup>3</sup>.

#### C Our Duties towards the Guardian Angel

632 These offices *St. Bernard* sets forth: "How great a reverence should this word (guardian angel) bring upon you, how great a devotion it should bring to you, how great a confidence it should contribute to you! *Reverence* for his presence, *devotion* for his goodness, *confidence* for his defense<sup>4</sup>".

### III. THE BAD ANGELS

The bad angels<sup>5</sup> or devils attack man in a two fold way: first, in the ordinary manner through *temptation*; secondly, in an extraordinary way through *possession* and *magic*.

#### A Diabolical Temptation \*

633 1. **Its Existence**: *More often than not devils incite or tempt men into sin*. This statement is de fide from the universal magisterium of the Church.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* VII, 12.

<sup>2</sup> *II Kings* XXIV, 16.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Luke*, XVI, 22. Refer to Cardinal Newman's *Dreams of Gerontius* wherein no less theologically than poetically he describes the struggle of the Christian soul with the devil before death.

<sup>4</sup> *Sermon* 12 in Ps. 90, n. 6.

<sup>5</sup> The bad angels have received various names; they are called *devils* (*Deut.*, XXXII, 17; *St. Luke*, VIII, 2; *St. Matthew*, VIII, 31); *wicked spirits* (*St. Luke*, XI, 26; *Acts*, XIX, 12); *unclean spirits* (*St. Luke*, VIII, 29); *rulers of the world of this darkness, spirits of wickedness* (*Ephesians*, VI, 12). One of them is regarded as their leader and he is called the *prince of this world* (*St. John*, XII, 31, XIV, 30); the *prince of devils* (*St. Matthew*, IX, 34); *Satan* (*St. Luke*, XI, 18); the devil (*St. Matthew*, XIII, 39); the god of this world (*II Corinthians*, IV, 4); the great dragon, the old serpent (*Apocalypse*, XII, 9).

\* *Major Synopsi*, n. 811-818.

#### a. Proof from Scripture.

In the *Old Testament* we see that our first parents are led into sin by the devil<sup>1</sup>, and that pious Job is likewise tempted by him in various ways.

In the *New Testament* the devil assails Christ Himself,<sup>2</sup> he urges Judas the traitor on to handing over the Master<sup>3</sup>, and he incites Ananias to tell a lie to the Holy Spirit<sup>4</sup>.

Besides, in general *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* warn us to beware of the temptation of the devil: "your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour... for our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness..."<sup>5</sup>

#### b. Proof from Reason.

a) On the part of God: for temptation demonstrates the need man has for grace when he is tempted; it also manifests the divine wisdom, for, in helping us when we are tempted, God shows how to choose a greater good from evil.

b) On the part of man: through temptations of various kinds man's virtue is tried and strengthened; he more readily senses his own infirmity and in this way he is moved to real *humility*; finally, by resisting temptation, he does penance for his past sins.

#### 634 2. The manner in Which Diabolical Temptation Takes Place \*

a. The devil cannot act directly on the intellect and on the will, because the intellect and the will are faculties which are entirely spiritual and in their own right—to this degree that they depend on God alone and are moved by Him alone.

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, III, 1-6, refer to F. Nau, *D. A.*, t. I, p. 917 and following.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, IV, 3-10.

<sup>3</sup> *St. John*, XIII, 2, 27.

<sup>4</sup> *Acts*, V, 3.

<sup>5</sup> *I Peter*, V, 8-9. *Ephesians*, VI, 12; refer to *St. Luke*, XXII, 31; VIII, 12.

\* Refer to the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. IV, sixth q., n. 5;

SCHRAM, *Instit. theol. myst.*, CXIV and following; *St. BONAVENTURE*, In

2 *Sent.*, dist. 8, p. 2, a. 1.



b. However, the devil can act:

- 1) On the *external* and *internal* senses, for example, on the memory and on the imagination;
- 2) On the *sensible appetite*, for these faculties are *organic* and *corporeal* and corporeal nature serves the angels. Nevertheless, in all these cases man is free and, with God's grace, is able to overcome temptation<sup>1</sup>.

## B Diabolical Obsession and Possession

### 635 1. The Idea of Obsession and of Possession.

a. *Obsession* is an action of the devil who *from the outside* as it were besets the body of a man by attacking it with various molestations and at the same time by plaguing the soul with grave temptations — for example, the history of St. Anthony.

b. *Possession* is the action of the devil who *enters* the body of a man, dwells and operates therein by making use of the body's senses and members and by producing unaccustomed and unusual acts.

*Signs of diabolical possession*, according to the *Roman Ritual* are "speaking unknown languages fluently or understanding those who speak these languages, disclosing matters that are distant and hidden, displaying powers which are beyond the nature of age or condition, and other things of this kind, all of which are stronger indications and proofs when many of them are present"

### 636 2. Thesis: *Demoniacal possessions must be admitted, even after the time of Christ. This thesis is certain.*

a. *Proof from Scripture.*

Very often mention is made in the *Gospel* of those obsessed by the devil and of the sick who are distinguished from the former: "They presented to him all sick people that were taken with diverse diseases and torments, and such as were possessed by devils<sup>2</sup>".

<sup>1</sup> *I Corinthians*, X, 13.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, IV, 24; VIII, 16.

Besides, *Christ* speaks to the devils, rebuking them and forbidding them to speak, or ordering them to depart: "And he cast out many devils, and he suffered them not to speak, because they knew him... Deaf and dumb spirit, I command thee, go out of him, and enter not any more into him<sup>1</sup>".

Finally, *Christ* gives to the Apostles the *power of casting out devils* as a power distinct from that of healing the sick<sup>2</sup>. But if demoniacal possession is nothing other than natural disease, then *Christ* deceived the Jews and the Apostles by his manner of acting and by his words — such an idea is certainly repugnant.

### b. Proof from Tradition.

It is evident from innumerable confirmations of the *Fathers* that in the first centuries there were cases of real possession by the devils, and that Christians had the power of casting out unclean spirits. These facts are equally evident from the *practice of the Church* in instituting the special order of *Exorcist* for expelling devils, and in including in the *Ritual* special prayers for liberating those possessed by the devil. Furthermore, *history* substantiates this point, referring to many cases of possession, the truth of which can hardly be called into doubt<sup>3</sup>.

### c. Proof from Reason.

Reason can show the possibility of diabolical *possession* once we posit the existence of devils. For since the devil possesses great ingenuity and power, he certainly can produce far greater wonders than can those who practice hypnotism. But these last can so govern the hypnotized person that they direct his physical and psychical powers at will, even contrary to the person's inclinations. Certainly, a fortiori, the devil can do the same.

<sup>1</sup> *St. Mark*, I, 34; IX, 24; *St. Luke*, VIII, 30.

<sup>2</sup> *St. Matthew*, X, 1; *St. Mark*, XVI, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to RIBERT, *La Mystique divine*, p. 198 and following; LERICHE, *Etude sur les Possessions en général et sur celles de Loudon en particulier*, Paris, 1859; J. SEGAUD, *Une manifestation diabolique*, Lyon, 1899.



If we ask, "Why does God permit possession?" we receive our answer from *St. Bonaventure*<sup>1</sup>: "God permits this either to show his own glory (*St. John*, IX, 3), or to punish sin, or to correct the sinner (I Corinthians, V, 3), or to enlighten us.

### 637 3. *Helps against the devils*

The helps which we should employ to protect ourselves against demons are:

- a. A purifying of conscience through sacramental confession;
- b. Reception of Holy Communion;
- c. Prayer with fasting;
- d. The use of sacramentals, especially of holy water;
- e. Exorcism, which must be practiced cautiously, and not without the permission of the bishop.

### C. *Magic*

638 In general *magic* is the *power of producing extraordinary and unusual effects*. It is distinguished in a two-fold manner: *natural*, by which marvellous or extraordinary things are accomplished through the hidden forces of nature<sup>2</sup>, or by means of skill; *diabolical* or *black magic* through which amazing things have been accomplished with the help of the devil.

Theologians distinguish the *crime*, the *art*, and the *fact* of magic. The *crime* of magic is the impious attempt to produce extraordinary results with the aid of the devil, either through an explicit or an implicit pact with the devil himself.

The *magic art* is the faculty (with certain signs posited) of producing certainly and constantly wonderful effects with the help of the devil. Its existence must not be too readily admitted. So states St. Thomas<sup>3</sup>.

*Magical facts* are phenomena performed with the devil's help, which can be explained neither by physical forces nor by the efforts of man. We have mention of such facts:

<sup>1</sup> 2 *Sent.*, dist. 8, p. 2, a. 1, q. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Some of those devoted to this kind of knowledge have come into suspicion of being in league with the devil because, from a very diligent investigation into natural forces, they have been able to do things which were considered prodigious by the common person.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 110, a. 2.

1) *In Scripture*: "And Pharaoh called the wise men and the magicians, and they also by Egyptian enchantments and certain secrets did in like manner". Similarly in the New Testament there is the same matter of magical works performed by Simon, by Elymas and by the girl with the pythonical spirit<sup>2</sup>. Also Christ and Paul predicted that there would be great signs and prodigies in the time of the Anti-christ.

2) Among the *Church writers*: while some of these may be fabled, there are, nevertheless, a few which are worthy of belief because of the teaching and piety of those who bear witness to them.

### D. *Facts which Approach Magic, Magnetism, Spiritism, and Hypnotism*<sup>3</sup>

639 **State of the Question.** In our times under the name of *magnetism*, of *spiritism* and of *hypnotism* many phenomena have taken place about which we may wonder whether they be diabolical or not.

1. *Antony Mesmer*, who died in 1815, is acknowledged as the discover of *animal magnetism*. A doctor in Vienna, he thought that he had discovered a wonderful medium in a certain most subtle fluid which supposedly flows from the bodies of animals, which, in fact, pervades absolutely all bodies.

Three phenomena in particular are ascribed to magnetism:

- a. *Convulsions*,
- b. The state of *paralysis* and of *cataplexis*, in which one's members are rigid and sensibility disappears,
- c. Magnetic *sleep*, in which state the person magnetized, although deprived of the use of his senses, nevertheless, sees, hears, and speaks, actually knows wonderful things which before were unknown to him, and perceives actions which are being accomplished secretly or at a distance.

640 2. Modern *Spiritism* had its origin in the United States of America, but soon spread throughout Europe and became common by the middle of the nineteenth century. There have been different forms of spiritism: for sometimes the spirits sent forth responses with a revolving table mediating, or through a *medium*

<sup>1</sup> *Exodus*, VII, 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts*, VIII, 9, 11; XIII, 8; XVI, 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 820-827.



or intermediary person; but occasionally the direct evocation and appearance of spirits took place. However, it is apparent that in all of these many frauds were involved.

Among the phenomena which have been *scientifically* examined and are considered to be free from fraud, these facts were of special note.

#### 641 Physical phenomena :

- a. The noise of the table which produces the responses;
- b. Objects affixed to the walls fall and are moved confusedly;
- c. The bench on which the medium sits is raised in the air; this is called *levitation*;
- d. Flames appear;
- e. Human hands, feet, head become visible, even an entire body which walks and speaks.

#### Intellectual phenomena :

- a. Distant acts are disclosed, lost objects are discovered;
- b. Responses are given which are pious, heretical, repulsive to the mind, the nature, and the dispositions of the bystanders;
- c. The presence of a spirit which is evil and fearful of holy things is revealed from the *convulsions* of the table whenever blessed rosaries are placed upon it<sup>1</sup>.

3. The phenomena of *hypnotism* are divided into three kinds :
  - a. *Somatic* or *corporeal*, which are catalepsy, lethargy, and sleep-walking;

b. *Intellectual*, the principal of which is *mental suggestion* : this takes place especially in the state of sleep-walking : that is, the hypnotized person hears and carries out all that the person hypnotizing suggests and commands;

c. *Mixed*, which, through the mediation of the imagination, are produced on the body — for instance, a bloody sweat.

