Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology

By Msgrs. Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, Salvatore Garofalo

Translated by Rev. Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I.

All the questions of faith from “Abolition” to “Yahweh” are adequately answered in everyday language in this modern, exact, up-to-date ready-reference book on dogmatic theology.

The first Italian edition of this renowned work by Monsignor Parente, one of the outstanding theologians in Rome, and his coauthors Monsignor Piolanti and Monsignor Garofalo, was exhausted shortly after publication, requiring subsequent printings. This success prompted a consultor at the Apostolic Delegation in Washington to recommend an English version. Father Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., associate professor of theology at the Catholic University, has given our country that welcome English version.

A Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology covers the whole scale of theology concerning the truths of God and His works. Here the Church’s teachings on the Triune God, on God as Creator, the Divinity of Christ, grace, the sacraments are amazingly concentrated into a readily understandable encyclopedic form.

The material covered also takes in some philosophy providing concise, brief answers to such problems as free will and evil, as well as ethics, mystical theology, ascetics, and law. In its historical aspect, it defines and answers the heresies that have sprung up through the centuries, and clarifies such important events as the Inquisition and the Reformation.

Besides its reference value, this book offers material that can well be read straight through by any Catholic who wishes to be informed on these phases of theology and direct this knowledge to advantage in conversation and thought.

In format it conforms to the best practices of modern typography. Each entry is set in boldface type, placed in alphabetical order, and followed by a brief bibliography for further study. Two-column arrangement makes for easy reading.

This work is the only publication of its kind . . . compact but complete in its purpose which is to “enlighten the minds of the reader by presenting the substance of dogmatic doctrine in a form that conveys synthetically but faithfully the riches hidden in the scholastic formulas.”
PREFACE TO THE FIRST ITALIAN EDITION

It is not in order to follow the fashion of our hurried day with its pre-
dilection for outlines, condensations, and telegraphic style, but to fill the
need of a class of Christians for whom the catechism is too little and
theology too much, that we have set about compiling this brief DICTIONARY
OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY for laymen.

It should be judged according to its purpose: choice of the entries and
their development, style, bibliography—all must be considered in relation
to the reader, who is the cultured layman.

To achieve brevity and clarity, we have sacrificed erudition, dialectic
virtuosity, technical formalism, and many other things. What we have set
our hearts on doing is to enlighten the mind of the reader by presenting
the substance of dogmatic doctrine in a form that is pleasing to the non-
thelogian and that conveys synthetically but faithfully the riches hidden
in the scholastic formulas.

Both the choice of entries and their manner of treatment prove difficult
in works of this kind. It has been our desire, in this first attempt, to present
an all-inclusive work, but we do not presume to have successfully accom-
plished this end. The readers will judge and their observations and sugges-
tions will be a guide in any future attempts.

Two able colleagues have collaborated with me, and others have been
generous in their counsels: Professor Piolanti, whose name I wish to place
next to my own, has treated the sacramental and ecclesiastical material.

We indulge the hope that our labor is not in vain.

PIETRO PARENTE

Rome, October 1, 1943
PREFACE TO THE SECOND ITALIAN EDITION

The flattering reception accorded to the first edition of this Dictionary, out of print in a few months despite the difficulties of the moment, assures us that our labor has not been in vain. Evidently the work responds, at least in substance, to the desires of many people, and so it is with pleasure that we take it in hand again with the purpose of eliminating the defects, enriching the material, and rendering it in every way possible more worthy of the readers, especially the more discerning and exacting ones.

Favorable judgments have been welcome, but even more so the critical observations, insofar as these have been more useful. Criticisms of the first edition were put to good use. We wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to remind our readers of the criteria that have guided us in the compilation of the Dictionary.

1. The work is to be judged and evaluated for what it sets out to be: a clear and concise ready-reference book of dogmatic theology for cultured laymen.

2. As a consequence, the development of the entries is reduced to the necessary minimum. The scientific exactness of concept and expression is tempered in order to maintain contact with readers not accustomed to the scholastic style.

3. The choice of items is governed by the limits imposed by dogmatic theology proper; account, however, being taken of borderline material (philosophy, history, ethics and moral theology, ascetics, and law).

4. The bibliography is not and does not intend to be exhaustive. In general, works that are voluminous or too scientific or difficult of access are not cited. To cite for the sake of citing is pure ostentation, particularly in works of popularization.

In this second edition we have continued to be inspired by these criteria, but have wished to go along with the best suggestions. Speculative theology has been integrated by the addition of more than 150 entries; so-called positive theology has been amplified, considerable space being given to biblical, historical, and philosophical entries. Nor have we failed to insert the most interesting items of ascetics, mystical theology, ethics, and law that are more closely connected with dogma.

Moreover, the general and special bibliographies have been retouched and brought up to date. Finally, we have favored the request for a synthesis of all the dogmatic material: this will serve to overcome the inevitably fragmentary character of the Dictionary, orientating the reader in the vast field of theology.

We confidently await the public judgment on this laborious rewriting. Beside my name I wish to place, in addition to the already known name
of Prof. Piolanti, also that of Prof. Garofalo, for his long-standing extensive co-operation in biblical material.

May this humble work strike or rekindle in the minds of men that light of Christian faith, which is the best reconstructive force in this grave hour of the world.

PIETRO PARENTE
Rome, June 29, 1945
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3. The writings of the Fathers were diligently collected by J. P. Migne in the monumental *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* (Latin series of 221 vols. and Greek series of 161 vols.). In addition there are two later collections, more critical but far from being completed: the *Corpus* of Vienna and the *Corpus* of Berlin.
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Esdras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezch. (Ez.)</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal. (Gal.)</td>
<td>Epistle to the Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab. (Hab.)</td>
<td>Habacuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb. (Hebr.)</td>
<td>Epistle to the Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. (Isa.)</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James (Inc.)</td>
<td>Epistle of St. James</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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SYNTHESIS OF THEOLOGICAL DOCTRINE

Christian doctrine is not a fragmentary collection of truths, as a casual reader of this manual might suspect, but a compact system of truths organically elaborated, in which reason moves in the light of faith and divine revelation. It is also science, but science that transcends the subject matter and the method of common human sciences, because its principles consist in a datum or known fact which rests on the authority of God, the infallible Truth. The datum or premise is divine revelation consigned in two sources: Holy Scripture and Tradition. Custodian and authentic interpreter of both these sources is the living and infallible teaching authority (magisterium vivum et infallibile) of the Church instituted by Jesus Christ.

The act of faith is a free adhesion of reason to truth revealed by God and as such proposed by the Church. Faith is a humble act of reverence to God the Creator, who is absolute Truth; a reasonable reverence, however, because faith, while of the supernatural order on account of its object, which is revealed truth, and on account of grace which helps the will and the intellect to adhere to the divine word, nevertheless has presuppositions which appertain to the sphere and domain of reason. Such are the existence of a personal God distinct from the world, the fact of divine revelation historically ascertaining, the value of the testimony of Christ and the Church He founded.

The serene study of these prerequisites prepares for faith because it demonstrates the credibility of revealed truth, but does not determine the act of faith ("I believe"), which depends negatively on the good dispositions of the subject and positively on the grace of God.

The Vatican Council (Sess. 3, Ch. 4) affirms that "right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith"; and so Catholic doctrine proclaims the rights and dignity of human reason even with respect to faith just as it defends the integrity of human freedom with respect to divine grace.

Apostles is a scientific introduction to theology, demonstrating the possibility and the fact of divine revelation, proving in a rational way the presuppositions of faith. In the first place, apostlesis takes from sound philosophy the conclusion of the objective value of human knowledge. This truth assured, it gives the proof of the existence of God, utilizing that part of philosophy known as theodicy or natural theology: subjective proof from the light of truth that shines in the intellect, or the thirst of an infinite good that burns in the heart, or the force of the moral law which dominates conscience: objective proof from the beauty, perfection, unity, and order of the world in which we live. Both orders of proof draw their demonstrative validity from the principle of causality, which, showing the characteristics of limitation and contingency of cosmic reality and of our own internal
world (the effect), constrains the affirmation of an adequate Cause of both these characteristics in which is seen the raison d'être of ourselves and the world.

The principle of causality makes us understand not only the distinction between God and the universe, but also the determination of their mutual relationship, which is actualized in the creative act. But this metaphysical demonstration does not remain in the sphere of abstract speculation; it has a confirmation in the individual and collective consciousness, in the ethicoreligious patrimony of humanity. Religion, tendency, guiding norm, and indestructible force of the spirit, is like the nervous system of human history and manifests in a thousand forms the persuasion of moral relationship between man and God, as between son and father. These relationships are generally consecrated by the concept of a divine revelation. There is no religion that does not jealously guard a code or a tradition with the sacred title: Word of God.

Confronted with this constant and universal affirmation, not even a twentieth-century man can remain indifferent. If God has spoken, man must listen to Him and draw from the divine word a rule of life and of orientation toward his supreme destiny.

Hence the historical quest to find the true revelation.

Among the numerous religions, which claim a divine origin, Christianity presents more evident and sure guarantees of truth. It embraces and dominates the whole history of humanity; its code is the Bible, which records the pact (testament) between God and men and which is divided into two broad phases: the Old Testament which prepares the advent of Christ, the Messiah, and the New Testament which accompanies and enriches the kingdom of Christ on the move. This great book, which opens with the description of the creation (Genesis) and closes with the sinister flashes of the end of the world (Apocalypse), contains sublime truths and supernatural elements (prophecies and miracles) which seal its divine character. No book has been studied so passionately as the Bible, not to mention the myriad number of souls who have absorbed light and strength of holiness from it to the point of heroism. Let it suffice to speak of the ferocity of historical and philosophical criticism that has been unleashed on the Bible for more than a century. All the resources of genius and erudition have been engaged in turn; from this crucible, the Bible (particularly the Gospels) not only emerged substantially unchanged, but even forced the respect of its most hostile critics by virtue of its historicity and its authenticity.

Now, the Bible is centered on Christ, in whom are accomplished marvelously the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament and from whom irradiates the new light of the Gospel sealed by the miracles, especially that of Christ's own resurrection. The historicity and authenticity of the Bible being demonstrated, its contents must be accepted without reserve. Since Christ, on whom is focused the entire ancient revelation, declares Himself to be the representative of God and speaks and acts in His name, the teaching of both Testaments must be accepted as something divine; and Jesus Christ, who seals His statements with miracles, must be recognized as the Revealer par excellence and, what is more, as true Son of God, as He claims to be. In guarantee of His truthfulness stand the ancient prophecies fulfilled in Him, His own miracles and prophecies, His wonderful psychological and moral equilibrium, the testimony, often in blood, of His followers, the sublimity and victorious strength of His doctrine.

Christ, moreover, has founded a Church in the form of a perfect society with its hierarchy, its teaching authority, its means of sanctification (the sacraments). He also declared that He will remain in this Church to the end of the world, making Himself one with it, especially with its visible head (the pope), to whom He has entrusted the task of acting for Him and taking His place, by governing, by teaching, and by sanctifying.

Recapitulating the rational procedure of Christian apologetics, we may trace it schematically as follows:

Man, with his intellect made for truth, examines himself and the universe outside of himself and discovers in it the character of creation, of effect, from which he ascends to a First Cause, to a creating and provident God. Religions deal with relationship with God, with divine revelation; in his search for truth, man encounters Christianity, which offers the greatest guarantees of truth. Here revelation has Christ as its center, a divine Representative, nay, the very Son of God, who corroborates His declaration with supernatural facts. God, therefore, has spoken in the Bible through the prophets, has spoken through the mouth of His incarnate Son, Jesus Christ. And so man can and, what is more, should believe in Christ, in His word, His laws, His divine institutions.

But since the demonstration of apologetics is not mathematical but of a moral nature, the intellect can remain perplexed, especially in the face of transcendent and mysterious truths and of laws imposing sacrifices and renunciations. The conclusion of every good apologist, then, will be the possibility and the moral necessity of believing; but the act of faith itself, the "credo," needs the impulse of grace, and so it is free and meritorious.

Where apologetics ends, theology begins. It supposes the truth of revelation (objectively) and the assent of faith (subjectively). The object of theological science is God in Himself and the created world, man especially, in relation to God.

The source of theology is divine revelation contained in Holy Scripture and Tradition and understood through the interpretation of the living and infallible teaching of the Church. Therefore theological argumentation is based on the authority of God's revelation, and so is substantially dogmatic. A dogma is a truth revealed by God and defined as such by the Church; a truth, therefore, sacred and unchangeable in itself. Dogma both contains a truth accessible to human reason and, at times, a truth which transcends its capacity (a mystery). In the first instance, reason understands the truth and accepts it not only in homage to God who proposes it, but also motivated by its intrinsic evidence. Thus it is, for example, with the immortality of
the soul, which is a truth of reason and of faith. In the case of mysteries, reason adheres only through faith and on the authority of God.

From revealed truth, theology, by a dialectic process illuminated by faith, draws "theological conclusions," which are a further explanation of the revealed truth and a more or less immediate radiation from it. These conclusions are certainly more than a merely rational truth, but do not have divine value like dogma.

It is evident that dogma, even though it surpasses the capacity of human intelligence (as, for example, the mystery of the Holy Trinity), can never be in contradiction with rational principles, because it is always God who is the one source of supernatural and natural truths. God cannot be in contradiction with Himself. Theology strives to demonstrate at least that the mystery is not repugnant or counter to reason.

In a broad sense, all the sacred sciences which constitute the sum of ecclesiastical knowledge belong to theology, because they move in the orbit of faith's light and cannot proceed from the supernatural, which dominates human life in relation to God. But theology, par excellence and in the strict sense, is dogmatic theology, with which we are dealing in this work.

Dogmatic theology includes the following treatises:

1. **Trinitate**. In this treatise we study the existence, the essence, the attributes of God, especially intelligence and will with relation to the world and man. We also study the inner life of God, who is revealed as being one substance in three distinct Persons which are constituted by the relations between the terms of the two immanent processes (of intellect and volition).

2. **God as Creator**. God is the Creator of all things, including man. God not only has created these out of nothing, but conserves their being by His continual influence and determines their actions. For the angels and for man God has disposed a supernatural order, destining these privileged creatures to the immediate vision of His own essence. Both angels and men fall into sin; for the fallen angels, pure intelligences, no reparation; for man, composed of spirit and matter, God decrees redemption through the means of His incarnate Son. Original sin, transmitted in all the children of Adam (except the Immaculate Virgin Mary), wounds human nature without, however, destroying its essential properties. It creates in the life of man a vexatious sense of moral uneasiness, which gradually resolves itself in an appeal to the future Saviour.

3. **The Man-God**. The Son of God (Verbum — Word) takes human nature and makes it His own, partaker of His own personal subsistence. There is thus a "hieandric" (divine-human) being, two distinct natures and only one person. It is Jesus Christ who goes forward to endure suffering, even the martyrlike death of torture on the cross, to free man from the slavery of evil and sin. Redemption is accomplished with the life, the passion, and the death of Jesus, followed by His glorious resurrection. Man, however, must make it his own, adhering freely to Christ by faith and grace, the source of energies for a new life whose happy fullness lies in the future possession of God.

4. **Grace**. Grace is the fruit of the Redemption. This divine force is communicated to man through Christ the Redeemer. It is a certain participation of the very nature and the inner life of God. This force does not strangle but, on the contrary, demands the co-operation of free will for sanctification, the road that must be taken to arrive at the supreme goal: eternal life in God.

5. **The sacraments**. The sacraments are the channels of grace, a prolongation, as it were, of the sacred and holy humanity of the Saviour, the source of supernatural life. The assumed humanity is the instrument conjoined to the Word for the sanctification of souls. The sacraments are separate instruments, which derive supernatural efficacy from the first instrument (Christ's humanity). The Holy Eucharist is the central sacramental vitality, containing in itself the very source of grace. The other sacraments accompany man from the cradle to the grave in the various phases of his mortal life, providing him with specific help for all the difficulties and struggles to be overcome in the conquest of heaven.

6. **The Church**. By an ineffable mystery Christ found a way to incorporate in Himself the men who answer His call. He instituted the Church as a Mystical Body, of which Christ is the head and the faithful the members. The Church is a social organism, with a visible hierarchical structure and a spiritual vitality, nourished by Christ through the sacraments. The life of the Church springs from Christ the Redeemer and is guarded and regulated by the bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, constituted by the Lord as the foundation stone of His Church and its supreme pastor. This marvelous Mystical Body, synthesis of all God's works, rich in the light of truth and inexhaustible lifeblood of supernatural life, is open to all men of good will. The soul enters it, meets with Christ, purifies itself in Him, is transformed, treads firmly with Him the return road to the heart of God whence it came into being at the moment of its creation.

These are the principal treatises that constitute the solid organism of dogmatic theology. This sacred science is like an itinerary, which scans the pace of infinite Wisdom and Love toward Its creature and the pace of the creature, who has found again the way of salvation, the way that leads to His Father's house. God, Thought and Love, who contemplates Himself in the Word, His Son, and loves Himself in His Spirit, wishes a being outside of Himself to whom to communicate His perfections, His love, His life: hence the work of creation, in which man, made to the image of God and enriched by grace and other privileges, dominates. Man falls miserably into guilt and remains under the weight of sin and of the divine maldescription for centuries. Eternal Love does not tolerate so much ruin and, bending over His wayward creature, He becomes one with it by taking on His flesh; hence the Incarnation of the Word and the Redemption, which reopens the roads to heaven. And the Word inserts itself and rests in
the breast of humanity to save it; thus we have the Church with its infallible teaching body, with her graces and sacraments, sources of supernatural life. The Church is the marriage between God and man, as it were, the prolongation of the Incarnation in which Christ continues His redeeming work made up of suffering and love, living in every soul which, through the struggles and tribulations of the present life, yearns for the light and peace of eternal life.

A true romance: romance or drama made up of truth and living reality, in which man, in contact with Christ, redeems himself from guilt, liberates himself from evil, recaptures his true being, and moves on to the conquest of God, his beginning and his necessary end.

Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology

Abelard. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302).

absolution. See penance.

Acacians. Followers of Acacius, disciple of Eusebius and his successor as bishop of Caesarea in Palestine (349-366). Acacius followed in the steps of Eusebius in favoring and embracing Arianism (q.v.) in a mild form. An ambitious and incoherent man, he caused St. Cyril to be deposed as Patriarch of Jerusalem (357), became self-chosen at the Synods of Seleucia and of Constantinople (359-360), and dominated the situation under the Emperor Constantius. He accepted the Nicene faith under Jovian (against Arius), but under Valens returned to heresy, and was deposed by the Lampsacan Synod (365).

Acacius and his followers are called also Ones from the Greek term ὄνειος (like), which summed up their teaching. They reject the Anomoeans (q.v.) of Aetius and Eunomius, who taught the dissimilarity (διαφωνεῖες) between the Father and Son: they do not admit the ἰδιωτικὸς (consultant) defined at the Council of Nicaea (325) nor do they accept the ἰδιωτικὸς of the Semi-Arian followers of Basil of Ancyra, who held a substantial similarity or likeness between Father and Son; but they stop at simple similarity (ἰδιωτικός) between the two divine Persons, appealing to the authority of St. Paul, who calls Christ the image of the Father.

According to St. Hilary, this similarity proposed by the Acacians referred only to the concord or harmony of the will of the Son with that of the Father. In other words, these heretics were returning to full-blown Arianism.
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accidents, eucharistic. See eucharistic accidents.

acolythe (Gr. ἄκοιλης — he who accompanies, an attendant). The fourth minor order (see orders, holy). The office of the acolyte is to carry the candelabrum, to light the lights of the Church, and to offer the wine and the water for the Eucharist (cf. Roman Pontifical). The origin of this order goes back at least to the third century, for Pope Cornelius wrote to Fabius of Antioch (261) attests that at Rome there were 42 acolytes. Their functions, various in the beginning, were gradually determined and fixed in the current form.
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action, divine. See operation, divine.
Act, Pure. Connected with the Aristotelian theory of being, divided into act and potency. Heraclitus had reduced all reality to movement or change (mòira; poiein): Parmenides, on the contrary, had conceived reality as an intelligible being, denying motion. Aristotle, in an effort to explain change or becoming, so evident in things, came to discover that the being of the world has necessarily two phases: one of indetermination, of poverty, of capacity, of development; the other of determination, of acquisition and enrichment. Example: the seed which becomes a plant. The first phase is called potency; the second, act. Potency, or potentiality, means limited reality, which may be reduced to the minimum, to the boundary of nothingness, like prime matter; act, on the other hand, means the richness of realization and, therefore, of being. Act paces regularly the march of being toward an always greater perfection, and so the more a thing is act, the more it is in perfection, i.e., in being. A being can be conceived and can exist which is all act without any potency. Such a being would be, therefore, all perfection, i.e., all being, without possibility of development, and so without possibility of change. This Being is God, called Pure Act, because He is subsisting being (see essence, divine), fullness of being, and, therefore, immutable.

St. Thomas, following Aristotle and understanding movement as a passage from potentiality to act, proves (in the first argument or via) the existence of God as Prime Mover Immobile, who moves all without being moved, i.e., as Pure Act, Source of all perfection. Possessor of all being, in whose fullness the world participates through creation, and to whom it tends, in its becoming, as to its proper end.
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acts, notional. See notions, divine.

"ad extra, ad intra." See operation, divine.

adoptionism. Christological heresy which represents Christ not as the true natural Son of God, but as the adopted Son. This error is closely connected with subordinationism (see subordinationists) and was spread at Rome in the second century by Theodotus the Elder, coexcommunicated by Pope Victor in 190, and at Antioch in the third century by Paul of Samosata, who also was condemned. Adoptionism and subordinationism deny substantially the divinity of the Word, and so prepare the way for Arianism (q.v.).

In the eighth century in Spain, two bishops, Felix of Urgel and Elipandus of Toledo, while admiring the divinity of the Word, natural Son of the Father, thought that Christ, in His holy humanity, could be called adopted Son of God. This is mitigated adoptionism, also proscribed (cf. Council of Frankfurt and Friuli, DB, 311 and 3907; and the letter of Hadrian I to the Spanish Bishops, DB, 290). Really Christ is only natural Son of God and not adopted Son, even according to His humanity, because the terms to which filiation is referred is the person, and in Christ the person is only one, that of the Word, true Son of God (q.v.).
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Adventists. A Protestant sect founded by W. Miller, an American, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. They were called Adventists because of their belief in a proximate advent or return of Christ on earth. Miller, interpreting Daniel and the Apocalypse in his own way, believed he could determine the date of the advent of Jesus, first as March 22, then as October 22, 1844.

The prophecy unfurled, Miller's numerous followers split into different groups, among which the Seventh Day Adventists became the most numerous and prominent.

(They are so called because they are defenders of the Sabbath, i.e., rest from work on Saturday instead of Sunday.) Their first leader was R. Creston. Afterward they were headed at Washington by J. White and his wife, Ellen, who claimed to be a prophetess. From America this

BEING, supernatural. Mentioned explicitly several times by St. Paul with the proper legal term of the language of the Temple: sivus. Thus in his letter to the Romans 8:15: "For you have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear: but you have received the spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry: Abba (Father)" (cf. Eph. 1:5; Gal. 4:5). The term evokes the current concept of juridical adoption usually defined as a gratuitous assumption of an outside person as son with the right of inheritance. This human adoption is a moral substitute of natural filiation, which creates a right in the adopted person without changing his physical nature or personality. The adoption spoken of in Holy Scripture transends the natural order and therefore also the natural concept of common adoption, with which it agrees only analogously. In fact, man, who by faith answers Christ's call, according to the documents of revelation, is enriched by sanctifying grace, which establishes between the creature and God a relationship of paternity and sonship by virtue of a spiritual regeneration which resolves itself into an ineffable participation of the very nature of God. Cf. John (Prologue of the Gospel): "He gave them the power to be made the sons of God, to them who are born of God", 2 Peter 1:4: "He hath given us most great and precious promises: that by these you may be made partakers of the divine nature."

Supernatural adoption therefore means an intrinsic transformation of the soul, a vital divine communication, which makes man domesticus Dei, i.e., a member of the divine family (Eph. 2:19), like to God in being and action. In the ancient liturgy and in the writings of the Fathers divine adoption is a dominant motif: the Copts (especially St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Cyril of Alexandria) illustrate the relationship between our adoptive filiation and the natural filiation of Jesus Christ with respect to the Father, and prove that the one is the effect of the other. The Scholastics go deeper into this truth (cf. St. Thomas), and after the Council of Trent the theologians fix the expression of this truth in these terms: adoption is a formal effect of sanctifying grace by which the faithful become sons of God, and so brothers of Jesus Christ, their Cohere of eternal life.
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In theology, agnosticism is applied to the existence of God or to His nature. A classical example of agrnosticism is the doctrine of Moses Maimonides, a Jewish philosopher (†1204), who held that the attributes which we refer to God have no objective value and maintained that reason can know nothing about the divine essence. St. Thomas contributes him, demonstrating the value of our knowledge of God which, although inadequate, is however true analogically (see analogy). At an age closer to ours, agnosticism has been systematically affirmed in two broad philosophical currents: positivism and Kantianism (q.v.).

a) Positivist agnosticism (Comte, Littré, Spencer): Starting from empiricism and sensism, it restricts the limits of human knowledge to the phenomenon and the experimental fact. It is not, therefore, so much concerned with the essence as with the existence of natural things. This is the only knowledge which has the character of evidence. On the contrary, the intimate nature of things and their first cause, namely God, is mysterious. Here is the zone of the Unknowable, object of religion. God and His marvels do not concern us and, therefore, it is better to refrain from discussing these things (Littré) or we may admit them temporarily for a practical, moral, social motive (Spencer), pending scientific progress, which will be able to eliminate religion altogether.

b) Kantian agnosticism: The one objective reality for us is the phenomenon which makes an impression on our senses; the thing in itself (the noumenon) escapes us and reason replaces it by its forms or a priori categories, which are subjective. Much less can we arrive at God with reason, who transcends all Nature. I have the idea of God, but I cannot demonstrate His reality outside of myself (Critique of Pure Reason). But God can and should be affirmed by the will, as a necessary postulate (Critique of Practical Reason).

Modernism, adopting Kantian immanence, adopts also its agnosticism.
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Albert the Great. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302).

Albigenses. Heretics, followers of the ancient Manichaeans (q.v.), who expanded considerably toward the end of the twelfth century (Langue-doc) with their headquarters in Albi, whence they took their name. Actually they called themselves Cathars (Gr. καθοδόσ — pure) and were known in other countries of Europe also under other names: Catharins, Patharins, Publicans, Bulgars, etc. The Albigensian Cathars succeeded in gaining popularity and in organizing themselves in a way that threatened the Church and Catholic civilization.

Doctrine: They professed Manichaean dualism in order to explain evil. There are two principles: one good, creator of spirit and light; the other bad, creator of matter and darkness. The bad principle is the God of the Old Testament; the good principle is the God of the New Testament. The good God had created the angels, many of which sinned and were condemned to descend into bodies, becoming men. God (one, not triune), sends Jesus.
one of His angels, to free spirit from matter (redemption of men). Jesus had an apparent body (Docetism), and neither suffered nor died nor rose again, but simply taught. The primitive Church has degenerated, beginning with Constantine; God dwells in the hearts of the faithful rather than in the Church. The spirits pass from one body to the other (metempsychosis) to purify themselves until complete expiation.

The Cathars, starting from the principle that matter is evil in itself, abhorred matrimony, riches, food, and sense pleasures. The faithful were placed in one of two categories: either that of the perfect, who obligated themselves, even by vow, to the rigorous practice of Cathar ethics and asceticism, or that of the believers, to whom much liberty was granted. The perfect was constituted in his high grade by means of the consolamentum, a kind of baptism consisting in the imposition of hands, and so assumed the mission of going and preaching the new religion. The faithful received the consolamentum in danger of death to insure salvation. There was also a kind of public confession, a blessing and breaking of bread, and a hierarchy of bishops and deacons. The more dangerous element of this heresy was the category of believers, the great mass whose only requirement was faith and the desire of the consolamentum in case of danger of death; for the rest they were granted complete freedom, which degenerated easily in unbridled license.

This heresy was not only a danger for the Church, but also for civil society. Innocent III, greatly worried about it, published the famous crusade against the Albigenes, which is justified fully from a moral and social standpoint, even if in some cases it shows dark spots and exaggerations. St. Dominic, mild and luminous soul, contributed by his preaching and example to the conversion of the Albigenes to the Catholic faith, not to their destruction. About that time the Inquisition (q.v.) was inaugurated as a doctrinal proceeding against heretics. The sectarian spirit has falsified in many points the history of these events; but now many calumnies have been exposed by the calm study of the documents.

The Albigenes were condemned in their false doctrines by the IV Lateran Council (1215). Cf. DB, 428 ff.
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allegorism. A method of exegesis of Holy Scripture championed among the Hebrews by Philo of Alexandria (†42) and introduced into the Christian world by the teachers of the famous theological school of Alexandria in Egypt, founded in the second century. The greatest luminary of this school, Origen (186–254), codified the principles of allegorism. In conformity with the constitution of man, as conceived by the Platonic philosophy (body-soul-spirit), he distinguished in the texts of the Bible three senses: (1) corporal or literal, for the beginners; (2) psychic or moral, for the proficient; (3) pneumatic or spiritual, for the perfect. Not all the sacred texts, however, have all three senses; some lack the first.

Allegorism was justified with the following reasons: if the literal sense of the Bible were always held, absurdities or immoral actions would have to be admitted; Paul used the allegorical method for some texts of the Old Testament; material things — according to the Platonic theory — are figures of supersensate realities. It was the need of apologetics that made Origen adopt allegorism, although he was outstanding in works of textual criticism. The Chaldaists, insisting on the literal sense of the Bible, maintained the reality of a millennial kingdom of all pleasures (see millenarianism); the Gnostics interpreted literally the texts which attributed to God a human aspect and quality; the Jews denied that Christ was the Messiah, because He had not founded a kingdom of material and political prosperity according to the letter of the ancient prophecies. Exaggeration in the application of Origen’s method led, however, to the pulverization of the Bible, to metaphysical fantasies which seriously endangered the value of the texts.

The Antiochian school, founded at the end of the third century, fought against the Alexandrian school — represented by St. Athanasius (†373), Didymus the Blind (†398), and St. Cyril of Alexandria (†444). It insisted on the intelligently literal interpretation of the holy texts and developed the doctrine of the typical sense (see senses of Scripturé) and the theory according to which the literal sense is at the base of a more profound and deeper penetration especially of the Messianic prophecies. The most celebrated representative of this current, which triumphed over allegorism, was St. John Chrysostom (†407). Recently some Catholic writers have tried to restore the ancient allegorism, but the encyclical Humani generis has pointed out the dangers of such an endeavor.
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Americanism. Term popularized at the end of the past century in the movement and controversy arising from the ideas and methods of Father P. Hecker, founder of the American Society of Paulist Missionaries. Rather than a system, Americanism is a tendency based on certain principles of a practical nature which lack coherence. Leo XIII, aware of the danger, sent the apostolic letter “Testem Benevolentiae” to Cardinal Gibbons (1889) and through him to the episcopacy of the United States. In this pontifical document the principal errors of Americanism are brought out: the necessity of the adaptation of the Church to the exigencies of modern civilization, through abrogation of some old canons, mitigation of ancient severity, orientation toward a more democratic method; more latitude for individual freedom of thought and action, since the Holy Spirit acts on the conscience of the individual more directly than the hierarchical organization (influence of Protestantism); abandonment or subduing of the passive virtues (mortification, penance, obedience, contemplation), and concentration on the active virtues (action, apostolate, organization); favoring the religious congregations of active life. The Pope, after this calm examination, concludes with these grave words: “We cannot approve these opinions which constitute the so-called Americanism.”

Prescinding from the intentions of the “Americanists,” certainly their doctrinal and practical position cannot be made to agree easily with the doctrine and traditional spirit of the Church. Rather, to put it mildly, it opens the way to theoretical and practical errors among which the
Anabaptists (or Rebpavitizers).

Followers of a fanatic sect who re-baptized adults in the belief that baptism conferred on infants was invalid. This was the logical consequence of the Lutheran principle, according to which faith alone justifies: infants are not capable of an act of faith, and consequently their baptism is invalid. The movement, begun at Zwizau, in Saxony, in 1521–1522 by Nicholas Storch and Thomas Münzer, spread rapidly in southern Germany, and acquired adherents especially among the lower classes (artisans and peasants). Two currents quickly formed with this movement, one pacific and the other revolutionary; this last got the upper hand and involved the sect in an iconoclastic struggle which brought destruction and desolation to many provinces (churches destroyed, priests killed, goods confiscated, etc.), and which provoked a fierce repression (the peasants' war).

The inspiring idea of the sect was the establishment of God's kingdom in individual souls by direct divine influence. The individual joins the Communion of Saints independently of any external form (and so, abrogation of ecclesiastical and civil authority, of the priesthood, the sacraments, the Bible, and so forth), by mere collaboration of the individual with the impulses of the Holy Spirit (they admitted, therefore, the efficacy of good works).

The Anabaptist system, therefore, has nothing in common with Lutheranism except the starting point (only faith justifies), which was applied rigidly to the baptism of infants, but was at once softened by admitting the value of good works. After its political reverses, Anabaptism lost its revolutionary character and became organized on purely religious principles (Mennonites of Frista). Since the most vital part of their doctrine has been absorbed by the Baptists, the Anabaptists today consist of small, scattered groups in Germany, England, and the United States.
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**analogia** (Gr. ἀνάλογος—similar, proportionate, relative to another). A relationship between two things, either because of likeness or causal dependence. Analogy is the basis and soul of all human language: man always reasons and knows by way of comparison, because the natural tendency of the intellect to unity in-clines it to discover the connections and relations among different things in order to conquer their multiplicity.

Aristotle perceived the importance of analogy and fixed its fundamental laws (cf. VII Phys., c. IV; Poster. Anal. II, cc. XIII and XIV; Ethic. ad Nic., I, c. 6; Metaphys., b. IV, c. 1; b. X, c. 1; b. XII, c. 4). St. Thomas devoted much study to analogy in order to defend the value of our knowledge of divine things against the agnostic current of Jewish medieval philosophy (Rabbis Moses Maimonides). According to St. Thomas, the supposition made that God is the cause of the world, there must be a relation of likeness between one and the other, which swings between a minimum and a maximum of similarity, in such a way, however, that the creature is not so similar to God as to attain formal identity (univocality) nor so dissimilar as to be altogether extraneous (equivocality). This relationship of likeness between Creator and creature is called analogy of attribution when it consists in the simple relationship of effect to its proper cause (e.g., Matter and God), without any intrinsic reason of likeness. If, on the other hand, that relationship, in addition to causal subordination, includes also a formal likeness between the creature and God, then it is called analogy of proportionality.

On the basis of this latter kind of analogy, a created perfection, e.g., goodness, can be attributed to God and to man under the same formal concept, not in the same way, because man participates in the divine goodness imperfectly, while God is goodness itself. In every case, created perfections must be purged of every imperfection before being attributed to God. In this way we form the many concepts of God according to the perfections of His creatures. These concepts, although not expressing the divinity adequately, are not false, because just as only one perfect principle responds to the multiple created perfections which represent it imperfectly, so to the diverse concepts, which we get from things, there responds only one supreme idea imperfectly expressed.

The analogical process is realized in three phases: (1) affirmation—God is good (because creatures are good); (2) negation—God is not good (in the way creatures are good); (3) eminence—God is goodness itself (in a transcendent way).

Analogy works even in the field of revelation, where incomprehensible mysteries are expressed in analogical formulas taken from common language (natural analogy); in addition, there is supernatural analogy or the analogy of faith, consisting in comparing the mysteries among themselves to understand them better, as the Vatican Council states, Sess. III, Ch. 4 (DB, 1796).
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**anathema** (Gr. ἀναθήμα). In the proper sense it means something vowed to God, votive offerings (ex-voto) hung in the temples, from ἀναθῆμα—I put on, I hang (cf. Jud. 16:19; 2 Mac. 9:16; Luke 21:25). But in the Septuagint the word anathema generally translates the Hebrew הַל֮ל, meaning a thing or person destined to destruction by God. In the New Testament it conserves the Hebrew meaning with a slightly distinct nuance: thing or person struck by God's malediction and intended for ruin (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3; 16:22; Rom. 9:3; Gal. 1:8–9).
In ecclesiastical language, it appears for the first time in the Council of Helvira (305) with a not-well-defined meaning. Later, in the council canons of Chalcedon, anathema adds to excommunication the idea of a special curse which aggravates the penalty of separation from the Church. In the Decretales anathema corresponds to major excommunication, fulfilled in the most solemn manner. In current discipline, it is no more than excommunication inflicted with those external solemnities contained in the Pontifical Romanum (cf. CIC, can. 2257). Anathema, in actual Church discipline, is the term also used for excommunication incurred by those denying a solemnly defined truth, as is concluded principally from the dogmatic canons of the Council of Trent and the Vatican Council: “If anyone denies [this truth] . . . let him be anathema,” i.e., excommunicated.
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angel (Gr. ἄγγελος — messenger; Heb. מלאך — mal’akh). In Holy Scripture it signifies messenger or minister of God. St. Gregory the Great notes that nearly every page of written revelation attests to the existence of the angels; suffice it to recall in the Old Testament the Cherubim placed to guard the earthly paradise after the fall of Adam and Eve, the three angels who appeared to Abraham, the Seraphim of which Isaiah speaks, the Angel Raphael who helped Tobias, Michael and Gabriel recalled by Daniel, and reappearing in the New Testament, in which testimonies are more numerous (cf. the Apocalypse, the Gospels in the story of the birth of Jesus, and the Resurrection; St. Paul enumerates various classes of angels).

The IV Lateran Council speaks explicitly of the creation of the angels (DB, 428), which is therefore a truth of faith. Creation ab aeterno is excluded (IV Lat. Council and Vatican Council say ab initio temporis); it is not known precisely when the angels were created. Scripture and Tradition speak of a boundless number. The angels are pure spirits; such, in fact, Holy Scripture calls them constantly, although a few Fathers have attributed some kind of corporal nature to them. As spirits the angels do not need a material place to exist, but may be present in a material place by way of action (St. Thomas).

From the Scripture it is known that the angels are distributed in nine groups: Thrones, Dominations, Principalities, Powers, Virtues, Archangels, Angels, Cherubim, and Seraphim (names corresponding to various functions).

According to the more probable opinion (St. Thomas), the angels are not individuals of the same species, as man is, but every individual angel constitutes a species (because of the absence of matter which individualizes and multiplies forms numerically). The angels were all created in the state of sanctifying grace (they are, in fact, called saints, friends of God); but not all persevered in grace. Many of them committed, immediately after creation, a sin of pride, abusing their freedom (Lateran Council, DB, 428). Revelation speaks several times of the sin of the angels: “God spared not the angels that sinned” (2 Pet. 2:4; cf. 1 John 3:8). They were punished immediately and cast into hell: Christ attests He saw Satan being hurled down like a lightning bolt (Luke 10:18).

St. Thomas comments that the angel, understanding as by intuition, adheres unchangeably, once free choice is made, to good or to evil: therefore, the angels did not have and will not have any way to repent, differently from men, who understand by reasoning progressively.

As the good angels assist and help men for their good and salvation, so the demons (q.v.) entice to evil with temptation and can invade the body by obsession, by which the body becomes a sort of instrument of the evil spirit.
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ST. THOMAS, Summa Theol., I, q. 50—64.

Anglicanism. Predominant form of English Protestantism which, because of its conservative character, has kept itself closer to Catholicism and more resistant to the dissolving currents of modern thought. The Anglican Church had a painful origin. King Henry VIII (1509—1547), once greeted by the pope as Defensor Fidei because of his love for religion and a theological writing against Luther, allowed himself to be carried away by license and the thirst for gold to the consumption of his own apostasy and that of his kingdom. Lawfully married to Catherine of Aragon, he became infatuated with the courtier Anne Boleyn. With the connivance of Thomas Cranmer (a supporter of Lutheranism), appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry determined to marry Anne at any cost. Pope Clement VII threatened the sovereign with excommunication. Henry took revenge by severing from Rome and having himself proclaimed the religious head of the Church of England. The life of Henry VIII is sulfed with immorality and dark crimes: he put Anne Boleyn to death and married successively four women, executing one and divorcing another. He persecuted Catholics in the realm, consecrating churches and monasteries. But, notwithstanding the pleas of Cranmer and others, Henry refused openly to embrace Protestantism; rather, with his famous 6 articles, he maintained the chief tenets of Catholic doctrine and cult, except dependence on the Holy See.

Protestantism, however, spread in England in the six years of the reign of Edward VI, still a child (†1553). Mary, a Catholic who succeeded Edward VI, tried to counter this great evil with perhaps too violent a repression. Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, succeeded Mary and rekindled her father's persecution against the Catholics, favoring the Protestant current by adopting 39 of the 42 articles of Cranmer and making the hierarchy a docile instrument of the royalty. Pius V excommunicated her (1557). Elizabeth may be called the real foundress of the Anglican Church which, however, soon began to undergo crises and schisms (Puritans, supporters of pure Calvinism; Presbyterians, priests adverse to the episcopacy; Congregationalists, who demand independence and autonomy for every religious community or congregation; Baptists, etc.).

Deism and Illuminism (q.v.) dried up in great part the supernatural life of the Anglican Church which, under the action of internal ferment and the external influences of the various Protestant sects, developed into three different tendencies, which are called the three churches: (1) High Church, conservative with its episcopal hierarchy and sacramental-liturigical organism; (2) Broad Church, liberal, open to the currents of independent lay thought; (3) Low
Church, left wing, more anti-Roman, dedicated especially to the evangelical movement. In the High Church there developed during the past century the so-called Tractarianism (Tracts), soul of the Oxford Movement, headed by Pusey, Keble, and Newman. The last became a convert to Catholicism, and a cardinal. This movement contributed to clarify the position of Anglicanism, orienting it progressively more and more toward Catholicism. In 1866, however, Anglicanism was struck in its episcopal hierarchy by Leo XIII, who declared their ordinations invalid by reason of the interruption in the succession of its bishops. However, among the Protestant Church the Anglicans seem most suited to serve as a bridge for a return to Rome (see Protestantism).
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Anglican orders. The title of the ordinances performed in the schismatic Anglican Church according to the Edwardian rite, or the Ordinal promulgated by Edward VI in 1559, is a Cranmer’s invention. The imposition of hands being retained, the form of ordination is reduced to these words: Receive the Holy Spirit. The sins that you will remit, shall be remitted, those that you will retain, shall be retained. Be a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments.

After mature historical and theological investigation, Leo XIII in the bull, Apostolicæ Curae, solemnly declared these ordinations to be invalid (irritae pro Scriptus omninoque nullae, DB, 1866). The reasons on which the Pontiff bases his statement are both the lack of due form and of intention on the part of the minister, and the preceding declaration of Paul IV.

In fact, the form studiously omits any word that might indicate power of offering the sacrifice, which is the chief power conferred by the sacrament of orders (see orders, holy; matter and form). From this illegitimate change of the form one may logically conclude the lack of intention on the part of the minister, since whoever changes voluntarily a rite established by Christ in the conferring of a sacrament, shows that he does not wish to do what Christ instituted and what the Church faithfully repeats (see intention).

Besides, it is historically certain that the authors of the Edwardian rite wanted to exclude absolutely all reference to the Mass; therefore, their intention was diametrically opposed to that of Christ who instituted holy orders for the principal purpose of renewing the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Already in 1555, Paul IV, in the bull, Praeclare carissimi, and the brief, Regimini universalis, had declared null the orders conferred according to Edward’s Ordinal—a declaration which traced the guidelines constantly followed by his successors. Thus, since the entire Anglican hierarchy descends from Matthew Parker, who was consecrated bishop according to the Edwardian rite, it is absolutely devoid of holy orders and of the character annexed thereto.
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Animoism. A theory formulated by Ed. B. Tylor in the past century to explain the origin of religion. Like Spencer, Tylor starts from the premise of evolutionism (q.v.) then in vogue and maintains that man evolved from the animals. Through consideration of the phenomena of sleep and dreams, sickness and death, Tylor comes to discover in himself a vital principle distinct from the body, that is the soul, to which he attributed a kind of survival. Hence, the cult of ancestors (manism), whose spirits are said often to become incarnate in other bodies (metempsychosis). Primitive man, once in possession of the concept of soul, by an anthropomorphic tendency projected his own image on Nature, and saw in everything a body animated by the spirit. Thus began animism, which led to the cult of the forces of Nature and consequently to polytheism. By means of animism Tylor explains also the origin of fetishism and idolatry (q.v.): the fetish is any object chosen by a spirit for its habitation; reduced to the figure or representation of a superior spirit, the fetish becomes an idol, by identification of the symbol with the symbolized being. Idolatry, thus, is said to derive also from animism. Later on, by selection and by giving prominence to one of the gods (idols), it is claimed that monotheism gained acceptance.

Tylor’s theory, in the beginning, was hailed enthusiastically but quickly met with failure. Eminent scholars have pointed out the flaws and inconsistencies of the animistic structure. Its foundation especially, evolutionism, is anything but solid. Moreover, it is not true that religion follows on animism; in many primitive peoples it precedes animism. Nor is it true, as Tylor would have it, that animism was universal and uniform: it is but one of the phenomena found here and there in the history of human culture. But what checkmates the whole theory is the proved fact that monotheism, as cult of the Great Being, is found in primitive peoples before animism and polytheism, which seem rather religious degenerations.
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Animoism (Gr. ἀνίμος — dissimilar). A sect founded by Aëtius and Eunomius (Eunomians) in the second half of the fourth century. They adhered to Arianism (q.v.), maintaining that the Word is dissimilar to the Father, in so far as it is generated, and therefore is not God like the Father, since the true divinity is without beginning and so not generated (ἀγέννητος). Animoism, especially as presented by Eunomius, has interesting aspects also as regards other sects of theology, beside the Trinitarian.

Eunomius, speaking of the attributes of God, denies their value, reducing them all to mere anthropomorphic names (nominalism); only one attribute has real value, namely the attribute of ἀναστάτωσις (ingenerability), which reveals to our mind the divine essence in an adequate manner, as by intuition (a prelude of antinomism).

St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa confuted the errors of the Eunomians both in the theological and in the philosophical fields.
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Anselm. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 302); innocence; satisfaction of Christ.

anthropomorphism (Gr. ἀνθρωπομορφή—man and μορφή—form). The tendency of man to consider external things as if they were an imitation of himself. In philosophy anthropomorphism leads to extravagant conceptions, like the panpsychism of Thomas Campanella with its soul for all created things, or the cosmic sensism of Bernardine Telesio with its universal sensation, which recalls the hylozoism (living matter) of the pre-Socratics.

In religion, we find an anthropomorphic expression in animism (q.v.), kindred to these philosophical aberrations, and which is held by some authors as the origin of religion. Anthropomorphism is even more manifest in the concept of a divinity, formed to man’s likeness with his vices and virtues. The religious mythology are generally anthropomorphic; suffice it to mention the Greco-Roman mythology. In Christian revelation anthropomorphism is found in the language and in certain episodes of the Old Testament, which attribute to God human qualities at times human ways of acting (as when it speaks of God repenting, suffering, etc.). Evidently here it is a matter of metaphorical speech and style, as is proved from the context of the holy books and the sublime concepts they suggest about the nature of God (see essence, divine). The so-called theophanies (apparitions of God) in the Old Testament have special theological interest, as the one made to Moses from the burning bush. Some Fathers think they were personal manifestations of the Word (q.v.; see Logos); more correctly, the theophanies were sensitive signs of the divine presence, by which the Word appeared as a man in the midst of men.

In the history of Christian thought there is mention of the gross error of the so-called anthropomorphies who, following in the steps of a certain Aelianus in the four centuries, spread the opinion in Syria and Egypt that the biblical metaphors about God are to be understood in the literal and proper sense. St. Augustine and other Fathers speak of this error as childish and unworthy of refutation.
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Barreille, “Anthropomorphism,” DTC.
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Antichrist (Gr. ἀντίχριστος—adversary of Christ). The term is John’s but the concept is common also to other biblical authors (cf. Ezch. 28:29; Dan., Chs. 7—8; Matt. 24:15, 24; Mark 13:16, 22; Luke 21:8; 2 Thess. 2:3—12; 2 John 2:18—2:4; 3 John 7; Apoc. 11:7 ff.; Chs. 13—14).

The Antichrist is, in general, a force hostile to the person and work of Christ. The common interpretation of the Christian writers sees in the Antichrist a person distinct from Satan but sustained by him, who will manifest himself in the last days, before the end of the world, to attempt a decisive attack on and triumph over Jesus and His Church. Paul describes him as “the man of sin...the son of perdition, who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.” Whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved” (2 Thess. 2:3—4, 9—10).

What thwarts the unleashing of this formidable power is a mysterious obstacle which is at the same time considered in the abstract as a force, or in the concrete as a person. The precise identification is difficult and varies among scholars. Among modern exegeses the opinion according to which the Antichrist is not a person, but a collectivity, is gaining ground: the Antichrist signifies the agents of anti-Christianity in all times. St. John speaks of “many Antichrists” who recognized neither Jesus nor the Father, St. Paul says that the mystery of iniquity is already at work; only now someone is holding his back, until he is removed (2 Thess. 2:7). If the obstacle is always in action and is already fighting the Antichrist, this means the Antichrist too must be in existence continually. But it may be noted that the obstacle impedes the manifestation of the Antichrist, not his personal work. The Antichrist will reveal himself in the last phase of the anti-Christian struggle which rages in all times and is slowly preparing the appearance of the “son of perdition” at the end of time.
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Antidichomarians (Gr. ἀντιδικομαρινά—litigant, and Mary). A religious sect sprang up in Arabia in the fourth century, which denied Mary’s virginity, abusing certain texts of Holy Scripture (see virginity of Mary). St. Epiphanius wrote them a letter confuting their doctrine point by point.

Later on all adversaries of the virginity of Mary came to be called Antidichomarians, or simply Antinomians.
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antitype. See senses of Scripture.

Aphthartodocetism. See Docetism.

Apocrypha (Gr. ἀποκρυφα—hidden thing, from the verb ἄφηκα—hid). For the ancients, apocryph was a book containing religious doctrines reserved for the initiated; in Church language, on the contrary, it was a book not admitted to public reading in the community, notwithstanding the similarity it presented with the inspired books of the Bible by reason of the name of its presumed author and of its contents. An apocryph, therefore, is a book to be excluded in so far as it is noncanonical (see Canon of the Bible). Such books were of suspect origin and circulated by sects endeavoring to give an authoritative foundation to their teachings. Certain of them, however, are the results of the pious curiosity of readers who failed to find in the sacred books enough minute details on the persons and episodes of sacred history, wishing to complete them with material which very rarely was from a good source but usually was the product of sheer fancy. Some of these books written in good faith found credence among the faithful and the ecclesiastical writers.

In the current official Latin edition of the Bible the III and IV Books of Esdras and the Prayer of King Manasses, based on canonical texts, are inserted as an appendix. Certain liturgical texts, e.g., the Requiem (4 Esd. 233—34) were derived from the afore-mentioned two books. Modern scholars give particular attention to this considerable literary production...
which is of interest for the knowledge of the religious and moral ideas current in the times of Christ.

The vast apocryphal literature of difficult access to ordinary readers, follows the major and minor divisions of both Testaments.

The Old Testament Apocrypha, nearly always by Jewish authors, has a Messianic theme and have at times undergone Christian interpolations.

Some, like Solomon's Odes, seem entirely Christian in origin. They may be distinguished, although inadequately, in historical (dedicated to the great Old Testament figures), didactic (of ethical content), and apocalypptic (containing presumed revelations about the angels, the mysteries of nature, the future, and the Heavens and Little Genesis is noteworthy among the Apocrypha of the first kind; written by a moderate Pharisee toward the end of the second century B.C., it narrates the story of the world from creation to the exodus from Egypt, distributing it in jubilee periods of 49 years. Others are: III Esdras, III Maccabees, Ascension of Isaiah, and Testament of Solomon. Among the didactic books are not to be noted: the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, in which the Twelve Tribes descending from them; the Psalms of Solomon and of David; the Odes of Solomon; the IV Book of the Maccabees. Among the prophetic books, the Book of Henoch, to which the Apostle Jude probably refers in his Letter (5:14 f.), is well known. It is made up of various Jewish writings of the first and second centuries B.C., and is important for the knowledge of the first religious ideas of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus. In the Messianic is called "Son of Man." Other books of this same class are: the Assumption of Moses, IV Esdras, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Sibyllic Oracle (a book of Jewish propaganda among the pagans).

The New Testament Apocrypha go back to the second and third centuries, and are divided into Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses. The Protoevangelium of James is the most diffused of the gospels; it relates the life of Mary and Joseph and the childhood of Jesus; it influenced Christian art very extensively, and liturgy drew from it the Feast of the Presentation of Mary in the Temple. Other gospels are: According to the Hebrews; of the Babylonians; According to the Egyptians; of Peter; of Thomas; of Nicodemus. Among the Acts of the Apostles we may recall those of Peter; of Paul; of John; of Andrew; of Thomas. The apocalyptic epistolary is also very rich, and includes the Letter of Abgarus, King of Edessa to Jesus and the reply of the Redeemer, and the Epistle of the Apostles, and the Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians; his III Letter to the Corinthians; the letters exchanged between St. Paul and Seneca, the philosopher. Among the apocalypses we may cite the Apocalypse of Paul; of Peter; of Thomas. In general, the apocalyptic literature is mediocre and jumbled. It betrays imitation of its inspired models without catching, however, their spontaneity and balanced moderation.
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Apostolicrinism. Christological error of Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea (c. 350), which opens the way to Monophysitism (q.v.). Apollinaris started out in the struggle against Arianism by maintaining that Christ was really God incarnate (πατρικον), i.e., the Word, Son of God, united to the human nature. But the better to defend the union between the divine and the human elements, he suggests the concept of a human nature consisting only of flesh and a sensitive soul with the Word performing in that nature the function of the intellective soul (νοεμ). This is the best-known and most diffused form of Apollinarism which, however, was expressed in other fashions by various of its followers. Apollinaris spread his error even under the name of St. Athanasius—who had always been very kind to him—by fraudulent writings in one of which he placed the famous expression: μια φύσις τεον λόγου σωφροσυνή (the incarnate nature of the Word is one). This formula was afterward adopted by St. Cyril as if it were really of Athanasius, and was used as a weapon by the Monophysites, who appealed to St. Cyril's authority (see Eutychianism). Apollinaris was deposed and his error condemned in 377 and 382 by Pope St. Damasus (cf. DB, 65).

apologetics (Gr. ἀπολογητική—defense). The rational and defense and defense of the truth of the Christian faith. By reason of its universality, it is distinct from apologia (apology), which is the defense of a particular truth. More closely, the proper object of apologetics is the rational credibility of the true religion, and hence the demonstration of the fact of divine revelation through Jesus Christ, God's Legate, who entrusted that revelation to His Church. Apologetics thus has a philosophical part (the existence of a personal God, the ideas of religion and revelation, the necessity of revelation, and its discernibility by means of the miracle); and a historical part (Jesus Christ, divine Legate, historical value of the Gospels, foundation of the Church). Apologetics treats all this in the light of reason in order to dispose the mind for the divine gift of faith through the rational demonstration of the motives of credibility. According to the expression of the Vatican Council (Sess. 3, Ch. 4, DB, 1796), "right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith." Apologetics, therefore, is distinct from theology (q.v.), which proceeds in the realm and the light of faith.

Its method is twofold, one rather extrinsic, or the philosophico-historical approach, and the other rather intrinsic, the psychological approach. The former is the traditional method which was developed systematically in Scholasticism from the philosophical viewpoint, and in modern theology (from the seventeenth century) from the critico-historical viewpoint. In the past century, however, the psychological method was developed under the influence of the French Oratorian Fathers (Ollé-Laprun and Fonsagrive). It acquired a new form in the works of Blondel, who introduced the method of immanence (consideration of man in his intimate tendency to act, to accomplish, and to achieve, and in his inability to attain his ideal end; facts that necessarily involve an appeal or call for a superior help, and a real need, which only Christianity is able to satisfy). The two methods are not self-exclusive but, on the contrary, mutually integrative and complementary.
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apologists. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 301), subordinationists.

apostasy. See infidels.

Apostles. See members of the Church.

apostolicity (mark of the Church). The fourth and last characterizing mark or property which the Nicene-Constantinople Creed attributes to the true Church of Christ. Like the other three marks of the Church, it issues from the intimate nature of the Church itself. Since the Church is humanity organized socially in Christ, that is, hierarchically in Peter and the “college” of the Twelve, apostolicity is the backbone of its constitution, the guarantee of its continuity, and the condition of its fruitfulness.

Holy Scripture attests that Christ established His Church on the rock of Peter and the foundation of the Apostles (Matt. 16:18-19; Eph. 2:20; Apoc. 21:14), and the history of the nascent Church, narrated in the Acts, shows us the Apostles at work, preaching a doctrine transmitted by the Master, applying the means of salvation instituted by Him, and exercising the authority derived from Him. They then appoint successors for themselves with the same aims and purposes of teaching, sanctifying, and governing. Apostolicity implies, therefore, a legitimate continuity of succession to the chair occupied by Peter and the apostolic “college,” with the keeping of the same doctrine, of the same sacraments, and the same authority. We may imagine it as the uninterrupted relay of the popes (successors of Peter) and of the bishops (successors of the Apostles), transmitting each to the next one, throughout the ages, the torch of the same faith, the chalice of the same blood of Christ, the pastoral rod of the same authority. “Like the first branches of a tree do not die, but renew themselves and extend themselves, spreading their vital force into the new part, so it is in the Church through the succession of the pastors (bishops). In it, the episcopacy renews itself from time to time, but only by diffusion and prolongation of the apostolic life. The apostolicity of the Church is not for us, therefore, a remote or a passing fact, but something ever present, because today too the life of the Church comes from Christ into the Apostles, from the Apostles into their legitimate successors, and from them into us” (Card. Capecelatra).

A distinction is made between formal apostolicity, described above, and material apostolicity. This last means apostolic origin but with a lack of legitimate continuity, in so far as it is separated from Peter living in the Roman pontiff, to whom the bishops are subject just as the Apostles in their time were to Peter. The schismatic Oriental Church, styled the “orthodox” church, has only material apostolicity.
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apriorism (Lat. a priori). A theory which posits in the human mind ideas which precede experience or are independent of it. Distinction must be made between: (a) a priori knowledge, which is no more than either an intuitive intuition or an innate idea which precedes all sense experience; and (b) a priori demonstration, which is a process of knowledge going from cause to effect and is also called demonstration proper quid (to distinguish it from a posteriori demonstration, called quia).

Apriorism applied to our knowledge of God manifests itself: (1) as ontologism (Machmole, Gioberti) — at the base of all our knowledge there is an immediate intuition of God (primus logicum and primus ontologicum — first in the mind and first in reality); (2) as innatism (Descartes) — the idea of God is innate, i.e., infused by God Himself in our soul; (3) as transcendental subjectivism (Kant) — there is in us an idea of God, which, however, does not imply His objective reality. Instead, God is a postulate of practical reason. These three forms of apriorism conflict with the Catholic doctrine, especially as defined by the Vatican Council (see God). The so-called ontological argument of St. Anselm,
sometimes styled a simulacrum, is close to apriorism. It attempts to demonstrate the existence of God from analysis of the concept that we have of God: God is the Being to whom we can think none greater or more: as such, He must have all perfections, including that of existence: therefore, God exists. Descartes, Leibnitz, and some modern theologians have reworked this argument in various forms; but many reject it, as did St. Thomas, because it hides an illegitimate passage from the logical (mental) to the ontological (real) order.
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**Aquarians.** Heretics who, in imitation of the Ebonites, Maronites, Encratites, abstained from the use of wine not only at meals but also in the Eucharistic celebration, consecrating in bread and water. Wine for them, as for all the Manicheans, was a work of the principle of evil and a dangerous vehicle of impurity. Their presence is noted in Roman Africa in the middle of the third century, as appears from a letter of St. Cyprian to Cecilius (the first De Sacrisse Missae treatise), written to confute the usage of consecrating without wine. In this same letter the holy Bishop of Carthage explains the symbolic significance of the few drops of wine infused in the chalice of water: wine (people) is united to the wine (Jesus Christ) in order that one soul sacrifice be made of head and members.
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**Arianism.** Trinitarian heresy started at Alexandria about the beginning of the fourth century. Arians, a priest of Alexandria trained, however, at the Antioch school under Lucian, was its author. Chief points of this heresy are: (a) The one true God is not generated (from him, and is not communicable to creatures. (b) In order to create the world God generated the Word, who, since He had a beginning, is not God, but an intermediary being, between God and the world. (c) The substance of the Word, therefore, is different from the substance of God (the Father). He is called Son of the Father, not in the natural or natural sense, but in the sense of adopted Son.

Arians evidently draws the elements of his heresy a bit from Gnosticism (transcendence of God and the intermediate Being between God and the world: subordinationism), and a bit from the erroneous theory of adoptionism (q.v.), professed by Paul of Samosata at Antioch in the third century. Warned by the Patriarch of Alexandria, Arians did not abandon his false opinions. Instead he left his diocese and took refuge with his friend Eusebius of Nimedia, in Asia Minor, where he continued to spread his errors among the populace chiefly through a literary composition, a mixture of prose and poetry, called _Thaléia_. In 325 the Council of Nicaea, assembled in Bithynia with the Emperor Constantine and over 300 bishops in attendance, defined the Word to be of the same substance of the Father, _homousios_ (constubstantial), and hence true God equal to the Father. St. Athanasius, as deacon, later patriarch, of Alexandria, was the soul of the Council and of the whole struggle against the great heresy which, nonetheless, continued to circulate craftily under insidious forms (see Semi-Arians).
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**Articles of Faith.** An expression which gained popularity in the Scholastic epoch (eleventh century) to indicate especially the propositions or statements contained in the _Apostolic Symbol_ (see Symbol), i.e., the Apostles' Creed, which was first called _sententiae_ (sentences). All theologians agree in calling the revealed truths of the Symbol articles of faith, but differ in the specific determination to be given to the concept _article_.


**Aristides.** See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

**Articles, Fundamental.** The subject of a religious controversy that arose with Lutheranism in the sixteenth century. From its beginnings, the Lutheran reform saw itself threatened by fragmentarism and by that instinctive and fatal tendency to schism, which is inherent in the doctrine of _liberty of thought_ (see _free thought_), which was to produce the dizzy whirl of the innumerable sects of which Protestantism today is composed.

Having eliminated the infallible _magisterium_ of the Church, the Lutherans were quickly forced to seek another way in order to form at least an embryonic unity in the midst of such a great confusion of ideas. Accordingly, the device of _fundamental articles_ was invented which, in the intention of several theologians of the Reformation, were to constitute a minimum creed or doctrine of faith, acceptable to all the sects. Introduced by Calixtus in Germany, by Trent in Switzerland, and by Cranmer in England, the system of _fundamental articles_ was zealously elaborated in France by Jurieu, who was refuted effectively by Bossuet with arguments which retain their force today.

Actually, the system of _fundamental articles_, as a substitute for the living _magisterium_ of the Church, does not hold up. Evidently there is a gradation among the mysteries and the other revealed truths so that one is more important than another; but both Scripture and Tradition do not permit the faithful to accept certain revealed truths and reject others, even when these are of less importance. The Christian is called to adhere to Christ and His teaching _integritatim_; the unity of faith is the dominant motif of divine revelation on which St. Paul insists energetically, as, e.g.: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing and that there be no schisms among you: but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10).

There is, then, no place for selection in the truths proposed to the faith of the believers, as the Protestants would have it. Even were there the possibility of selection in order to affect the unity desired, it would still have to be proved that there is someone or something having the right to establish what the fundamental articles indispensable of belief are; and so, willy-nilly, the Protestants return to the concept of a _regula fidei_ (rule of faith) imposed by a teaching authority, which is what they denied.
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Artotyrites, an organic part or element of an organism. Therefore, not any truth of revelation is called an article, but only those truths in which the formal reason of faith (to believe on the authority of God) is present and which is bound up organically with the principal body of revealed doctrine. Thus understood, the articles of faith in theological science have the function of fundamental principles, which the theologian accepts without discussion as being certain and sure by virtue of the authority of God, absolute truth. Analogously in human sciences subordinated among themselves one takes, without discussion, its basic principles from another, e.g., physics from mathematics, architecture from geometry.
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Artotyrites (Gr. ἀρτοτύρι — bread and τύριον — cheese). Heretics of the third century who celebrated the Eucharist with bread and cheese, under the pretext that the patriarchs of old nourished themselves with such food, and that Jesus Christ would not have departed from their eating habits at the Last Supper.
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**Ascentis, asceticism (Gr. ἀσκητικός — I practice).** Ascetic or ascetical theology is the science of Christian perfection. It is based on dogma, from which it draws light and vitality; it presupposes moral theology and goes beyond it, leading man from the observance of the law to that of the evangelical counsels (poverty, chastity, obedience). It is distinguished from mystics or mystical theology (see mystics), for which it is a preparation.

Asceticism consists in the practice of the Christian virtues in order to effect the union of the soul with God, in so far as possible, on this earth. The Greeks had a physical ascetic (athletics) and an intellectual and moral ascetic, as that, e.g., of the Stoics and the Neo-Platonists, intended to free the spirit from the chains of the passions and of material things.