The following thesis makes clear what we must think of these phenomena.

#### 642 Thesis : The phenomena of magnetism, of spiritism, or of hypnotism, through which things hidden, remote and future

<sup>1</sup> These facts have been made known by reputable eyewitness — Refer to D. D. GODEF. BROSSAIS SAINT-MARC, *Rapport épiscopal sur les tables tournantes et parlantes*, July 6, 1853 from the archives of the Chancery of Rennes.

are disclosed, are *diabolical*; but the other considerations can be explained by fraud or by natural laws.

#### Proof of Thesis

##### I. Proof from Authority.

This thesis is deduced from the various answers of the *Holy Office*; from these it is evident that :

- a. Many of these phenomena *in se* are not preternatural, nor are they illicit;
- b. Other phenomena, however, have no proportion to the means employed and are, therefore, illicit.

In answer to the question as to whether magnetism, as it is generally accepted and as it is *in se*, should be considered licit or illicit, the *Holy Office*, on June 23, 1840, replied : " If all error, soothsaying, explicit and implicit invocation of the devil is removed, the use of magnetism, namely, the act alone of employing physical means which are in all other ways licit, is not morally forbidden provided such an act does not tend to an end which is illicit or in any manner perverse. But the application of principles and of means which are purely physical to things and to effects which are *truly supernatural*, for the purpose of explaining them physically, is nothing more than deception, completely illicit and heretical ". This decision was confirmed on July 28, 1847.

Just what these *supernatural effects* are, the *Holy Office* made clear in a letter, July 30, 1856 : " While the licitness or illicitness in the use or abuse of magnetism is sufficiently explained by this general decree, nevertheless, the evil of men has increased so much that, neglecting the licit pursuit of the sciences and pursuing curiosities instead, to the great loss of souls and the detriment of civil society itself, they glory in the belief that they have found a certain principle of foretelling and of divining. Hence these followers of *sonnambulism* and of *clear vision*, as they call themselves, foolish women carried away by deceptions and by gesticulations which are not always proper, chatter on and on that they *perceive invisible* things and with rashness and senseless daring they presume and pretend to draw up teachings on religion, to call up the souls of the dead, to receive answers,



to discover things unknown and far removed, and to exercise other superstitious practices of this kind. In all of this, whatever art or illusion is employed, since physical means are ordained to effects which are not natural, we find deception which is completely illicit and heretical, and a scandal opposing the integrity of morality<sup>1</sup>.

Furthermore, on April 24, 1917, *The Holy Office* forbade "attendance at any of these spiritist manifestations whatsoever":<sup>2</sup>.

#### 643 2. Proof from Reason.

a. Proof of the first part of the thesis: the disclosure of hidden things, especially of future things, cannot be attributed to natural forces; for there is no proportion between this certain knowledge and the natural powers either of the one practicing magnetism or of the one magnetized, or of any kind of fluid. Our faculties, even when hyper-stimulated, cannot, in opposition to the laws of nature, see the secrets of hearts or the future things which are known only to God. Also, if we were to admit the existence of magnetic fluid as material, it would not be able to affect our intellect which is immaterial — not even through the mediation of the senses, because they can make known to the intellect nothing besides their own sensible impressions. It is necessary therefore to have recourse to a superior cause. This cause can be neither God nor a good Angel, for in the use of spiritism, of magnetism, or of hypnotism, employed for the detection of the occult, so many things are worthless, indecorous, and shameful that they would in no conceivable way become God and His Angels. What remains but that the devil himself is the cause. In a very special way spiritism, when it is the alleged evocation of spirits, is illicit, and its doctrine is full of errors contrary to faith.

644 b. Proof of the second part of the thesis: Physical and intellectual phenomena which do not exceed the forces or powers of the bystanders can be attributed to natural causes or to fraud. *Lekmühl* rightly declares: "It is most certain that

<sup>1</sup> A. S. S., I, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> A. A. S., XI, p. 268.

things which are wholly unusual can happen in man in an entirely natural manner because of changes in his nerves and in his brain; in fact it becomes evident that amazing hallucinations sometimes take place in an entirely natural manner".

1) A sound general principle is this, that nothing should be considered supernatural unless it cannot be otherwise explained. But hypnotic phenomena, whether mechanical, or physiological, or intellectual, provided they do not surpass the powers of bystanders, can very frequently be explained through the influence of an image on the senses and on the body itself. Even when one is particularly watchful this influence is so strong that sometimes it is sufficient to cause sickness<sup>1</sup>.

2) Suggestion itself shows nothing miraculous since, in some way, it is similar to those things which occur in the state of natural sleep; very often it happens to those sleeping that they regard as real the imaginary likenesses of things which are represented in their phantasy<sup>2</sup>. Now the hypnotized person, at the suggestion of the one hypnotizing, vividly perceives in his phantasy likenesses of things which are described, and regarding these as real, he acts in the same manner as if he were truly perceiving the very things themselves. But the authority which the one hypnotizing exercises over the one hypnotized is explained both through the consent given at the beginning by the one hypnotized wherein he abdicates, so to speak, his own will, and through the influence which the one hypnotizing possesses directly over the senses and nerves, indirectly over the will, of the subject<sup>3</sup>. Nor can it be stated that suggestion at a distant time is absolutely repugnant, provided that it be recalled by one or another means into the memory of the one hypnotized.

3) Also, phenomena which are produced by scientific experiments in a regular and nearly constant manner should not be easily attributed to the devil. But reliable witnesses affirm that the greater part of the phenomena of this kind are so produced<sup>4</sup>.

From the fact certain acts of magnetism must be attributed to the devil some argue that all acts and facts are caused by him. This argument labors under a manifest defect.

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas has noted this in *Contra Gentiles*, book III, c. 99. Refer to COCONNIER, O. P., *L'hypnotisme franc.*

<sup>2</sup> It even happens that a man sleeping and dreaming enters a conversation with another who is awake, provided this one does not break off the thread or outline of the dream.

<sup>3</sup> COCONNIER, previously referred to, p. 347 and following.

<sup>4</sup> *Revue thomiste*, 1895, p. 413 and following, 693 and following.



*their souls were created immediately by God; the opinion, once common, which asserts that even man's body was formed immediately by God has now fallen into controversy.*

That man was created by God, at least *mediately*, is so clearly stated in Scripture that no Christian can deny it.<sup>1</sup> But, in addition, it was commonly held that God *immediately* fashioned the body of Adam from the slime of the earth at the same time that He created his soul as the breath of life.

The reasons for this assertion and those against it we shall explain.

#### A Scripture

The obvious meaning of the narrative in Genesis<sup>2</sup> is that Adam's body was formed immediately from the slime of the earth, that is, from inorganic matter, but not from the body of some brute, and that the body of Eve was formed from a rib of Adam.

On the contrary, if the nature of this narrative is considered to be *popular-historic*, employing metaphors then in use among the Semites, *slime* can thus be metaphorically understood to signify only the material or physico-chemical elements from which man's body is constituted, whether they be still inanimate and inorganic, or whether they be already ordered and living in an animal organism. In other words, the sacred author intended only to teach this: man has been created by God of matter and of spirit, — without affirming anything concerning the form or the manner of being of this matter. This interpretation seems to be entirely in conformity with the principles set forth by Leo XIII in the Encyclical "Providentissimus",<sup>3</sup> and repeated by Pius XII in the Encyclical "Divino afflante Spiritu",<sup>4</sup> namely: the sacred authors do not give a properly or peculiarly scientific teaching, but "they describe and treat these very things either according to a certain manner of translation, or as the common speech reported them in those times."

The nearly unanimous interpretation of the Fathers and of the ancient Theologians, excepting Origen, Cajetan and a few others, favors the opinion of the immediate production of the human body.

On the contrary we must understand that the Fathers and the ancient Theologians only repeat the words of Sacred Scripture.

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, I, 27.

<sup>2</sup> Genesis, II, 7, 21-22.

<sup>3</sup> Ench. Bibl., n. 106.

<sup>4</sup> A. A. S., Oct. 20, 1943, p. 299.

### CHAPTER III

## MAN<sup>1</sup>

We pass now to a discussion of man, namely of his *origin* of his *elevation*, and of his fall.

#### ARTICLE I. THE ORIGIN OF MAN<sup>2</sup>

In relation to man's origin we shall briefly explain four points:

1. the *creation* of our first parents;
2. the *unity* of the human race;
3. the *nature* of man;
4. the *origin* of individual men.

##### I. THE CREATION OF OUR FIRST PARENTS

###### 645 State of the Question

We must make mention of a few facts which are related to the theories of the *transformists*. First, those who are called *materialists* and *positivists* contend that both the body and the soul of man take their origin from the brute through the natural laws of evolution without God's intervention — thus *Darwin*, *Spencer*, *Haeckel*, *Vogt*. Such an error is obviously opposed to the mosaic narration. Secondly, the *Spiritualists* or those who hold a more moderate opinion claim that man's body has been gradually formed by the progressive evolution of some species of animal, and that when it was ready for a higher life, it received a rational soul directly from God — nearly all scientific men believe thus.

**646 Thesis:** *It is de fide that our first parents in regard to body and in regard to soul were created by God: it is certain that*

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the works mentioned in the *Major Synopsis*, refer to A. D'Alès, *D. A.*, vol. II, 473-514.

<sup>2</sup> D. T. C. *Transformisme*, a. already cited.



A dispute had not arisen regarding the manner of forming the human body; this dispute they had no intentions in any way of settling. Wherefore it is apparent that *they do not propose as a doctrine of faith* the immediate formation of the body by God from the slime of the earth in opposition to the mediate formation.

647 C *By force of implied reasoning* man spontaneously avoids admitting that he has taken or drawn his origin from animality, both because of the bodily differences between man and ape and especially because of the transcendence of his intellectual soul over the sensible soul of the brute.

Contrariwise, we must note that such reasoning is not over-forceful because, when we consider the transcendence of *the whole* man over the brute, we realize that this transcendence denies that a *mere* evolution of the *body* of an animal into the body of a man can take place.

To be sure, because of the transcendence of the soul, which is called by its own proper name of *spirituality*, the soul of our first parents could arise only from a spiritual cause, and hence could be formed neither from natural forces alone nor from the biological forces of nature. More than this, since spirituality absolutely denotes the subject's independence of matter as much in being and becoming as in acting, it must be stated that the human soul could be educed by no cause from the potency of animality, but that the human soul *has been created immediately by God from nothing* and has been infused into a prepared body.

As long as the spiritual origin of the human soul is correctly preserved, the differences of body between man and ape do not oppose the origin of the human body from animality since all transformists acknowledge that man descends not from an ape but from a remote common parent (from the order of "primates") according to progressively divergent lines.

D Finally, it is pertinent to repeat for the sake of soundness the *scientific* arguments, at least briefly<sup>1</sup>; paleontological discoveries offer always more numerous and inter-allied corporal forms which are *intermediary* between modern day men and animals called "primates", and which indeed are chronologically set in order according to ascending grades and which gradually

<sup>1</sup> BERGOUNIUX et CLORY, *Les premiers Hommes*; — BONE, *L'homme : genèse et cheminement*, Nouv. Rev. Théologique, April, 1947.

approach the human form to such a degree that it becomes more and more probable, in fact it now appears almost *certain* among the *scientists*, that these successive forms have received their origin one from the other. Especially in the last discoveries (Sinanthropus, Africanthropus, Meganthropus, Java Man, New Pithecanthropus, etc.), forms have come to light which, bearing more resemblance to the superior primates and inferior to Neanderthal man, remove every gap or division between animal and man; and although they are tributed to what the French call "anthropiens", they seem to be, according to many learned men, the vestiges and signs of primitive men who were endowed with an intellect.