Christian asceticism is defined by Christ Himself, who invites to renunciation, abnegation, and the struggle for the conquest of Heaven. The Apostles and the saints of all times have understood the lesson and carried it out in full, imitating the example of Jesus Christ. St. Thomas (Summa Theol., III-II, q. 24, a. 9) has outlined, in a schema that has been classical since his time, the whole of Christian asceticism. Asceticism, according to the Angelic Doctor, tends to render man perfect in his relationships with God; this perfection ripens through love in three consecutive phases: (1) *beginners' phase*, consisting in withdrawal from sin by repression of the passions, especially concupiscence (the practice of mortification of the body and its senses comes in here); (2) phase of the *progressive* (positive phase), i.e., of those who progress in good by the practice of all the virtues under the impulse and domination of charity; (3) phase of the perfect, proper to those who, having triumphed over sin, are masters of themselves through subjection of their passions, and, therefore, adhere to God through charity and in Him foretaste the happiness of Heaven. These three grades are also called the three ways: *purgative, illuminative, unitive*.

The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola are a marvelous treatise on asceticism. It has been lightly said that Christian asceticism deadens and depresses the spirit, debases man, and alienates him from life; the best answer is the simple list of great ascetics who, touching the highest spheres of Christian perfection, have impressed new orientations on the life of peoples: St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Dominic, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Ignatius, St. Theresa.
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**Asceity.** See essence, divine.

aspiration. See baptism.

**Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.** The passage of the Blessed Virgin in soul and body from earth to life in heaven. Being immune from original sin (see Immaculate Conception), she was not subject to death, which is a penalty of that sin. For that reason some writers (e.g., Epiphanius in the fourth century) doubted, and others (Palestinian tradition) denied, the death of the Blessed Virgin. But Tradition, in prevalent part, teaches that Mary died in fact, although she did not incur the debt of death. Thus, St. Augustine, St. Modestus of Jerusalem, St. John Damascene, and others were of that opinion; thus also the liturgy (Gregorian Sacramentary, Mass of the Assumption) which introduced the feast under the titles: "Dormitio" (Sleeping), "Deposito" (Depositing or Burial), and "Pausatio" (or Pausation) — all terms relating to death. It was fitting that Mary should die, when even the Son of God had died. But Mary's death, if it took place, was a death without corruption, an ineffable passing.

Many legends on the death of the Virgin flourished (Historia Euthymii, recorded by St. John Damascene, Homily II, PG, 86, col. 748 II; Liber Transitus Sanctae Marie, PG, 5, col. 1233). But abundant liturgical documentation, dating at least from the sixth century, attests the explicit faith of the Church in the corporeal assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven by God's power: Emperor Maurice (582-602) fixed the feast (which already existed) on August 15; there are five testimonies in the Monastic Missal (sixth century), Gothic-Gallican Missal (seventh century), and in the Sacramentarium Gregorium (As regards the doctrine of the Assumption we have the writings of St. Gregory of Tours (sixth century), St. Modestus of Jerusalem (seventh century), St. Andrew of Crete, St. Germain of Constantinople, and St. John Damascene (eighth century); nor are traces and indications lacking in the earlier Fathers (Timothy of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa). In the Scholastic epoch, the theologians (e.g., St. Thomas) treat the Assumption as an indisputable truth.

After the Vatican Council the definability of this truth, as a dogma of faith, has been increasingly emphasized by the theologians and very recently the opportuneness of the definition has been widely debated. Pope Pius XII on November 1, 1950, authoritatively settled the question by defining this dogma *ex cathedra*, in strikingly similar circumstances to those in which, nearly a century ago (December 8, 1854), his predecessor Pius IX defined the twin dogma of the Immaculate Conception, likewise implicitly contained in the same fundamental truth of the divine materninity.
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ataraxia. See Suffering.

Athanasius. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301 f.); Ariantism.

atheism (Gr. ἄθεος — without God). The attitude of those who ignore or deny God. Atheism is: (a) theoretical, if it is founded on judgments of the mind; (b) practical, if it proceeds from reasoning and shows itself in the manner of living. Theoretical atheism can be either negative or positive, according as it implies ignorance of God or denial of God with motivation. The question which apologists and theologians pose is twofold: 1. Are there or can there be negative atheists? Many answer negatively; others admit the fact and, consequently, the possibility with various limitations (for some time; not for one's whole life; relative and not absolute ignorance, etc.). The more correct answer: absolute and invincible ignorance of the existence of God, in principle, cannot be conceded because it is impossible for human reason not to ascend from experience of the external world and the internal world of man to the cause of them, as well as it is impossible for man not to feel at all the force of the moral law (see God). The Vatican Council speaks to this effect. But it is also true that relative ignorance of God is possible on account of abnormality, or some period of psychological darkness; likewise, it is also possible that a clear idea of the existence of God be lacking.

2. Does positive atheism exist or is it possible? Here there is a divergence of opinion, which, however, is not substantial. The more probable answer: Since the existence of God is not immediately evident, man can fail to see the force of the arguments advanced to prove it and can, consequently, accept some contrary argument, forming thus a false conviction. But a positive atheist is always guilty, at least initially, for lack of prudence, of careful consideration, and of more accurate and dispassionate investigation. An atheist really convinced and in perfect good faith is a hypothesis bordering on the absurd.
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Athenagoras. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

attention. The application of the mind to what one is doing at the moment. It is an act of the intellect and is formally distinct from intention, which is an act of the will (see intention). Attention, in opposition to distraction, is termed internal when it excludes all wandering of the mind on things extraneous to the act being done; it is called external when it excludes all those external actions which are incompatible with internal attention; e.g., one who draws, reads, talks, etc., during prayer, does not have the external attention of prayer.

Now, as regards meditation, all are in agreement in requiring internal attention; as regards satisfaction of the obligation of reciting the Breviary, some say that external attention is enough (Durand, Lugo, Tambrunin, Noldin), but many say that internal attention is required as well (Cajetan, D. Soto, Suarez, Billuart). This last opinion is considered more probable and more common by St. Alphonsus. In the administration of the sacraments, external attention is enough for validity, but internal attention is required for licitness in reception of the sacraments on the other hand, no attention is necessary in the subject for validity, while for licitness, not only external but also internal attention is required.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


attributes of God. The human mind, considering the various perfections of creatures, forms different concepts and attributes them to God analogically (see analogy), e.g., good, just, omnipotent. Again, revelation gives many names of God (Creator, Holy, Eternal, etc.). The attributes are properties predicated of God as being (static attributes) or as acting (dynamic attributes). At first sight these multiple and diverse attributes would seem to be in conflict with the divine simplicity (q.v.). Hence the dilemma: either the attributes have a real and ontological value, and then God is no longer simple; or they do not have a real value, and then nearly all revelation and theology are a vain play on words.

The problem consists in determining the distinction between the essence and the attributes, as well as the mutual distinction among the attributes themselves. Distinction is opposed to identity and can be real or logical, according as two or more things are distinct in themselves, ontologically, e.g., the soul and body, the body and one of its parts, the person and the qualities of the person), or are distinct only in our mind as concepts (e.g., the same person considered as a doctor, an artist, a citizen, is really only one subject, which is distinct logically in three). Logical or conceptual distinction (distinctio rationis) may be purely such, as when I designate the same person by two names: Puffin, Cicero; and then it is called distinctio rationis (ratio rationalizad on), e.g., between the living body and its life.

In God, while every kind of real distinction is excluded (see simplicity), a logical distinction with real foundation is commonly admitted. The real attributes are logically distinct among themselves and from the essence because they involve formally different concepts, like justice and mercy; but they are not pure concepts, because there corresponds to them a true reality, i.e., the infinite essence of
attrition. See contition.

audients (auditors). See catechumen.

Augustine. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 302); Augustinianism; grace; Pelagianism; predestination; Semi-Pelagianism; sin, original.

Augustinianism. Term of broad historical and doctrinal signification, used in philosophy and theology to indicate the tendency, the spirit, and the doctrine of St. Augustine, according to the development obtained in the interpretations of the various schools. Philosophically, Augustinianism, which in various points is connected with Neoplatonism, dominates the Middle Ages up to the advent of Aristotelianism, introduced in the schools by St. Thomas and his teacher St. Albert the Great. The principal philosophical theories of Augustinianism were: fusion of theology with philosophy and so of the natural with the supernatural, the primacy of Good over Truth and of the will over the intellect, divine illumination of the intelligence, sharp division of the soul from the body, plurality of substantial forms in one composed being and, therefore, also in man, rationes seminales in matter (see cosmogony), hyloporomorph composition (matter and form) applied also to spiritual creatures. This current prevailed in the school of St. Victor and in the Franciscan Order (St. Bonaventure, Scotus), and developed a sharp hostility against St. Thomas and his doctrine based on Aristotle.

Theologically, Augustinianism triumphs as a vigorous affirmation of the supernatural against Pelagianism (q.v.) at the Councils of Ephesus and of Orange (2nd), but degenerates in the erroneous interpretations of predestinationists (q.v.), and later, through the medium of nominalism, passes after being deformed into the heresy of Luther, Calvin, Bavinus, and Jansenius (see Lutheranism; Calvinism; Bavinianism; Jansenism), all of whom appeal to St. Augustine in their aberrations. In the sixteenth century, the Banneresian claim for themselves St. Augustine’s concept on grace and predestination, having recourse to the sound interpretation given by St. Thomas; however, the Malines, especially the congregists, believe they too can adopt the principles of St. Augustine to their system. Finally in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Augustinians, Noris, Berti, and Belelli, returning rigidly to the doctrine of St. Augustine, attempted to demonstrate its difference, notwithstanding apparent similarity, from Jansenism. Benedict XIV approved the work of Cardinal Norizio. A new, very mitigated interpretation of Augustinianism reappears in the system of the Sorbonnians, as it is called, to which adhere Thomasinus and St. Alphonsus; these theologians distinguish an ordinary and an extraordinary or special grace, of which only the second morally determines the will to the salutary act (moral predetermination).
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authenticity (Gr. α'θερόνα, in the later meaning of authority or author of a book). It means, in the juridical sense, that a book is authoritative, has an indisputable and definite value. Tertullian (De praesc. hacr., 16) seems to have been the first to apply this word to the sacred books.

In opposition to the apocrypha (see Canon of the Bible), written on human initiative, the sacred Scriptures are authentic in the juridical sense in so far as they enjoy infallible authority, being inspired by God, essential Truth. They are, therefore, authentic documents of divine revelation.

The originals or autographs of the inspired writings are authentic in the full sense of the word; in absence of the originals, the copies are authentic inasmuch as they reproduce the originals faithfully. The Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek text of the New Testament are, therefore, authentic. A translation can be called authentic when it is declared such by the competent authority, i.e., by the Church. The Council of Trent (EB, 41) declared authentic the Latin version called Vulgata (Vulgate) because it was used for many centuries by the Church. Inasmuch as it is authoritative, it has probative value in matters of faith and morals (see Vulgate). Intensification of the scientific method in biblical studies popularized the term authenticity in a sense that may be called critical; namely, a book is said to be authentic when it is really of the author or of the time to which it is attributed, or when its origin is legitimate, not vitiated by fraud. It is a question, therefore, of the human origin of Holy Scripture and of research on the human authors of the sacred books, a research which is often for cases where there exists explicit affirmation of the Scripture itself or of the magisterium of the Church—is conducted with rational methods of investigation.
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babies

babies deceased without baptism. On the fate of these little ones, some doctors expressed themselves too rigorously, others with too great indulgence.

St. Augustine (followed by St. Gregory the Great, St. Anselm, Gregory of Rimini, the torturer of infants, Bossuet, Berti) taught that they are damned, although punished with very light suffering. Many theologians, on the contrary, considered the most benign hypotheses. Cajetan taught that they could be saved by an act of faith made by their parents in their name. Klee thought that in the first instant of separation of the soul from the body they might be illumined in such a way as to be able to choose between good and evil. Schell believed to discern in their death a kind of martyrdom, since they die on account of Adam’s sin. These opinions, despite the laudable intentions of their proponents, are not in agreement with the sound principles of Catholic theology.
The more common teaching constantly favored by the Church is that these babies are not only exempt from any suffering, but enjoy a natural happiness not very different from what man would have possessed had he not been elevated to the supernatural order. They are, however, subject to the pain of loss (poena damnit), which consists in the privation of the possession of God (see penalty; sin, original).

Bibliography

Bainanism. An erroneous system of Michel de Bay (Bains in Latin), professor at Louvain in the second half of the sixteenth century. The root of this error lies in the confusion (begun by Luther) between the natural and the supernatural order (see supernatual). It may be said that Bay is a Pelagian (see Pelagianism), in the earthly paradise, and in principle a Lutheran after original sin. He had a heretical mentality, but fortunately since faith saved him by inducing him to submit to the judgment of the ecclesiastical authority.

The chief points of Bainanism are:
(a) original justice (grace, supernatural and preternatural gifts; see justice) was in reality a property of man as an integral part of his nature and so was due to that nature and not gratuitous;
(b) original sin corrupted human nature intrinsically, weakening its freedom which has become a slave to concupiscence, making it a sin in itself;
(c) fallen man, therefore, is incapable of any good, unless grace, integrant force of his nature, is restored to him and confers on him the capacity of doing acts naturally good, which through the will of God are meritorious of eternal life;
(d) grace is not a habit (see Lutheranism), but is the good activity itself, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, corresponding to a need of nature itself;
(e) man is either under the dominion of grace and of right love, excited by the Holy Spirit, which makes his actions good and worthy of heaven; or under the power of concupiscence and earthly love, which make all his actions sins (the works of the pagans, deprived of grace, are "vices in the garb of virtues");
(f) efficacious and irresistible grace is necessary for every good work; it determines the will intrinsically without destroying or hampering freedom, since only extrinsic coercion is contrary to freedom, not intrinsic necessity.

Bay, proceeding thus in the direction of pessimism, prepared the way for Janesianism (q.v.). In 1567 Pius V condemned 79 propositions extracted from the writings of Bay, who submitted. However, he remained attached to his principles and discussed pontifical infallibility in an unfavorable tone (cf. DB, 1001–1080).

The currents of modern religious immunitism (q.v.) are connected with Bainanism in many respects.
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Bañez. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303); Bainanism.

Bainesianism. The development of the teaching of St. Thomas on the divine concourse, on grace, and on predetermination (q.v.), elaborated by the Dominican, Dominicus Bañez (1528–1604), professor at the University of Salamanca and author of acute commentaries on the Summa Theologica of Aquinas.

Bainesianism is the antithesis of Molinism (q.v.). Toward the end of the sixteenth century, in order to combat Lutheranism and Calvinism (q.v.) more effectively, the Jesuit theologians, in the delicate questions on the relationship of free will with grace and predetermination, took as a starting point human freedom, proceeding from that to the influx of God. On the other hand, the Augustinian and Thomistic tradition proceeded in the opposite direction. Louis Molina in 1588 published his famous work Concordia, in which he defended the simultaneous divine concourse, i.e., divine action parallel to human action, and the middle knowledge (scientia media) of God (see science, divine). He hoped thereby to eliminate the difficulties of reconciling human freedom with the divine influence on every human action. Bañez, having been requested to pass judgment on the matter, pointed out certain erroneous propositions in the Concordia. Thus a sharp controversy was kindled between the Jesuits and the Dominicans, which, referred to the pope at Rome, was hotly discussed in many sessions (Congregatio de Auxiliis), without arriving at a conciliation of the two tendencies. Discussion continues even today on these matters in theological schools.

Bañez interprets St. Thomas so as to solve the problem with the following principles:
(a) God moves the human will in the natural order: the divine motion moves the will previously (prevenient) and determines it to choose this or that thing (premotion or rather physical predetermination);
(b) in the supernatural order, efficacious grace is a predetermination to the salutary act; (c) notwithstanding this predetermination in the two orders, the will remains free because it does not lose the capacity of resisting the divine influence, although in fact it does not resist (freedom in the divided sense, not in the composite sense);
(d) God foresees the free future acts in the decrees of His will, by which He decides to give the predetermination to the will of those persons whom He wishes to induce infallibly to good; (e) predetermination, bound with efficacious grace freely distributed, does not depend on the provision of our merits (ante praemia meritis).

Bañez goes further than St. Thomas, although he remains substantially faithful to the Angelic Doctor’s principles.
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Baptism (Gr. βάπτισμα — washing). The sacrament of spiritual purification and regeneration.

Variously prefigured in the creation, the flood, the passage of the Red Sea, the rock struck by Moses, predicted on several occasions by the prophets (Isa. 44:3–4; Ezck. 36:25–26; Zech. 13:1), and immediately prepared by the baptism of the Precursor, this sacrament was directly instituted by Jesus Christ with a progressive determination of the elements which constitute it. He indicated vaguely the exterior rite in His baptism in the Jordan, where on the water (matter) there appeared mysteriously the Holy Trinity ("The Father in the voice, the Son in the flesh, the Holy Spirit in the dove"), in whose name it must be conferred (form); He inculcated its necessity in His colloquy with Nicodemus (John 3:5). He established a particular use of baptism before His passion (John 19:26, 30; John 4:12); He imposed it as a universal law on the
day of His Ascension: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19).

The ministers, from the last cited text, are the Apostles and their successors, the bishops, who soon were to be helped in their ministry by the priests and in particular cases by the deacons (Acts 8:12-16). From the earliest times baptism conferred (in case of necessity) by the simple faithful was recognized as valid. In the third century baptism conferred by heretics, and later baptism conferred by infidels, was also recognized as valid; the IV Lateran Council (1215) defined that this sacrament is always valid, by whoever it may be administered (DB, 666).

In the exact words of Matt. 28:19, water is indicated implicitly (however it had been explicitly designated in John 3:5) and the Trinitarian formula clearly as constitutive elements of the external rite of baptism. The water, moreover, can be applied in three ways: by immersion (ancient usage, cf. Rom. 6:3-11), or infusion (common use in the Latin Church), or aspersion (in case of necessity). The effects of baptism are the character and the grace of regeneration. The character (see character, sacramental) of baptism is a true participation, although only initial, of the Priesthood of Christ, in so far as it confers the three prerogatives of all priesthood: (1) sacerdotal power, because the character is an ontological consecration; (2) sacerdotal power, because, although it is principally a receptive faculty, it is also secondarily an active faculty both in the line of ascending mediation, in so far as it renders all the faithful capable of offering mediately (through a priest) the Eucharistic sacrifice, and in the line of ascending mediation, as it renders simple Christians suitable to administer the sacrament of matrimony; (3) the congruous exercise of the priestly power, because it demands, amplifies, and defends grace. With respect to the Church, the character is the first and fundamental distinctive sign, which differentiates the faithful from the infidels, and the insertive sign of incorporation into the mystical body of Christ (cf. CIC, can. 87).

The grace of baptism is regeneration (John 3:5), which implies (Rom. 6:3-11), on the one hand, death to sin (original and actual, mortal and venial, with all its penal consequences), i.e., total separation from the old Adam; and, on the other, resurrection to a new life accomplished through insertion in Christ, the new Adam, by means of sanctifying grace. Inasmuch as Christ exerts His action by the infusion of grace, He functions as Head, constituting the faithful His own members. Inasmuch as the effect of Christ's influence is grace, He configures them to His nature, making them His brothers through likeness to Him (Rom. 8:29).

Now, since Christ is our Head and our older Brother, natural Son of God, in and through Him we become adoptive sons of the Father, who sends into us His Spirit ("in whom we call: Abba, Father.") (Rom. 8:15). Sons of God, we have a right to the helps (actual grace), to the food (Eucharist), to the inheritance of the Father (beautif vision) (cf. Rom. 8:17). Finally, being brothers of the First-born of the Father, sons of the same Father, we all form one family, the Church, vivified by the circulation of the same spiritual goods, the "Communion of Saints."

This second effect (the grace of regeneration) may be obtained by way of exception, so to speak (quasi per baptismis supplementa, i.e., through quasi-substitutes for baptism), either by an act of charity (baptismus flammis, of flame) or by martyrdom (baptismus tanguinus, of blood). But all, babies (see babies deceased without baptism) and adults, must in one way or another participate in the Church to be able to enter God's kingdom (John 3:5; Mark 16:15).
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Barnabas. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

Basil. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301 f.).

Beatification. The recognition and declaration of the sanctity of a servant of God, made by the competent authority (in the current discipline, by the Holy See). Such declaration is formal when the Roman pontiff, after juridical proof that public cult has not been given to the servant of God, demonstration of the heroic quality of his virtues or the fact of his martyrdom, authentic recognition of miracles worked through his intercession — permits public cult of the servant of God under determined conditions and limitations. The declaration is equivalent, on the other hand, when the Holy See confirms the public cult paid to a servant of God ab immemorabilis, after juridical discussion on the fame of sanctity or on his martyrdom.

In the first centuries the authority of the bishop was sufficient to approve the cult of martyrs. Likewise, in the early Middle Ages the bishops confirmed or at least permitted the cult spontaneously offered by the faithful. Only in the twelfth century did Alexander III reserve to the Holy See the causes of beatification — a reservation that was not entirely effective until the constitution, Coelestis Jerusalem, of Urban VIII (1634), forbade severely the paying of public cult to any servant of God who was not regularly beatified. This constitution permitted, however, that those "blessed" should continue to be so honored to whom public cult had been paid ab immemorabilis or at least for several years, even though they had not been beatified officially. In the eighteenth century Benedict XIV, with that juridical acumen with which he was distinguished, codified into a system the procedure for beatification, now substantially incorporated in the Code of Canon Law.

None, even the uninitiated in juridical studies, can fail to recognize the supreme prudence, evident in every procedural step of the beatification process. The Church really proceeds, as the saying goes, "with feet of lead."
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Beatific Vision. See vision, beatific.

Beatitude. The ultimate perfection of the intellectual being. Boethius defines it: "A state perfect by the summation of all goods" (De Consol. Philos., III, 2).
Beatitude may be considered objectively and subjectively (formally): in the first sense it is the supreme good, capable of rendering the intellectual being perfectly happy; in the second sense it is the perfect happiness of the intellectual subject who enjoys that good. Scotus and, in part, St. Bonaventure, place beatitude preferentially in an act of the will (love); St. Thomas makes it consist principally in the intellect (knowledge), on which the will follows.

For man, in the actual state of things, beatitude is the beatific vision (see vision, beatific), i.e., God seen intuitively (immediately, directly, "face to face") in His essence (superme, supernatural). But beatitude in its highest grade belongs to God alone: objectively, He is the summum bonum (supreme good), and subjectively, He knows Himself and loves Himself in an infinite way, and so is infinitely blessed or happy. This divine happiness may neither be diminished or increased by creatures: when revelation speaks of God's sorrow or increase in joy it speaks in figures so as to be intelligible to men. By the Incarnation God put Himself in a condition to taste our joys and sorrows with a human heart.

The word beatitude is also used to signify the eight rules promulgated by Jesus in the Gospel (Matt. 5:1-11): "Blessed are the poor . . . Blessed are the meek . . ." etc. They go by the name of Sermon on the Mount, and are the synthesis of the gospel message.
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Beighborhood (old German bēgga - to beg; to pray). One of the numerous religious sects which seceded, as it were, between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Europe. Actually the Beghards are a derivation of the Beguines, women consecrated to a life of chastity and, often, of poverty. Both societies were orthodox in the beginning, but soon began to deviate, especially the Beghards, who tried to imitate the extravagances of other sects, as that of the Fraticelli (Little Friars).

It is interesting from a theological viewpoint to know the doctrine they professed and spread. We have an authentic summary of it in the propositions condemned by the Council of Vienna (1311-1312). Man may attain in this life so great spiritual perfection as to become impeccable. Arrived at this height, man can do without fasts, prayers, obedience to authority, and, besides, should no longer worry about his body, to which he may give anything it wishes without sinning. Moreover, the perfect spiritual man can, even in this life, rise to the vision of God without the light of glory ("lumen gloriae"). What we are naturally inclined to is not sinful; the contemplative mystic should not lower himself to the cult of the Eucharist and of the humanity of Christ (DB, 471, 478).

Aversion to the Roman Church is another characteristic of Beghardism. The features of the later quietism (q.v.; see Molinosism) are easily discernible in this heresy.
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Bellarmine. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302).

Berengarius heresy. Berengarius of Tours, archdeacon of Angers (1000-1088), was educated in the School of Chartres under the direction of Fulbert, but quickly departed from the example and teaching of his pious master. Indulging in his rationalistic predilections, he denied the truth of transubstantiation (q.v.), giving the following reasons: (1) the accidents are inseparable from their substance, and, therefore, since they remain unchanged after consecration, we must conclude that their substance also remains without any change; (2) it is impossible for a substance to be transformed into another pre-existing substance. Having rejected transubstantiation, it was logical he should deny the Real Presence. He did, advancing these arguments: (a) were Christ present in the Eucharist, He would have to be multiplied and to be distant from heaven; (b) the Eucharist, moreover, is a sacrament, i.e., a signum rei sacrae (sign of a sacred thing), according to the definition of St. Augustine; therefore, the eucharistic bread and wine do not contain, but merely signify the body and blood of Christ. Such dialectic shows not only heretical daring, but also philosophical poverty and lack of theological judgment.

The audacious statements of the archdeacon provoked a heated polemic in which the best minds of the age united (Lanfranc of Bec, Guittmund of Aversa, Adelmann of Brescia, Duranus of Tournon, etc.). Several condemnations of the Church followed: seven councils assembled in order to condemn the crafty scholastic, who finally in the Roman Synod (1079) accepted a Eucharistic formula, worked out by Alberic of Monta Cassino, in which transubstantiation and the Real Presence were clearly enunciated. But his was a feigned submission, for as soon as he returned home he began to defend his error again; overcome finally by grace, he performed ten years of penance, and died reconciled with the Church. Although a contemporary writer reports that even common people took an interest in the Berengarian heresy, the polemic was confined within the walls of the theological schools, with the effect rather of occasioning more profound study of the doctrine (the word transubstantiation was then coined), and with it an increase in Eucharistic piety.
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**Berengarius. See Berengarian heresy.**

**Bernard.** See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302).

**Bible.** The noun bible reproduces the Greek neuter plural τὰ βιβλία (the books), which passed into medieval Latin and into the modern languages in the singular form with the meaning of the collection of all the books inspired by God, commonly called Holy Scripture. While the Greek word brings out the composite character of the divine book, i.e., the multiplicity of books contained therein, the derived word (Biblia, Bible) stresses its one author and one spirit.

The 72 books of the Bible are divided into two large sections: the Old and the New Testaments (q.q.v.). The word Testament, according to the meaning of the original Hebrew noun (berith) and of the Greek term which translated it from the beginning (diatheke), can mean either that those books contain the dispositions with which God promised (Old Testament) and granted (New Testament) to His faithful, the goods culminating in the possession of
eternal happiness, or that they contain the series of pacti and alliances by which, in the course of the centuries, God bound man to Himself in view of His Redemption. The Old Testament, initially the sacred patrimony of the Hebrew people elected by God as repository of His promises of Redemption, passed subsequently, completed by the New, by legitimate inheritance to the Church, which is the real Israel, the authentic chosen people, in favor of whom the divine promises of old were fulfilled.

Actual Church legislation (CIC, c. 1391, 1399, 1400) forbids the faithful to read vernacular translations of the Bible which do not have the approbation of the Holy See and are not published under the vigilance of the bishops, furnished with annotations extracted from the Fathers and Catholic interpreters. The editions of the original texts of the ancient versions, as well as translations by Catholic authors, are permitted to scholars.
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Billot. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

bishops (Gr. ἐπίσκοποι — inspector, superintendent). The successors of the Apostles, from whom they have inherited by divine right the triple power of instructing, sanctifying, and governing a portion of the flock of Christ (cf. Matt. 28:19).

The Apostles, having had the mandate of constituting by conquest the kingdom of God in the world, had no territorial limitations. But the function of conquest, being directed to the organization of the ecclesiastical society, was of its nature transient (personal prerogative). In fact, from the beginning the Apostles, put in charge of the individual communities, founded in the various regions of their apostolate persons that might represent them during their lifetime and be their substitutes after their death (cf. 1 Tim. 1:1-27; 2 Tim. 1:21 or 4:23). But it is true that in the inspired documents bishops and priests (presbyters) are named promiscuously, but at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second we learn from the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch († 107) that every Church was ruled by its bishop (monarchical episcopate).

The bishops, through consecration, which is the most suggestive ceremony of Catholic liturgy, are elevated to the apex of the Christian priesthood. The episcopal character being impressed on their souls by virtue of which they are vested with the power of orders, which implies the power of conferring and ordaining (cf. Council of Trent, sess. 23, cans. 6 and 7; DB, 966, 967). The power of jurisdiction, on the other hand, which includes the twofold faculty of teaching and governing, is transmitted to them by the missio canonica, which is a juridical act directly or indirectly emanating from the pope, the head of the bishops as Peter was the prince of the Apostles. The power of

jurisdiction of the bishops is ordinary and immediate in their own dioceses, notwithstanding the primacy of the Roman pontiff (Vatican Council, DB, 1828).

The priests are subalternately united to the bishop like "chords to the zither" (Ignatius Martyr, Ephes. 3-4), as are the deacons and the inferior ministers who help him in the performance of his duties and ecclesiastical offices.
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body, human. The material constitutive element of man. Holy Scripture maintains that the body of the first man was formed by God Himself, by special action, from the earth (Gen. 2:7; cf. Tob. 8:18; Exclus. 33:10; Wisd. 7:17, etc.).

The integral evolutionists extend evolution of the lower species up to man (soul and body): according to them, the human body is the result of the development of the animals nearest to man (the apes). Reasons:

(a) the discovery of skeletons which are halfway between man and ape (e.g., the Pithecanthropus erectus of Java);

(b) the great anatomical affinity of the human body and those of lower animals. The Biblical Commission (Response of 1909; see cosmogony) forbids the calling in doubt of the historicity of the biblical account of the special creation of man. The reasons adopted by the evolutionists are uncertain and equivocal; anatomic affinity proves only the harmonic unity of nature. While natural reason has no opposition to make to the biblical account, it recognizes, on the other hand, the absurdity of a body generated by animals and then informed by a soul (see soul): a substantial form cannot inform a matter which is organized and which belongs to a level below its perfection. Moreover, evolutionism has yet to prove why apes do not continue to produce human bodies or, what is more, men.

The body of Eve, according to the sacred text, was formed from a rib taken from Adam by God. The divine action has a deep meaning, both proper and figurative, according to the Fathers: (1) the profound unity of the two sexes and the subordination of woman to man; (2) Eve symbolizes the Church, issued from the wounded side of Christ.

Catholic doctrine energetically defends also the unity of the human race derived from one couple, Adam and Eve (monogenesi). Paleontology, ethnology, racialism cannot advance against this truth any difficulties worthy of consideration (see evolutionism).
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Body, Mystical. See Mystical Body.

Bogomile (Bulgar. bog-mile, equivalent of the Gr. θυβόλος — friend of God). A sect with a basic dualistic cast (see Manichaeism), which spread from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries particularly in Bulgaria, with some ramifications in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Greece, and Hungary. It was
attacked and condemned by Popes Honorius III, Gregory IX, Boniface VIII, and Benedict XII. A Bogomilian strain still subsists in Bulgaria.

Like every sect infected by Manichaeism, it rejects: (a) all specifically Christian truths; (b) the hierarchical form of the Church; (c) sacramental organism and external cult. It retains only the recital of the Pater Noster and is characterized by its claim of establishing direct relations with God through a purely interior cult, including attainment of the beatific vision on earth with bodily eyes.
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**Breviary.** See *liturgy.*

**Buddhism.** See *suffering.*

*bull* (Lat. *bulla*—imprint of a seal made to authenticate public documents). One of the most solemn documents emanating from the Roman pontiff, having a determined external form and varying in content according to the intention of the pope.

Its external form distinguishes it from all other documents of the Roman Curia: it bears, not on the front but on the first line, the name of the reigning pontiff, e.g., “Pius Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei.” In the date, the years are computed from the coronation of the pontiff, but, in case the bull antedates coronation, the phrase “*Ad die suscepti Apostolatus*” is used. It has a lead

**canonization.** The solemn pronouncement by which the pope declares that a blessed actually enjoys the beatific vision and enjoys worship of the saint on the whole Church. The Roman pontiff is infallible in this judgment, according to the more common doctrine. Whereas beatification (q.e.) is a preliminary judgment, not infallible but only permissive of worship, canonization is a definitive and infallible judgment which orders worship. In virtue of this pontifical act: (1) worship of veneration (*cultus dulation*) is due to the saints; (2) their image must be surrounded with a halo; (3) their relics may be exposed and venerated; (4) the Mass and Holy Office may be celebrated in their honor; (5) feast days may be dedicated to their memory, and so on.

Although the Church intervened from the beginning to regulate the cult of the martyrs and confessors and laid down rules, which were later slowly developed and codified (see *beatification*), it was only under Urban VIII, however, that a clean-cut distinction was made between beatification and canonization, and both were absolutely reserved to the Holy See.

**Calvinism.** The heretical system of Calvin (John Chauvin), who was born at Noyon, France (1509) but who lived most of his life at Geneva, Switzerland, where he exercised the most powerful influence on the populace. Switzerland was already disturbed by the religious ideas of Zwingli, a contemporary of Luther, with whom Calvin agreed on various fundamental points of the Reformation although he was generally more moderate. Calvin borrowed from one and the other, adding his own personal principles.

He adopted the Lutheran concepts on liberty of thought (individual interpretation of the Holy Scripture), on original sin and its consequences, on extrinsic justification, and on the sufficiency of faith without works (see *Lutheranism*). Proper to Calvin himself are the following: (a) the *inaudibility* of grace (grace or justification being conceived as an imputation made to us of the holiness and merits of Christ); whoever by faith is justified can no longer lose such a favor and is certain to be saved (Luther spoke only of the certainty of justification, not of eternal salvation); (b) absolute predestination decreed by God for some people independently of any merit or demerit. God destines, according to His choice, to hell or to paradise; hence the works of those predestined to beatitude, even if evil, are considered as good by God, while the works of the future damned are evil without qualification. Moreover, he departs from Luther in that he wants a strongly organized Church: one that dictates even to the State. Calvin’s Church is that of those predestined to eternal life, i.e., of the faithful adhering to Christ by faith; it is invisible in itself, but visible in the ministry of the pastors.

Calvin admitted only two sacraments: *baptism* and the *Supper,* and as regards the nature of these he sided rather with Zwingli than with Luther. The sacraments for Calvin were *external signs* which attested the grace of God in us and the honor with which we compensate God. His eucharistic doctrine was rather obscure, it has been interpreted later by the Calvinists in the sense that the faithful receiving consecrated bread and wine receive from Jesus, who is in heaven, a divine force (denial of transubstantiation, of the Real Presence, and even of the symbolism which is characteristic of the sacramental teaching of Zwingli).

The principal work of Calvin is *Institutiones religionis Christianae* (4 vols.). He followed the principles of Luther, systematized them logically, but did not name his comrade. Calvinism was condemned together with Lutheranism by the Council of Trent.
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Canon of the Bible (Gr. κατάλογος — rule). Designates the collection or catalogue of those books which, since they are inspired by God, are the rule of truth and light. A book is, therefore, canonical which is found in the Canon, inasmuch as it is inspired by God and as such has been recognized by the Church.

From the sixteenth century it has been the custom to call protocanonical the books on whose divine origin there has been unanimous consent of the whole Church from the beginning, and deuterocanonical those books whose inspiration was challenged prior to about the fifth century. The term deuterocanonical does not have an absolute value in so far as it does not indicate a book which at a second (δεύτερος), i.e., later time, was introduced into the Canon; even the books of a doubtful authenticity had been received into the Canon of the Church from the beginning.

The Hebrews, followed by the Protestants who have also influenced schismatic Churches, repudiate the following deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament: Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees, passages of Esther and Daniel — books and passages all written and preserved in Greek. The deuterocanonical books of the New Testament are: the Epistles to the Hebrews, of James, of Peter, 2 and 3 of John, of Jude, and the Apocalypse.

Books with titles and content similar to those of the Old or New Testament, but not recognized by the Church as inspired, and excluded from the Canon, are called Apocrypha (apoc.).

The Protestants call the deutero-canonical books apocryphal, reserving the term pseudopigrapha (false title) for the books which we call apocryphal.
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Canon of the Mass (Gr. κατάλογος — rule). That body of prayers of the Mass which begins after the Sanctus and ends with the Amen before the Pater Noster. The Canon has been designated by different names. In ancient times it was called the prayer (έφο) par excellence, because the supreme Gift, namely, Jesus Christ, was asked in it; it was called also Action, from the Latin expression agere causam (to defend a case at law); in fact, the priest, in the person of Christ, defends the cause of the whole Church before God the Father. The Greeks call it anaphora (εναφορά), i.e., offering. In the Middle Ages it was called canon consecrationis, because in those prayers the bread and wine are consecrated to distinguish it from the communion (canon communio) which follows. The Latins preferred the term canon, as expressing the fixed and regular part of the Mass. The present-day Canon in the Roman Missal is that of St. Gregory the Great and goes back, therefore, to the end of the sixth century. There are elements in it which warrant the assertion that at the end of the fourth century it was substantially the same as today. The central nucleus of the Canon takes its inspiration from the words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper. If, in fact, the passages which were added later are left out of consideration (memento of the living and dead, in connection with the reading of the diptychs or tables with the names of the living and the dead to be prayed for), the fundamental theme of the Canon is thanksgiving to God for the work of Redemption (Christ "gratias egit"), which is renewed in the sacrificial consecration (Christ consecrated bread and wine) and again offered to the Father in union with the Son and the Holy Spirit. The priest, faithful to the command of Christ "Do this for a commemoration of Me," commemorates His passion, death, resurrection, and ascension and, together with all the Church, renews the offering which He made of Himself.

At first the Canon was recited aloud, but later it became the custom to pronounce it in a low voice and with the most profound recollection, perhaps to surround such sacred words with a halo of mystery. This does not mean that the people should not know the rich content of this prayer. Rather it is the desire of the Church that the faithful be impregnated in its spirit and follow the priest, repeating the same formula which is penetrated with faith and perfumed with piety, full of power and action. Its simple language has a vital character and an imprint of antiquity, which moves the pronouncer with the same impression produced by the mysterious shadows of the basilicas of the Eternal City." (Gibb). It is noteworthy that the Council of Trent has declared the Canon of the Mass to be immune from all error (DB, 742).
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Carlostadius (Carlstadt). See Presence, Real, Eucharistic (fact).
the catechesis became progressively more extensive and more profound, up to the teaching of the great mysteries and the sacraments. In this connection, the most complete and precious document is the 24 catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in which are distinguished: an introduction (protocatechesis); 18 catecheses for those to be baptized (φωτισμοί — to be illuminated), which treat of sin, penance, baptism, and faith, and develop the articles of the Creed in a popular style; and, finally, the 5 mystical or sacramental catecheses for the newly baptized (νεοφύτοι — neo-illuminated). The old catechism gave birth to the Catechism, a compendium of Christian doctrine adapted to children and adults.
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catechumen (κατεχομένος from κατεχω — I re-echo, inform, teach). The official name of the aspirant to baptism who was being carefully prepared for the Christian initiation. The catechumen, embryonic in the apostolic age, was gradually and progressively organized to accommodate the influx of converts to the new faith (from the end of the second century, under Emperor Commodus). It consisted in the instruction of the mind (catechesis, q.v.), which gave rise to existent schools (cf. the Alexandrian Didascaliae), and in the formation of the heart by means of rites, prayers, and ascetic practices (fasting, penances). Its organization varied according to the different churches, but generally included two classes of candidates: audient and competent catechumens, corresponding to the two periods of preparation:

descends as a natural corollary from the essence of the Church itself. If, in fact, the Church is humanity socially and supernaturally organized in Christ, of its very nature it embraces all individuals of the human race; it is, in other words, universal. The whole of the gospel teaching, as well as the sympathy manifested by Christ for the Gentiles, were a prelude to the universal message which He entrusted to His Apostles on the moment of leaving the earth: “Going therefore, teach ye all nations” (Matt. 28:19). He had said, during His ministry, that the kingdom of God is comparable to a mustard grain, grown into a full and leafy tree and stretching its branches over all the earth. He had compared it to a handful of leaven which made the whole mass of flour rise, and to a net cast into the sea and gathering all kinds of fishes in its mesh. The Church is catholic de facto, because it is like a seed destined to permeate the whole human mass, permeating its various intellectual and moral, civil and religious aspects. It is catholic de facto because of the special assistance of God, from the beginning it waxed strong among all peoples, breaking all barriers, overcoming all persecutions, and making its enemies bow in defeat.
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catholicity (mark of the Church). Catholicity (Gr. καθολικός — general, universal) is the third note or property which the Nicene-Constantinople Creed attributes to the Church. Like unity and sanctity, this prerogative is represented in Scripture and in Tradition: “As instruments in the hands of God, ordained to infuse grace, just like the brush in the hands of Leonardo da Vinci was the means of painting the Last Supper. God the Father, according to the words of St. Paul, has saved us through means of the laver of regeneration (Tit. 3:5); the Holy Spirit, according to the teaching of St. Ephrem († 373), penetrates the waters of the sacred font to elevate and purify souls (Adv. scribentiores, sermo 40).

2. As instruments which produce their effects immediately, i.e., by the simple performance of the rite, independently of the merits of minister or subject. St. Luke attests that the faithful received the Holy Spirit by the simple imposition of hands by the Apostles (Acts 8:17; 19:6), while St. Paul exhorts Timothy (2 Tim. 1:6) to revive the grace which had been communicated to him by the same rite. The Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries compare baptism to a mother’s breast: “That saving wave [water] has become for you both a sepulchre and a mother” (Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. Mystag. 2, 4); from which we rightly conclude that in their doctrine the sacraments are endowed with a real and immediate efficacy, as the causality of the minister in the generation of the Offspring is real and immediate. Parallel to these testimonies, which enunciate the objective effectiveness of the external rite, are many others excluding depending of such efficacy on the merits of the minister or the recipient; suffice it to cite the classic words of St. Augustine which, pronounced on the occasion of the Donatist controversy (see Donatism), represent the synthesis of Tradition: “Baptism does not have its value from the merits of the one who administers it or even of the one who
receives it, but by reason of its own holiness and efficacy, communicated to it by Him who instituted it” (Contra Crescentium, 4, 19). In addition, we have the constant practice of recognizing as valid even baptism administered by heretics, and the custom of apostolic origin of baptizing children prior to their use of reason.

3. As instruments demanding moral dispositions in the subject, as prerequisites absolutely necessary for the production of their effect in the soul. Similar to the craftsman who cannot form iron into an artistic form with his instrument unless the iron is first made malleable by heat, so the heavenly Artist cannot introduce grace in man through the sacraments, unless the soul has first been made flexible to the intention of the divine art by the fire of penitence and love. The sources of revelation inculcate the necessity of faith and penance (cf. the exhortations addressed in Acts 2:38-41, to the first converts: “Do penance, and be baptized... for the remission of your sins” and the frequent solicitations to virtue addressed to the catechumens and penitents by the Fathers) and point out the dispositive or preparatory function of faith and penance with respect to the justification produced by the sacramental rites.

Basing herself on these sure testimonies, the Church defined (against the Protestantism) that the sacraments are real instruments in the hands of God, and that through the objective application of the rite (ex opere operato, q.v.) they produce the effect of grace in every subject who does not put an obstacle to it (non potens bibere; see obex) (DB, 799, 849, 951).
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**cause, causality.** In Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, **cause** is defined: “Principle which properly and directly has an influence into the being of another.” It is, therefore, a realizing (reality-making) force.

We distinguish: (1) efficient cause, in which the above definition is fully verified; (2) final cause (id proprium quod, or that on account of which), which is the motive of the efficient cause; (3) formal cause (id per quod, or that by which), which unites with matter in order to determine it specifically, either in the substantial order (e.g., the soul, substantial form of the body), or in the accidental order (e.g., the figure, form of a statue); (4) material cause (id ex qua, or that of which), which, together with the form, constitutes in the constitution of a determined being. The **exemplary cause** (id secundum quod) is reducibly a formal extrinsic cause.

The interplay of causality is evident in the world: but the English phenomenalist, David Hume, denied causality, and Kant reduced its value to that of a subjective category of man’s mind. For Christian philosophy, the principle of causality (“every effect has its cause”): (1) has ontological (real, objective) value, i.e., really is in things; (2) is so evident as to resolve itself proximately in the first principles of the human mind (principles of identity and contradiction). In fact, given a being which has the characteristics of “effect” (i.e., which is participated and contingent), the intellect sees it in, as implicit, the exigency of a cause. All our theodicy
celibacy of the clergy (Lat. caelebritas — status of one who is not joined in matrimony). The example and the teaching of Jesus Christ, Son of a Virgin and Mirror of unstained purity, as well as the example of the Apostles, who, following Jesus, abandoned their families, exercised a powerful attraction on the first Christian generations. Hence, the high esteem which the nascent Church had for virginity; an esteem which exercised a great influence on the choice of persons appointed for the cult.

Actually at the beginning of the third century, Tertullian and Origen tell us of the great number of constant clerics, and at the beginning of the fourth century, Eusebius of Caesarea gives us the intimate reason for this: "It is fitting that whoever is dedicated to the divine ministry abstain from the use of marriage, so that free from all earthly care he may be better able to attend to preaching" (Dem. Evang., l. 1. c. 9; PG., 22, 81).

These testimonies assure us of the widespread custom of clerical celibacy, but no document of the first centuries tells of an established law. Rather the Nicene Council tolerates, for the Oriental Church, the use of legitimate marriage for priests and deacons. This is still the constant rule in the Oriental Church up to the present day.

In the West, however, a very much more rigorous tendency must have developed very early, since the Council of Elvira, Spain (in 306), was able to promulgate a canon of the following tenor: Placuit in totum prohibere episcopeis, presbyteris et diaconibus vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio abstine re se a coniugibus suis et non generare filios; quisque vero fecerit ab honore clericatus excommunicatur ("It is the will of the council that bishops, priests, deacons, and all clerics engaged in the ministry abstain from marriage and the generation of children under the penalty of expulsion from the honor of the clerical state"; EFHE, 399). This is the first law on celibacy, and pointed the way which was afterward to be followed rigidly by the Latin Church. The aptness of this law is set forth in magisterial fashion by J. de Maistre in his classical work Le Pape, l. 3. c. 3, and especially by Pius XII in the encyclical Ad Catholicos Sacerdotii (1935), which exalts sacerdotal chastity as the most beautiful gem of the Catholic Church.
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3. With respect to the effects which it can produce, considering the particular circumstances of time and place, although it is not erroneous in content or form. In this case the proposition is censured as pernicious, vicious, scandalous, dangerous, seductive of the simple, etc.

Ecclesiastical censures are to be carefully distinguished from these theological censures. The former are medicinal penalties (e.g., excommunication).
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character, sacramental (Gr. χαρακτήρ — impressed mark, die, seal, sign). An indelible sign impressed on the soul by baptism, confirmation, and holy orders, in consequence of which these sacraments cannot be administered twice to the same person.

This doctrine, vaguely referred to in Holy Scripture (2 Cor. 1:21-22; Eph. 1:13-14; 4:30) and extensively developed by the Fathers, especially by St. Augustine who was the first—on the occasion of the Donatist controversy (see Donatism)—to bring out clearly the separability of the character from grace, exalting its Christological and ecclesiological function, reached perfect systematization with the Scholastics, who explained its intimate nature from both the philosophical and the theological aspect.

Philosophically it is a spiritual reality (a real or ontological consecration), to be classified in the predicament of quality, as a physical, instrumental faculty, which is indelible both in this life and in the next.

Theologically it is: (1) in relation...
to Christ, a participation of His priesthood, in so far as it confers on the faithful a power (initial in baptism, more developed in confirmation, perfect in orders) of offering the sacrifice of the New Testament and of imparting grace through the administration of the sacraments. This power is a reflection, as is evident, of the functions of reconciler of men with God through means of the sacrifice of Calvary (ascendant mediation) and of sanctifier or dispenser of the divine gifts to men through means of the sacraments (descendant mediation) which belong to the humanity of Jesus Christ in virtue of the hypostatic union. (2) With reference to grace it is an exigent cause, a defense, and, in certain cases, an effective cause. It is an exigent cause of grace because in its quality of supernatural consecration it is like a precious stone, which must be placed in its proper setting in order to shine in all its splendor; that setting is grace. It is also a safeguard of grace because, as the Fathers say, while it frightens away the demons, it attracts the custody of the good angels as well as the special benevolence and attention of the heavenly Father, who sees in the “seed” a participation of the divine light which shines on the human brow of the only-begotten Son. Finally, in the case of reviviscence, the character is taken and used by God as a circumstance of grace to produce that grace whose infusion had been impeded by moral indisposition (obex) of the subject. (3) With respect to the Church the character is a distinctive sign marking the faithful from the infidels, and a constitutive sign of the hierarchy, in so far as it distributes in different grades the members of the kingdom of Christ: simple citizens (baptism), soldiers (confirmation), leaders (orders).

This doctrine was rejected by the Protestants, who considered the character as a creation of the Roman pontiff (Luther) and more precisely of Innocent III (Cerisetti), or as an escape found by St. Augustine to conclude the antinomies of his sacramental theory (Harnack). The Council of Trent defined the central nucleus of the doctrine exposed above (DB, 852).
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Lack of sufficient elements makes identification of the individual gifts difficult. He speaks of the gifts of apostolate, prophecy, discernment of spirits, teaching, exhortation, canticles, tongues, interpretation; and of a gift of evangelist. In virtue of these gifts, which could invest any of the faithful, the Christian communities were instructed and edified with discourses of various kinds. Other gifts were intended for the spiritual direction and charitable assistance of the faithful: gifts of government, of ministry, of alms, gifts of patronate (of orphans and widows), of hospitality, of faith (effective of miracles), gifts of healing, of power (e.g., the resurrection of the dead).

The gifts were very important in the life and constitution of the primitive Church, contributing efficaciously to the growth and propagation of the faith.
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charism (Gr. χαρίσμα — gift). In general, any gift that the benevolence of God grants man; in particular, a gratuitous and transitory supernatural gift conferred on the individual in view of the general good, for the building of the Church, Mystical Body of Christ.

The prophet Joel (2:28; cf. Acts 2:16 f.) had predicted for the Messianic epoch an abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit, and Jesus, before ascending into heaven, promised to the disciples that singular marvels would accompany and confirm their preaching (Mark 16:17-18).

St. Paul gives four lists of gifts bestowed on the nascent Church, but they are not alike nor complete (1 Cor. 12:8-10, 28-30; Rom. 12:6-8; Eph. 4:11-12; cf. 1 Cor. 14:26).

charity. A theological virtue infused together with grace, which inclines the will to love God for Himself. The three theological virtues (faith, hope, and charity) have God as their object, but while faith refers to God as not seen and hope as not yet attained, charity makes one tend to God and adhere to Him as already possessed. Therefore charity is the most important not only of the theological virtues but also of all the other virtues. The primacy of charity is clearly affirmed by St. Paul in a beautiful page of 1 Cor. 13:13: "Now there remain faith, hope, and charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity." The Apostle adds that in this life nothing avails, not even martyrdom, without charity, and that in the other life faith and hope will cease, but charity forever. Not less enlightening is the testimony of St. John on the excellence of charity: to him belongs the well-known expression which defines God as charity and reveals the efficacy of this virtue in determining a mutual indwelling between God and man: "God is charity: and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him" (1 John 4:16). Furthermore, the entire Gospel is the happy message of love. This fundamental motif of revelation is largely developed by the Fathers, especially St. Augustine.

As regards theology, it is enough to recall the teaching of St. Thomas who, notwithstanding his intellectualistic tendency, admits the primacy of charity and deeply studies the reasons for this primacy. According to him, the excellence of charity is shown principally from its object or formal motive, which is the goodness of God considered absolutely in itself; therefore, charity is not interested love (amor concupiscientiae), but love of pure friendship (amor benevolentiae), which seeks and reposes not in one's own good, but in the good of the Beloved. Even when love makes one love creatures, its motive is always the goodness of God which shines in them. Moreover, St. Thomas demonstrates that charity is the root, the mover, and the form of all the other virtues, because it has as its object the last end, God in Himself, to which charity directs all supernatural activity of the spirit with a continual influence, either latent or manifest.

Charity is so intimately connected with sanctifying grace (Scouts and others identified them) that through sin they are both lost together, while the other virtues can remain, although in a condition of sterility (inform
chiliasm. See millenarianism.

chirotony. See imposition of hands.

Chrysostom. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

Church (Lat. Ecclesia. Gr. κκλησία — assembly, meeting, congregation). The kingdom of God on earth governed by the apostolic authority (D. Palmieri).

Institution. Jesus Christ, as is strikingly evident on every page of the Gospel, represented Himself to the world as the founder of “the kingdom of God,” which in its earthly phase is ordained to gather together all men (cf. the parables of the kingdom): the people.

As rulers of the kingdom He appointed the Apostles (cf. Luke 6:13; Matt. 18:18-19, etc.; the clergy in the people (see bishops).

As head of the Apostles He constituted St. Peter (cf. Matt. 16:18-19; John 20:27): the primacy in the clergy (see primacy of St. Peter).

With these elements our Lord instituted a real society, hierarchically constituted (with subjects and superiors), visible to the eyes of all, but with a nonpolitical and religious end (cf. Matt. 2:19-20; Acts 3:13; 4:7, 12; 16:27-27, etc.), assigning it the function of applying, through the centuries, the fruits of the Redemption.

Esence. From this we clearly understand that the Church is the continuation and the prolongation of the Incarnate Word. His Mystical Body (Rom. 12:4-6; 1 Cor. 12:12-27; Eph. 4:4), which actualizes in each individual as in all humanity the work of the Redemption, through the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass and the exercise of the triple ecclesiastical power (magisterium, ministerium, iuridicium — teaching, ministry, jurisdiction).

As its Founder is a Person subsisting both in heaven and in the divine nature, the Church is at the same time a human and divine society; the human element, visible, perceptible to the senses, consists of the multitude of men socially organized; the spiritual, invisible, divine element is furnished by the supernatural gifts which put the human aggregate under the influence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, Soul and unitive Principle of the whole organism (theandric constitution of the Church). The Church is, therefore, the union of man with Christ in a social form, “the social synthesis of the human and the divine” (Seriatianos).

Properties. If the Church is the union of humanity with Christ in a social, hierarchically organized form, it has to be necessarily one, since Christ is one and the human race is one; it has to be holy, because contact with Christ is sanctifying; it must be catholic, i.e., universal, since the union of humanity in Christ embraces (in tendency) all the individuals of the human species; it must be apostolic, because, since it is a union in hierarchical form, it is necessarily based on Peter and the Apostles and their successors, who constitute the hierarchy (see unity; sanctity; catholicity; apostolicity).

One, holy, catholic, apostolic. These are the four properties of the Spouse of Christ: its individual characteristics which become also marks of identification; when considered in historical reality they appear to the eyes of all as distinctive signs of the true institution of Jesus Christ (see marks of the Church).

Power and operations. Operatio sequitur esse (operation or action following). Being human-divine, visible and invisible, the Church operates in a way corresponding to its nature: through a teaching body (magisterium) which transmits the divine thought in the clothing of human words; through a ministry which, by means of sensible rites, the sacraments, infuses supernatural life; through a government which makes known the laws of the spirit in a form perceptible to the experience of the senses (see hierarchy).

Errors about the Church. Since the Church is the prolongation of Christ in time and space, there is a very striking analogy between the Christological and the ecclesiological errors. Just as some erred with respect to Christ by denying His divinity (Jews, Gentiles, rationalists), His humanity (Docetism, Pantheism), or by separating the two natures (Nestorians), or by absorbing one nature in the other (Monotheism); so also with respect to the Church, some deny her divinity or divine mission in the world (Jews, pagans, rationalists), her humanity or visibility (Wycliff, Huss, Protestants), her social, external perfection hinged on the Roman pontiff (Eastern Schismatics, Gallicans, Pelagians, etc.); others separate her from the civil society (liberalism), and, finally, there are those who would have her absorbed in the State (regalians).

The many documents of the magisterium concerning the Church are collected in DB under the heading "Ecclesia."
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circumcision

(Lat. circumciscere — to cut around). The Hebraic rite which consists in cutting the membranous foreskin (prepuce or preputium) of males. Many ancient peoples also practiced it (e.g., the Egyptians), but when God in the Old Testament prescribed this practice to Abraham and his descendants He made it a sign or symbol of the religious pact which bound that patriarch and the heirs of His promise to Himself.

The solemnity and precision of the holy narrative (Gen. 17) show the importance of the ceremony. God appeared to the ninety-year-old Abraham and revealed His name to him, "the Omnipotent," and changed the patriarch's name from Abram to Abraham, and his wife's from Sarai.
to Sara, to indicate that a new era was about to begin for them. After having secured the patriarch to pledge a perfect life and complete adherence to Him, God established a covenant with Abraham and his descendants, in which Abraham obligated himself to offer exclusive cult to God, to be faithful in His service, and to bear the symbol of this covenant in his flesh: circumcision. On His part, God pledged to protect the patriarch, to give him a numerous offspring, to reserve to him the Messianic blessing (see Messianic hope) and to give him the land of Canaan (Palestine) as his possession. Thus Abraham became the friend of God. This friendship aimed at re-establishing communion of man with God, broken by Adam's guilt, and at a return to grace, which involves the remission of original sin. Circumcision in the Old Testament had an effect analogous to baptism in the organization established by Christ.

The efficacy of circumcision did not lie in the rite considered as a material action, but in its symbolism; and so, even in the ancient law, insistence was placed on the "circumcision of the heart," i.e., on purity of intention and docility to the will of God (Deut. 10:16; 30:6). Circumcision was practiced on the infant after birth—eight days after, according to the custom—and the infant received its name on that occasion (Luke 2:21).

Circumcision with its relative moral obligations was necessary to be able to share in the blessing and promises made to Abraham. Carnal descent from the patriarch was not sufficient.
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circumcisioned (Gr. περικοπή). The mutual immunance of the three divine Persons, none of whom may stand without the others: the Father is in the Son, and vice versa; the Son and the Father are in the Holy Ghost, and vice versa. The reason of such circumcisioned lies in the numerical unity of the divine essence common to the three Persons. It is a truth of faith (cf. Council of Florence, DB, 704). In the Gospel, Christ Himself reveals (John 10:38; 17:21) that the Father is in Him and He in the Father. Tradition speaks of it constantly, but with a difference in concept between East and West. The Occidentals think of the Trinity rather in a static sense (each Person resides in the other, according to the term sessio); the Greeks, on the other hand, conceive circumcisioned in a dynamic sense (like a vital circle in which the divine life flows and reflows from one to the other of the Persons: προσέγγισις—motion, advance).

The Trinitarian diagram of the Latins is:
Father > Holy Spirit
Son
That of the Greeks is:
Father → Son → Holy Spirit.
The two concepts do not differ substantially.
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Clement Alex. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

Clement Rom. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

clergy (Gr. κληρον—lot, part; according to the dictum: quos in sordem Domini vocari—called to the lot of the Lord, so to speak”). The body of all the persons dedicated to the divine cult, from the lowest cleric to the Holy Father. Entrance into the clergy is effected through a sacred ceremony called tonsure (q.v.). The members of the clergy (divided into major clerics, if they have been marked with the orders of subdiaconate or higher, and minor clerics, if they have received only tonsure or minor orders) have the right of exercising the power of the order and jurisdiction inherent in the grade occupied in the twofold hierarchy (q.v.), the right of receiving benefices, offices, and ecclesiastical pensions, and the right to reverence from the laity. In addition, the clergy enjoy four privileges: of canon, of forum, of personal immunity, and of competence (see tonsure).

The clergy, on the other hand, are bound by grave obligations. These obligations are: (a) positive: greater sanctity than that of the laity, many practices of piety, and, above all, the recitation of the canonical hours (the Breviary or divine office), cult of the sacred sciences, canonical obedience to their respective bishops, chastity (see celibacy), the wearing of ecclesiastical dress, and visible tonsure; (b) negative: abstention from everything unbecoming to their dignity and to their character, such as military service of a combatant kind, clamorous lawsuits, the medical profession, the legal profession, frequenting markets or exchanges, etc. Such are the rules sanctioned by the Church in the Code of Canon Law (Can. 108-144), drawn from her two thousand years' experience.

If it is true, alas, that certain members of the clergy, by violating their sacred bonds imposed on them by the Church, have not done honor to the class to which they belong, it is also admitted by all serious historians that the priestly class, as a whole, has been the spiritual ferment which has raised in each epoch the mass of the Christian people. Moreover, the clergy have given very real and illustrious contributions to every branch of human knowledge and activity.
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cleric. See clergy; hierarchy.

"communicatio idiomatum" (communication of idioms) (Gr. τοιχολογία—property). The mutual attribution of the properties of the divine and of the human nature of Christ. It is legitimate on account of the hypostatic union, through which Christ is but one Person and so only one subject of attribution, which possesses both natures with their respective properties. The Nestorians (see Nestorianism), who placed in Christ two distinct subjects (persons), the Man and the Word, denied such mutual exchange of attributions between the two natures. The Monophysites, on the contrary, who fused into one the two natures, exaggerated the exchange of attributes to the point of eliminating the line of distinction between the divine and the human in Christ. The Church has condemned one and the other error, and declared such communication legitimate on the basis of the personal unity of Jesus Christ (Council of Ephesus), while at the same time it maintained firmly the distinction of the two natures with
their respective properties (Council of Chalcedon). In the light of these two definitions, the correct sense of the “communication of idioms” amounts to this: the mutual attribution of the properties of the two natures is not made directly to the natures themselves, taken as natures and in abstracto, but through the Person and in force of the unity of Person, the incarnate Word, real God and real Man. And so we may say of Christ: God is Man, the Christ-Man is God, the Immortal is mortal (because it is always the Person of the Word to whom we attribute that which is proper to one or to the other nature). But we may not say that the divinity is the humanity (because here attribution would be made between the two natures directly, without any reference to the Person).

On account of this communication, the Church sings in the Creed that the Only-Begotten of the Father has become man, suffered, died for us, and was buried.
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**Comminion, eucharistic** (Lat. *cum*—with, and *unio*—union; i.e., union with another). The participation in the sacrificial banquet in which the faithful feed on the body and blood of Christ.

The effects of this participation are the individual and social union of the faithful with Christ, ordained to the glorification of the soul and the body.

The individual union (*incorporatio*) is taught in a sublime way by Jesus Christ in the discourse of the eucharistic promise: the two mysteries of the trinitary life, mutual immanence of the Father in the Son and the procession of the Son from the Father, are repeated, in a way, in the relationship of Christ with the faithful: “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me” (John 6:57–58).

The social union (*concorporatio*) revealed in a classical Pauline text: “For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread” (1 Cor. 10:17), is reechoed by St. Augustine: “O Sacramentum pietais, o signum unius, o vinculum caritatis” (In Johannis, tr. XXV, 13).

The glorious resurrection (*in ad gloriam*—right to glory) is promised by the Lord in the sermon at Capernaum: “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day” (John 6:55), whence St. Ignatius Martyr († 107) exalts the Eucharist as the “drug of immortality and the antidote for death” (Ep. 20:2).

The *intimate nature* of these effects cannot be understood except in consideration of the general economy of the sacraments, of which they are the crown. Tradition represents the Eucharist as the perfection and summit (*consummatio*) of the whole supernatural order. As such it should complete the whole spiritual organism in its being (habitual grace), in its faculties (the virtues), in its activity (actual grace), and in its fruits (good works). In fact, as is drawn from a number of theological documents, the Eucharist produces more abundant habitual grace, increases charity, queen of all the virtues, to the highest grade, excites, with frequent *stimuli* of actual grace, that fervor from which shoot up luxuriantly, as a natural consequence, in greater number and perfection the good works that merit life eternal. Now, as is easily understood, effects of this kind constitute full incorporation in Christ, the most perfect union among the faithful, the highest right to glorification of soul and body, through which the individual faithful as well as the whole Church reach the acme of spiritual perfection, i.e., *maturity* for the beatific vision. After the Eucharist only one thing remains to be attained, i.e., glory.

**Commination, communio**


**Commination of Saints.** A truth of faith, which constitutes one of the articles of the Creed.

It consists in an intimate union and in a mutual influence among the members of the Church Militant, Church Suffering, and Church Triumphant (the Church on earth, in purgatory, and in heaven). This union and participation of the proper goods of the Church is founded chiefly on the truth of the Mystical Body (q.v.), through which all men in the large sense belong to Christ in virtue of the Incarnation and the Redemption; in the strict sense they are but one thing in Christ, as members of one sole organism, by force of baptism and, therefore, of faith and charity. In this mystical organism, which is the Church, Christ the Head injects the supernatural life of grace by means of the Holy Spirit, who is like the soul. United to Christ, the faithful are united among themselves; and this union is reinforced by the sacraments, channels of that grace which is the participation of the divine nature and the cause of the indwelling of the Holy Trinity in each sanctified soul. The gospel image of the vine (Christ) and the tendrils (Christians), the doctrine developed by St. Paul (1 Cor., Col., Eph., Rom.) about the Mystical Body and the Church, are a living expression of the dogma of the Communion of Saints, i.e., of all Christian souls for whom Christ, by way of the Last Supper: “That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee” (John 17:21).

The Eastern Fathers of the Church illustrate this dogma in the light of the Holy Spirit, who diffuses supernatural life in all Christians. The Western Fathers prefer to explain it from the focal point of the Church, Mystical Body of Christ, temporal and eternal society of the redeemed. Both considerations lead to the concept of a common life of a vital and mystical communion, in reason of which Christians fighting for good on earth, the souls in purgatory, and the blessed in heaven, communicate mutually one to the other the fruits of the Redemption, kept in the treasury of the Church, by prayer and by charity.
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**Commination.** See transsubstitution.