It seems difficult to admit a general evolution of species without also admitting that the human body was formed through evolution. For the terminus of this wonderful and progressive ascent of species obviously is man who, with his reason and freedom, has dominion over all sensible creation and in whom alone as in a proximate end is found the reason and intelligibility of all vital evolution.

#### 648 Conclusions.

1. The opinion which asserts that the human body has arisen from animality through the forces of evolution is *not heretical, in fact it can be admitted theologically*, as Cardinal Liénart declared in a fairly recent article<sup>1</sup>.

2. It is of great interest that in this question neither paleontological nor theological science should pass beyond its own proper limits and that in this way no empty conflict should arise with great danger in matters of faith to souls which would result. The greatest prudence is needed in order to propose to the unskilled this opinion about the origin of the human body; those who enjoy a reputation in the sciences must impose no burden beyond that which faith legitimately exacts.

### II. THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE

#### 649 State of the Question

That all men have taken their origin from *one* first parent in the past was denied by the Pre-Adamites (Isaac de la Peyrère,

<sup>1</sup> *Le chrétien devant les progrès de la science*, Etudes, Dec. 1947.



1655) and in modern times by the Polygenists who, while admitting evolution, think that the transition from the animal to the human body was accomplished not in one and man one woman, but in many.

650 Thesis : *The universal human race has arisen from the one first parent Adam.* According to many theologians this statement is proximate to a matter of faith.

#### A Proof from Scripture.

1. Scripture directly states that there was no creature existing when Adam was created. "And there was not a man to till the earth." "But for Adam there was not found a helper like himself." Hence Adam is called the father of the world, and Eve the mother of all the living.<sup>1</sup> Again, St. Paul directly asserts that all men are descended from one: "He hath made of one all mankind to dwell upon the whole face of the earth."<sup>2</sup>

2. This is indirectly proved from St. Paul's teaching which Catholic Tradition corroborates in regard to original sin; according to this teaching all are born infected with original sin by reason of the fact that all draw their nature, infected by sin, from the same head or source.<sup>3</sup>

#### B Reason confirms this thesis.

Today nearly all scholars confess that there are present in all men many things which argue for specific identity, namely: anatomical structure of body, physiological operations, the laws of generation and of birth, the faculty of speaking, the indefinite fecundity of marriages which are contracted among the men of every manner of diversity.<sup>4</sup> All of this positively confutes the polygenists who profess *Polyphyletism*, that is, from many "phyla" or stems of animals different in species have arisen many human "phyla".

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, II, 5, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Wisdom, X, 1; Genesis, III, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Acts, XVII, 26.

<sup>4</sup> Romans, V, 12.

<sup>5</sup> Réfer to De Quatrefages, *Unité de l'espèce humaine*; VIGOURoux, *Les livres saints et la Critique*.

Opposing the polygenists are the monophyletists, maintaining *Monophyletism*, a system which states that one human phylum has arisen from one animal phylum but that the transition has been made in many individuals of the same phylum. It must be declared that *Monophyletism* is only a hypothesis or probability which as yet cannot be proved by paleontology; nor can one conjecture just how it could be proved.

### III. THE NATURE OF MAN

651 First Thesis : *Man is composed of an organic body and a rational, spiritual, and immortal soul, which coalesce into one nature.*

This thesis is certain.

#### A Proof from Scripture.

1. God is said to have formed the body of Adam from the slime of the earth, and to have breathed into it the *breath of life*, the life principle, or the *soul*, indeed a *spiritual* soul, since by his reason man is the *image* of God who is a spirit. In this way man was made "into a living soul", or was made of one nature determined by the soul.

2. Those things which are predicated of *Sheol*, the grave, suppose the immortality of the soul<sup>1</sup>; as much is evident from the resurrection of certain bodies<sup>2</sup> and from the practice of evoking the dead<sup>3</sup>.

3. Among the prophets<sup>4</sup>, in the *Sapiential Books*<sup>5</sup>, in the Books of the Machabees<sup>6</sup>, the spirituality and the immortality of the soul are very clearly proclaimed.

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, XV, 15; XXV, 8; XXXV, 28; XLIX, 32; Numbers, XX, 26; Judges, II, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Elias raised up the son of the widow of Sarepta (III Kings, XVII, 17-24); Eliseus raised the son of the Sunamitess (IV, Kings, IV, 17-27); by a touch of the bones of Eliseus a cadaver came back to life (IV Kings, XIII, 20-21).

<sup>3</sup> Deuter., XVIII, 11; I Kings, XXVIII, 8; Isa. XIV, 19.

<sup>4</sup> Ecclesi., XXXVII, 10.

<sup>5</sup> Sap., IX, 15; III, 1-4; V, 16; Prov., XII, 28; XIV, 32; Eccl. XII, 7;

Ecclesi., 19-21.

<sup>6</sup> II Machabees, VII, 23; VI, 26; XII, 43-46.



4. In the *New Testament* the human soul is represented to us as completely distinct from the body which it survives<sup>1</sup>, as a spirit that knows the things of a man<sup>2</sup>, as immortal and capable of eternal life.

#### B Proof from Tradition.

Very often the Fathers affirm the spirituality and the immortality of the soul. Thus we read in the *Constitution of the Apostles*:<sup>3</sup> "We fully acknowledge within us an incorporeal and immortal soul".

#### 652 Second Thesis: The rational soul is *per se* and essentially the form of the human body.

This is de fide according to the Council of Vienne (1311-1312): *Defining... that whoever presumes thereafter to assert, to maintain, or to hold that the rational or intellectual soul is not the form of the human body per se and essentially, must be regarded as a heretic*<sup>4</sup>.

There are three essential included in this definition:

1. The human soul is the form of the human body or is substantially united to the body just as form is united to matter; and therefore the human soul communicates to the body its own esse, constituting, along with it, one nature.
2. *Per se*, that is, not through another, but directly, immediately through its own very self;
3. Essentially, namely, through its own essence (but not through some faculty<sup>5</sup> or through a knowledge of its operations<sup>6</sup>, or through accidental influx or influence) so that the essence

<sup>1</sup> *Matthew*, X, 28.

<sup>2</sup> *I Corinthians*, II, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Book VI, C. 11, P. G., I, 938; Refer to JOURNEL, *Enchir.* Patrist., 147.

<sup>4</sup> *D. B.*, 481; refer to 738.

<sup>5</sup> This R. J. Olivi taught, insisting that the rational soul informs the body not *per se*, but through its sensitive and vegetative faculties. This teaching was condemned by the Council of Vienne.

<sup>6</sup> The teaching and proposition of Rosmini condemned by Leo XIII: "The union of soul and of body properly consists of an immanent perception by which the subject, contemplating the idea, affirms the sensible after the subject has contemplated its essence in that (idea) or perception. *D. B.*, n. 1914.

of the soul truly elicits intellectual activities but also sensitive and vegetative activities along with the body to which it is united.

653 *Corollary.* From this it follows that the soul of man is one; and that we cannot admit trichotomism according to which man is composed of three substances, *spirit* (spiritual soul), *soul* (animal soul), and *body*. Following the Greek philosophers, *Philo*, *Apollinaris*, some *Protestants*, and *Gunther*<sup>1</sup> taught this theory.

654 *How is the soul the form of the body?*<sup>2</sup> According to *Cardinal Zigliara*, the Council of Vienne defined that the soul is the form of the body in a strictly scholastic sense. According to *Palmieri*, who defends the theories of the modern atomists, the Council defined only that the soul in man is one, that it gives life to the human body, but the Council did not define *how* the soul is the form of the body.

It is certain that the Council of Vienne did not condemn the theory of the Scotists; according to this theory there exists in man, besides a soul, a form which gives corporeal esse. But the doctrine of St. Thomas is more sound, stating that there is no other substantial form in man than the intellectual (rational) soul.

#### IV. THE PROPAGATION OF THE HUMAN RACE OR THE ORIGIN OF INDIVIDUAL MAN

655 *State of the Question.* The body of individual men is propagated through *generation*; but the question is — *how does the soul have its origin.*

A The *Originists* and the *Priscillianists* taught the *preexistence of souls*, namely: souls *per se* are incorporeal spirits and from the beginning they were created, all of them, by God; but in punishment for their defection they have been inclosed in bodies.

B According to *Traducianism* the human soul is produced from the substance of the parents: some claim from the actual bodily seed, others say directly from the soul of the parents

<sup>1</sup> VIGOURoux, *Dict. de la Bible*, I, p. 454-448.

<sup>2</sup> GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *Le sens commun*..., p. 128-131.



— this last is also called *Generationism*<sup>1</sup>. Allied to this are the opinions: of Froschammer who claimed that the soul is created by the parents through a peculiar or particular power placed in them by God; of Rosmini who held that the sensitive soul is generated by the parents and that afterwards through the enlightenment of being it becomes rational.

**656 Thesis: Human souls are created by God when they are infused into bodies.** This thesis is certain.

**A** The Council of Constantinople condemned Originism in 553: "If anyone claims the fabulous pre-existence of souls..., let him be anathema"<sup>2</sup>. *Anastasius II* rejected as *heretical* the opinion of those who declare that souls are transmitted from the seed by parents<sup>3</sup>. Froschammer was condemned by *Pius IX*<sup>4</sup>, Rosmini by *Leo XIII*<sup>5</sup>.

**B** *Scripture*<sup>6</sup> supports this thesis: "The dust return into its earth, whence it was, and the spirit return to God who gave it".

**C** The Fathers in common have supported Creationism: thus, among others, *Lactantius*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Jerome*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Gregory Nazianzus*, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*<sup>7</sup>. Their teaching *Peter Lombard* has summarized thus: "The Catholic Church teaches that souls are infused into bodies and in being infused are created"<sup>8</sup>. After reporting on the three opinions, *Generationism*, *Precristianism*, and *Creationism*, *St. Thomas*<sup>9</sup> says: "The first two were condemned by the judgment of the Church and the third was approved". The other scholastics generally agree with this.

<sup>1</sup> Thus TERTULLIAN, *St. Fulgentius*, *St. Augustine*, in varying forms; in modern times Klee and Hermes.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 203.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 170.

<sup>4</sup> In the Brief, *Gravissimas* to the Archbishop of Monac., Dec. 11, 1862.

<sup>5</sup> *D. B.*, 1910; refer to 433.

<sup>6</sup> *Ecclésiastes*, XII, 7.

<sup>7</sup> *P. L.*, VII, 73; X, 358; XIV, 366; *P. G.*, XXVII, 552; LXXVII, 22.

<sup>8</sup> *Sent.*, book II, d. 18, n. 8.

<sup>9</sup> *De Pot.*, q. 3, a. 9; *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 118, a. 2.

**D** *Reason*<sup>1</sup> confirms this thesis. If souls are transmitted by parents, they are, reasonably, transmitted by the body or by the soul. But neither can be so: not the first because the intellective principle in man is a principle transcending matter; nor the second for the soul of an infant cannot be created by the soul of the parents because creative power belongs to God alone; and is not an emanation from the soul of the parents because the soul is a simple substance from which, therefore, nothing can be taken away. Therefore souls are not transmitted by parents but are created by God.

Nevertheless, parents are rightly said to generate man because from their own substance they produce a body so set in order that, by reason of the natural law which God has established, the infusion of a soul necessarily follows or attends it (the body). Hence it is shiningly clear *how great the dignity of man is*: from the manner in which He was created by the special intervention of God: from his relationship to the world, of which he is the center, the ruler, and the priest; finally, from his nature which is in the image of God.