**Compenators.** See *cæterum.*

**Comprehensors.** The blessed who enjoy the beatific vision (q.v.), i.e.
the immediate intuition of the divine essence. The term *comprehensor* is used to indicate one who has arrived in the celestial country and who has reached God, the Supreme End, in opposition to one who is still a pilgrim on earth (*vivator*). But we are *not* to understand comprehensor in the sense that the blessed comprehends Himself, the blessed see Him through the light of glory, more or less intensively, but not with exhaustive knowledge—*totem* but not *totaller*, as the theologians say. However, each blessed, subjectively considered, is fully happy, since he sees as much as he is able to see.
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See under *vision*, *beatitude*.

**conclave** (Lat. *conclave* — locked room; from *cum* — with, and *clavis* — key). A closed place (ordinarily in the Vatican) where the cardinals assemble to elect the pope, or the assembly itself.

According to current discipline, as last amended by Pius XI, a conclave must assemble between 15 to 18 days after the death of the pope. The purpose is to give even the most distant cardinals a chance of attending the assembly.

On the day set, toward evening, the cardinals, each accompanied by a secretary and an attendant (*camerii*) enter the conclave. All the doors are closed, and the only means of communication are the *ruote*, sort of revolving dumb-waiters, which are constantly guarded. Outside are posted the “maggiorodoto” of the Sacred Palaces, representing the clergy, and the marshal of the holy Roman Church, representing the laity.

The next morning, in the Sistine Chapel, the election procedure begins.

**concursus, divine**. The influence of the first Cause on creature activity. The finite being, dependent on God in its being (see *creation; conservation*), must, consequently, depend on Him also in its operations, according to the Scholastic adage: *Operator sequitur esse.* Very few theologians, among whom Durand, reduced this operational dependence only to the creative and conservative action of God, who would concur remotely (*concursus medius*) in the operation of creatures, insomuch as He has given being and the power of action to them. On the other extreme, others stressed divine intervention in such a way as to eliminate creature action (e.g., the occasionalism of Malebranche). Sound theology is unanimous in admitting the necessity of a positive action of God on the creature in order to explain creature activity (*concursus immediatus*). This truth, although not one of defined faith, has its foundation in revelation: “Lord... for he is all our help” (Ps. 102:12); “In him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:28).

Reasons: (a) Only God is His Being, and so is essentially His operation (see *operation, divine*); the creature, on the contrary, receives its being and, therefore, must receive the impulse to operation, since a potency cannot pass to act of and by itself (see *Act, Pure*). (b) God, as first efficient and final Cause of the universe, has absolute dominion over all things and so it is absurd to exempt the activity of creatures from divine influence. (c) All creature activity is realizing, i.e., it produces in some way and touches the being or reality of things; but being, the most universal of all, must go back, in last analysis, to God as its proper and principal Cause, to whom the creature is subordinate as an instrumental or secondary cause. St. Thomas, in his *De Potentia*, q. 3, a. 7, fixes the divine concourse in four points. God is cause of the action of every creature (including man): (1) insomuch as He creates it; (2) insomuch as He conserves it; (3) insomuch as He moves it to act; (4) and uses it as an instrument (*concursus immediatus*).

On these points is based the theory of *physica promotion*, developed by the rigid Thomist Baez (sixteenth century), to the point of affirming a *predeterminatio ad unum* (predetermination to one thing), by which God would not only start man to act, but push him to do this rather than that (taking from man *active indifferenctia*). Such interpretation (see *Aniennesism*) was attacked by the Jesuit Molina, who proposed immediate divine concurrence, not exerted on the creature but with the creature in relation to the same effect: a kind of parallelism between God and the creature co-operating together (*concursus simulatium*). This opinion, while safeguarding human freedom, is certainly foreign to the thought of St. Thomas (see *Molinism*).

A divine motion is admissible which makes the creature pass to the exercise of the act, providing the creature itself contributes to the specification of the act (see *Thomism*).
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**concupiscence** (Lat. *concupere* — to long for). Psychologically, it is generally understood as a function of the *sensus* appetite which is divided into *irascible* (with respect to good or bad, difficult to attain) and *concupiscible* (with respect to good or bad, easy to attain). In this sense, like all passions, concupiscence is a natural property good in itself, but which may be used for good or for bad.

Morally, the word *concupiscence* is a disordered inclination to sensuous pleasures, against the direction of reason; accepted still more strictly, it is sensuality. Concupiscence, understood in a moral sense, is also called *fomes peccati* (that which foments, incites to sin). Luther (see *Lutheran-
non novit non indicat, sicut medicus quod ignorant non curat ("What the judge does not know, he does not judge, just as the doctor does not cure what he does not know").

But confession does not appear less necessary if it is considered from the side of sin, which is a pronouncement of the whole human being. To raise oneself, therefore, from sin, it is not sufficient for the soul to purify itself in the crucible of repentance, but it is also required that the lips open themselves to confession. By manifesting what is going on in the human conscience, external confession harmonizes the heart and the tongue, re-establishing order in the whole human person. Such order and harmony is a good which can only come from an act of virtue, of the most difficult virtue, humility. This external humiliation of declaring oneself a sinner before one’s fellow man strengthens and renders more efficacious the internal disposition which fortifies the penitent in waging unlimited warfare on sin and its consequences; therefore, the Catechism of the Council of Trent exalts auricular confession as the rock of Christian virtue.

The reformers of the sixteenth century haughtily rejected confession, designating it as “the slaughterhouse of consciences,” but today there is a faint re-echoing which bears a tinge of homesickness for the practices of the old paternal home and of regret for the work of Protestantism which has broken the bond that attached the people to the ear of their spiritual director (see penance).
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**confirmation**

The bishop, from the very beginning, has been the minister of this sacrament. It was the Apostles, and not the deacon Philip, who administered the first confirmation. It is fitting that a sacramental act, which implies completion and perfection, come within the ordinary powers of one who enjoys the fullness of priesthood. But this episcopal prerogative is not absolutely reserved to the bishops, because priests of the Oriental rite, by a sort of general delegation of the Church—while still remaining extraordinary ministers of confirmation—commonly confer this sacrament. Priests of the Latin rite can be authorized by the Roman pontiff to confer confirmation in cases provided for in the Code of Canon Law.

The matter is twofold: the imposition of hands (Acts 8:14-17) and the anointing (resulting from Tradition). The form is constituted by the words: “I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the charism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

Effects. The Fathers, liturgy, and the theologians are unanimous in exalting the effects of confirmation as a “complement,” “perfection,” “crown” of baptism.

The character of confirmation perfects that of baptism, especially because: (a) It enlarges the sphere of baptismal activity, especially in descendant mediation. In fact, while baptism confers the limited power of administering the sacrament of matrimony, confirmation renders the faithful a participant in a certain way of the ecclesiastical teaching authority (magisterium), by deputizing to profess, diffuse, and safeguard ex officio the patrimony of the faith, under the direction of the legitimate pastors. (b) It augments the exigencies of grace because, being a more precious
The grace of confirmation perfects that of baptism: (1) because this sacrament of fullness makes the faithful "similar to Christ inasmuch as from the first instant of His conception He was full of grace" (St. Thomas, III, q. 72, a. 1, ad 4); (2) because it brings to virility and maturity the supernatural organism "which from imperfect becomes immediately perfect" (ibid., III, q. 72, a. 8, ad 4); (3) because by extending the circulation of the supernatural life, it develops the whole Mystical Body. On the one hand, abundant meritorious works are produced by the spiritual organism directed toward new conquests, works that enrich ad intra the treasury of the Church; on the other hand, in virtue of the simultaneous and compact advance of the soldiers of Christ, the breast of the Church is extended ad extra to receive and regenerate new souls for Christ.

The Protestants of the sixteenth century saw in confirmation nothing more than a superfluous ceremony, whose origin must be traced back to some ancient catechism in which the adolescents gave an account of their faith to the Church. They were condemned by the Council of Trent, Sess. VII (DB, 871-875).
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congruism. A system derived from Molinism (q.v.) of which it keeps the fundamental principles. Congrism is connected especially with the name of Suarez, but is linked also to others, particularly to Bellarmine. The doctrinal point on which this system pivots is the nature of the efficacy of grace with respect to human freedom. The Thomists see generally a sharp difference between Molinism and congruism; the Molinists, on the contrary, maintain that the two systems coincide in thought, their mutual difference being only verbal.

Briefly: Molina terms efficacious that grace which attains its effect not by itself, but through the free consent of the man who receives it; God foresees that effect through the means of the so-called middle knowledge (scientia media). There is no initiative difference between sufficient grace and efficacious grace: the same grace can turn out inefficacious through lack of consent of the free will in a given subject, but can be efficacious in another subject who consents. Suarez develops and integrates this teaching of the Master, saying that the efficacy of grace depends on its adaptation to the psychological conditions of the individual, to the circumstances of time and place: this adaptation renders the grace congruous, proportioned to the subject in such a way that the effect follows infallibly, without violating the freedom of choice of the subject himself. Bellarmine even grants that congruous grace has an intrinsic efficacy of its own, which is not physical (St. Thomas) but moral (St. Augustine), in so far as it attracts and persuades to action.

All the congruists agree with Molina in maintaining that grace, in order to be efficacious, is conditioned by the free consent of man. Suarez, however, departs from Molina and approaches Thomism when he speaks of an absolute predestination, in the intentional order, independently of any human merit foreseen by God (ante previa merita). For the predestined, God is said to prepare the most congruous graces.

In 1613 the General of the Jesuits, Claude Aquaviva, ordered that the theologians of the company should follow congruism.
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conscience (Lat. cau — with, and seire — to know). In the proper sense, conscience is not a faculty, but an act of reflex knowledge, directed on what one has done or ought to do (St. Thomas). When the cognitive act has, as its object, actions already done, it is called psychological conscience (real reflexion of the acting subject on his own activity); and it is sensitive if it regards only the senses and their sensations (the Scholastics call it sensus intimus, inner sense, i.e., the point of confluence and of control of all sense life). But psychological conscience, more properly so called, is an act of the intelligence, with which the subject reflects on his inner activity and knows himself as acting person or acting ego (conscientia sicut).

Modern philosophy attaches great importance to this psychological conscience to the point of making it a constitutive element of the person (q.v.). If the cognitive act considers the action to be done with regard to its end, it is called moral conscience, which is distinguished into habitus and actual. The former is a disposition of the intellect to know promptly the supreme principles of human activity with reference to the end (moral principles), e.g., that one must do good and avoid evil. This disposition of the intellect is called also syneresis. Actual conscience consists in a practical judgment of the reason on the morality of an action to be done; it is, therefore, an application of the universal principles of syneresis to particular practical cases. This conscience may be certain, if there is no fear of error, or doubtful, if there may be error or erroneous, according as it discerns right or is mistaken. The error is invincible or without guilt if it cannot be avoided, or invincible and therefore guilty if it can be overcome. It is not licit to act in doubt, but the doubt must be removed by reflexion, advice, and prayer, and we must arrive at a moral certitude on the honesty of the action. Man is always obliged to follow the dictate of a conscience which is certain, even if that same conscience happens to be erroneous (invincibly).

It can happen that one be unable to remove all doubt; then he may follow a probable opinion founded on serious motives (probabilism), nor is he obliged to follow the safer opinion, as the tutorists would have it.
The question of freedom and responsibility is closely connected with conscience: conscience which obliges, commands, prohibits, reprobates, and causes remorse is an evident sign of free will; and if man is free he is also responsible for his actions before the tribunal of humanity, and still more before that of his conscience, which would be an enigma if it were not subject to a supreme law, to a supreme Legislator, and to a supreme Judge. Such is the Christian doctrine which condemns all forms of determinism and the absolute autonomy of moral conscience, as professed by Kant.
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Conservatory. The continuation of the creative act, with which God sustains the being of creatures either by positive influence in it or by removing the causes that tend to destroy it (negative conservation).

This truth is implicit in the definitions with which the *magisterium* of the Church affirms divine providence and government (q.v.). Expressive texts are found in Holy Scripture: "But if thou tumest away thy face, they shall be troubled: thou shalt take away their breath, and they shall fall, and shall return to their dust. Thou shalt send forth thy spirit, and they shall be created: and thou shalt renew the face of the earth" (Ps. 103:29-30).

Consistorial Congregation. See Holy See.

"consortium," divine. A communication or participation of the divine nature to the human soul by means of sanctifying grace. The Apostle (2 Pet. 1:14) speaks of the great gifts which the divine power of Christ has made to us according to the promises of old, in order that we may become sharers (Gr. κοινωνοί; Lat. consortes) of the divine nature. This participation is identified by the best exegetists with that supernatural life, kindled and sustained by the Holy Spirit in the Christian, which St. Paul calls *χάρις* (grace) and *τηρημα* (spirit, rule of the spirit in opposition to the flesh).

Conservation sees in the expression of St. Peter sanctifying grace, St. Thomas (In a Sent., d. 26, q. 1, a. 3) translates the teaching of Holy Scripture and Tradition into this philosophical language: operation is proportionate to the nature from which it proceeds and to its faculties; since the meritorious acts of eternal life surpass the conditions of human nature, God through means of grace elevates man to a participation of the divine nature in order that he may be capable of a deiform activity, proportionate to his supernatural end, which is the beatific vision. This participation is mysterious, like all divine things; hence the explanations attempted by the theologians vary. Certainly divine *consortium* is not to be understood as a substantial communication of the divine nature to man (this smacks of pantheism), or as a likeness of a merely moral order (this is too little). The divine *consortium* is of a physical, real order; if sanctified man is capable of obtaining really the same object of the activity of God, which is the divine essence contemplated and loved, he must also, as subject or principle of operation, have been really elevated to a divine level.

A modern theologian very aptly compares grace and divine *consortium* with the beatific vision and the Incarnation. In these three mysteries, the uncreated Act (God) acts terminally a finite potency in different ways:

- **Incarnation** — in the line of subsistence
- **Beatitude vision** — in the intentional line
- **Divine consortium** — in the accidental physical line

But the mystery still remains (see indwelling of the Holy Trinity; Incarnation; vision, beatific).
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contemplation. In a generic sense, it means attentive (visual or intellectual) observation of an attractive thing, which strikes the senses or the intelligence. In a religious sense, contemplation belongs to mystics (q.v.) and can be defined with St. Thomas (Summa Theol., II-II, q. 180): a simple "intuition" of truth, of which love is the motive and the term. Likewise St. Bonaventure defines it as a savoy knowledge of truth. The object of contemplation is God, with His mysteries and His works, especially with respect to man. Contemplation admits of grades, in such a way that it can ascend from a fleeting, intuitive glimpse illumining the soul in a moment of grace, up to a foretaste of the beatific vision of the divine essence, as was the happy lot of St. Paul.

Certain authors (Lejeune, Poulain) distinguish between an acquired contemplation (human activity in cooperation with grace) and an infused or properly so-called mystical contemplation (exclusively divine gift), which has as its characteristic mark an experimental perception of God, accompanied by extraordinary, psychological phenomena (ecstasies, stigmata, etc.). Other more recent authors (Gardel, Carrugou-Lagarde) prefer to reduce all contemplative life to but one kind of species, broken down into various grades. Thus they identify it with the mystical life, as a progressive development in the supernatural life lived by the Christian, through grace and the supernatural gifts, in Christ and through Christ. This contemplation does not necessarily involve the extraordinary, psychic phenomena, which are not essential to it, but certainly does imply an altogether special knowledge of God and divine things, a delightful knowledge which anticipates, in a measure, the beatific vision, to which the entire supernatural life is ordained.

The mystics call it experimental knowledge, by analogy with sensation, which is immediate and alive. In fact, the mystical-contemplative person not only knows God but, in a certain way, feels Him present in himself; rather than a clear vision he has an obscure perception of the divine Friend near him in the mysterious shadows. Ontologically speaking, the sanctified man is the temple of God who dwells in him; psychologically, by way of mystical contemplation, he comes to experience the divine presence. All Christians can and should aspire through a healthy asceticism to this mystical-spiritual perfection, in which intuition and love of God are the prelude of eternal life. The extraordinary phenomena, which sometimes accompany this divination of the spirit, may result in dangerous aberrations when man pursues them without cultivating the supernatural life of the spirit, which is a gift of God and, at the same time, a daily conquest. Prayer (q.v.) is the very web of mystical contemplation.

St. Gregory the Great, from whom St. Thomas takes his inspiration, is the master of contemplative life in the West; in the East the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite is the outstanding doctor. In times closer to ours Spain gave two great mystics: St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa. So many of the Carmelite Order, have left us wonderful descriptions of their supernatural experience. For Italy it suffices to recall St. Francis of Assisi and St. Catherine of Siena with their priceless writings.
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contrition (Lat. consolare — reduce to little bits). The Council of Trent defines contrition: "Sorrow of the soul and detestation of sin committed, with the resolve to sin no more" (Sess. 14, Ch. 4; DB, 897). It is, therefore, not a vague sentiment but a decisive act of the will, in knowledge of all the deformity of sin, flies and detests it, and nourishes the firm resolve not to fall back into it. Contrition can be either perfect or imperfect. Perfect contrition arises in the heart of the sinner, who grieves for his sin so far as it is an offense against God, in whom he considers the paternal goodness, which has been united with this sin. Moved, therefore, by a pure love, called benevolence or charity, the penitent, as it were, breaks his heart to bits under the blows of sorrow, whence the name of contrition, a quasi crushing into bits of the penitent heart. With such repentance, all permeated with the flames of charity, there always goes hand in hand (given the intention of confession) justification, or the remission of guilt, because ubi caritas, ibi Deus est.

To make the sacrament of penance efficacious, imperfect contrition (attrition — breaking into larger parts) is sufficient. It rises in the soul of him who seriously renounces sin, for a supernatural motive indeed (like the fear of hell or the ugliness of sin), but inferior to perfect charity. Instead of seeing in God the image of the Father the penitent sees the image of the Judge, who threatens severe punishments to the transgressors of His laws.

When attrition (namely internal, supernatural, and universal sorrow for sins committed) is "informed" by absolution, the penitent from attrition becomes contrite, that is, he becomes justified, because then there is a valid sacrament which, ex opere operato, infuses grace infallibly connected with charity. So the faithful who approach the tribunal of penance still shaking with a fear which the theologians call servitium, in virtue of the Passion of Christ which works through the sacramental rite, go away reinvigorated with a feeling of filial love and serene confidence in the goodness of the heavenly Father (see penance).
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Co-Redemptrix. A title in recent use to express the co-operation of the Blessed Virgin in the work of Redemption performed by Christ. The idea of Mary's co-operation in our salvation is as old as Christianity and has its dogmatic foundation in the divine maternity, through which both Christ and His work belong, in a certain sense, to Mary, who conceived, bore, and nourished the Redeemer, and in addition offered Him in the Temple and suffered with Him, shared with Him spiritually. His martyrlike death on the cross. Such is the classic, indisputable doctrine. Very recently, however, under the special impulse of the theological
cosmogony

faculty of Louvain, with Bittremieux at its head, a great controversy has flared up as to the value and the extension of that co-operation of Mary, and, therefore, as to the legitimacy and the nature of the titles: Mediatrix and Co-Redemptrix (see mediatrix).

Certain doctrinal points: (1) Mary, as Mother of Christ, is a partaker of His life and His works and so, in a broad sense, may be called Mediatrix and Co-Redemptrix; (2) in the designs of God, Mary is associated with Christ in the triumph over sin, as Eve joined with Adam in the ruin of the human race; (3) Mary consented to the passion and death of Christ, adding to them her own maternal anguish, thus meriting (de congruo; see meritis) the prerogative of treasurer and distributor of the fruits of the Redemption. This doctrine is founded on Holy Scripture and is extensively developed by the Fathers. The magisterium of the Church has always taught it.

Controversial points: (1) May Mary be called Mediatrix between God and men, like Jesus Christ and subordinately to Him? (2) May Mary be called truly Co-Redemptrix together with Christ, in the sense that she has added efficaciously, on her own part, works of her own to the work of the Redeemer? (3) Given that Redemption consists in the condign satisfaction and merit of Christ (see Redemption), can it be said that Mary, together with Christ, has satisfied the divine justice with her sufferings and has merited for us grace and salvation?

Some theologians, adhering closely to Tradition, answer negatively, fearing to take from the dignity of the one Mediator and true Redeemer, and out of reverence for the classical thesis of the necessity of the Incarnation (q.v.). Others follow the affirmative position, utilizing also recent pontifical documents (Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI), which seem to favor this second opinion.

It is still a moot question with no clear and sure solution in sight. But surely the association of the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Redeemer, her Son, involves a participation that is even direct and immediate, although mysterious, in the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. And so the title Co-Redemptrix is justified.
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Cosmogony (Gr. κόσμος — world, and γένεσις — generation, origin). Signifies the origin of the world, which in ancient times has been the subject of mythological poems and philosophical inquiries. What interests us theologically is the Mosaic cosmogony, or biblical account of creation contained in the book of Genesis. This account, called also hexameron (the work of six days) arranges the creation of all things in six days progressively, from matter to the vegetable world, to the animal world, and to man. The Scholastics reduced creation to three phases: (a) opus creationis: creation of the heaven and the earth in an “inform” stage; (b) opus distinctiones: division of light from darkness, of the earth from the waters; (c) opus ornatus: the creation of living beings. But from the beginning of Christianity the Mosaic account has had different interpretations according to two main currents, the one allegorical and the other literal.

1. Allegorism: Introduced in the Alexandrian School, it was adopted soberly by St. Augustine, who maintains that Moses does not have the intention of narrating the exact history of creation, but of affirming the truth that all has been created by God, and that human work and rest on the Sabbath are an imitation of the work and repose of God; therefore, Moses arranges creation according to the days of the week. Moreover, St. Augustine holds that all was created in an instant and afterward developed gradually according to the rationes seminiales (seminal reasons or causes) put in matter by God. This opinion has nothing to do with the evolutionism of our times (Darwin), which admits the evolution of one species into another, foreign to the Augustinian conception. Allegorism, contained by St. Augustine within the limits of orthodoxy, has degenerated in later times to the point of mythologism. Therefore, it is to be considered with caution. Modern Catholic exegesis has steered clear of it.

2. Literalism: The Mosaic account is understood according to the letter (many Fathers and theologians). Some modern Catholics, interpreting the Hebrew word yom (day) as an indeterminate period (periodism), push the literal sense so far that they attempt to maintain perfect agreement between the Bible and geological discoveries (concordism), notwithstanding grave difficulties.

The Church, as far back as the IV Lateran Council (D.L. 428), attributed to God not only global creation, but also the distinct creation of the spiritual and material creatures. As regards the Mosaic account, we have the answer of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (1909), which establishes firmly these points: (a) the account is substantially historical and literal and, therefore, exaggerated allegorism and mythologism are false; (b) certain facts, with regard to the foundations of Christian doctrine, are certainly historical and literal (e.g., the creation of man and woman, original sin, etc.); (c) it is unnecessary, however, to interpret literally the individual expressions, and so, for example, the word day can be taken in its literal sense or in the sense of a period of time; (d) Moses did not intend to teach the creation with scientific exactness, but in a popular manner, according to the language of the day; the account is, therefore, a true, popular story without scientific pretensions. On this last point see Pius XII encyclical Divino afflante (1948) and Humani generis (1950).
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council. The assembly of the bishops convoked to define questions of faith, morals, and discipline. The council is general (ecumenical) when it represents the whole Church, and particular when it represents a part of the Church—a nation (national council), or several provinces (plenary), or only one province (provincial).

An ecumenical council (Gr. οἰκουμενικός), representing the whole Church, requires the presence of the head (either the pope or his legate), and representation of the bishops of the majority of the ecclesiastical provinces. Since the Roman pontiff enjoys primacy over the whole Church (see Roman pontifex), there can be no ecumenical council which is not convoked through his authority, presided over by him (or his legate), and confirmed by his infallible assent (see infallibility of the pope). In the ecumenical council, the episcopate and the pope are the twofold subjects of jurisdiction, really but not adequately distinct, like the head is really but not adequately distinct from the body; hence the ecumenical council is not above the pope, but the pope is superior to the council,
for which reason there is no appeal from pope to council. This follows naturally from the Vatican Council definitions on the pontifical primacy (cf. DB, 1831).

Since dogmatic definitions of an ecumenical council are infallible, they are irrefutable, but its disciplinary measures are subject to modification by one superior to the council itself, i.e., by the Roman pontiff.
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creation. According to Catholic doctrine, the act by which God made from nothing all things. To create means to realize a being (i.e., to bring it into actual existence) in all its concreteness, to produce a thing which in no wise previously existed, either in itself or in the potentiality of a subject, ex nihilo sui et subjecti, as the Scholastics put it. The sculptor carves a statue: the statue as such did not exist, but it did exist as marble. On the contrary, God by His creative act realized the world, when there existed nothing outside of Himself. Pagan philosophy, even that of Plato and Aristotle, never reached a true concept of creation, which, however, is naturally knowable to human reason. This concept is a datum of Christian revelation.

It is a matter of faith that God has created the universe from nothing (cf. Apostles’ Creed, IV Lateran Council, Vatican Council: DB, 428, 1783, 1801 ff.). In Holy Scripture we read: “In the beginning God created heaven, and earth” (Gen. 1:1). The Hebrew verb b’rah of itself does not necessarily include the sense of creating from nothing, but the context demands it, and such is the understanding of the text in Jewish tradition (2 Mac. 7:28). In the New Testament revelation is clearer and peremptory; the Prologue of St. John’s Gospel is sufficient: “All things were made by him: and without him was made nothing that was made” (1:3; cf. Col. 1:15 f.).

The Fathers, from the first centuries, develop and defend the concept of universal creation, even of matter, against the Neoplatonists, the Gnostics, and the Manichaeans. Reason proves that, outside of divine creation, there is no other way to explain the existence of the world. The proofs of the existence of God are based on creative divine causality. The world has actually all the characteristics of an effect, that is, of a being ab aeterno (from another), because it is finite, mutable, contingent, multiple. Moreover, the other solutions attempted to solve the problem are absurd (materialism, pantheism, absolute dualism, with two eternal independent principles, God and the world, and idealistic monism).

The creative act is exclusively of God, formally immanent (identical with His essence) and virtually transient (see operation, dinome). According to St. Thomas it is also in the creature as a relation (transcendent and predeterminative), which implies order to and dependency on God. Together with the universe, God created space, and time which is the measure of motion of mutable things (see eternity).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

creationism. The doctrine of the Church about the origin of the individual soul. Holy Scripture clearly states the divine origin of the soul (q.v.) by way of creation, as well as its spirituality and immortality. But in the very bosom of the Church, from the first centuries, there arose the question of the origin of the individual souls of men.

Origin, under the influence of Platonism, was of the opinion that God had created ab aeterno a great number of spirits (angels and souls) and then had condensed the human souls to “inform” material bodies in expiation of an incurred guilt. This extravagant opinion, flavored by the excessive spiritualism of Plato and of the Gnostics, was rejected by the magisterium of the Church together with other errors of Origen (see Origivism). Opposed to this opinion is that of Tertullian, a realist, lover of the concrete, who, although the author of De anima, the first treatise of Christian psychology that was substantially orthodox, fell into the vulgar error of traducianism (q.v.), according to which the souls of the children would derive from the corporeal seed of the parents. This opinion also was explicitly condemned by the Church (DB, 170: Letter of Anastasius II to the Bishops of Gaul, 498).

Tradition, especially in the East, stands for creationism, according to which the individual souls are created by God, one by one, and infused into the embryonic bodies in the maternal womb. But the Pelagian heresy (see Pelagianism), which denied the transmission of original sin to the sons of Adam, threw some confusion on the doctrine of creationism in connection with the difficulty of explaining the transmission of that sin into a soul created instantly and directly by God. Even St. Augustine felt the irksomeness in confronting this difficulty. He rejected the traducianism of Tertullian, appreciated creationism and would have liked to embrace it, but in order better to expound the transmission of original sin against Pelagius he leaned toward a spiritual traducianism, according to which the soul of the offspring derives from the souls of the parents, like light from light. But the Church continued to teach creationism more or less explicitly (cf. the Letter of Anastasius II, loc. cit.; also a document of Leo IX, DB, 348; and of Alexander VII, DB, 1100).

Human reason itself does not see any way, outside of creationism, of explaining the origin of the soul, as St. Thomas demonstrates (Summa Theol., I, q. 90, a. 2). A spiritual substance cannot, in fact, derive from matter, as it is evident, nor can it emanate from another spirit, as spiritual traducianism asserts, because spiritual substances do not divide or split or change one into the other; they must, therefore, derive from God through creation.
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credibility. See apologetics.

Creed. See Symbol.

cross (Lat. crux — torturum, from the verb crucicare). The implement upon
which was accomplished the ignominious and cruel torture of crucifixion. Crucifixion, in Roman law, was the severest of capital punishments. It was particularly applied to slaves, for the expiation even of the slightest faults. It was used first by the Persians and then introduced into Greece by Alexander the Great. The Romans took it from Carthage.

Cicero (C. Verrem, II, 5, 62-67) upheld the thesis that no Roman citizen should, for any reason, be crucified. In the time of the Empire, in the provinces—like Judea—the cross was intended for rebels, brigands, and poor wretches.

Pilate, under the pressure of the Sanhedrin and of the mob, condemned Jesus to crucifixion. None of the Evangelists describes the crucifixion, which was performed according to Roman custom. The condemned went to the place of execution, carrying on his shoulders the transverse bar of the cross called patibulum. The vertical bar was permanently set in the place of crucifixion.

The cross of Jesus was a crux immissa whose two bars crossed at right angles at a great distance from the base (it is also called the Latin cross). On the small segment above the transverse bar was nailed the tablet with the motive of the sentence on it. The cross of Jesus measured about 13 feet or more in height, for the soldier needed a cane to extend the sponge, steeped in vinegar, to the crucified Christ.

Toward the middle of the crossbar there was a support on which the condemned could rest, so as not to have the entire weight of the body bear on the nails with which the hands were fastened. It is probable that the Romans took it into consideration the delicate sense of modesty of the Hebrews and consented, against the Roman custom, to let Jesus wear a loin cloth.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*Alger, History of the Cross (Boston, 1858).*
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**cult** (Lat. cultus, from colere—to honor). Basically, cult denotes a kind of honor, which in turn is a sign of esteem given to a person for his excellence. But cult adds to honor or esteem the feeling of one's own inferiority and subjection with respect to the person honored. Thus, in the proper sense, cult is the external manifestation of honor paid to a superior person in recognition of his excellence and our own submission. Since God is the supreme Being and the absolute Lord of the universe, to Him is due worship in its highest grade. This worship coincides with the essential characteristic of religion which, precisely, consists in honoring God for His excellence in serving Him as Lord. Worship, in the sense of religion, is due exclusively to God (whence we understand the gravity of the offense of idolatry); an inferior form of religious worship may be licit with respect to creatures only insomuch as these have reference to God and manifest His perfections.

**Distinctions:** Cult of its nature is not only internal but also external: external cult is either private (individual) or public (official—authorized by the Church). The singular worship reserved to God alone is called latrinx (Gr. λατρεία—to serve) or adoration; that given to the saints is called dulia (Gr. δουλεία—to serve) or veneration. The worship of the Blessed Virgin is called hyperdulia. A relative cult is given to images and to relics; it is called relative because it is referred to the person which the image represents and to which the relic belonged by reason of contact.

The humanity of Christ is the object of liturgical worship with this difference, that God is adored in Himself and on account of Himself, while the humanity of Christ is adored in itself, not on account of itself, but on account of the Word, to which it is hypostatically united. Errors: iconodulasts, Protestants (qq.v.; see Heart of Jesus).
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*Peter Pires, De Verbo incarnato (Rome, 1932), pp. 143, 382 ff., Pius XII, De cultiva, Dogmatic Theology, VI Mariology (St. Louis, 1946), pp. 139-180.*

**Cyril Alex.** See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

**D**

**Damascene.** See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302).

**damned.** The creatures (angels or humans) who are in hell (q.v.) and, therefore, are condemned to eternal punishment, i.e., subjected to the separation from God (poena damnii) and to the various positive sufferings which afflict the soul and, after the resurrection of the flesh, the body as well (poena sensus). The determining cause of damnation for human beings is the state of personal mortal sin at the moment of death, which has not been eliminated by an act of oblation, or of attrition united with a sacrament (penance or, if impossible, extreme unction). The doctrine of the Church, drawn from divine revelation, is explicitly stated in the Constitution of Benedict XII (DB, 530): “We define that according to the common order of God, the souls of those dying in actual mortal sin, immediately after their death descend into hell, where they are tormented with the pains of hell.”