## ARTICLE II. THE ELEVATION OF MAN TO THE SUPERNATURAL STATE

Since God has adorned man with *supernatural* gifts also, it remains for us to explain man's elevation to the supernatural order. But because gifts both *properly supernatural* and *preternatural* were granted to our first parents, we shall consider each type successively after giving some preliminary ideas about the natural order and the supernatural order.

### I. INTRODUCTORY CONCEPTS CONCERNING THE SUPERNATURAL ORDER<sup>2</sup>

Three points must be made clear:

**A** *the concept of the natural order and of the supernatural order*;

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 118, a. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 845-854; BAINVEL, *Nature et surnaturel*, 1905.



**B** the various states in which man could have been constituted relative to his end;

**C** the errors regarding the supernatural order.

#### A The Natural and the Supernatural

We shall explain :

1. what is *natural* and what is *supernatural*;
2. what the *natural order* is and what the *supernatural order* is.

**658** 1. **The Concept of Nature.** Nature denotes three things :  
*First*, individual nature in as much as it is the principle of being and of acting;

*Secondly*, the collection of all created substances (la nature) in as much as they form, as it were, a universal principle of operation;

*Thirdly*, God Himself since He is the *author of nature*.

**659** 2. **The Concept of the natural** — By the natural we understand that which, once creation is posited, is *due to any nature or person*<sup>1</sup> :

**a.** *constitutively* or according to essence : whatever is required for establishing or constituting any being in its own species; thus body and rational soul form the essence of man;

**b.** *consecutively*, that is, according to the forces or faculties which flow from the essence itself : for example, intellect and will in man;

**c.** *exigently* or according to *needs* : thus the divine concurrence is required for exercising faculties.

<sup>1</sup> Non-Catholics, especially rationalist, often use the word *natural*, in respect to *cognition*, for what is sensible, and the term *supernatural* for whatever goes beyond experience. *Metaphysically*, they call what is finite natural, but what is infinite they call supernatural.

All three points are concerned with what is called *due or owing to nature*.

**d.** *meritoriously*, that is, according to merit, — whatever an intellectual creature can attain through the manner of moral sanction or decree; for example, the acquisition of a natural end is something natural.

What is obtained thus is called *due to the person or merited by the person* who is legitimately exercising his faculties<sup>1</sup>.

**660** 2. **The Concept of the supernatural**<sup>1</sup>. *The supernatural is properly defined as that which is completely undue to nature or to person* and is, therefore, above the essence, the faculties, the exigencies and the merit of any nature.

The words, *is above*, are used because the supernatural is beyond nature and perfects it.

The words, *essence, faculties, exigencies*, and *merit* are made use of to show that the supernatural not only transcends the constitution of any being, but that it can neither be claimed nor acquired naturally; so, the supernatural in general is that which is granted to a being *above* and *beyond* what is *due to nature* and *merited by a person*.

The supernatural is divided into the *relatively* supernatural and the *absolutely* supernatural.

The *relatively* supernatural or the supernatural *secundum quid* or the *supernatural in a definite respect* is that which is above the faculties and exigencies of some natures only, but not of every nature : thus infused knowledge exceeds the nature of man, but it is not above the nature of an angel. Related to the *relatively* supernatural is the *preternatural*, that which, while not due, nevertheless does not go beyond

<sup>1</sup> Because the word *natural* sounds like the word *original* or like what is connected with origin, oftentimes it designates widely and improperly : 1) a *truly supernatural* gift which is *linked with origin*; for example, the original sanctity of Adam, conferred at the time of his creation, is called, in this sense, natural by some of the Fathers; 2) a *gratuitous* gift which perfects nature within the limits of its innate circumstances, for example, immunity from concupiscence. For the sake of removing equivocation we should carefully avoid such a manner of speaking.



the limits of natural perfectibility, but which perfects any being *in its own species*: the gift of bodily immortality, conferred on Adam, was *in itself* something natural, a continuation of natural life, so to speak. But by reason of the subject on which it was conferred it was supernatural, because immortality is not at all due to a being which is of itself corruptible.

The *simply or absolutely supernatural* is that which goes beyond the exigencies and faculties of all nature, created and create-able. It is divided into the *substantially* supernatural (supernaturale *quoad substantiam*) and the *modally* supernatural (supernaturale *quoad modum*). The *first* is intrinsically supernatural, that is, *in se*, in its entity; it is a certain participation in divinity. As a matter of fact there are only three examples of this: the hypostatic union, grace and glory. The second, that is, the *modally* supernatural, is something extrinsically natural but produced in a supernatural way; for example, the resurrection of the dead; or ordained in a supernatural manner for a supernatural end, for example, the act of acquired temperance set in order for eternal life.

#### 661 4. The natural order and the supernatural order.

*Order is the apt disposition of means to an ultimate end.* For such order four things are required: an *agent*, namely man, an *end* to which the agent tends, a *medium* through which the agent tends to an end, a *law* through which means are rightly set in order to an end.

a. A *natural order* is the apt disposition of *natural means* to a *natural end*. For man it is thus set up:

1. His *end* is the possession of God known through reason in a *discursive manner*;
2. The *first agent* is God, the author of nature; the *second agent* is human nature with its own proper faculties;
3. The *objective media* are created things known by reason; the *subjective means* are the faculties and the exercise of them, under the influence of God's natural concurrence;

4. The *law* is the *natural law*, ingrafted in the hearts of all, with the conclusions which can be deduced from it.

b. The *supernatural order*, which is the apt disposition of *essentially supernatural means* to a *supernatural end*, is thus constituted for man:

1. His *end* is the knowledge of God in a perfect and intuitive manner, face to face, and a similar love of God, because love follows knowledge;
2. The *first agent* is God, the *author of grace and of glory*; the *second agent* is human nature elevated to a higher mode of operating through *sanctifying grace*, the infused virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit;
3. The *objective means* are divine revelation and the sacraments, et cetera; but the *subjective means* are the light of faith and the exercise of faculties under the influence of the supernatural concurrence of God or of actual grace;
4. The *law* is the complexus of positive precepts which God can add to the natural law.

#### B The Various States of Human Nature Relative to Grace and Preternatural Gifts

662 State is here taken for a complexus of all the conditions or circumstances which set man in order to his end. There are six states in which human nature can be conceived in relation to grace and to preternatural gifts:

1. The state of *pure nature*, when neither grace nor preternatural gifts are bestowed; this state consists of the possession of any good due to human nature and of the absence of all undue good. This state is possible, but de facto it never has existed.
2. The state of *unimpaired nature* includes, besides the perfections of pure nature, the extension of these perfections *in their own species*, beyond the exigencies of nature, namely, *immunity from concupiscence, from ignorance, infirmities and death*.
3. The state *simply supernatural*, in which man would be destined for a supernatural end, and would be provided with



the means for attaining this end, without the privileges of unimpaird nature.

4. The state of *innocent nature*, in which grace and preternatural gifts are simultaneously bestowed. This state, which as a matter of fact was Adam's state, is also called the state of *original justice* or holiness.

5. The state of *nature, fallen and restored*, in which we are now involved, consists of this, that man remains destined for a supernatural end and at the same time is *capable through Christ* of recovering grace, but not the preternatural gifts, at least in this present life.

6. The state of *nature, fallen and not restored*, would have been the same as the preceding, but without any redemption.

### C Errors concerning the Supernatural Order

663 There are two outstanding errors: *naturalism* and *pseudo-supernaturalism*; to these we can add *augustinianism* and *immanentism*.

1. *Naturalism* rejects or diminishes whatever is supernatural. Thus the *Pelagians* deny man's elevation to the supernatural state. The *Unitarians*, the *Liberals*, and the *Rationalists* teach similarly; so also do the *Modernists*, according to whom the supernatural is a certain emanation coming forth from some inmost sense.<sup>1</sup> The *Atheists* and the *Positivists* claim that man has been evolved spontaneously from something irrational and they reject any dogma which is concerned with the supernatural.

2. *Pseudo-supernaturalism* admits the state of *original justice* and *integrity* for Adam and at the same time it states that these privileges were *essential* to human nature (*Luther*), that these privileges pertained to a complete or perfect human nature (*Calvin*), that they were *due* to nature (*Bauius* and *Jansenius*).

3. *Dangerous systems: Augustinianism* — Some theologians, particularly of the order of St. Augustine, declare that grace and the gifts granted to our first parents and lost through sin are due to man from the *nobility* of the Creator. According to some Catholic adherents to *immanence*, grace, while supernatural, is *demande*d or required by human nature in its present state wherein it is destined for a supernatural end.

<sup>1</sup>D. B. 2074 and following.

## II. THE EXISTENCE OF GRACE IN ADAM<sup>1</sup>

There are two points to be proved under this heading: first, that our first parents were established in the state of *holiness* and of *justice*; secondly, that this state is *gratuitous* or *supernatural*.

664 **First Thesis:** *Our first parents were established in a state of holiness and of justice.* This thesis is de fide from the Council of Trent: "If anyone does not confess that the first man Adam... lost the *holiness* and justice in which he had been constituted... let him be anathema<sup>2</sup>."

### A Proof from Scripture

In the *Old Testament* we find arguments which are very probable and which, with the added interpretation of the Fathers, become certain. From *Genesis* it is obvious that between God and man there was a certain *friendship*<sup>3</sup> before the state of misery and of reprobation was incurred; that, in addition, man had been created *in the image and likeness* of God, or, according to the force of the Hebrew text, in a most similar image<sup>4</sup>: from parallel places<sup>5</sup> we gather that this very suitably denotes the state of grace; in the book of *Ecclesiastes* (VII, 30) we read that man was created *right* — from the biblical way of speaking<sup>6</sup> this indicates sanctifying grace.

From the *New Testament* it is obvious that, since we are justified by sanctifying grace<sup>7</sup>, we are *renewed*, we are *reconciled*, we are *restored* to the state in which *the first man*

<sup>1</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 855-863.

<sup>2</sup> D. B., 788.

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, II, 18-24; III, 8; refer to A. MERCIER, *Le surnaturel*.

<sup>4</sup> *Genesis*, I, 26.

<sup>5</sup> *I Peter*, I, 4; *I John*, III, 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Psalms*, XXXII, 1; CXI, 2, 3, 7; *Proverbs*, XIV, 2; XXI, 18; *Wisdom*, X, 10;

Refer to JOURNEL, 1955.

<sup>7</sup> *Romans*, III, 24-25.



was<sup>1</sup>; this very plainly proves that Adam was constituted in this same grace.

#### B Proof from Tradition

Among the *Greeks*, St. Irenaeus declares that the first man was like to God through a participation in the *Holy Spirit*<sup>2</sup>; but this likeness, says St. *Athanasius*, was restored to us through Christ<sup>3</sup>.

Among the *Latins*, St. Jerome affirms that through the grace of the Holy Spirit we receive "the image and likeness into which we were placed in the beginning"<sup>4</sup>. St. Augustine also says this<sup>5</sup>: "The Spirit of grace accomplishes this, that He restores in us the image of God in which we were naturally made".

The Second Council of Orange defined the matter contrary to the Pelagians<sup>6</sup>: "Even if human nature remained in that integrity in which it was founded, it would in no way preserve or save itself without the help of the Creator".

#### 665 Corollaries.

1. As to the time at which our first parents were justified, it is commonly taught, as does St. Thomas, that Adam was created by God in the state of grace: these texts are forceful: "Let us make man to... our likeness... who was created in justice and in the holiness of truth".

2. In addition to sanctifying grace, our first parents possessed the infused virtues and the gifts of the *Holy Spirit* by means of which the faculties were disposed to eliciting supernatural acts and to meriting and gaining their ultimate end.

#### 666 Second Thesis: The state of original justice bestowed on our first parents was gratuitous and truly supernatural. It is

<sup>1</sup> *Ephesians*, IV, 23; *II Corinthians*, V, 18-19; *Colossians*, I, 13-14.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Hæres.*, book III, C. 18, 1-2; book V, C. 1, P. G., VII, 932, 1137.