Babies who die without baptism are not numbered among the damned, because they are subject only to the penalty of loss (poena damnii), and will not suffer any pain of sense (see babies deceased without baptism; limbo; penalty). Adults who die without baptism would go to limbo if they had no other sin except original sin. The theologians, however (Summa Theol., I-II, q. 89, a. 1, ad 6), find it morally, or at least psychologically impossible, that a man reach the use of reason and adult age without choosing between good and evil, i.e., without determining himself to good or to evil (in the choice of the ultimate end), and, therefore, without justifying himself, with the help of grace, or without committing a grave sin, by rejecting grace and acting against right reason.

Since it is the certain teaching of the Church that hell is not only a state or condition but also a place, it follows that the damned are confined to the infernal place and are there in the manner spiritual substances are locally present (according to the better opinion, by way of action). It is evident that, after the resurrection of the flesh, the bodies of damned men will be locally present in hell. We have it from Holy Scripture that the demons (q.v.) can be outside hell, among men, bringing with them their infernal suffering; but it is held that ordinariy damned men cannot wander outside of the place of their torment. It is not impossible, however, to conceive that God permit a damned soul to appear in some form to the living for a worthy and adequate motive, as we
read in certain serious documents of Tradition. So, likewise, God can suspend the application of the decree of damnation immediately after the death of a person, in view of the prayers of a saint, and grant the return to life of that person in order that he may be converted and die in the state of grace (cf. the miracle of St. Philip Neri on the son of Prince Massimo).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


See under hell.

death. The separation of the soul, which continues to live, from the body, which is dissolved into its elements. Of its very nature the soul is immortal, being pure spirit, and, therefore, simple and not subject to decomposition. The body, like all material things, is subject to corruption, according to nature's law. But God had provided by a special privilege for the integrity and immortality of the human body: *Deus creavit hominem inextinguibilem* ("God created man incorruptible," Wisd. 2:23). Separation of the soul from the body is the consequence of sin, according to the divine threat: "In what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die the death" (Gen. 2:17). "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death" (Rom. 5:12). Death is the universal law to which even Jesus Christ wished to subject Himself. Death is not only the terminus of earthly life, but also the deadline for meriting. Christ calls death "the night... when no man can work" (John 9:4), and St. Paul: "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment" (Heb. 9:27). Now the judgment decides inexorably man's destiny. This truth is amply developed by Tradition, and, while not defined, it is taught by the ordinary magisterium of the Church (DB, 530 ff.; and 693; cf. also 203 ff. where Origen's opinion on the possibility of a final redemption after death is condemned).

Physiologically, the moment of real death does not coincide with but follows that of apparent death. A recent theory, called "illumination of the Agonizing," holds that the soul between these two moments can undergo a beneficial crisis of conversion under a special divine influence. This theory would indeed broaden the salvation path, but it has not found wide acceptance.
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Decalogue (Gr. δέκα λόγοι—ten words, i.e., commandments). The name is taken from the Bible itself (Exod. 34:28; Deut. 4:13; 10:14) and designates the commands of a religious and moral nature that constituted the foundation of the past, concluded by God on Sinai with Israel, which made them chosen people. With the exception of the precept of the Sabbath (i.e., the day of rest from work), the Decalogue contains natural laws which have a universal value, and, therefore, remain in force, with the improvements added to them by Christ in the Christian Church (Matt. 5:17-47). The pact contained also a contingent series of dispositions of civil character (Exod. 21:1-23) for the regulation of the life of the-Israelite nation.

Since the Decalogue was consigned by God Himself to Moses, written on two tablets of stone which were afterward preserved in the Ark (Exod. 40:20) in testimony of the covenant concluded, it is probable that its original form was in brief sentences, as is the case in the majority of the present precepts. In later literary editing, a few explanations were added here and there (Exod. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:6-21). The order of the commandments is not constant in the text tradition.

The extension of the form of the first commandment, Exodus 20:2-6, has been the subject of discussion:

"2. I am the Lord thy God. . . . 3. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me. 4. Thou shalt not take to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth 5. Thou shalt not add to, nor take from the commandments that I give thee. 6. And shewing mercy unto thousands, them that love me, and keep my commandments."

Verses 4-6 are, obviously, an explanation of the commandment true and proper, as contained in Verses 2-3. Therefore, Catholics (together with the ancient Jews of Palestine and the Lutherans) do not consider them a commandment distinct from the preceding. They simply prohibit any figuration of the divinity, because the cult of images among the peoples that came into contact with Israel was, without exception, a cult in the service of polytheism and of idolatry. The Hebrews, the Fathers of the Greek Church, the Calvinists, and certain modern Catholics consider Verses 4-6 as a new (i.e., the second) commandment, and so they join in one the last two commandments (coveting both the possession of one's neighbor as well as his wife) which are more logically considered as separate by the other exegetes just mentioned, who see in Verses 2-6 only one commandment with its attached explanation. Indeed, the passion which inclines man to desire his neighbor's property is different from that which prompts him to covet his neighbor's wife.

Certain Protestants wrongly blame the Catholic Church for having suppressed in the Decalogue the precept relative to images. The real extension of the text of the commandment is not a theological question, but a problem of exegesis, which is of free discussion among students of various faiths and different Christian professions.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


"de condigno," See merit.

"de congruo," See merit.

**definition, dogmatic.** The solemn declaration of the Church on a truth contained in the sources of divine revelation (Holy Scripture and Tradition) and proposed to the faithful, who, therefore, are obliged to believe it on the authority of God, who has revealed it. Written and oral revelation contain a complexus of truths more or less clearly enunciated. First of all, a distinction must be made between what is formally, i.e., essentially, revealed, and what is deducible, by way of reasoning, from a revealed principle or premise (virtual revelation). The formally revealed truth is obviously divine and bears with it the whole weight of the authority of God, supreme and infallible. Truth. The virtually revealed truth, on the contrary, is the result of a divine element and a human element, and cannot impose itself on the conscience of the believer in the name of God. The
Church is the custodian of the de-posit of divine revelation and, therefore, has the duty not of creating divine truth, but of seeking it in the sources of revelation, bringing it into light, should it not be explicit, and of proposing it as such for belief.

The declaration of the Church can be made by way of the ordinary magisterium (unanimous consent of the Fathers and the theologians, unanimous preaching of the bishops, consent of the faithful, liturgical usage), or by way of the extraordinary magisterium (solemn declaration of the pope, through a bull or other document; declaration of an ecumenical council [see council] or of a particular council approved by the pope; symbols and professions of faith emanating from or approved by the Church). A dogmatic truth is a truth proposed in the second way; it constitutes in the strictest sense a formal dogma (see dogma), which is also called a truth of divine-Catholic faith, to which the faithful cannot refuse their assent without falling into heresy (q.v.). It should be noted, however, that generally, to constitute a dogma or a truth of divine-Catholic faith, the function of the ordinary magisterium is in itself sufficient, as the Vatican Council declares, Sess. III, Ch. 3 (DB, 1792): 

Fide divina et Catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur et ab Ecclesia sive sollemni judicio sive ordinariorum et universalis magisterii tantum divinitatis revelata credenda proponuntur (“All those things are to be believed on the basis of divine and Catholic faith which are contained in God’s word, either written or handed down by Tradition and are proposed for belief as being divinely revealed by the Church, whether by solemn judgment or by the ordinary and universal magisterium”).

deism. Etymologically it should mean a system in which God is affirmed; a meaning coincident with that of theism. Usage, however, not only distinguishes but expresses the one to the other. Theism is an orthodox system, which Christian theology (natural theology) admits integrally (in opposition to atheism and pantheism). Deism, on the other hand, is a rationalistic conception of the Divinity, based on human reason with the systematic exclusion of divine revelation. The deistic affirmation presents a God mutilated in His nature and attributes; according to the scope of this mutilation, theism has various grades. In the beginning (sixteenth century) the word deism was applied to identify the Socinians (see Unitarianism); in the seventeenth century a deism gained ground in England as Rational Christianity (Cherbury, Collins, Bolingbroke, and others); in the eighteenth century it became the insignia of the Encyclopedists (Voltaire and Rousseau especially). By minimizing the divinity, deism approaches closer and closer to atheism or pantheism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


demon, devil. Two words of Greek origin: δαιμόν, of uncertain root, and διαβόλος (from διαβάλλω — I accuse, calumniate) — accuser, used both to indicate the angels rebellious to God and for that reason cast into hell. In the Greek classics (Homer, Heriodot, Plato, Platarch) the use of δαιμόν is frequent (much more than that of διαβόλος), but with a varying meaning: numen (deity), doing good or evil to man, genius or protecting spirit (cf. the demon of Socrates), intermediary between the divinity and man, and at times also fate, destiny.

The concept of good or bad spirits, intermediary between God and the world, is met also in other religions and systems of mythological philosophy (Gnosticism); but Christian revelation presents so characteristic a teaching on the subject of the demons that derivation from outside sources cannot be sustained. In the Old Testament the figure of Satan (from דאון — ensnare, persecute) flashes sinister, as the adversary of man who, under the figure of a serpent, determines the fall of Eve and Adam, requests and obtains God’s consent to torment Job, excites Saul and incites David to evil. Mention is made of the devil in the book of Tobias, and in the book of Wisdom, which attributes to him the introduction of death in the world (Wisd. 2:24). The name of Satan, demon, devil, occurs more frequently in the New Testament. Satan tempts Jesus in the desert (Matt. 4:1); the Pharisees attribute the miracles of Jesus to Satan, but the Saviour proves their accusation to be stupid by showing His power in chasing out the devils and their head from the obsessed (cf. especially Mark’s Gospel); Jesus says He saw Satan hurled down from heaven like a lightning bolt (Luke 10:18); He forewarns the Apostles against His assaults (Luke 22:31); on the vigil of His passion and death, He declares that Satan is already judged and overcome (John 16:11).

The Fathers develop these data and furnish the material to the Scholastics for a definitive doctrinal systemization, to which the magisterium of the Church has contributed certain details (cf. IV Lateran Council, DB, 428).

The chief points of the Catholic doctrine on the devil are: (a) God created the angels (q.v.) who are good by nature, but some sinned and deliberately became bad; (b) it is not the devil who created matter and bodies; (c) Satan and his followers were punished by God by being cast into hell, whence they insidiously ensnare and persecute men, but only in so far as God permits (see temptation); (d) the devils, like all the pure angels, are pure spirits endowed with intellect and will; (e) these pure spirits were adorned with grace from the first instant of their creation: many fell into a sin of pride and were lost irremediably because, due to their spiritual nature, once they have made their free choice between good and evil they are immutable in their will and so without the possibility of repentance; (f) the devil, by sinning, lost his supernatural gifts, but he retains his spiritual nature, rich in intelligence and in will tenaciously bent on evil; (g) the devils hate men who are destined to replace them in heaven.
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deposit of faith. The expression occurs in the two letters of St. Paul (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14), in connection with the idea of doctrines of the faith. The “deposit” which St. Paul transmits to his faithful collaborator is the whole of divine revelation (1 Tim. 6:21; 4:6) made up of the dogmas of faith, Christian morals, the sacraments, Holy Scrip-
The hierarchical constitution of the Church. The juridical concept of deposit necessitates that it be not the propery of the guardian but of the consignor who has handed it over to him to keep it in a safe state. The “deposit of faith” has come from God and is entrusted to those to whom a special assistance of the Holy Ghost is assured (2 Tim. 1:14), i.e., to those who succeed the Apostles in their episcopacy and in their ministry.

Christ has transmitted the deposit whose content cannot be subjected to alterations. The privilege of infallibility in the safeguarding of the deposit belongs to the Church “pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim. 3:15): personal infallibility is the exclusive prerogative of Peter, foundation of the Church (Matt. 16:18), and of his successors in the apostolic primacy. To keep the deposit does not mean, however, to bury it, as the servant blamed in the parable did with the talents of his master (Matt. 25:14-30; Luke 19:11-27). The Church finds in the “deposit of faith” the riches that it communicates to her children, the arms with which she fights her adversaries, adapting herself with wonderful wisdom to the needs of men and of the times. Her living faith determines the content and the extension of the deposit which could not be and never was intended to be a complete inventory of Christian beliefs and institutions.
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descent of Christ into hell. Clearly affirmed in the New Testament (Acts 2:24; 22:30-31; 1 Pet. 3:19 f.; 4:6); this truth is found explicitly formulated since the fourth century in the Symbol (Creed), into which it was introduced without opposition and without any polemic end whatever. Since the Word through His Incarnation accepted all the conditions inherent in human nature—in sin excepted—the soul of Christ in the interval between His death and resurrection went to the sojourn of the dead (descendit ad inferos). Inferni means “lower regions.” It indicates the place where the dead were in a state of natural happiness, waiting for the Redemption which would open for them the gates of heaven. It is to be noted that during those three days the body of Christ remained in the tomb, while the soul left the body, the divinity was never separated either from the soul or from the body. Consequently, Christ descended into hell in His soul and in His divinity.

In the regions beyond the grave, Jesus announced the accomplishment of the Redemption to the just of the Old Testament. The biblical texts mentioned above present various difficulties of interpretation, and patristic tradition is not always unanimous in determining their meaning. The detailed accounts of the Apocrypha (q.v.) about Christ’s activity in the limbo of the Fathers are disputable. However, the dogma itself is clear in its essential lines.
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desire of God. Properly speaking, desire is an inclination of the sense appetite or of the will toward an absent good. Improperly speaking the inclination of the intellect toward truth is also called desire. That creatures, man especially, tend to God consciously or unconsciously is a truth of faith and of reason since God is the efficient and final Cause of all things.

In man, fashioned after the image of God, that tendency is more accentuated and, since the fall of man, this desire has become more dramatic, a real homesickness. But there is a long-standing theological question with respect to the desire of the beatific vision: Can man without revelation and grace desire to see the essence of God in an “intuitive” way, i.e., face to face?

Scotus and his school answer affirmatively, adding that such desire is innate, i.e., quasi instinctive, independent of the explicit knowledge of its object. This opinion binds man more intimately to God and presents the supernatural order as the object of a natural inclination; not clearly understood at the time of the condemnation of Arianism (q.v.), it has been revived lately by several theologians of various schools.

The Thomists, on the contrary, starting from a standpoint of rigid distinction between the natural and supernatural orders, maintain that there cannot arise in man a desire of the beatific vision without revelation, and that such desire can in no way be efficacious without grace. St. Thomas (Summa Theol., I, q. 12, a. 1, and in other works) speaks of a “natural desire” which arises in man at the sight of created effects, namely the desire of seeing also their first Cause, God in Himself.

Commentary on this statement of St. Thomas has led to an abundance of literature with the most varied solutions. Following the current of thought headed by Ferraris (Sylvester of Ferrara), we may hold, as more probable, the following interpretation: the desire of which St. Thomas speaks is really natural, not, however, innate (instinctive) but elicited, i.e., dependent on the knowledge of created things (effect), from which arises the desire to know their Cause (God). But God cannot be known fully except through the beatific vision; therefore, without knowing it, man with such natural desire tends materialistically to the beatific vision. In that desire is rooted the possibility of the elevation of man to the supernatural order (obediential potency), but it would remain a mere inefficacious tendency without the help of grace.
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destiny. In popular language it signifies an obscure and inescapable law which determines an event, a series of events, or the whole course of the life of a man, of a people, of an institution. In this sense destiny has aze as a synonym. It is quite common today, especially in those professing no faith, to find an uncontrolled consciousness of this obscure law, which slips into a banal superstition.

The concept of destiny is predominant in pagan religions and is not extraneous to philosophical systems. The Greeks personified destiny, making it a capricious ruler not only of poor mortals, but even of the gods themselves. Destiny is the omnipotent and inexorable Moira (Moipos), which predetermines everything in its immutable decrees; it is the Fatum.
deuteroecanonical

(spoken, decreed) of the Latins. The Parcae, Fortuna, are plastic representations of the same concept, particularly with respect to human life.

Stoicism is the most fatalistic of the philosophical systems. It has a whole theory of destiny as an unescapable law of the universe, which is conceived as a Whole destined to run its ascendant and descendant parabola, whirling in its rigid fatality all its parts, man not excluded. Marcus Aurelius gives in his Memorier the sad echo of this Stoic determinism which compromises human freedom. Cicero had already rejected against this inhuman conception in his work De fato, and, given the alternative between divine fate and human freedom, he decisively takes his stand for freedom up to the point of denying the influence of divine providence on man.

Christianity eliminates the mythology of destiny and corrects the pagan philosophical deviations attached thereto. St. Augustine (De Cive Itate Dei) reduces destiny simply to divine providence, in which shine the wisdom and love of God and to which all creatures are subordinate in being and in action.

St. Thomas develops the traditional thought of the Fathers when, speaking of the influence of God on creatures, on man especially, he demonstrates that such influence does not perturb but perfects creature activity and is harmoniously compatible with human freedom (see concourse, divine). There is a causal connection between the knowledge, will, and omnipotence of God, on the one hand, and creature activity, on the other; but this connection, however mysterious, does not do violence to, but helps both the necessary and the free causes in unfolding their activity according to their proper nature, necessarily or freely (see presence).

St. Thomas treats explicitly of Fatum and defines it: Ordinatio secundum causarum ad effectus divinorum prohibit ("the ordering of second causes to effects divinely provided for"). So fate is nothing more than the law impressed in second causes by the thought and will of God. The Christian, therefore, will say providence instead of destiny or fate.
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diastoeconanal. See Canon of the Bible.

devotion (Lat. devovere — to vow, to offer, to consecrate, especially to the Divinity). In the strict sense it is an internal act of religion, which St. Thomas defines (Summa Theol., II-II, q. 82, a. 1): Voluntas prompte facienda quod ad Dei servitum pertine ("The will of doing promptly what pertains to the service of God").

Devotion consists, therefore, essentially in the promptness of the will to serve God, namely, to subordinate our whole life to His glory and desires. In this sense devotion is a part of cult or worship; in fact, it is its very soul. Worship actually is a manifestation of honor rendered to a superior person in recognition of his excellence and of our own submission. Worship, therefore, includes an internal action (of the intellect and the will) and an external action (the manifestation of esteem and subjection). If by devotion we understand, in addition to the intimate disposition of the will, also an external manifestation, then it coincides with worship, as often happens in common language.

Devotion in this second sense can, like worship, be private or public; the distinction between one and the other depends on a single element: the intervention or approbation of ecclesiastical authority (bishop or Holy See). A devotion can be external, even spread among the faithful in some place, without being public, through lack of explicit ecclesiastical approbation (CIC, Cans. 1257, 1261, 1259). The Church proceeds slowly in approving new devotions or forms of cult because of the danger of superstition and of theological errors, which can be mingled in them.

With respect to devotion in the strict sense, which is of special interest to us here, it is noteworthy that: (1) it has, as essential elements, an illuminated faith and an ardent charity. Faith always yields a more congruous knowledge of God, charity always makes the soul adhere more strongly to Him, detaching it from creatures and from itself by the elimination of self-love. The devout soul therefore seeks nothing but God. (2) It has, as extrinsic cause, God, from whom it must be sought by prayer; as intrinsic cause, meditation of the eternal truths (Summa Theol., II-II, q. 82, a. 3). (3) It has, as immediate effect, progress in perfection and spiritual joy. Opposed to devotion, which is prompt eagerness, alacrity, and lively adherence to God, is sloth of spirit and its consequent tepidity.
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diaspora (Gr. διασπορά — dispersion). Refers to the community of Hebrews living outside the boundaries of Palestine.

The earliest disappearances or "displacements" of the Hebrews date from the fall of the Kingdom of Israel in 722 B.C. and from the fall of the Kingdom of Judah in 589 B.C., when the Assyrians and Babylonians, in order to cut off any idea of revolt, transferred the majority of that people to distant regions. Later the Hebrews spread throughout the world for com-
divinity of Jesus Christ. A fundamental dogma of Christianity.

The divinity of Christ is fore-shadowed in the Old Testament:
1. Messianic texts (Gen. 3:14 f.; 12:1-3; 49:14; Num. 24:17; Ps. 2, 44, 71, 88, 109; Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Micah. 5:2; Jer. 3:16; Dan. 7:13; Mal. 3:2). These texts have their full strength when considered in the light of the New Testament; taken in themselves they are not all indisputable, but at least suggest a vague idea of the transcendent nature of the future Messiah. A particular value must be attributed to Isa. 9:6, where the Messiah is prophesied as אל גבור (strong God), a title given elsewhere to Jehovah. Not less valid is the prophecy of Malachi 3, which announces the Precursor and the Messiah who will enter the temple as Dominus (Hebr. ה'־דוא, name of Jehovah).
2. Supersessionist texts, which represent the divine Wisdom as personified in such a way as to suggest a distinction of terms or subjects in the Divinity (Prov. 8:12 f.; Ecclus. 24:5 f.; Wisd. 7:21 f.; 18:4).

In the New Testament the divinity of Christ is evident:
1. The predicted Messias is Christ (in the whole Gospel).
2. In the Synoptics (Matt. Mark, Luke) Christ is the unique Son of God (Gr. ὁ γεννημένος — most beloved, unique): Matt. 3:17; 17:55; Mark 1:11; 9:7. He is confessed as such by St. Peter (Matt. 16:16 ff.), whom Jesus approves and prays. Moreover, Jesus distinguishes His relationship to the Father in the expressions “My Father,” “Your Father,” never associating Himself with mere men by saying “Our Father.” Before the Sanhedrin He declares Himself to be the Son of God and is condemned for it. He affirms Himself superior to Solomon (Matt. 12:41). He completes the divine law (Matt. 5:21), remits the sins of Mary Magdalen, of the paralytic, and promises eternal life to those who love Him above all things and follow Him. He rises from the dead and ascends into heaven.
3. St. John’s Gospel. Christ is the eternal Word, truly God; He is the One-Born of the Father, who exists before Abraham, who is but one sole thing with the Father, and who sends the Holy Spirit.
4. St. Paul declares energetically the divinity of Christ, especially in Rom. 9:5; Col. 1:15; 2:9; Phil. 2:15 ff.; Heb. 1:11; Tit. 2:13.

Tradition is a unanimous chorus, a testimony in words, in art, in life, in blood, sealed by the Council of Nicea (325).
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diocese (biskupija — administration).

The territory over which a bishop or other prelate extends his jurisdiction. It is an established fact that the division of ecclesiastical dioceses and provinces was originally modeled on the division and territorial extension of the provinces of the Roman Empire. Later, however, changes in historical, political, and social conditions brought about a radical modification of the primitive boundaries. The Pontifical Yearbook gives the exact listing of all dioceses of the Catholic world, with the names of their bishops.
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diptych. See Canon of the Mass.

discerns Ecclesia.” See “Ecclesia discerns.”

divination. See superstition.

divorce. In a strict sense, the solution of the marriage bond, by which the husband and wife can contract new nuptials; in a broader sense it is separation (as regards home, living, etc.) of the parties, the matrimonial bond remaining firm. Divorce, in the strict sense, was permitted to the Jews by God ob daturiam cordis eorum (“on account of their hardened-ness”). It so permeated Roman and barbarian custom as to make it particularly difficult for the Church to get the faithful and the legislators to accept the principle of the indissolubility of the conjugal bond, which the Church had taken from the natural law, and especially from revelation.

Although divorce is not directly contrary to the primary end of marriage, i.e., procreation and education of the offspring (and that is why God could dispense temporarily from the primitive law of the indissolubility of marriage), it is, however, diametrically opposed to the secondary end of matrimony, which is the mutual help and the reciprocal harmony of the husband and wife, as it is quite evident to whoever reflects on the many disorders following in the wake of and occasioned by divorce (hatred, rancor, vengeance, abandonment of the offspring, discord among families, degradation of the woman). These and similar reasons moved the divine Restorer of the family and of human society to revoke the concession made in the Old Testament and restore the institution of marriage to its original indissolubility. In an impressive sentence Jesus declared: “Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery” (Luke 16:18; cf. 1 Cor. 7:10-11; Rom. 7:2-3).

The thought of the Master was illustrated by the Fathers and applied constantly by the Roman Church, which had to undergo gigantic struggles with libertine emperors and princes, as in the case of Henry VIII who, on the occasion of Rome’s prohibition of his divorce, caused a whole people to be separated from the true faith. The divine truth was permanently and precisely defined in the Council of Trent (DB, 975, 977). The Oriental Schismatics and the Protestants, great champions of divorce, bring up in objection a phrase of the Lord: “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery” (Matt. 5:32; cf. 19:9). We reply immediately that the incidental phrase, even if separated from the rest of the text of the
gospel teaching and from Tradition, does not necessarily imply that Christ permits divorce in the case of adultery of one of the parties. In fact, if we stick close to the force of the words used, and to the content, we see that Christ, expounding the law of indissolubility, wants to preside from the very thorny question (for His audience) of adultery, and so, what He intends to say is: whoever sends away his wife (prenominating, for the purpose at hand now, from the case of adultery), makes her commit sin.

Recently, Allgeier, a lucid German exegete, endeavored to reconstruct the Aramaic sentence employed by Jesus Christ, and has come to the conclusion that the incidental phrase is merely an exclamation interposed by the divine Master to give greater strength to His words: “Whoever will have sent away his wife—and you are not to do that—makes her commit adultery.” If this is so, the whole difficulty disappears. In conclusion: even if, exegetically, there may remain a bit of obscurity, it is fully dissipated by Tradition.
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*docens Ecclesia.* See “Ecclesia discens.”

**Docetism (Gr. δοκεῖν— I seem)**, *δοκεῖτε καὶ δοκείτε* (appearance). An obscure heresy of the first centuries, which reduced Christ’s humanity to an appearance, compromising the veracity of the Gospel in its account of the human life, passion, and death of the Saviour, and with it the value of the whole work of Redemption. Traces of confusion of this error are found in St. Paul and St. John (cf. Col. 1:20; I Tim. 2:5; 1 John 4:2). A little later, St. Ignatius Martyr defends the reality of the flesh assumed by the Son of God against the Docetæ; St. Irenæus (Adv. haereres, l. 3) does likewise. Tertullian (De carne Christi) and St. Augustine (Contra Faustum) attack various forms of Docetism current among the Gnostics (Simon, Saturninus, Marcion) and the Manichaens. In the fifth century, Docetism was welcomed by the Monophysites (see Eutychianism), who admitted an absorption of the human nature in the divine, reducing the humanity of Christ, of which the Gospel speaks, to a mere phantasm (whence the name Phantasiastes), impassible, incorruptible (whence the name Aphthartodocos): of Julian of Halicarnassus; from the Gr. a. [private] and φθαρτός— I corrupt). Other Monophysist leaders, like Severus of Antioch, admitted the possibility of Christ’s humanity and, therefore, were called Phitaridatæ.

As the Docetæ compromised the reality of Christ’s passion, and thereby the value of the Redemption, so they were constrained to deny or pervert the truth of the Eucharistic mystery.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Tournell, La théologie antéchristienne (Paris, 1905).

**Doctors of the Church.** Those ecclesiastical writers who, not only by reason of the holiness of their lives and the orthodoxy of their doctrine but especially by the eminence of their knowledge, have been honored by the Church with this title. The Doctors differ from the Fathers of the Church (q.e.d.) for three reasons: (1) it is not necessary for them to have lived in ancient times; (2) it is required that their learning be really extraordinary so as to merit the liturgical praise of *Doctor Optime, Ecclesiae sanctae lumen* (“Excellent Doctor, light of the holy Church”); (3) it is required that this title be conferred on them in a sufficiently explicit way (actually a solemn act of the pope is needed).

Following is the list arranged in chronological order of the Doctors of the Church: SS. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom (the four great doctors of the East), Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great (the four great doctors of the West), Epiphanus, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Peter Chrysologus, Leo the Great, John Damascene, Isidore of Seville, Bede the Venerable, Peter Damian, Anselm, Bernard, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, John of the Cross, Peter Canisius, Robert Bellarmine, Francis de Sales, Alphonsus Liguori, Anthony.
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**dogma** (Gr. δογμά— seem, opinion, main opinion). Originally, it meant opinion. The classics use it with the meaning of criterion, rule, law; in this last sense, it is found in the New Testament (Luke 21:1; Acts 16:4). The earliest Fathers use it to indicate a principle of moral doctrine (rather than a principle of faith in general). From the fourth century, the meaning of dogma as truth of faith begins to prevail (Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa). The Scholastics preferred *article* or *sentence* in the last sense. From the seventeenth century to the present time, the theological doctrine of faith is separated from the moral doctrine, and called dogmatic theology.

A dogma, in the technical use of the word, is a truth revealed by God, and proposed as such by the magisterium of the Church to the faithful, with the obligation of believing it. Thus understood, a dogma is a divine truth and, therefore, immutable (Vatican Council, DB, 1800).

The modernists, having reduced dogma to a symbolic expression of religious sentiment in continual development (see symbolism) or to a practical rule or norm of religious consciousness (see pragmatism), have admitted an intrinsic evolution of dogma which must correspond to the indefinite phases of that sentiment and of that consciousness. These errors were condemned by Pius X (encycl. Pascendi and Lamentabili, DB, 2026 and 2079) and by Pius XII (encycl. Humani generis).

According to Catholic doctrine, a dogma cannot undergo intrinsic and substantial changes; there is an evolution, however, on the part of the faithful as to understanding and expressing a dogma (extrinsic and subjective evolution). This legitimate progress appears in the history of the dogmatic formulas defined by the Church, as gradually the meaning of the truths, contained in the sources of divine revelation, came to be more profoundly and clearly understood.
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Donatism. Draws its name from Donatus the Great, its chief proponent.

Ideologically it is linked up with the error of the rebaptizers, due to these facts: Tertullian, having first denied the validity of baptism by heretics (based on the false reason that heretics, being deprived of grace, are incapable of transmitting it to others), found in St. Cyprian († 258) an ardent and intelligent champion of his thesis. St. Cyprian requested Pope Stephen I to confirm it, but the Pope, founded in the Roman Tradition, replied with the famous rescript: Nihilo innovetur, nisi quod traditum est (“No innovation in traditional practices”). The Donatists, following the trajectory of the ideas of these two African scholars, pushed their position to its extreme but logical consequences: If the heretics cannot baptize validly, being devoid of the Holy Spirit and His grace, neither can sinners do so, for the same reason; sinners, therefore, cannot communicate grace through administration of the sacraments.

The historical occasion for such developments of the erroneous principle of Tertullian and Cyprian presented itself at the beginning of the fourth century when the Emperor Diocletian ordered the Christians to hand in their sacred books to be burned. Those who complied were called traditores (traitors, or handers-over) and were considered public sinners. Felix of Aphrodisias, who succeeded Cecilian Bishop of Carthage, was accused of this crime. Certain priests of Carthage, backed by the bishops of Numidia, took advantage of the principle of the rebaptizers and deduced with ease from it that Cecilian was invalidly ordained bishop. This last appealed to Rome and won. But the rebels set up Majorinus as bishop and, in 315, upon his death, Donatus the Great, who organized the schism in a solid hierarchical way and so gave his name to it.

Donatism was founded on two principles readily understandable to the people: (1) the Church is a society of saints; (2) the sacraments administered by sinners and heretics are invalid. Bolstered by the fanatical zeal of the Circumcellions and propagated by sharp writers (Ambrose, Tertullian, Pelagius, etc.), the new sect spread and consolidated so deeply that it endangered the existence of Catholicism in Roman Africa. Neither the repeated intervention of the emperors nor the brilliant polemics by St. Optatus of Milevis were able to break the spirit of the rebels. Only at the beginning of the fifth century, with imperial support, did the serried logic and winning charity of St. Augustine succeed in weakening definitively the century-old schism and bringing into clear light the Catholic principles, according to which: (1) the Church Militant is not a society of saints but a corpus permixtum (mixed body) of good and bad; (2) the sacraments draw their efficacy from Christ and not from their ministers, and hence they are sancta per se et non per homines (“holy of themselves and not by virtue of men”).
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Easter. See Pasch.

Ebionites (Hebr. ebion — poor). A Jewish-Christian sect of the Apostolic Age, living in Palestine. Their doctrine can be reconstructed from the testimonies of Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius: There is only one God, the Creator. Jesus is a pure man, born of Mary and Joseph, who becomes the Christ of God through His fidelity to the observance of the law. Every Christian can become like Him and be saved through the Jewish observances. The only authentic Gospel is that of St. Matthew; St. Paul and his epistles are to be rejected.

Toward A.D. 100 the Ebionites came into contact with the Essenes, another Jewish sect that had separated from official and ritual Judaism for a purer and more perfect life. From this contact stemmed the so-called Essenian-Ebionism, whose teachings are set forth particularly in the form of biographical novels in the pseudo-Clementine documents (homoites, contestation, epitome): God is one; He has a face and members; He created all things in antithetic pairs (Cain and Abel, light and darkness, etc.); only one Prophet exists, who manifested himself in Adam, Moses, and, finally, in Christ, who is son of God, but not God, because God is not, like Christ, generated (a prelude to Arrianism, 39); the soul is free and immortal and will be recompensed by God according to its merits. Circumcision is admitted as well as baptism (renewed, in a certain way, by a daily bath); vegetarianism and early marriage are recommended; bloody sacrifices are forbidden. Briefly, Ebionism is a hybrid merger of Essene, Jewish, and Christian elements, and has in itself the germ of future heresies.
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"Ecclesia discens" (learning Church) (Lat. discere — to learn). That part of the members of the Church which consists of subjects. The Church is a society of unequals, in which by divine right some are superiors (the pope and the bishops) and have the authority of teaching, while the others are subjects (all the other faithful) and have the obligation of accepting the teaching of faith and morals imparted by the legitimate pastors. Hence the theological distinction of Ecclesia docens (teaching Church — pope and bishops) and Ecclesia discens (learning Church — the other faithful).