<sup>3</sup> *Orat. de Incarn.*, 3, 4, 8, 44, P. G., XXV, 101 and following.

<sup>4</sup> *In Ephes.*, IV, 30, P. L., XXVI, 514.

<sup>5</sup> *De Spir. et Litt.*, C. 27, *JOURNAL*, 1732.

<sup>6</sup> *D. B.*, 192, 175.

*de fide*, in opposition to the *Pelagians*<sup>1</sup>, that the present order of grace is above the exigencies of fallen nature. It is *certain* that this order is above the forces even of innocent nature — this contrary to the *Protestants*. *Baius*, and the *Jansenists*: from the condemnation by *Pius V* of the twenty-first proposition of *Baius*: "The sublimation and exaltation of human nature into a participation in the divine nature was due to the integrity of its first state, and therefore must be called natural, not supernatural"<sup>2</sup>. Therefore the contradictory is true, namely, such an elevation is supernatural.

It is commonly taught, contrary to *Ripalda* and some few others, that this same state is beyond the forces and faculties even of a possible creature.

#### Proof from Scripture.

The grace which is conferred on us is truly supernatural because by it we are made the *adopted sons of God*<sup>3</sup>, *partakers in the divine nature*<sup>4</sup>, and thus we become suited for seeing and loving God just as the Three Divine Persons know and love themselves. <sup>5</sup> But the grace given to Adam was the same as the grace given to us (section 664).

#### Proof from Tradition.

The Fathers teach this thesis by openly declaring that the power of sanctifying is proper to God alone, and thus is above the exigencies of any nature. So *St. Basil*<sup>6</sup>.

#### Proof from Reason.

It is repugnant that the whole human race, because of the fault of one, be deprived of the perfection necessary for

<sup>1</sup> At the Council of *Carthage*, approved by Pope St. Zosimus, can. 5; *D. B.*, 105.

<sup>2</sup> The propositions of *Baius* were condemned in the *proper sense of the words intended by the defenders and assertors* as respectively heretical, erroneous, suspect, temerarious, scandalous, causing offense to pious ears; therefore none of these propositions may be safely upheld. All of this is also apparent from the condemnation of proposition 35 of *Quesnel* and of proposition 16 of the *Synod of Pistôia*, *D. B.*, 1385, 1516.

<sup>3</sup> *I John*, III, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *II Peter*, I, 4.

<sup>5</sup> *I John*, III, 2.

<sup>6</sup> *De Spiritu Sancto*, C. 16, P. G., XXXII, 136; *JOURNAL* 950.



attaining its natural end. Therefore, grace, which Adam lost for himself and for us, does not belong to human nature or grace was not due to human nature.

**Corollary:** Against the teaching of *Cardinal Noris*, of *Berti*, and of the *Augustinians* we can in practice conclude that the grace bestowed on our first parents was not so due in conformity with the nobility of the Creator that God by reason of a power set in order could not deny this grace. For what is owing from a certain nobility or decency is not entirely gratuitous and supernatural.

### III. THE GIFT OF INTEGRITY WHICH WAS GRANTED TO OUR FIRST PARENTS

**667** In addition to grace, four gifts were conferred on our first parents which constitute the state of integrity. These are, as regards the soul, immunity from inordinate concupiscence and from ignorance; as regards the body, immunity from death and from the miseries of this life. To these were added a certain dominion over the animals and forces of nature. We shall explain at this time the existence of these gifts and the gratuitousness of them.

**668 First Thesis:** Our first parents were constituted in a state of unimpaired nature, that is, they were immune from concupiscence, from ignorance, from grief and from death<sup>1</sup>.

**A** They were immune from unrestrained concupiscence, or from inordinate inclination to sensible goods either illicit or licit, but beyond or contrary to reason.

#### I. Proof from Scripture.

In Scripture<sup>2</sup> these three points are made clear: first, before the fall our first parents were not ashamed of their nakedness; secondly, after the fall they were observing and thinking of their nakedness; thirdly, thus it was because of their disobedience. These three points show that before their

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 864-875.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, II, 25; III, 7, 11.

sin our first parents were not harassed by the incitement of concupiscence.

#### 2. Proof from Tradition.

**a.** In the case of the text just quoted the *Fathers* testify that Adam was free from carnal concupiscence. St. Augustine says: "They were not ashamed; for what was there to be ashamed of since they discerned or felt in their members no law that was opposing the law of their mind"? St. Cyril of Alexandria writes: "The mind (of Adam) was completely and always occupied with the vision of God, and his body rested in tranquillity and repose, immune from any shameful pleasure; in him there was no tumult caused by irrational sensations".

**b.** The *Council of Trent* declares that concupiscence is called sin by the Apostle, "because it is of sin and inclines to sin"; but if it is of sin, it did not exist before sin.

#### c. Proof from Reason.

It was fitting that, as long as man, in his state of innocence, remained subject to God, his lower powers would obey reason, and the body would obey the soul, that in this way the order would be complete and perfect; in turn then immunity from concupiscence was founded on or placed in this subjection of inferior powers<sup>2</sup>.

**669 B** They were free from ignorance in this sense that from the beginning they received from God infused knowledge, both natural and supernatural, in proportion to their state and to the nature of moral Head of the whole human race; that is, a knowledge of religious and of moral matters necessary for their own instruction and for that of their children; also a knowledge of physical affairs necessary for functioning in paradise and for watching over it.

**I.** From Scripture it is plain that Adam was constituted the physical and moral head of the human race. (*Romans*, V, 12-19; *I Corinthians*, XV, 21-22). But Adam could not carry out so great a duty without a special knowledge which he possessed from the beginning.

<sup>1</sup> Session V, can. 5; refer to session VI, can. 5; *II Council of Orange*; *D. B.*, 174, 186.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 95, a. 1.



2. Many of the *Fathers* extol Adam's knowledge. Among the *Greeks*, St. Cyril of *Alexandria* writes: "Our first father Adam seems to have attained to wisdom, not in time like us, but from the very first moment of his birth he is shown to be perfect in intelligence...<sup>1</sup>". So also wrote St. John Damascene<sup>2</sup>. Both authors refer to *Genesis*<sup>3</sup>.

670 C Our first parents were immune from the necessity of dying, in this sense, that, on the completion of a period of probation, they would be transported living to an immortal life. This statement is de fide from the Councils, from the Council of Trent<sup>4</sup> in particular, which defines that the first man through sin incurred "the wrath and indignation of God and thus death with which God had previously threatened him".

#### 1. Proof from Scripture.

Directly, where it is stated: "God created man incorruptible... but by the envy of the devil death came into the world"<sup>5</sup>.

Indirectly, from the places wherein it is made clear that death is a punishment for sin: "For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death"<sup>6</sup>, but that death of which He is speaking is the death of the body we gather from the context (*Genesis*, III, 19), and from St. Paul: "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death"<sup>7</sup>.

#### 2. Proof from Tradition.

The Fathers insist often and expressly that man, of his nature mortal, was adorned with the privilege of immortality.

<sup>1</sup> In *Joan.*, book I, c. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *De fide orthodox.*, book II; refer to *JOURNAL*, 2104, 2360.

<sup>3</sup> Today, however, it is commonly admitted that this thesis cannot be proved from *Genesis*, II, 19-20, where it is related that Adam gave names to living creatures (refer to Hummelauer); nor can it be proved from *Ecclesi.*, XVII, 6 since the words, "He created in them the science of the spirit..." are not found in the *Septuagint* and since, moreover, the Hebrew text is wanting. Refer rather to *Romans*, V, 12-19; *I Corinthians*, XV, 21-22.

<sup>4</sup> Session V, can. 1, *D. B.*, 788.

<sup>5</sup> *Wisdom*, II, 23-24.

<sup>6</sup> *Genesis*, II, 17.

<sup>7</sup> *Romans*, V, 12.

Summarizing the teaching of the Latin Fathers, St. Augustine explains what kind of immortality was granted to our first parent<sup>1</sup>: "He was mortal because of the condition of his animal body, but he was immortal through the beneficence of the Creator". He defends this theory in opposing the Pelagians; against these the *Synod of Carthage* (418) decreed: "Whoever says that Adam the first man was created mortal in such a way that, whether he sinned or did not sin, he would die in the body, that is, he would go out from the body not in punishment of sin but by the necessity of nature, let him be anathema"<sup>2</sup>.

#### 3. Proof from Reason.

It was fitting that, as long as the soul remained submissive to God, the body similarly would be perfectly submissive to the soul and would be preserved incorruptible by it.

671 D Our first parents were immune from grief and enjoyed singular happiness.

This thesis is certain. It is obvious:

1. From the description of paradise; in this three features in particular express the loveliness of the place: the fruit-bearing trees, the river divided into four heads, the gold and the precious stones;
2. From the fact that sorrows and excessive labors are shown as the punishments for sin;
3. A certain impassibility seems to follow from bodily immortality<sup>3</sup>. This is confirmed by the various traditions of peoples concerning the golden age.

672 E To these privileges can be added five others, namely, dominion over the animals, by reason of which they were subjected to man not unwillingly; after God created man he said: "Let

<sup>1</sup> *De Gen. ad lit.*, book VI, c. 25, n. 36. *P. L.*, XXXIV, 354, refer to *Journel*, n. 231.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 101.

<sup>3</sup> *JOURNAL*, 1762.



him have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth...<sup>1</sup> *It was fitting indeed that, as long as man was subject to God, those things which are naturally inferior to man would also obey him.*

**673 Second Thesis :** *The gifts of integrity, bestowed on our first parents, were gratuitous and preternatural.* This is certain.

#### A The Argument in general.

1. The following propositions (26, 55)<sup>2</sup> of Baius were condemned: "The integrity of first creation was not an undue exaltation of human nature, but was its natural state." "God could not have created from the beginning man such as he now is born." We must note at this point that these propositions were rejected *in the sense intended by their advocates.* However, the words, *as he now is born*, in the sense of Baius mean nothing more than man *without grace and without the gift of integrity.* The contradictory statement is therefore a safe one, namely, integrity was not due to human nature, but God could have created man as he now is born, that is, without grace and the gift of integrity, accordingly with a *certain* ignorance and concupiscence, infirmities and death.

2. From experience it is clear that the entire human race lost the gifts of integrity through Adam's sin. But it does not appear just that men, through no fault of their own, lose gifts which are due to human nature itself.

#### B Immunity from Ignorance.

In the order of knowledge that alone is strictly due to man which will enable him to know his end, namely God, and the means to attain this end. But man is able to know all this without integrity of intellect, that is, without special acuteness of understanding, facility and correctness of intellect, and also without infused knowledge: for man is so equipped by nature that step by step he ascends from sensible things to spiritual matters by *reasoning, by induction, by syllogism.*

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, I, 26-28; refer to *Eccl*, XVII, 4.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1026, 1035.

#### C Immunity from Concupiscence.

This immunity is not due to man because:

1. In itself concupiscence is not repugnant since it is not sin;
2. It is not contrary to *freedom* for, in spite of concupiscence, man can still judge rightly and follow the judgment of reason, with the assistance of divine help which will never be denied;
3. Concupiscence is not inconsistent with *man's natural state* for, on the contrary, concupiscence naturally proceeds from man's constitution: it cannot but happen that the sensible appetite sometimes tend to the good which reason rejects and thence that conflict naturally arise.

#### D Immortality.

Likewise *immortality* is not due to man; for death can eventuate *naturally* in two ways, either from an extrinsic cause, for example, from fire, water, the sword, etc., or from an internal cause, namely, natural corruption.

#### E Impassibility.

This is not due to man because his nature, something sensitive, is subject to various sensations; furthermore, since impassibility is a natural corollary of immortality, it is sufficiently apparent that it is not due to one who is naturally mortal.

### 674 Corollaries.

1. *The state of pure nature is possible.*
  - a. This is evident from the condemnation of Baius' proposition previously referred to.
  - b. The state of pure nature consists in this, that man be destined for a natural end and that he receive the means sufficient for attaining this. But God is not bound to give to man anything further, since grace and the preternatural gifts are wholly undue to man (sections 666, 673 and following).

2. From what has been stated we realize that the goods bestowed on our first parents were *natural, preternatural, and supernatural.*



ARTICLE III. MAN'S FALL<sup>1</sup>

Under this heading we consider : *first, the fall of our first parents or original sin at its origin or by way of origin; secondly, original sin in the human race or original sin reproduced.*

I. THE SIN OF OUR FIRST PARENTS  
OR SIN AT ITS ORIGIN

We treat of *the existence, the effects, and the nature* of this sin.

## 675 A Its Existence.

*Our first parents transgressed the order given to them by God and therefore they sinned gravely.* This is *de fide* from the *Council of Trent*<sup>2</sup> : " If anyone does not confess that the first man, Adam, when he transgressed the commandment of God in paradise immediately lost the holiness and justice in which he had been constituted, and through the offense of that prevarication incurred the wrath and indignation of God, and thus death with which God had previously threatened him and, together with death, captivity under his power who thenceforth had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil, and that the entire Adam through that offense of prevarication was changed in body and soul for the worse, let him be anathema ". In this way Adam's *sin* and its special effects are defined.

1. *Proof of the first part of 675 : Our first parents transgressed the order given them by God.*

*Proof from Scripture.* From *Genesis* it is clear that our first parents received a real order and that they freely transgressed it by eating the forbidden fruit. In addition,

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 882-888.

<sup>2</sup> *Session V*, can. 1; *D. B.*, 788.

the fall of our first parents is mentioned in *Wisdom*, in *Ecclesiasticus*, in *Tobias*, in *St. Paul*<sup>1</sup>.

*Proof from Reason.* Reason asks only *how could Adam have sinned* since he was immune from concupiscence. He alone is by nature impeccable whose rule is his own will : but this is proper to God because He is not ordained to a superior end. Also it was better that men and angels be both free and peccable in order that they might attain their end freely and not coercively. Nor was confirmation in grace something that was due to man; not perchance something fitting and accordant — that is, if we view the question broadly.

2. Proof of the second part of 675 : *Our first parents sinned gravely.*

a. This is obvious from the *seriousness of the precept, shown first*, in the end of the precept, imposed that the tribute of subjection and of obedience be paid to God, *secondly*, in the *threat of a grave punishment* such as is the penalty of death for body and for soul.

b. That Adam's transgression was a grave sin is clear also from the *effects* of the sin on our first parents and on their posterity : through sin our first parents lost grace or the intimate and supernatural friendship with God<sup>2</sup>; they lost also the preternatural gifts, as we see in the mosaic narrative<sup>3</sup>.

## 676 B The Effects of Our First Parents, Sin.

Through sin they lost :

1. *Supernatural gifts or grace* (they had sinned gravely);
2. *Preternatural gifts*, that is, immunity from concupiscence, immortality, and happiness, which were joined to the sanctifying grace bestowed on Adam. As to grace and immortality the teaching is *de fide* from the Council of Trent

<sup>1</sup> *Wisdom*, II, 24; *Ecclesi.*, XXV, 33; *Tobias*, IV, 14; *Romans*, V, 12-19; *I Corinthians*, XV, 21-23; *I Timothy*, II, 13-14.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, III, 9-23.

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, III, 7-19; 16-20.



(already quoted in section 675); as to the other gifts the teaching is *certain*.

### 677 C The Nature of Our First Parents' Sin.

According to the decision of the *Biblical Commission* (section 593), both the *entirely allegorical* or *mythological* explanations of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen, of the liberal Protestants and of Loisy, and the completely literal explanations of the old Commentators on Genesis<sup>1</sup> must be rejected. The opinion of St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> appears more probable to us; according to this the first man sinned through pride, by inordinately seeking after divine likeness, *principally* in regard to a knowledge of good and of evil, wishing to determine for himself, through the power of his own nature, what was good to be done and what was bad; but *secondarily* in regard to his own power of acting, so that by virtue of his own nature he was working for the purpose of attaining happiness.

Then disobedience resulted from pride<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, Adam committed the sin of inordinate love for his wife; Eve, on her part, was guilty of the sins of *scandal* and of *unfaithfulness*<sup>4</sup>.

As to the question of the *conversion of our first parents*, the common opinion is that they attained salvation<sup>5</sup>. In the Greek Church the feast of Adam and of Eve is celebrated on the Sunday which precedes the Nativity of Our Lord<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Declarations of *Biblical Commission*, June 27, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 63, a. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> According to St. Thomas, therefore, the eating of the forbidden fruit was something entirely secondary; thus the difficulty disappears which results, according to the Rationalists, from the lack of proportion between the command and the punishment. Indeed, according to St. Thomas, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 81, a. 2, and *de Malo*, q. 4, a. 8, the sin of Adam infected the entire human race, in as much as it was the first grave sin; to this degree that if Adam had not sinned but any of his posterity had sinned, this one would have brought original sin into his posterity. L. BILLOR also teaches this, *Original Sin*, 1910, p. 13-14.

<sup>4</sup> *I Timothy*, II, 14.

<sup>5</sup> *Wisdom*, X, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Refer to X. LE BACHELET, *Adam*, in *D. T. C.*, I, 379.

## II. ORIGINAL SIN IN ADAM'S DESCENDANTS

We divide this topic into four sections: first, *its existence*; secondly, *its effects*; thirdly, *its nature*; fourthly, the *agreement* of this dogma with *reason*.

A *The Existence<sup>1</sup> of Original Sin in Adam's Descendants*  
 678 **Errors:** This the *Pelagians*, the *Unitarians*, and the *Liberals* deny; also, the *Rationalists* hold that it is inconsistent with reason.

**Thesis:** *All men and every man naturally born of Adam, with the exception of the Blessed Virgin, in their conception contract a sin which is rightfully called original sin.* This is *de fide* from *The Council of Trent*<sup>2</sup>: "If anyone asserts that the transgression of Adam injured him alone and *not* his posterity, and that the holiness and justice which he received from God, which *he lost*, he lost for himself alone and *not* for us also; or that he, being defiled by the sin of disobedience, *has transfused* only death and the pains of the body into the whole human race, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul, let him be anathema, since he contradicts the Apostle who says: *By one man sin entered into the world*, etc."

### I. Proof from Scripture.

a. In the *Old Testament* the transmission of Adam's sin is inferred<sup>3</sup> from certain texts, and in particular from its entire economy which was the manifestation of a fallen state from which the Messiah alone could free the human race.

b. In the *New Testament* original sin is affirmed *implicitly* in the Gospels, *very clearly* by St. Paul in his *Epistle to the Romans*<sup>4</sup>. Treating explicitly of justification (or of the

<sup>1</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 889-904.

<sup>2</sup> Session V, can. 2; *D. B.*, 789.

<sup>3</sup> "Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed? Is it not thou who only art?" *Joh*, XIV, 4.

<sup>4</sup> For behold I was conceived in iniquities (*Hebreæ*, deformity), and in sins (*Hebreæ*, sin) did my mother conceive me."

*Psalms*, L, 7. Refer to *Eccl*, XXV, 33; *Wisdom*, II, 23-24.

<sup>5</sup> *Romans*, V, 12-19.



infusion of grace) he sets up a parallelism between Christ and Adam and shows that *all men die* because *all have sinned*, in truth *through Adam*, — just as *all are reborn through Christ*: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom *all have sinned*... death reigned from Adam unto Moses even over them also who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam, who is a figure of him who was to come... For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners". From these words we see that *through Adam a certain sin entered into this world*, that is, *into all men*. But this sin is original sin: for *first*, it is a *real sin*, because it is opposed to justice or grace (verses 18, 19) and is "to condemnation"; but *secondly*, it is not *actual sin* because it is even in those "who have not sinned after the similitude of the transgression of Adam", (verse 14); *thirdly*, it is a *special sin*, however, which, committed by Adam alone, passes over into all his descendants as an *inheritance* by reason of the *solidarity* through which all men are united with Adam (the head of the human race, who is a figure of him who was to come), just as all are united with Christ.

## 679 2. Proof from Tradition.

We must distinguish two periods: *before* and *after* the Pelagian heresy. In the *first* of these periods belief in original sin was *explicit* and strong, but it was not expressly proposed; in the *second* or *latter* period it was proposed *more frequently* and *more explicitly* and finally it was defined.

<sup>1</sup> Whether *in quo* (Greek ἐν ᾧ) means *in Adam* or *by the fact that, because, is disputed* among the Commentators. The *first* opinion, stating that *in quo* means *in Adam*, is supported by the Latin Fathers whose authority, however, in the question of Greek philology is not so great as that of the Greeks; it is supported, too, by many ancient Catholic scholars and some modern scholars. The *second* opinion is backed up by syntax and the manner of speaking of the Greeks; it is supported by Greek Fathers most skilled in their language, by many versions, and by several outstanding modern scholars. Whatever interpretation is accepted, it does not refer to the proving of this thesis; for even if *in quo* means the same as *quia, because, or quatenus, seeing that*, the whole context insists on this, that death and sin have passed over into *us through Adam*, both because it is stated: "by one man sin entered into this world", and because it is later added: "by the offence of one many died... as by the offence of one unto all men to condemnation".

a. *Before the Pelagian heresy*, throughout the first four centuries, belief in the transmission of original sin was affirmed in a two-fold way: *First, through the practice of the Church*, which administered the sacrament of baptism even to *infants*, and in truth unto *the remission of sins* — this we learn from the actual rite of immersion, from the symbols, from the various exorcisms at baptism, from the Fathers who in common corroborate this truth as early as the third century, and from the text of *St. Cyprian*, who, together with sixty-six African bishops, wrote in *Epistle LIX*, 5: "A newly born infant has committed no sin except that, having been born in the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted from the first moment of his birth the contagion of ancient death, he who comes forward more easily in order to receive the remission of sins because of that very fact that *not his own sins*, but sins of another are being remitted to him".

*Secondly*, from the testimony of the Fathers as they set forth Catholic dogma incidentally. Thus, in the *second century St. Irenaeus*<sup>1</sup> wrote: In the first Adam we have offended God by not carrying out his command, but in the second Adam we have been reconciled, having become obedient even unto death. For we were debtors to no one else but to him whose precept from the very beginning we had transgressed". In the *third century*, besides St. Cyprian whom we have previously quoted, we find *Origen* over and over again affirming the transmission of original sin: "Whatever soul is born in the flesh, is defiled with the uncleanness of iniquity and of sin". In the *4th century* Didymus<sup>2</sup> stated: "All contract (sin) in succession from Adam;" and among the Latins St. Ambrose<sup>3</sup> wrote: "We have all sinned in the first man, and through the succession of nature there is a succession of fault also transfused from one into all". Rightfully therefore did St. Augustine oppose the Pelagians with the authority of the Fathers: "I have not fashioned or invented original sin which the Catholic faith has believed in from ancient times, but you, who deny it, without doubt you are the new heretic..."

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Haeres.*, book V, c. 13, n. 3, P. G., VII, 1168, JOURNAL, 255. Refer to St. Justin, *Dial. with Trypho*, n. 88, P. G., VI, 686, JOURNAL, 140; THROPHIL. ANTIQCH, *Ad Autolyce*, II, 25, P. G., VI, 1092 JOURNAL, 183.