Even the priests, while they do indeed have care of souls, like parish priests, belong to the Ecclesia discens, although the bishops ordinarily use their priests in the service of teaching the divine word; the bishops are teachers by virtue of their function, while the priests are such only by participation and delegation.

Moreover, the bishops, united with the pope in their teaching, enjoy active infallibility (infallibility in teaching). The faithful, in so far as they are the recipients of this teaching and assimilate the doctrines without error, enjoy a sort of reflex infallibility, called by the theologians passive infallibility (infallibility in believing).
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"Ecclesia docens." See "Ecclesia discens."

ecstasy (Gr. έκτομας from ἐκ — from, outside of, and τομαι — I put). An extraordinary state in which a
person is, as it were, outside of himself. There is a whole gamut of ecstatic phenomena running from simple delirium, quasi-absolute insensibility, levitation,ilocution, bleeding stigma, to diarvoynce bordering prophecy. Ecstasy may be induced by extrinsic agents (alcoholic beverages, anesthetics, solitude, fixation of the senses or of the mind on determined objects, etc.) or it may spring from a subjective impression in contemplation of the beauty of nature or art; or it may be determined without motives, unexpectedly, even in babies. Unprejudiced physicians often reduce all forms of ecstasy to pathological phenomena of hysterical catalepsy, of neurosis, or of hypnotism as in the medium of spiritism (q.v.). According to Catholic teaching, a distinction is to be made between: (a) natural ecstasy, of spontaneous origin, artificial or pathological, with phenomena explicable by the laws of physical and psychic nature; (b) preternatural ecstasy, with phenomena requiring the intervention of a superior force (devil); (c) supernatural ecstasy, due to a special action of God or the rational creature.

The first lies in the field of medical science, but the last two require the judgment of the theologian. Diabolic ecstasy is marked with phenomena and actions contrary to faith and morals. Supernatural ecstasy is proper to holy and privileged souls, and consists chiefly in that superior knowledge of God, made up of love and experience, which constitutes the apex of contemplation (q.v.). The somatic phenomena, e.g., stigmata, may accompany supernatural ecstasy, but are not in themselves the proof of it. As the highest grade of contemplation, ecstasy consists primarily in cognition, an intellectual experience of God, which is analogous to sensation (the mystics speak of spiritual senses), through which a quasi-contact is made with Him. The ecstatic, in this phase, though not seeing the divine essence, has clear knowledge of supernatural truths and mysteries; this is explained by direct infusion of intelligible species by God. An ardent love accompanies this knowledge, and incites the will to accept any sacrifice for God. A more elevated form of ecstasy is rapture or flight of the spirit, in which the soul is transported and seemingly absorbed in God with flashing rapidity. Ecstasy is prevalently passivity of the soul: but this fact does not eliminate personality (as in the nirvana of Buddha), or liberty, or merit.

The foregoing is all gathered from actual descriptions left by the great mystics, outstanding among whom are SS. Catherine of Siena, John of the Cross, Teresa, and Catherine of Genoa.
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See under mystery; contemplation.

Efficacy of the sacraments. See causality of the sacraments (fact).

Elect. Those predestined by God to eternal life. Several questions are connected with this entry (see predestination), but only two are examined here: (1) the character of divine election and its relationship to divine knowledge, love, and predestination; (2) the number of the elect.

1. Character of divine election. St. Thomas frequently reminds us of the difference between God's love and ours. We love a creature attracted by the perfection we find in it and that can be helpful to us; while God, unable to undergo any external influence, loves the creature by infusing into it the good it did not have.

Our love, then, is the effect of the perfection of the thing loved; God's love, on the contrary, is the cause of that perfection: "Amor Dei est infinitus et creativus bonitatem in rebus." (The love of God is infusing and creating goodness in things," Summa Theol., 1, q. 20, a. 2). Therefore, while we are moved by the perfection of a creature, prefer that creature to others and love it, God first loves a creature and then prefers it on account of the perfection He has bestowed on it by loving it. Hence, the Thomists find this succession (logical, and not chronological —rationes et non temporis) in the divine acts: love, election, predestination. Thus, election as fruit of God's love is absolutely gratuitous, as is also predestination to eternal life. But in order to love a creature with preference (predilection), God must first know the elect, and so a certain foreknowledge must precede the "forelove" or election. If we ask what is the cause of this choice, the Thomists reply that it depends exclusively on the Goodness of God who communicates Himself to whom He wishes; the Molinists insist generally that prevision (forsight) of the elect's merits must, in addition to the divine goodness, be a contributory factor in God's choice. In any system, the distinction between elect and nonelect remains enveloped in deep mystery, as St. Augustine recognized long ago. If, indeed, in the abstract and intentional order election is independent of the consideration of human merit, practically, in the order of execution, it is certain that merits (in the adults) are a condition of salvation that cannot be precluded from, just as demerits are a requisite condition for damnation.

2. Number of the elect. The question has been discussed from the earliest centuries, there being two opposite tendencies: one optimistic, opening heaven's portals wide to the majority of men, the other more rigorous, reducing the elect to a few. In ancient times the rigorous tendency predominated, while today even the theologians are somewhat more liberal, although they reject the exaggerated optimism of certain authors (e.g., the Humanists). The truth is that God alone knows, with certainty and ab aeterno, the exact number of the elect; in the liturgy, the Church says this expressly: "Deus cui soli cognitus est numerus electorum in superna felicitate locandus." ("God to whom alone is known the number of the elect who are to be put in the place of happiness above"). We can — harmoniously with God's wisdom and the redeeming work of Jesus Christ — think that the elect are more numerous than the reprobate, but each faithful, as far as he is concerned, must pray, fight, and even fear for his salvation, according to the warning of the Apostle: "With fear and trembling work out your salvation" (Phil. 2:12).
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Elevation (to supernatural order). A truth of faith that God not only created man with his natural perfections of soul and body (q.v.), but also enriched him with supernatural and preternatural gifts (q.v.), in view of the end which He had appointed for him, and which transcends human nature, namely, the beatific vision (see vision, beatific). The Council of Trent speaks of the sanctity and justice in which [Adam] was constituted" (DB, 788). Pius V condemned Bay (see Baisanism) who denied this elevation to the supernatural order.
empiricism

1. Adam was enriched with sanctifying grace and the virtues and gifts deriving therefrom. The entire New Testament speaks of the work of the Redemption, as a return to the original state (rehabilitation). But the Redemption consists chiefly in the restoration of the reign of grace in the human soul (cf. St. Paul); therefore, in the primitive state of Adam there must have been grace with the virtues and the supernatural gifts.

St. Augustine, re-echoing the other Fathers, writes (De Genesi ad litter., 5, 24, 35): "We will renew ourselves in our spirit according to the image of Him who created us, an image which Adam lost by sinning.

2. Adam had also the preexistent gift of integrity (q.v.), which includes immunity from concupiscence (q.v.), from corporal death and from ignorance. This supernatural and preternatural endowment constituted Adam in the state of innocence or original justice, which in Adam God had bestowed, as it were, to all mankind, as it was virtually in Adam as in its origin and source (see innocence).
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empiricism (Gr. εμπειρία — experience). A philosophical system which reduces all reality to the data of experience, whether internal (data of consciousness) or external (data of sense perception). Empiricism is a method rather than a system, which makes sensation the only means of knowledge, and the sensible phenomenon the only reality. Therefore, it is principally found in positivism and materialism (q.v.), and from the gnosiological standpoint it is also known as sensism.

Empiricism is traced back to the atomism of the Abdera School (Leucippus, Democritus, etc.), to Stoicism, which reduced everything to corporeal substance, and to Epicureanism. In more modern times empiricism, favored by the scientific methodology of Francis Bacon, was developed in England by the materialism of Hobbes (†1679), which found favor also with the French Encyclopedists, the sensism of G. Locke (†1704), and more decisively in France the sensism of Condillac (†1780) and Comte (†1857). Likewise pragmatism (q.v.) is characterized psychologically by empiricism, and so is the intuitionist philosophy of Bergson. Obviously, empiricism makes the construction of any metaphysics impossible by denying objective value to any reality that transcends sensation or psychological experience. It is, therefore, opposed to sound philosophy and to religion.
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Enérateurs (Gr. ἐνεργεύοντα — mastery of self, continence). Heretics who observed a rigorous temperance (abstinence from wine, meat, conjugal relations) for fundamentally Manichean motives (see Manichaeism). The Enérateur movement developed in the second century under the direction of Tatian, called by St. Jerome princeps enérateurum, of Dositeus of Clicia and of a certain Severus, through whose work an Enérateur sector broke up into small groups with individual names: Apotactici (abstinentes), Hydoraparatiae (aquaristae), Sacerdotes (because they dressed as such). A strong propaganda, favored by the rigoristic tendencies of certain primitive ascetics, stimulated the widespread influence of the sect. St. Epiphanius, in the middle of the fourth century, points out their existence on the borders of the Church. They were effectively attacked by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and severe juridical measures were taken against them.
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encyclical (Gr. ἐγκύκλιος — circular, revolving in a circle, periodical). A letter that the pope sends to all the bishops in communion with the Apostolic See in order to make known to the whole Church his mind and will on some point of dogma, morals, or Church discipline. The popes of modern times especially have made great use of such circular letters, enriching them with a large and intense doctrinal content.

The encyclicals of Leo XIII are famous. They deal with the most vital problems concernig ecclesiastical constitution or social and political life: Aeterni Patris (1879) on Thomistic philosophy; Arcaenum divinum saeculorum (1886) on Christian marriage; Divinerum illud (1881) on the State; Immortale Dei (1885) on the Christian constitution of governments; Libertas (1888) on freedom and civil activities; Rerum Novarum (1891) on social and labor problems; Providentialis (1893) on biblical studies; Satis cognitum (1896) on the unity of the Church; Mirae Caritatis (1897) on the Enchiridion.

Well known is the encyclical, Pascendi (1907), which with Pius X condemned modernism.

The encyclicals of Pius XI are numerous, rivaling those of Leo XIII.

Pius XII gave us, in 1939, his first encyclical Statio Pontificatus, an outstanding document of juridical wisdom and Christian charity, followed by the others on the Mystical Body, Holy Scripture, St. Cyril of Alexandria (defender of Church unity), Liturgy, modern errors (Humani generis), the Council of Chalcedon which propound themes of current interest and importance.
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end, ultimate

The supreme term to which is ordained the action of the efficient cause. The end is the final cause; hence whatever is said of the final cause applies to the end (see final cause). The ultimate and primary end of creation is the divine goodness communicated to creatures (extrinsic glory of God). Now this effusion of goodness and glory of God may be considered objectively, in so far as it shines by itself in the life of the universe, and formally, in so far as it is known and loved by the one who is capable, namely: by the rational creature. This is the absolute ultimate end, to which divine providence orders all things.

Nothing escapes this end, not even rebellious man, since the sinner leaves the order of divine love only to enter inexorably that of divine justice.

Here, however, we wish to speak of the relative last end of man. The lower beings have a proper finality too, which for all of them consists in the attainment of their perfection and which is realized in their subordination to the higher beings, and
definitely, to man (anthropocentric relative finality). Man, made to God's image and likeness, is not ordered to any other created being, because his spirit, naturally extended toward an infinite Good and an infinite Truth, cannot find its specific perfection and satisfaction in finite things, i.e., in any creature whatsoever. Therefore, his ultimate end will be a supreme Good, capable of satisfying his unlimited aspiration, and so of actuating in full his specific perfection of rational creature. This Good can be but God, who is, therefore, man's proper final end.

God, however, may be considered objectively as the highest Good in Himself, and subjectively with respect to man, as the object of man's happiness (see beatitude). Formally, then, the ultimate end of man is the possession of God, effected through knowledge and love. This end could be limited within the natural order; but we know from revelation that God has elevated man to the supernatural order (grace—beatific vision) from the first instant of creation (see elevation), and that this order, disturbed by original sin, has been restored by the Redemption. God, ultimate end of man in the natural order, determines the ethical world based on morality (relationship between human action and human end, expressed in the law). God, ultimate end of man in the supernatural order, determines meritorious activity which, under the impulse of charity (q.v.), tends dynamically to the beatific vision, supreme goal in which will be actualized fully the perfection of man, who in the intuitive knowledge and love of God will achieve his end and implicitly also the end of the universe, of which he is the apex and synthesis.
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**energumeni** (Gr. ἐνέργευμεν — curious). In ecclesiastical language energumeni is one who is under the evil influence of the devil as manifested by phenomena beyond the power of nature (vision of the future, introspection of consciences, overpowering strength, etc.) or by morbid effects (epilepsy, paralysis, melancholy, dea-ness). Energumeni, rare in the Old Testament (cf. 1 Kings 16:22; 19:15; Tob. 6:9, 10, 8:3), appear frequently around Christ in the hope of obtaining cure. In the Church, their number has progressively decreased, but they have never completely disappeared. A very old liturgical practice, called exorcism (q.v.), for the purpose of expelling the devil, still exists in the Church. The possession of energumeni by the devil is called obsession (Lat. obiurare — occupy, besiege), and consists in the use of the evil spirit makes of the body of his victim as an instrument. The devil can influence the soul only indirectly, through sensations (see demon, devil).
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**epiklesis** (Gr. ἐπίκλεσις — invocation). The name used to designate the prayer that is read in many eastern liturgies after the consecration. The epiklesis, taken literally, asks God to effect the transubstantiation, as if the words of consecration already pronounced had not had their full effect.

For this reason, from the fourteenth century certain Greeks, like Nicholas Cabasilas, Simeon of Thessalonica, Marcus Eugenicus, maintained that the epiklesis is absolutely necessary for transubstantiation. Later they were followed also by two Latin theologians, the Dominican Ambrose Car-ino and the Franciscan Christopher Chevaintes, who maintained that transubstantiation is the effect of the words Quam oblivionem, which in the Roman canon precede the consecration.

But the most ancient patristic tradi- tion, represented by St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, etc., has constantly attributed to the words of institution the power of changing the elements into the body and blood of Christ.

The Church, therefore, in its ordinary magisterium, has on more than one occasion inculcated the ancient doctrine; not long ago Pius X has explicitly declared: "The Catholic doctrine on the sacrament of the Eucharist, not only in the Greek and in the Western churches, is held acceptable, according to which the words of consecration do not have their effect until after the epiklesis" (Letter to the apostolic delegates of the Orient, Dec. 26, 1910).

As regards the apparently singular fact that the epiklesis requests transubstantiation anew, after it has happened, there are two convenient ex-Planations: (1) St. Thomas says that the epiklesis is asking for the spir-Itual transmutation of the mystical body; (2) Bousset holds that it is characteristic of the liturgy to go back over what occurred solely at one instant, in order to make the whole effect of that single occurrence better understood.
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**eschatology** (Gr. ἔσχατος — last things; ἔσχατος — last, recent). That part of theology which treats of the end of life and of man's future after death (the last things: death, judgment, heaven, hell, purgatory, the end of the world, and the resurrection of the body).

The eschatological doctrine, revealed substantially in Holy Scripture, is developed in Tradition gradually and occasionally in connection with erroneous doctrine on one or other of its various elements. Thus in the second and third centuries, millenarism (q.v.) was much discussed, with writings pro and con. The fourth and fifth centuries were characterized by great polemics against Origenism (an aggregate of errors drawn from the writings of Origen, often badly interpreted), which cast doubt on the eternity of the pains of hell and suggested the idea of a final catharsis or purification for all, the demons included. Orthodox eschatology finds its first systematic organization in St. Augustine, and its definitive and complete systemization in the development of the Scholastic teaching, synthesized by St. Thomas. As regards the recent eschatological theories on the kingdom of God announced in the Gospel, see Parousia.
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**essence, divine.** Essence, in general, is the formal element, constitutive and distinctive of a being. A being is specifically what it is, precisely on account of its essence. Man is man on account of animality and reason (essence). What is God essentially? Old and New Testament revelation answers: God is spirit, wisdom, goodness, omnipotence, holiness; God is eternal, immutable, the synthesis of all perfections, infinite, unique. But these are so many concepts formed from our knowledge of creatures and attributed to God analogically (see analogy); they are only an attempt of the human intellect to express the divine essence. Ecclesiastics declare: “We shall say much [about God], and yet shall want words: but the sum of our words is, He is all” (4:329). But even this concept is very vague. There is, however, a passage in Exodus 3:13 ff., in which God reveals Himself to Moses, saying: “I am that I am,” more properly: “I am who I am”; the Hebrew text has: “I am the Is” (Is — Yahweh). And this is the most sublime revelation: God is Being of Himself, or Being itself. From this stems the theological teaching on the divine essence.

The theologians distinguish: physical essence, which in God is the aggregate of all the perfections; and metaphysical essence, i.e., that most formal reason without which God cannot be conceived and which is the source of all His perfections. For some, the metaphysical essence of God is infinity, for others intellectualit, and for others aeternitas (being from oneself). But the opinion most consonant with revelation is the one which places the metaphysical essence of God in being. While in creatures the existence is participated and thus is distinct from their essence, in God essence and existence are identical. Being subsisting by itself (ens per se, esse subsistent), accounts for the infinity of God and for all the other attributes, while it places an abyss between Him and the created world (see Tetractys).
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**eternity.** Eternity is made up of two essential characteristics: the absence of a beginning and of an end, and the absence of all succession and change.

The Scholastics distinguish: (a) time (defined by Aristotle: measure of movement according to a “before” and an “after”), which involves change, even substantial, in things; (b) aevum, proper to spiritual beings (duration of souls and angels), which involves a beginning but not an end, and admits of only an accidental change; (c) eternity, which excludes all limitation, all change, all succession. It is a truth of faith that God alone is properly and simply eternal (see immutability). There are immortal creatures, like human souls and the angels (qq.aa.), which have a beginning, but on account of the simplicity of their nature do not tend to perish. According to St. Thomas, the hypothesis is not absurd of an eternal world (i.e., which never began), created so and conserved by God. In the absolute sense, however, no creature can be eternal, i.e., in such a sense as to exclude not only beginning and end, but also change and succession, and to possess in act (i.e., actually and together) its entire perfection. Absolute eternity belongs to God alone, as defined by Boethius: Interimibilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio (“Perfect and simultaneous possession of a life without terms — beginning and end”).

Eternity excludes and transcends time, and so in God there is no past or future, but only a changeless present. The problem of “before” and “after” makes no sense in God, to whom all of time in its succession is always present, like all the successive points of a circumference are simultaneously present to its center. This is the divine presentetity, one of the most important elements in the solution of the problem of the so-called precesence or foreknowledge of God.
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**Eucharist**

In other words, the Eucharist is the prolongation of the Incarnation (Leo XIII): as the Word of God became present in human form to procure salvation for us by rendering due homage to God and con dignifying for sin, so Christ renders Himself present under the eucharistic veils to apply to us the work of the Redemption, in its ascendant phase, by renewing the sacrifice of the Cross, and in its descendant motion by distributing grace through the sacramental rite of Holy Communion.

The eucharistic Mystery embraces, therefore, the Real Presence (see Presence, Real), the sacrifice of the Mass (q.v.), and the sacrament of Communion (see Communion, eucharistie). On account of the multiplicity of the mysteries it includes, the Eucharist is the compendium of faith, the center of gravitation of Christian piety, and the polar star that directs all the activity of the Catholic Church. The numerous names given to the Eucharist reflect, as in a prism of many facets, the variety of its aspects: Most Holy Sacrament, Body of Christ, Body of the Lord, the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, Mass, Synaxis, Viaticum, Communion, Divine Table, etc.
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**Eucharist**

The Holy Eucharist (St. Louis, 1946). RAU-SCHEN, Eucharistie et Penance dans l’Eglise des Six Centuries de l’Eglise, trans. from the
eucharistic accidents. The species of bread and wine (quantity, color, taste, and smell) which remain unvaried. They are an absolute, necessary condition for the body and blood of Christ to be present in a sacramental manner (see Presence, Real, Eucharistic [fact]). In fact, if the accidents did not remain, the presence of the body of Jesus could only be in a sense proper, that is, by adaption of the single parts of the glorious body to the corresponding parts of surrounding space, so that remaining enclosed in place A it could not simultaneously be in place B, just as a quart of water cannot be in its entirety simultaneously contained in two bottles of one quart each. The accidents remain unchanged, and the body of Christ, which is contained locally, one time only, in heaven, cannot be made present “after the manner of substance” as many times as there are eucharistic consecrations. In this manner the claim of absurdity cannot be made, the absurdity of a body many times distant from itself. Distance is the interval between two bodies locally present in space, and so it does not occur in the case of Christ’s body in heaven and the same body in the Eucharist, seeing that in the host it is not present locally (i.e., after the manner of quantity), but only sacramentally (i.e., after the manner of substance).

There has been much discussion among philosophers and theologians on the nature of the accidents, but the data of Tradition as well as the declarations of the Church, made at Constance (DB, 58a) and at Trent (DB, 88a), lead us to accept the classic doctrine of the Scholastics. The Scholastics constantly maintained that the sacramental species are not subjective modifications of the senses (against Descartes) or effects produced divinely in the place of the bread and wine (against the Atomists and dynamists), but that they are the same numerical realities which had the substances of bread and wine as their subject of inference before transubstantiation. After transubstantiation, these realities remain without any natural subject, sustained in their first being by that same divine omnipotence which, having been able to form in the Virgin’s womb the body of Christ without human seed, can also in an eminently manner supply the effect of substance with relation to the accidents.

On corruption of the eucharistic species, the Real Presence ceases immediately because their relationship of container with respect to the body of Christ vanishes, without the body of Christ being subject to any change.
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Eutychianism. Christological heresy of Eutyches, Archimandrite of Constantinople, also called Monophysitism because, in opposition to Nestorianism, it defends the substantial unity of Christ up to the point of positing in Him not only one Person, but also one theanic nature (Monophysitism: Gr. μόνη — one, and φῶς — nature). The genesis of this heresy lies entirely in an attempt to exaggerate the position of St. Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorianism; in his polemic fervor the holy Doctor had advanced some extreme expressions on the profound unity of the Man-God (unity not of nature but only of person) and had adopted a famous Apollinarianistic phrase (see Apollinarism): "μία φως τού Λόγου ακοροβολητή (the incarnate nature of the Word is one) which he attributed to St. Athanasius. But the concept of a fusion of the divine and human natures of Christ is foreign to the mentality of St. Cyril. The Eutychians appeal abusively to his authority. Besides, Eutyches, a man of no great ability, maintained stubbornly and without reasons that before the union there were two natures, but after the union there was one sole nature in Christ. His disciple advanced various explanations, often fantastic, of that statement of their master: they speak of mixture of the two natures, of absorption of one in the other, of normal union similar to that of the soul with the body. All these formulas compromise inexcusably the integrity of one or of both natures.

The Council of Chalcedon (451) condemned the new heresy, vindicating precisely the integrity of the two natures and their real distinction, notwithstanding the personal unity: Christ is one, sole subject (Person), the Word, who incarnating Himself remains perfect God and becomes perfect man. Distinction and not division, union and not confusion or transformation: the two natures, subsisting in the Person of the Word, remain integral with their respective properties. The Council follows and repeats in its definitions the doctrine expounded by Pope St. Leo the Great in his famous letter to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople (449).

Monophysitism spread widely on account of its definite mystic character, giving rise to various churches and sects, among which is noteworthy that of the Jacobites (from Jacob Baradai, Bishop of Odessa, † 578) which still remains in the East with its hierarchy (see Theopaschism; Doceism).
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evil. The subject of a problem that has always harassed philosophers and theologians. The first who attempted an integral solution of the old question was St. Augustine in his struggle against Manichaeism (q.v.), which by the side of the Principle of good put the Principle of evil, according to the Madrasitc conception of the Persians.

St. Augustine refuted this extravagant dualism by bringing to service the neoplatonic (cf. Plotinus) concept of evil as non-being, i.e., as privation of being and, therefore, of goodness. The Pseudo-Dionysius speaks along the same line (De Divinis Nominiibus, Ch. IV). From these sources St. Thomas drew his principles in developing on repeated occasions the important doctrine of evil in relation to creation, divine providence (q.v.) and knowledge (see science, divine) and divine motion in creatures (see concourse, divine).

The chief heads of the Thomistic teaching are: (1) metaphysically, evil is a partial privation of good, and, therefore, it is rather a non-being (non est); e.g., a substantless mere absence, lack of the good of sight in a man who ought to have it. (2) Where there is fullness of being, pure act (God), evil is not possible; but evil blends with good where there is po-
evolutionism

The scientific theory, according to which all present living beings are the result of a progressive transformation from one or more primordial elements. It is also called transformation. This theory arose at the beginning of the past century from the work of the French botanist John de Lamarck and, more proximately, from the work of Charles Darwin, from whom the theory took the name of Darwinism.

Lamark assigned, as the cause of the evolution of species, adaptation to environment and natural finalistic tendency of the organism (internal factors); Darwin attributed the evolution of species to natural selection and the struggle for existence (external factors). The Dutchman, H. de Vries, also made an important contribution to the evolutionary theory, admitting real natural mutations in plants (mutationism). The new theory aroused great enthusiasm: the materialist Haeckel used it as a weapon of propaganda for his atheistic monism, even using fraud in scientific experiments. But, after the enthusiasm cooled down, doubts and delusions set in, once scientists began to examine the facts more accurately.

This is not the place for a scientific exposition and an adequate refutation of this complex system; a cursory evaluation of it from a philosophico-theological standpoint will be appropriate and sufficient. Atheistic materialistic evolutionism, philosophically and theologically speaking, is just as absurd as materialism and atheism (q.v.). But there is a theistic evolutionism, which desires to be linked with Christianity; it is integral or partial. The former maintains the evolution of all living beings from one or a few primordial organisms up to the human body inclusively (the soul is excluded, being an effect of creation). The latter, partial evolutionism, admits an evolution of various primitive organisms, restricted, however, within the limits of principal groups or genera. Theistic evolutionism, whatever its form, always supposes an influence of God, immediate or mediate, on the progressive development of the organisms. Its adherents mistakenly appeal to St. Augustine (see cosmogony). Scientifically speaking, evolutionism lacks solid foundations; serious difficulties militate against it from systematics, geology, paleontology, and embryology, which at one time seemed to favor it. The stability of the species is the reef of destruction of the whole system.

Philosophically, if we prescind from a direct divine intervention, evolutionism clashes with the principle of causality, which does not admit derivation of a higher effect from a lower cause (the more from the less). Theologically speaking, it is possible to admit hypothetically a kind of partial evolutionism, provided it is subordinated to the influence of the First Cause. Such evolutionism could embrace the vegetable and the animal kingdom, but could not be inclusive of man, for, according to divine revelation, man's soul was created by God and placed in a body which He fashioned. But such a concession would have to be backed up by plausible scientific evidence which, up to now, is lacking.
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'ex cathedra.' See infallibility.

exegesis (Gr. ἐξηγεῖον, from the verb ἐξηγέω— to explain). The art of finding and proposing the true sense of a text, and, in the theological field, of a text of Holy Scripture. It is an art insomuch as it applies the rules and principles of both the rational and the theological orders, which the science of hermeneutics (q.v.) establishes.

The process of interpretation of a biblical text starts with the determination of the text itself through the principles of textual criticism. Through the means of the rules of hermeneutics the exact exegesis of the text is given, recourse being had, whenever necessary, to literary criticism to determine the literary style of the book in which the text under examination is contained, and to historical criticism to locate it in its time relations. The supreme purpose of exegesis is to illuminate through human words the fullness of the light and thought of God.
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See under hermeneutics.

exemplary cause. That according to which something is made (see cause). It is proper to intelligent being to act according to ideas conceived in the mind, which are, therefore, exemplary causes of the effects produced. Plato placed ideas in a supersensible world, subsisting in themselves outside the mind of God; according to such ideas the Demiurge molded and arranged the material world (exemplarism).

Catholic doctrine, based on divine revelation, teaches that God, as He is the efficient cause, so He is also the exemplary cause of the created universe. In Holy Scripture, divine wisdom is called the craftsman of the universe and God Himself is compared to an architect who creates and forms things according to his mind's plans and designs. That is why theologians distinguish in the mind of God the so-called archetypal ideas, exemplary causes of creation;
these ideas are the divine essence itself, as known by God as imitable outside of Himself. Absolutely speaking, the divine Idea is but one, the Word (q.v.), but the archtype ideas are said to be many, insomuch as in the Word the divine essence is viewed as imitable in various ways. By virtue of exemplary causality there is in all things an imprint of God, which in irrational creatures is a simple mark, while in men, who have thought and will to the likeness of God, it reaches the intensity and perfection of an image.
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existentialism. A philosophical current started in the past century by the Dane, Søren Kierkegaard (†1855), and developed by recent scholars (Heidegger, Jaspers, Marcel, Abbagnano) in a variety of interpretations and connotations. Existentialism originated as a reaction to Hegelian idealism, but today is generally presented as an antithesis to abstractism or transcendentalism and as an adherence to the concrete existence of the individual man.

Existentialism is the basic problem of existentialism. There in man a collective, public, and superficial existence, enslaved to the tyrannical exigencies of the mass, of society; but there is in him a more deep, more proper and subjective, more free existence: the authentic existence, which is not, but is being made, which is not static but dynamic, and constitutes our own proper unmistakable personality. Descending into the depths of his own personality, man discovers that his own real, authentic existence is in tragic conflict with his superficial existence, and feels himself seized by anguish. This anguish or distress is determined by consciousness of our own finiteness, by the sense of guilt, by the desire of emancipating ourselves from the crowd, and of being truly ourselves. To discover oneself in this authentic existence is to find out one's own possibilities and stretch forward to a future of conquest: but on the horizon of these aspirations the specter of death looms as an inexorable barrier, and increases the distress of the spirit. In this way, living authentically is living with the thought of death. For Kierkegaard (a Protestant) the tragic discovery of this real existence resolves itself in an appeal to the supernatural and, what is more, to an appeal without further ado to Christianity; but the other existentialists have eliminated this religious motive in order to stand aside in the problematic of life and thought, and be free from the worries of definitive solutions.

From a philosophical standpoint, existentialism tries to be realistic and claims to be so, even with a Thomistic penchant, in Marcel; but in the others it remains caught in a Kantian position, halfway between realism and idealism. Its pesimistic tinge, its tendency to affirm the irrelationality of life, its agnostic attitude toward God and the supernatural world, make existentialism unacceptable, without important reservations, to the Christian. But is must be recognized that existentialism, with its realistic motives, has broken the spell of the haughty dreams of idealism and revived the problem of individual life by spurring consciences to find an adequate solution.
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"ex opere operato." The Council of Trent, sess. VII, can. 8, defined: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law do not confer grace ex opere operato, let him be excommunicated" (DB, 851).

The expression ex opere operato and its contrary ex opere operantis were used for the first time by Peter of Poitiers (+1305), and long before the Council of Trent had a precise and fixed meaning in Scholastic usage; in fact, in theological speech opus operuman means the objective act considered in itself independently of the moral value that may derive from the one who does the act. Opus operantis, instead, means the act subjectively considered, in so far as it has a moral value deriving to it from the person acting.

To sacramental theology, the opus operatum is nothing more than the sensible sign validly performed, i.e., the external rite consisting of matter and form (q.v.) administered according to the institution of Christ; the opus operantis, on the contrary, is the act of either the minister or the subject insomuch as it has a moral or meritorious value. Now since causality ex opere operato is opposed to that ex opere operantis, to affirm the first is the same as to deny the second. Therefore, the Tridentine Fathers, by saying that the sacraments produce grace ex opere operato, teach that the grace of the sacrament is caused by the sacramental rite validly placed and not by the merits of the minister or the subject. Thus with a brief formula they disposed of the Lutheran principle, according to which confidence or fiducial faith (opus operantis) is the cause of grace and not the sacrament itself, and they consecrated the Catholic doctrine already formulated by St. Augustine: "Baptism has its value, not through the merits of the minister, or through those of the recipient, but on account of its own proper holiness, communicated to it by Him who instituted it" (Contra Crescentium, l. IV, c. 19).

(See causality of the sacrament.)
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exorcism (Gr. ἕξορκισις — the act of conjuring up). A rite administered by a person legitimately deputized for the purpose of expelling demons, especially from energeutem (q.v.). Authority over the devil was directly conferred by Christ on the Apostles and disciples; in the primitive Church we find numerous references to the practice of exorcisms. In the middle of the third century the office of exorcist (see exorcistate) was established. In the actual discipline, only a priest is permitted to exorcise according to the formula of the Roman Ritual and after explicit authorization from his bishop. In the liturgy, exorcism is very frequent (e.g., in the baptismal ceremonies, the blessing of holy water, etc.). Exorcism supposes that persons and elements may be infested with malignant spirits who seek to impede the fruitful use of holy things.
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exorcistate (Gr. ἕξορκισις — he who conjures out). The third of the four minor orders (see orders, holy).