<sup>2</sup> In *Levit.*, VIII, 3, P. G., XIII, 1334, JOURNAL, 495. Refer to TERTULLIAN, *De Testimonio animae*, c. 3, P. L., I, 613, JOURNAL, 286.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra Manich.*, 8, P. G., XXXIX, 1096, JOURNAL, 1077.

<sup>4</sup> *Apost. prophetæ David*, P. L., XVI, 915, JOURNAL, 1291.

<sup>5</sup> *De nup. et concup.*, book II, c. 12, n. 25, P. L., XLIV, 450.



On account of this Catholic truth, in their treatment of sermons on divine matters, the holy, blessed and famous priests, *Irenaeus, Cyprian, Reticus, Olympius, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory, Innocent, John Chrysostom, Basil*, to whom I add the priest (elder), whether you are unwilling or willing to list him, Jerome (and) to pass over those who have not died, (these famous priests) preach against you their opinion about *the original sin of all men in its fruitful passage from generation to generation* <sup>1</sup>.

680 b. In opposition to the *Pelagians* <sup>2</sup> *St. Augustine* very expressly defended the existence of original sin by means of Scripture of Tradition, and of reason: he confirmed the Catholic thesis from the miseries of this life which affect infants themselves and which cause such disturbance within us that, unless we admit a certain original fault, they seem to stand out in opposition to the holiness and justice of God <sup>3</sup>.

Furthermore, *St. Augustine* combined the provincial councils for the purpose of condemning Pelagianism. The Council of Carthage (418) stated, canons 1 and 2: "Whoever says that Adam the first man was created mortal in such a way that, whether he sinned or did not sin, he would die in the body, that is, he would go out from the body not because of punishment for his sin but by reason of the necessity of nature, let him be anathema. Likewise, whoever denies that children newly born from the womb of their mothers must be baptized, or says that these are baptized indeed unto the remission of sins but that they contract from Adam nothing of original sin, which is atoned for by means of the

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Julianum*, book II, c. 10, n. 33, *P. L.*, XLIV, 697, *Journel*, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> *Pelagius* taught that Adam, created as a mortal, was not adorned with grace, that his sin harmed himself alone but not the human race, that all infants are born in the same state in which Adam was before his sin, and that they are able, without receiving baptism, to enter *eternal life* although they would remain exiles from the kingdom of heaven. He made a distinction between *life eternal* or beatitude and the kingdom of heaven for entrance into which baptism was necessary according to *St. John*, III, 5. According to *Pelagius*, by nature we are good, but by baptism and grace we become better: in baptism are conferred a spiritual illumination, the adoption of sons of God, citizenship in the heavenly Jerusalem, sanctification and a transferring into the members of Christ, and possession of the kingdom of heaven.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra Jul.*, VI, 67 and following, *P. L.*, XLIV, 865 and following; *Conf. Jul. op. imperf.*, I, 1, 27, 29, 49; II, 87, 119; V, 48, 64; VI, 36; *P. L.*, XLV, 1061 and following; *De Civit. Dei*, book XXII, c. 22, 1-3, *P. L.*, XLI, 784-785.

washing of regeneration... let him be anathema <sup>1</sup>". This decree was approved by *Zozymus* who wrote an *explanatory epistle* in which he correctly explained the Church's belief <sup>2</sup>. Later at the Council of *Ephesus* (431) <sup>3</sup> he again condemned Pelagianism. *St. Celsine*, confirming the decrees of *Innocent* and of *Zozimus*, rejected the errors of the Semi-pelagians <sup>4</sup>.

## B The Effects of Original Sin on Adam's Descendants <sup>5</sup>

### 1° IN THE PRESENT LIFE

We shall consider what is *certain* and what may be *freely* discussed.

#### 681 What things are certain.

The first effect is the loss of *sanctifying grace*. This is *de fide*, the Council of *Trent* declaring that Adam lost holiness or original justice not only for himself but also for us <sup>6</sup>. This loss of grace is at the same time a sin and a punishment for sin: since it is an habitual *aversion* from God, it is a sin or a sinful state; as a *deprivation* of a gift previously granted, it is a punishment.

The second effect is the loss of *preternatural gifts*. This is clear from the decree of the Council of *Trent* which states that "the entire Adam was changed in body and soul for the worse <sup>7</sup>", and that this condition passed over to his descendants. Through the loss of these gifts man is called *wounded*, that is to say, the powers of his soul, formerly perfectly united, have been, as it were, divided and separated <sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *D. B.*, 101-102.

<sup>2</sup> *P. L.*, t. XLV in appendix, p. 1730.

<sup>3</sup> *D. B.*, 126.

<sup>4</sup> *Ep. 21* at *Ep. Galliarum*, 431 — *D. B.*, 129-142.

<sup>5</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 905-918.

<sup>6</sup> Session V, can. 2; *D. B.*, 789.

<sup>7</sup> Session V, can. 1, *D. B.*, 793.

<sup>8</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 85, a. 3.



The wounds of fallen man are: in relation to his *body*, passibility and mortality; in regard to his soul, the following four:

- a. The wound of *ignorance*, through which the intellect is so debilitated by comparison to the state of original justice that with difficulty it recognizes what is true, especially, practical and moral, truth, that it easily falls into error, and is more inclined to consider temporal things than eternal things;
- b. The wound of *ill-will*, because of which the *will* is prone to evil and with difficulty overcomes vices and cultivates the virtues;
- c. The wound of *infirmity*, through which the *irascible appetite* labors under sluggishness when difficulties arise and at the same time is prone to becoming inordinately angry;
- d. The wound of *concupiscence*, through which the *concupiscible appetite* is immoderately moved to sensible good, even in opposition to reason and order.

We must realize, however, that the force of *concupiscence* is *not the same in all*, as the spiritual directors of souls know: for once the bonds are broken by means of which original justice held the passions in check, these passions are then so much the more violent by reason of the fact that they were stronger by force of natural temperament<sup>1</sup>.

The *third* effect of original sin in Adam's descendants is the *tyranny of the devil* over the human race — according to the words of *St. Peter*<sup>2</sup>: "By whom a man is overcome, of the same also he is the slave".

## 682 What things are controverted.

Among theologians there is the discussion as to whether man is *weaker in the state of fallen nature than he was in the state of pure nature*.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologica*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 82, a. 4, ad 1.  
<sup>2</sup> *II Peter*, II, 19.

Following *St. Augustine*, some theologians have taught that the *natural forces* of man *have been made intrinsically weaker* towards good because of original sin. However it appears that such an opinion should be rejected because:

1. It is not just that one be despoiled of the natural gifts due to him without his own personal fault.
2. It is not fitting that God infuse into our souls a positive habit that inclines us to evil.

*Suarez*, *Bellarmino*<sup>1</sup>, many Jesuit theologians, and several others, going further, teach that the natural forces of man *were diminished neither intrinsically nor extrinsically*, and that man is *now in the same state as he was in the state of pure nature*. This opinion is actually *probable*, but it seems that it does not sufficiently explain the words of the Fathers and of the Councils which assert that fallen man, although free, has been impaired in his forces or faculties; nor does it explain our moral impotence for knowing what is true, for accomplishing the good that is difficult, and for over-coming grave temptations.

Many *Thomists*, among them Goudin and Billuart<sup>2</sup>, contend that the natural powers of man have been diminished not indeed *intrinsically* but only *extrinsically*, since there are in our present state extrinsic obstacles which were not present in the state of pure nature, namely, the *tyranny of the devil*, *aversion from God* as *our natural end*, and *withdrawal of helps*, and other things of this kind.

This opinion seems *more probable* to us: both as regards the *tyranny of the devil* which would not exist in the natural order: and as regards the *loss of aids*. In the state of pure nature God would have owed it to himself to grant to man the natural helps by which he could have morally conquered grave temptations, while in the present state, with supernatural helps withdrawn, we are involved in a certain moral impotence of conquering all the grave temptations collectively taken and of accomplishing the good which is very difficult. However, it is not evident that Adam's descendants have been turned away from God as a natural end because of original sin. Man *naturally* tends toward God and there is nothing to prove that this natural tendency has been changed by original sin<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Refer to *Suarez*, *Grace*, Prolegomenon, IV, c. 9; *Bellarmino*, *Grace of the First Man*, c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Goudin, *Grace*, q. II, a. 4, concl. 3; Billuart, *Grace*, Diss. II, a. 3.

<sup>3</sup> When, in this connection, we are called the *children of wrath by nature*, the *enemies of God*, we must understand these terms as of the *supernatural order*, not of the natural order. It can hardly be conceived how God can create a soul that is naturally alienated from Him.



683 **Thesis:** *Little children or the feeble-minded who die with original sin only do not enjoy the intuitive vision of God.* This is *de fide* from *The Council of Florence* which defined: "The souls of those who die in actual mortal sin or in original sin only directly descend into hell to suffer punishments of different kinds<sup>2</sup>". But in hell there is no beatific vision: therefore —

*Proof of Thesis.*

- a. *Scripture* states that baptism is necessary for salvation (*St. John*, III, 5; *St. Mark*, XVI, 16).
- b. Innocent III very accurately makes a distinction between punishment for actual sin and punishment for original sin: "The penalty for original sin is the *privation of the vision of God*; but the penalty for actual sin is the *torment of eternal hell*"<sup>3</sup>.
- c. Besides, the *Council of Trent* decreed that baptism is necessary for little children to attain eternal life<sup>4</sup>.

684 There is some controversy as to whether those dying with original sin only are *sorrowful* because they are deprived of the beatific vision.

Some, with *Bellarmino*, answer in the affirmative because these souls know, at least in judgment, that they have been deprived of the greatest good; however, these theologians acknowledge that the grief of these souls would be most mild<sup>5</sup>. But others, *St. Thomas*<sup>6</sup> included, say that much more probably these souls are not in sorrow. Little children are not sad because they are without the supernatural blessedness which they cannot know about without faith. Also, some of these theologians believe

<sup>1</sup> *St. Thomas, De Malo*, q. 5; *Diction, Moris sans Baptême*.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 693.

<sup>3</sup> *Book III Decretal.*, tit. 42, c. 3., *D. B.*, 410, 102, 175.

<sup>4</sup> *Session V*, can. 4, *D. B.*, 791.

<sup>5</sup> *Bellarmino*, previously quoted, book VI, c. 6 and 7.

<sup>6</sup> *In II Sent.*, dist. 33, q. 2, a. 2.

that these souls will not be present at the general judgment because that will bring together only the adults.

There is also discussion as to whether those dying in the state of original sin will suffer *punishments of the sense or fire*.

Some Latins, *St. Augustine*<sup>1</sup> in particular, taught that these little ones experience the pain of the senses, but in a very gentle form. They descend into hell, to be sure; but in hell there is the pain of fire.

The most common opinion, defended by the Greek Fathers and by nearly all the Scholastics, holds that these children *experience the punishment of the senses in no way*. That this opinion can be maintained safely is apparent:

1. From the condemnation of proposition 26 of the Synod of Pistoia, which rejected this opinion as a Pelagian fable<sup>2</sup>;
2. From the decree of *Innocent III* previously referred to (section 683);
3. *From theological reasoning*: it does not seem proper that divine justice impose a *positive* punishment on those who in *their own* will have not sinned<sup>3</sup>.

Finally, the question is asked: do those departing this life with original sin only on their souls *enjoy a natural happiness*.

Many theologians deny that they do because, according to the *Council of Florence*, they descend into *hell* to be punished with different penalties; because they remain estranged from God also as their *natural end*.

Along with *Sfondrati*, *Suarez*, and *Lessius*<sup>4</sup>, there are some who give an affirmative answer to this question because to them it seems too hard to deprive these souls of natural goods because of a fault which is not voluntary and personal.

<sup>1</sup> *Sermon* 294.

<sup>2</sup> *D. B.*, 1526.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to *St. Thomas, On Evil*, q. 5, a. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to *Suarez, De Vitiis et peccatis*, disp. IX, s. 2, n. 18; *Lessius, de Divinis perfectionibus*, XIII, 22 and following.



St. Thomas<sup>1</sup> favors this opinion: "Although the unbaptized children are separated from God so far as that union is concerned which is a union through glory, they are not, however, completely separated from Him. In fact, they are joined to Him through a participation in natural goods: and so they will be able to take pleasure in Him through natural knowledge and love". Today this opinion has become more common. Nevertheless, it must not be stated that these little ones have attained their end. They were destined for a supernatural end; of this they are deprived and so, in this way, they are in a state of damnation.

A practical consideration in this connection — parents should be urged to have their infants baptized as soon as possible lest these children be deprived of eternal supernatural blessedness.

#### *Nature of Original Sin in Adam's Descendants*<sup>2</sup>

##### 685 1. Explanation of errors concerning this question.

The Protestants, with the exception of the Socinians, the Unitarians and the Liberals, contended that original sin:

- a. Essentially consists of an *overwhelming concupiscence* which is so great that it *destroys free will* (thus Luther and Calvin);
- b. Further, that it *wholly corrupts the very substance of man* (*Flaccius Illyricus*). The heresy of Luther, for so long a time moderately retrained, the Jansenists renewed in strength; they also taught that there is present in concupiscence the guilt of fault and that, because of it, free will is so much weakened that it is *necessarily* drawn and attracted by worldly pleasure unless it is helped by efficacious grace.

##### 2. Solutions of these Errors.

The Council of Trent defined against the Protestants: through baptism "all that which has the true and proper essence of sin is taken away", but not concupiscence; original sin is death to the soul, proper to everyone, one in origin, continued and spread by propagation, cleansed by regeneration.

<sup>1</sup> *In II Sent.*, dist. 33, q. 2, a. 2, ad 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Major Synopsis*, n. 919-940.

The same council declared<sup>1</sup>: the holiness and justice received from God he (Adam) lost for us also and he has transfused into the whole human race sin, which is the death of the soul, — the sin of Adam which in its origin is one, by propagation transfused into all, is in each one as something that is his own, — infants derive from Adam original sin which must be expiated by the laver of regeneration for the attainment of eternal life in order that in them what they contracted by generation may be washed away by regeneration, — in baptism the guilt of original sin is remitted, the whole of that which belongs to the essence of sin is taken away, and is not only canceled or not imputed; but in those baptized there remains concupiscence, which truly and properly in those born again is not sin.

This doctrine is in agreement with Scripture; according to Scripture the essence of original sin consists not in concupiscence alone but in the deprivation of supernatural justice.

##### 686 3. Various Opinions of Theologians.

- a. Before the Council of Trent. St. Augustine<sup>2</sup> recognized original sin in concupiscence, especially in carnal concupiscence, but in a sense other than that of the Protestants; he made a two-fold distinction in the matter of concupiscence: namely, the guilt of blame and the punishment for sin. He taught that the guilt of blame is taken away by baptism, but that concupiscence, as it is the punishment for sin, remains in those baptized. Therefore, not expressly indeed but really, nevertheless, he included the deprivation of justice and of grace in the nature of original sin<sup>3</sup>. St. Anselm<sup>4</sup> taught that original sin is founded in the deprivation of original justice or of the rightness of the will, that is, more probably<sup>5</sup> in the loss of grace and of the preternatural gifts.

<sup>1</sup> Session V; D. B., 787-792.

<sup>2</sup> Tixeront, II, 436-482.

<sup>3</sup> Portalié, S. Augustin, in *Dict. de théol.*, I, 2393, 2395-96; Tixeront, II, 463-465.

<sup>4</sup> *De Conceptus virginis et originali peccato*, P. L., CLVIII, 432-464.

<sup>5</sup> R. M. MARTIN, *La question du péché originel dans S. Anselme*, in *Revue des Sc. Philos.*, t. V, 1911, p. 735-749.



According to St. Thomas<sup>1</sup>, who united and improved the theories of St. Augustine and of St. Anselm, original sin consisted essentially in the loss of original justice; because this comprised two features, namely, grace and the gift of integrity, the sin consists of a two-fold element, one formal, the privation of grace, and one material, concupiscence<sup>2</sup>.

687 b. *After the Council of Trent.* The Tridentine teaching concerning original sin was set forth in a diversified manner.

1. Some thought that this sin is the sin of Adam imputed to his descendants, or persevering morally in them. Thus, somewhat before Trent, A. Catharinus and A. Pighius taught that original sin formally is the actual sin of Adam extrinsically imputed to his posterity. This can hardly be reconciled with Trent which declared that this sin is proper to everyone and is really blotted out through baptism. Wherefore, certain others<sup>3</sup>, trying to correct Catharinus' theory, said that original sin is the very sin of Adam in as much as, morally committed by his descendants and continuing morally in them, it renders them hateful to God, so that the loss of grace is only the effect of original sin. But it is not apparent how the sin is proper to each one.

2. Many of the moderns<sup>4</sup> teach that original sin is the loss of original justice by which we are turned from God as our supernatural end, since in some way this loss is voluntary on our part because of our union with Adam. In diverse manners they explain how this deprivation is voluntary on our part not by an act of our own will, but causally from the sinful act of Adam.

<sup>1</sup> *Summa theologiae*, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 81, a. 1; *De Malo*, q. 4, a. 1.

<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas, however, retains St. Augustine's way of speaking, especially when he asserts that original sin is taken away by baptism in regard to guilt, but that in its effect it remains as far as the excitement or desire, which is the disorder and irregularity of the inferior parts of the soul and also of the body. (1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, q. 81, a. 3, ad 2).

<sup>3</sup> SALMERON, TOLETUS, CARD. DE LUGO, WICHBURGENSES.

<sup>4</sup> SUAREZ, *De Vitiis et peccat.* disp. IX, sect. II, n. 18, PESCH, n. 248.

688 3. Along with many others, the Thomists say that original sin essentially consists in the loss of original justice since this loss rests on the voluntary act of the first parent who was the source and beginning of nature. Today this teaching is common. According to it, original sin is not an act, but rather a sinful state which directly infects nature (a sin of nature)<sup>1</sup>, and indirectly the person: original justice was conceded by God to Adam not only to be retained for himself, but also to be imparted to his children and to his descendants as a specific gift of human nature and an accident pertaining to the nature of the species. Therefore, because of his sin which cost him this justice, Adam transmitted to us a nature deprived of the grace, which according to the positive ordering of God, would have to be present within us<sup>2</sup>; consequently, in this sense we are born hateful to God, the children of wrath and sinners, in the state of spiritual death. According to Trent, original sin consists of the deprivation of justice, which was received from God, which Adam lost not only for himself but also for us. But this justice includes habitual grace and the gift of integrity. Thus original sin is comprised of the privation of both, principally of grace and secondarily of integrity.

#### COROLLARIES

689 1. *Original sin is transmitted through generation to all those who are born of the seed of Adam.*

a. All those and only those contract original sin who receive human nature from Adam. But human nature is transmitted through generation to those who are born of his seed.

b. *The Council of Trent*<sup>3</sup> corroborates this: "This sin of Adam, which in its origin is one, and by propagation, not by imitation transused". These words lend themselves to a two-fold understanding: first, in the sense that generation is, so to speak, the instrumental cause of original sin; secondly, in that it is only a condition sine qua non. This second interpretation is

<sup>1</sup> GONET, CLYPEUS, tr. VIII, disp. I, a. 5; BILLOT, *De peccato originali*.

<sup>2</sup> St. THOMAS, *De Malo*, q. 4, a. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Session V, 3; D. B., 790.



sufficient for preserving faith. Refer to the words of the *Council of Trent*<sup>1</sup>.

690 2. In regard to what is a matter of one's own free will, original sin has the smallest claim on us. From what has been written we see that this sin is not voluntarily in us by reason of our own will, but *by reason of the will of our head*. St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> declares: "Original sin is least of all among all the sins in this way that it embraces very little of what is voluntary. For this sin is not voluntary according to the free will of the person, but according to the *free will of the beginning of nature only*".

3. If Eve alone had sinned, probably the descendants would not have contracted original sin, for this sin is transmitted through generation. But the active principle in generation is the father, namely Adam, and not the mother, Eve.

4. If Adam had begotten sons before his sin, these would not have contracted original sin because grace, once possessed, cannot, it seems, be lost unless through one's own will.

#### D The Agreement or Consistency of the Dogma of Original Sin with Reason<sup>3</sup>

Under this heading there are two topics to be proved: that there is nothing inconsistent or repugnant about the fact of original sin; that, once original sin is admitted, the present condition of the human race is *more readily and better explained*.

691 1. *There is nothing inconsistent or repugnant about original sin:*

##### a. *In itself:*

1. Not on the side of *divine justice*, since it is a depriving of grace and of supernatural gifts or of *something which is not due*, but it assumes the essence of sin only in that thus we are deprived of grace, contrary to God's will and because of a fault committed by our head. Truly God could have

<sup>1</sup> Session VI, chap. 3; D. B., 795.

<sup>2</sup> In II Sent., dist. 33, q. 2, a. 1, ad 2.

<sup>3</sup> Major Synopsis, n. 941-948.

given grace to the human race *on condition* that Adam, our head, would not sin and thus could have extended the inheritance and solidarity which naturally flourish between a father and his descendants in regard to natural gifts into the gratuitous and the supernatural.

2. Nor on the side of *divine wisdom*: in conferring on our first parent the power to hand down grace to us, He provided sufficiently for us a means to attain our supernatural end. But furthermore, after Adam's fall He provided a more wonderful and more efficacious means in the Redemption.

3. Nor on the side of *divine goodness*: original sin notwithstanding, man keeps entire his natural gifts, in fact through Christ he is once more provided with superabundant helps of grace for his supernatural end: "O happy fault that merited our having such and so great a Redeemer".

692 b. There is nothing inconsistent in the matter of transmission. For:

1. When God creates a soul, He infuses into it neither stain nor vicious habit but He brings it forth in such a condition as it would have been in the state of pure nature. But if He does not infuse sanctifying grace into it, this is to be attributed to Adam alone who did not keep the stipulation under which such a grace was to be communicated.

2. As long as parents beget children, they are doing a work which is of *itself* good, and if the children of them are born deprived of grace, that situation is neither intended nor effected by the parents themselves, but it comes about per accidens not from their fault, but from the fault of Adam.

2. *Once the existence of original sin is admitted, the present circumstances of the human race are better explained.*

a. In this present life man is involved in and, as it were, overwhelmed by so many and such great difficulties, he is so easily turned away from God, he is so violently attracted to what is wrong, he appears so fickle in the face of problems, so prone to evil inclinations that, although it can correctly be



said that defects of this kind proceed from man's constitution, nevertheless, (once we accept the existence of divine providence) they certainly are better explained if they are viewed and meditated upon as penalties and expiations. Thus we conclude that "the human race has been infected at its origin with some sin". Or at any rate the present state of man appears as man's impotence and indigence without grace, so that the *present economy* (according to this through Adam's sin, man, *gratuitously despoiled and wounded in his natural gifts*, in the sense previously explained, can attain salvation and happiness only by the grace of the Redeemer) is a much sounder thesis than any other hypothesis.

b. That the existence of original sin better explains the present state of the human race is confirmed by the various *traditions of people* as recorded by the pagans, by poets and by philosophers. In these the existence of the fall is more or less explicitly acknowledged. Among *the Greeks*, for example, Hesiod describes the fate of *Prometheus* who, after taking away the fire from heaven, not only undergoes cruel punishments himself but also becomes the cause of the diverse evils which are spread throughout the world.

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Gentiles*, book IV, C. 52.