The functions proper to this order is to impose the blessing on the afflicted, whether baptized or catechumens, and to recite prayers in order...
to expel the devil from the body. In the first period of the Church this office did not constitute an ecclesiastical dignity but was a gratuitous gift (charism) granted by the Holy Spirit even to laymen; only in the third century did it rise to the dignity of a minor order.

In the present Church discipline, exorcisms are reserved to priests practicing them with prudence and authorized to do so by their bishops (see *exorcism*).
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dedicated, religious experience. In the generic sense it can be defined as the aggregate of psychological impressions relative to the origin and development of religion in the consciousness and life of man. Thus understood, religious experience is no more than religious intimacy lived and felt in the various phases of its development in each religious subject, and has nothing heterodox about it. Christian consciousness day by day lives the drama of its faith, of its relationship with God, beloved and loved, and through ascetic exercise can attain, in the hunt of innocence and of the heavenly gifts, the sphere of mystical life (see *mystic; contemplation*), in which religious experience manifests itself intensely in the phenomenon that accompany union and contact with God (see *ecstasy*).

The term “religious experience” in later times has taken on a specific meaning in certain currents of religious philosophy, like pragmatism and modernism (*qq.v.*), in open conflict with Catholic doctrine. The American, W. James, is the author and principal proponent of a whole complicated theory on religious experience (cf. his work, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 1902). He studies the religious fact chiefly as an individual psychological phenomenon, in which *sentiment*, breaking through from subconsciousness (*qq.v.*), holds sway over the functions of intelligence. This psychological experience has, as its proper object, not a God personally distinct from man, but “the divine.” Vaguely felt as something that transcends man and at the same time is immanent in him, and toward which the soul has sentiments of love or fear, of filial confidence or desperation, of joy or sadness.

All religions, according to James, are in their essence reduced to this kind of experience and, therefore, it cannot be said that one is more true than another, all religions being expressions of that experience. This theory has its roots in Lutheranism (*qq.v.*), which denied reason and faith, as intellectual acts, affirming in their stead a kind of fiducial faith and sentiment; a tendency which found later justification in Kantianism (*qq.v.*) with the playing down of reason (agnosticism) and recourse to the will and to faith for religious existence. Contributory to James’s theory was the sentimental theology of Schleiermacher († 1854), a disciple of Kant, who was in turn followed by Ritschl († 1892), professor, an exponent of the historical fact of the Christian religion documented by Holy Scripture, subjected all Christian truths, including the divinity of Christ, to the control (value judgment) of sentiment or religious experience. A. Sabatier (*qq.v.*), made himself a popularizer of these ideas; and Le Roy added to them the attractiveness of Bergson’s philosophy.

Modernism has adopted without reserve this current of psychological immanence, thus compromising the substance of Catholic doctrine.

Indeed, religious experience, upheld systematically as a criterion of knowledge and of ethico-religious life, opens the way to all aberrations of which sentiment—blind, individual, undisciplined by the light and strength of reason—is capable. It reduces religion to the status of a psychological caprice, denying, to get with the dignity of the intellect, the personality of God, the historical fact of revelation, and all external religious facts, which impose themselves upon our conscience instead of stemming from it.

The Church has condemned this tendency by rejecting Lutheranism (Counc. of Trent), Molinosism, and modernism (*qq.v.*; encycl. *Pascendi*).

**EXPATRIATION**


**EXPATRIATION**

(Lat. *expatriare* from *pere*—to place to a sacrifice the divine wrath; hence *piaeculum*—a means for placating the divinity). The act by which man seeks to placate the divine wrath caused by a sin or an offense, and to regain heavenly favor by subjecting himself to a penalty. The feeling of guilt accompanied by the fear of punishment and, therefore, the desire of expiation are found in nearly all peoples and religions. Generally, sacrifice has also an expiatory character: the bloody immolation of animals (of men at times) was to serve to placate God, divert His punishment, and purify the people from the crime committed. This concept is also found in the Hebrew religion, especially in the feast of *Kippurim*, in which a goat was killed and its blood sprinkled on people and things in sign of purification and reconciliation with God (Lev. 16:16; cf. Heb. 9:19-28).

In the Catholic religion the concept of expiation integrates the doctrine of Redemption (*qq.v.*), especially in relation to the passion of Jesus and His bloody sacrifice on the cross. Isaias of old (Ch. 53) had predicted that the future *Messias* would be the expiatory Victim for the sins of men; the Gospels re-echo this sublime thought when they say that Christ will give His life in redemption (λίττος) and His blood to remission of sins (Matt. 20:28; 26:28). Still more emphatic is the insistence of St. Paul on the expiatory value of the death and the blood of the Saviour, using the technical term *λειτουργία* (instrument of expiation) to specify the sacrifice of Christ (Rom. 3:25). Tradition, too, is rich in testimonies emphasizing this truth.

Hence we understand why the Church has condemned the following proposition of modernism: “The teaching on the expiatory death of Christ has its origin not in the Gospel but in Paul” (decreet, *Lamentabili, DB*, 1928). According to the teaching of the Church, therefore, the expiatory character of the death of Jesus is simply a revealed truth. However, not all the doctrine of Redemption lies in this truth. Luther and his followers transformed the concept of the Redemption by restricting their view to the external aspect of the passion and death of Christ, in which they saw only a punishment of God for our sins (penal substitution). Christ thus would be a passive Victim of the vindictive justice of God. Expiation corrects this ultra-severe concept with the idea of the spontaneity with which Christ accepted death to pay off the punishment due for our sins. Catholic doctrine rejects the Lutheran theory, accepts the theory of expiation, and goes beyond it to a more adequate concept of vicarious satisfaction (see *satisfaction of Christ*), which brings out the
moral content of Redemption (love, humility, obedience of Christ). Expiation and satisfaction are mutually integrative: in the former, the passion of Christ is the principal means of reparation, in the latter, the passion is concomitant.
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extreme unction (Lat. extrema — last; unctio — anointing, unction). The sacrament of the dying. The Apostle St. James, in his Catholic Letter, writes: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him" (5:14-15). In this inspired text are found all the elements constitutive of the sacrament of the sick.

Its institution is indicated in the incidental phrase in nomine Domini, which in the Greek original means "by virtue of the command and on the authority of the Lord," i.e., of Christ, because in the style of the New Testament the term Kyrios (Dominus, Lord) is the proper epithet of Jesus Christ.

The ministers are the "presbyteri," by which we are to understand not the old men or ancients of the people but the duly ordained bishops and priests, as the Church has always understood in theory and in practice.

The elements of the unction are expressly indicated in the oil (the matter) and the prayer (the form). Olive oil blessed by the bishop is used to anoint various parts of the body, which are the most likely instruments of sin — eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, hands, feet — and at the same time the sacramental formula is recited. The Latin form is: "Through this holy unction and His most pious mercy, may the Lord pardon you all evil you have committed with the eyes, with the ears, etc.

The effects are summarized by the Council of Trent, which, synthesizing the data of Tradition, it calls this sacrament sacramentum paeniten- tiae (sess. 14, exord., DB, 909), i.e., completing and perfecting the sacrament of penance. It completes the effects of the sacrament of forgiveness because it completes the incorporation in Christ restored by penance; strengthens the soul for the last struggle against the devil; removes the remnants (residua) of sin, slaying down the last obstacle to perfect adhesion to Christ; disposes the sick to suffer and die in Christ and for Christ, associating him with the sufferings and death of Christ the Head.

Particularly, this sacrament makes the supernatural organism robust and fit to overcome the supreme weaknesses of the spirit, aggravated by the exhaustion of the flesh. In fact, the wounds of original sin were healed by baptism, and of personal sins, healed by penance, weaken the spiritual organism of the soul, which, at the point where the body is about to break down and the devil makes his final assault, finds itself exposed to the grave danger of succumbing in the supreme struggle. To obviate such a danger, the sacramental grace of extreme unction increases the virtue of hope, by which the sick gives himself with confidence into the hands of the divine mercy and multiplies the helps of actual grace, effecting for the sick a strong shield against the darts of the enemy. This is the alleviatio (the relief), of which the Apostle speaks. To all this are added the maternal attentions of the Church, who increases her efficacious assistance for this child whom she is bearing unto eternal life: She invokes all the saints of heaven, calls on the souls in purgatory, assembles the just on earth who pray unseen around the bed of the dying, while the priest, official representative of the Church, performs the sacred rite, in which the devotion of the recipient, the personal merit of the ministers, and the general merit of the whole Church are of very great help" (St. Thomas, Suppl., q. 32, a. 3). In the case where the sick man is unable to confess his sins, this sacrament supplies for the effects of the sacrament of penance, and, should the Lord judge it expedient, it procures also bodily health.

The subject is the adult and sick Christian; therefore, extreme unction cannot be administered to one in good health, even if he is very close to death, like the soldier entering combat, or even the condemned going up to the gallows.

The definitions of the Council of Trent against the Protestants, who call extreme unction "a hypocrirical farce" (Calvin), are found in sess. 14, right after the canons on penance (DB, 926-929).
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effect of the grace of God (cf. the II Council of Orange against the Semi- Pelagians). It is indispensable for sanctification and salvation (Council of Trent), but is not sufficient without good works: *Fides sine operibus mortua est* (St. James).

Luther reduces faith to a blind trust or confidence in the divine mercy, the modernists to a sentiment erupting from the subconscious (see *subconsciousness; Lutheranism; modernism*). Cf. Council of Trent, sess. VI, cc. 6-7 (DB, 2074); Vatican Council, sess. III, cc. 3-4 (DB, 1789-1800); encyclical *Pascendi* (DB, 2074).
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Harnett, "Foi," DTC.

Ingrate, *Unbegotten* (Engelrain, 1852).


faith, articles of. See *articles of faith*.

fatalism. See destiny; freedom.

Father. The proper name of the First Person of the Holy Trinity, which has its foundation in the intellectional generation (see procession, divine) from which originates the Son — Word. This paternity with respect to the Son is to be taken in the proper and natural sense. Besides, God is called in a figurative or analogous sense Father of the universe, the effect of His omnipotence, and, in a sense more connected with His true paternity, He is called the Father of men, especially by virtue of sanctifying grace (see *grace, habitual*) which makes the rational creature the adopted son of God, and sharer, in a way, of the natural filiation of the incarnate Word. Two other proper titles belong to the Father: Principle and Unbegotten (Ingenere, Unborn). He is called Principle, because He is the first term and the first source, as it were, whence derive the processions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But in the Holy Trinity we must exclude all concepts of chronological priority and of productive causality, because the three Persons are perfectly equal and hence coeternal. The Father is called Unbegotten (Ingenitus; Innascibilis; dy-evéntos) not only in the sense that, unlike the Son, He is not generated, but also because, unlike both the Son and the Holy Spirit, He is not proceeding from any principle.
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St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, I, q. 35. 10.
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Fathers of the Church. The ecclesiastical authors who, according to the classical definition of Mabillon, "doctrina eminent, sanctitae florent, antiquitate vigent, qui expressa vel tacita Ecclesiae designatione gaudent" (Pref. ad opera S. Bernardi, § 2, No. 23). This means that, to be honored with the title of Father of the Church, an ecclesiastical author must possess four qualifications: eminent doctrine, holiness of life, antiquity, recognition (explicit or tacit) by the Church. Such are, for example, SS. Ignatius of Antioch, Justin, Irenaeus, Cyprian, etc. Others who stand out only with respect to doctrine or antiquity are called simply ecclesiastical writers, like Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius, etc.

The morally unanimous consent of the Fathers in matters of faith or morals is an irrefutable testimony of divine Tradition (q.v.). This consent may be established either directly (from explicit testimonies) or indirectly: (a) from the agreement, e.g., of all the Western Fathers, (b) from the testimonies of many Fathers outstanding in doctrine and authority, existing in different times and places, when their statements have gone uncontradicted, (c) or even from the testimonies of a few, provided they have been given in such circumstances that it may be argued they reflect the common faith of the Church.
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Breen, *The Religions of Primitive Peoples* (New York, 1897).


fideism. A system which exaggerates the function of faith in the knowledge of truth. There is a fideism which has shown itself openly in the very bosom of the Church under different forms more or less pronounced. The Neoplatonic-Augustinian current at the time of Scholastics reacted, on the basis of sentiment and of faith, against the rationalistic tendencies. This reaction affirmed itself without moderation in nominalism, but became heterodox in Luther. Mistrust of reason lurks in the works of Pascal, finds a systematic exposition in Daniel Huet, Bishop of Avranches († 1721), if indeed he is the author of *Tractatus de debilitate intellectus humani* (Muratori doubts it), and becomes organized into a system in traditionalism (q.v.).

But a worse fideism (because it is naturalistic) is that derived from Kantianism (q.v.), based on The
Filioque.

The term which the Catholic Church uses in the Creed: Qui [Spiritus] ex Patre Filioque procedit ("Who proceeds from the Father and the Son") to signify that the Holy Spirit has His origin from both the Father and the Son.

The "Filioque" was not in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol originally, but was inserted into it in Spain in the sixth century; later in France in Charlemagne's time, then in Germany, in Italy, and finally also at Rome (eleventh century).

One of the oldest and main points of accusation of the Greek schismatic Church against the Roman Church is the insertion of the "Filioque" in the Symbol and the consequent corruption of the traditional doctrine. To this we can respond: (1) The magisterium of the Church cannot change the Creed, but can add to it an expression, or, what is more, a truth of faith, e.g., that of the Euchrist, in order to integrate it. (2) The addition of the "Filioque" is legitimate because Holy Scripture affirms that the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son (John 15:26), will receive from the Son (John 16:14), and is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9) — expressions which cannot be understood unless we admit the procession of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father, but also from the Son.

As regards Tradition, it is to be noted: (a) The Greeks Fathers agree (at times even verbally) with the Latins in saying that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son (Ephraem, Epiphanius, and others). But it is also true that while the Latins use more often the formula a Patre et Filio, the Greeks generally prefer the other formula a Patre et Filio. It is, however, evident that the two formulas say substantially the same thing.

Consequently, the schismatic Greeks wrongly reproached the Roman Church, which is perfectly right.
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Critique of Practical Reason: its most outstanding representative is the German, Jacoby, who places above reason an intuitive faculty (verstehen) which reaches God. The positivists (Spencer, Mill, and the pragmatists (James) often appeal to faith to affirm the Divinity, which they are not able to demonstrate by way of reason (see positivism; pragmatism). The modernists, with their theory of religious sense and experience (q.v.) also modernism draw close to deism.

As the Church defends the dignity of human freedom while affirming the efficacious power of grace, so it does not fail to defend reason's dignity in its affirmation of the rights of faith (cf. Vatican Council, sess. III, DB, 1781 ff.).

"Fomes peccati." See concupiscence; Immaculate Conception.

foreknowledge. See prescience.

form (Gr. μορφή). In philosophy and theology form is used in the proper sense to indicate the formal, intrinsic cause, which constitutes the nature of things. It is applied to the angelic world (separate forms), to the human composite (soul, form of the body), to material things which are composed of matter (passive and determinable element) and form (active and determining element, the "αρχής" of Aristotle).

In an analogical sense, form is said of all that implies actuation, perfection. Thus it is applied to grace (supernatural, accidental form), to charity which infuses faith, etc. (i.e., perfects it: "fides formata"), to the words as the determining element of the sacramental sign (see matter and form of the sacraments).
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fortitude. See gifts of the Holy Ghost; virtue.

"Forum internum"—"forum externum." See hierarchy.

Franzelin. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

Fracicelli. A sect of vagabond religious of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, deriving probably from the rigorist tendency represented in the Franciscan Order by the so-called Spirituals opposed by the Conventuals of more moderate views. The story of the Fraticelli is very obscure and complicated; it enters popes, with different attitudes, and
princes, as well as theological, ascetical, political, and juridical controversies. Suffice it to recall here that the Fraticelli, sprung up already in the time of Nicholas III, consolidated and gained strength with the blessing and protection of Celestine V, and fell into disgrace with his successor, Boniface VIII, through struggles and troubles they managed to get by up to the pontificate of John XXII (1316), who tried to put an end to their activities by disbanning the sect and condemning its errors.

From this condemnation (Constitution Gloriosam Ecclesiam, DB, 484 ff.), we can deduce the principal errors of the Fraticelli which had their repercussions on the heresies of the following centuries. For most of all, the Fraticelli are independent spirits, rebellious to the authority of the Church; to justify themselves, they invented the theory of the two Churches: one carnal, rich, corrupt, with the pope at its head; the other spiritual, poor, pure, and holy, to which belong the Fraticelli and their followers. Priests and bishops stained with sin lose their power of jurisdiction and of administering the sacraments. The Gospel and Christ's promises are fulfilled only in the family of the Fraticelli. The sacrament of matrimony is detestable, and the end of the world is near (DB, 484-490).

It seems that the Fraticelli were influenced by other sects, indulging somewhat in sensuality. In the social field this sect contributed more or less directly to weakening the principle of the right of private property, by criticizing the luxury and riches of the official Church. Condemned, they did not disband, as late as the fifteenth century, and find them going around spreading errors and stirring up strife, in Italy especially. Two saints in that century, John Capistrano and James della Marca, worked efficaciously to convert them.
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**freedom.** An essential property of the will which consists radially in the dominium over one's own actions, by which the will can will or not will, and will this rather than that. The will is an appetitive faculty proper to every intelligent being. It has for its object, "good," which coincides with being, and has therefore no limits, like "true," object of the intelligence. Thus the will has a quasi-infinite potentiality with reference to pure and absolute good. Should the will be confronted with the absolute good, its adequate object and end, it could not fail to adhere to it, but would adhere to it necessarily (not, however, with blind necessity). But since the human will operates in the midst of creatures, limited beings and limited goods, it cannot be determined necessarily by any of them. On the contrary, it dominates them with an active indifference, according to which it can choose one or the other or none, consequent on the judgment of reason, which considers the relationship of those particular goods as means, more or less useful, to the end.

Freedom may be of exercise or contradiction (to will or not will), of specification (to will this rather than that), and of contrariety (to will good or, its contrary, evil). To be able to do evil is a defect of the human will, which per se tends to good. The true freedom lies in the choice of good. This is physical freedom or free will, which is proved by the testimony of the individual and of the social conscience: man feels he is free before, during, and after the action; and on the basis of this certainty, humanity punishes or rewards, respectively, the one doing evil or the one doing good. Without freedom there would be no responsibility, and, therefore, no moral world.

In addition to physical freedom, also called psychological freedom, there is a moral freedom, which consists in immunity from obligation (law): this liberty, absolutely speaking, exists only in God, who is the Author of Law. In man, there is immunity from this or that law, but not from all law. Hence, human freedom is limited; physically man has freedom of will, but morally his will is subordinated to the exigencies of the law and of the supreme end of life.

**Errors: fatalism, which subordinates the world and man to an ironclad and blind will, called also destiny (q.v.).** Still more insidious is determinism, according to which man believes himself to be free, whereas his action is the result of psychological and external coefficients, which necessarily determine it.

The Church has always defended human freedom, even with respect to the divine knowledge and will, and to the action of grace; she has condemned every attack on freedom (see Lutheranism: Jansenism; predestination). Cf. DB, 317, 615, 1904. As to the freedom of God, and of Jesus Christ as Man, see will, divine; will of Christ.
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**freedom of Christ.** See will of Christ.
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**free thought (free inquiry).** The basic principle of Lutheranism (q.v.). Having eliminated the authority of the Church and its infallible magisterium, Luther gave the believer the Bible, telling him that this is the sole source and the only rule of his faith. There is no intermediary between God and man; the believer goes to the sacred books, reads them, examines them freely, and draws from them the truth to be believed and the law to be observed. Very quickly, however, Luther became aware of the implicit danger in such a principle. When he saw opinions and tendencies multiply according to the individual choice of the faithful, he raised his voice to impose his creed, paying no heed to the incoherence of his action; what is more, he had recourse to the secular arm of the princes. But liberty of thought, i.e., freedom of examination of the Scriptures, had taken over consciences and was producing its bitter fruits: the disregard for the eclesiastical authority was followed by scorn of all authority, rebellion against all law and everything imposed from without.

Free thought ad absurdotandam et ad totam inferius demagogic tides, that infests the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have their first root in the doctrine of free inquiry introduced by Luther. In religion, this harmful principle has produced the innumerable Protestant sects in a process of gradual decay and disintegration that nothing succeeds in arresting. "Liberty of thought," as explained above, has no foundation in Holy Scripture: rather it is imposed by the institution of the teaching authority of the Church (see magisterium of the Church).
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**freedom of thought.** See free thought (free inquiry).
fruits of the Mass. The eucharistic sacrifice has a fourfold efficacy (cf. Council of Trent, DB, 950): laetrue (it adores and praises God), eucharistic (thanks Him for benefits bestowed), imperative (obtains new graces), and proprietary (moves the divine mercy to the pardon of sins). The first two effects regard God, the last two, men.

The offering of the Mass is three: the Principal (Jesus Christ), the ministerial (the priest), and the general (the faithful). Inasmuch as the Mass is the work of Christ it produces its effects ex ope operato (q.v.), i.e., independently of the merits and dispositions of the priest and the faithful; in this sense the Mass is an ever pure sacrifice (oblatio mundi) which cannot be stained by any iniquity of its secondaries ministers (cf. Council of Trent, DB, 939). Inasmuch as it is the work of the priest and the faithful, it fulfills the four effects of eucharistic sacrifice, i.e., in the measure of the proper opera operantis, i.e., in the measure of the holiness and fervor of the minister and the assistants, and in this sense it is said that the Mass of a holy priest is better than that of a sinner. The effects that derive to men (the imperative and the proprietary) are commonly called fruits of the Mass, of which we distinguish: (1) the general fruit, in favor of the whole Church; (2) the special fruit, in favor of the person for whom the Mass is celebrated; (3) the most special fruit, which is inalienably reserved to the celebrant.
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Gallicanism. A complex of theories developed in France, especially in the seventeenth century, which tended to restrict the authority of the Church. The political Gallicanism, the religious Gallicanism, the conciliar Gallicanism. The remote roots of Gallicanism go back to the polemics of the Church. The struggle between Pope Pius VIII and Philippe de Béthune, King of France, and then to the period of the Western Schism, which exposed to contempt the pontifical dignity contested by various antipopes. Peter d'Ailly, who played an important role in the Council of Constance (1414–1418), collected and developed the principles of other writers who preceded him, and formulated a whole doctrine on the superiority of councils over the pope and on the derivation of the jurisdiction of the episcopacy and the clergy directly from God, and not through the pope. Four famous articles were approved in the Council of Constance, under the tutelage of the chairmanship of d'Ailly (a cardinal now), which reflect his antipapal teaching. The Gallicans of the seventeenth century cited these articles as articles of defined faith, while Martin V and Eugène IV refused to recognize them as legitimate. Another precedent of Gallicanism is the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), compiled by the clergy and signed by Charles VII of France, in which are repeated the principles about the superiority of the council, defined by a faction of the Council of Basil, opposed to the orders of Eugene IV.

In the seventeenth century, under Louis XIV, an absolutist in politics and religion, Gallicanism set itself up officially as a system. The French atmosphere, even in universities like La Sorbonne, was by this time impregnated with teachings adverse to papal jurisdiction: Peter Pithou (†1596) and Peter Dupuy (†1651) had already compiled, with commentary heightened by much erudition, the list of Listes de l'Eglise Gallicane; Dupuy was encouraged by the astute Richelieu. The question of the regalia (right of the king to receive the incomes of vacant bishoprics) moved Louis XIV to call a general assembly of the clergy (1661), from which came forth the Déclaration du clergé gallican in 4 articles, formulated by Bossuet, which was immediately approved and promulgated by the King (1662).

Art. 1. Absolute independence of the king and the princes, in temporal matters, of the ecclesiastical authority.
Art. 2. The pope is subordinate to general councils.
Art. 3. The pontifical authority is moderated by the sacred canons, and, in any case, cannot touch the rules and customs of the Gallican Church.
Art. 4. The papal judgment lacks value, unless the consent of the Church concurs in it.

These four articles, which were immediately condemned by the Church (DB, 1332 and 1598), reappeared in the seven-seventy seven organic articles which Napoleon I added abusively to the concordat stipulated with Pius VII (1802).
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Genealogy of Christ. Is recorded by two Evangelists: by Matthew, at the beginning of his narrative (11:17) and by Luke after the story of the infancy of Jesus (3:23–38). No serious difficulty can be advanced as to the origin and preservation of this genealogy, because it is a characteristic of the Orientals, and of the Hebrews especially, to preserve with accuracy the memory of their ancestors. Official documents also facilitated this work, because important rights depended on descendency. The specific difficulty in the genealogy of Jesus is that from David to Joseph only two of the ancestral names are the same in Matthew and Luke. Matthew follows the descent line from Abraham to Joseph, and Luke the ascending line from Joseph to Adam; both go through David of whom the Messiah was to be the "Son." Both are obviously sketchy and incomplete.

But how are we to explain that while in Matthew the father of Joseph is called Jacob, in Luke he is called Heli, and so the ancestors of Jesus in Matthew are not those recorded by Luke?

Various solutions of this singular problem have been attempted from the first Christian centuries. The oldest and most common has recourse to the Hebraic law of the levirate (levir — brother-in-law), according to which the widow of a man dead without sons had to be married by her
brother-in-law, and the first-born son received the name of the deceased in order to give him a descendant. Joseph, therefore, is said to be the natural son of Jacob but the legal son of Heli, brother of Jacob who had died without sons. Matthew, then, gives the natural genealogy and Luke the legal.

A reader and more recent solution sees in Matthew the genealogy of Joseph and in Luke, Mary's. So that Luke 3:23 should be understood thus: "Although Jesus was held the son of Joseph, he was really only the son of Mary, whose father was Heli, etc."

Some modern authors have recourse to a particular form of adoption in use among the Hebrews: Joseph's case was that of the husband of an only daughter-and-heir, who entered his father-in-law's family with the full rights of a son and shared in the genealogy of that family. Thus Luke gives the adoptive genealogy of Joseph, which corresponds to the list of Mary's ancestors. The quality of daughter-heir in Mary has not, however, been definitively proved.
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generation. See Only-Begotten; procession, divine; Son.

gift. See charism.

gifts of the Holy Ghost. The gifts of the Holy Ghost are dispositions infused by God, by which the sanctified soul is made docile to and ready for the impulses of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of salutary activity. There is an explicit text of Isaias (11:1-2) that enumerates seven gifts: intellect, counsel, wisdom, knowledge, fortitude, piety, and fear. This text is inserted in the liturgy of the sacrament of confirmation. Leo XIII, in his encyclical Divinum illud, develops the doctrine of the gifts according to the principles of St. Thomas (ASS, 29, 954).

There is a scholastic question on the nature of these gifts; namely, whether they are an actual movement or a habitual disposition. St. Thomas and the majority of the theologians are for the second opinion. The gifts are infused habits distinct from virtues. The difference is that while the virtues are intrinsic principles of activity, the gifts are dispositions of the faculties of the soul to receive the external impulse of the Holy Spirit. Billot appropriately compares the virtues to the motors of a ship and the gifts to sails unfurled and ready to receive the impulsion of the wind.

The gifts are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. intellect</th>
<th>2. counsel</th>
<th>theoretical practical</th>
<th>simple apprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. wisdom</td>
<td>4. knowledge</td>
<td>theoretical practical</td>
<td>judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. fortitude (with respect</td>
<td>6. piety (with respect</td>
<td>to oneself)</td>
<td>to others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the will</td>
<td>in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. fear of the Lord</td>
<td>8. concupiscible appetites (modulating</td>
<td>concupiscible and</td>
<td>supernatural organism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gifts of the Holy Ghost, together with the virtues and sanctifying grace, which is the root of both the gifts and the virtues, constitute the so-called supernatural organism, which may be represented graphically as follows:
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gnosis. See Gnosticism.

Gnosticism (Gr. γνωση — knowledge). A very complex system of religious doctrines and practices, philosophical, theurgical, and mystical in character, which began in the Alexandrian period in Judeo-pagan circles and developed in the first centuries of Christianity.

The basic principle of the "gnosis" is: In religion there is a common faith, which may be sufficient for the ordinary people, but there is also a higher knowledge, reserved to the learned, which offers a philosophical explanation of the common faith. Christian Gnosticism draws various elements from Plato, from Persian Mazdaism, from the pagan mysteries, and applies them to the Christian religion by using and abusing the allegorical exegesis of Holy Scripture. The Christian "gnosis" may be defined as a theosophic philosophism, tending to absorb divine revelation in order to make a religious philosophy of it. It developed in Syria with Simon Magus, Menander, and Saturninus, and in Egypt (Alexandrian gnostics) with Basides, Valentinus, and their respective disciples. Despite differences, the "gnosis" is reducible, more or less, to this outline: (a) God is the inaccessible Being (Platonic transcendence), who can have no contact outside of Himself; opposed to God but coeternal with Him is matter (Platonic-Persian dualism), bad in its nature (pessimism); (b) between God and matter is the pleroma or etero, an intermediate, supersensible world (the hyperuranium of Plato) inhabited by beings called aëoms, emanating one from the other or disposed in pairs (syzygies); (c) one of these aëoms, the Demiurgo (God of the Old Testament) worked matter into the actual form of this world; (d) a divine spark from that superior world fell one day on the matter of this world of ours and remained there to suffer as in a prison (soul in the body); (e) another of the aëoms (Christ) descended into this world, took the appearance of a body (see Docetism) and lived and died to free spirit from matter (Redemption); (f) side by side with these theories there was a moral teaching, often lax, and a superstitious cult, in which the sacraments appear deformed. Marcion developed some Gnostic elements along lines of a very predominant and austere asceticism.

Gnosticism constituted one of the gravest dangers for the newborn Christianity; Judaism was the other. Fortunately, Gnosticism was anti-Jewish. The Fathers spotted the menace immediately and endeavored
to eliminate it. St. Irenaeus refutes Gnosticism in the 5 books of his *Adversus Haereses*. His position, like that of Tertullian, is conservative, with uncompromising reaction; but in Alexandria, Clement and Origen used the false gnosticism to build up a *Christian system* (science in service of the faith): hence theology was born.
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God. In all peoples, in all times and places, the idea of, and the faith in, a superem being, creator and lord of the universe, and of man especially, has always been existent and lively. According to the best historians of comparative religion, polytheism is a degeneration of primitive monotheism (q.v.). The idea of God does not stem exclusively from the revelation made to the first parents, as traditionalism (q.v.) would have it, but it is also the result of spontaneous reflection of human reason on the world. St. Paul (Rom. 1:18 ff.) affirms that the Gentiles, outside of the sphere of the Hebrew religion, knew God through creatures, but did not adore Him duly, and through their own malice fell into idolatry. Against all forms of agnosticism (q.v.) the Church has defined in the Vatican Council, sess. III, c. 2, that man with the sole light of reason can arrive at the sure and certain knowledge of God, by considering created things, which are a reflection and a manifestation of the perfections of God the Creator. Moreover, the Church has always rejected the opinion, diametrically opposed to agnosticism, which holds that God is the object of a direct and immediate intuition (ontological).

Theologians translate this teaching of the Church in the following statements: (1) God, supreme being, who transcends infinitely all created nature, cannot be known intuitively either by an innate idea or sentiment (ontological and innatism are outside of and against psychological consciousness). (2) God can be known and, what is more, His existence can be demonstrated, by starting not from God Himself (a priori), but from a first principle (a posteriori), which even at first blush present the characteristics of an effect, in which the exigency of a cause is implicit. (3) This natural knowledge of God is never adequate, but only analogical (see analogy). St. Thomas, working on these principles, has developed five arguments or ways of demonstrating the existence of God:

1. **1. dynamically (becoming)**
   - First way: from the origin of motion or becoming to the first Immovable Mover.
   - Second way: from the origin of being to the First Cause.

2. **2. statically (being—essence)**
   - Third way: from the contingency of being to the Necessary Being.
   - Fourth way: from the limited essence to the highest and most Perfect Being.

These arguments are all based on the principle of causality, and to them are to be reduced all the other arguments, which take as a point of departure either the universal truths of our intellect, our desire of a supreme Good, or the moral law engraved in our hearts.

As to the argument of St. Anselm, see *apriorism*. As regards the knowledge of God in the other life, see *vision, beatific*.
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St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, I, q. 2.


*goodness*. See *perfection*.

**Gospels** (Gr. εὐαγγέλιον, from εὖ ἀγγέλλω—good news, happy message). In the time of Christ and the Apostles, the *gospel* is the good news of universal Redemption contained in the preaching of Christ. Very soon, however, already in the first generation of Christians, the term indicated the four books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, which contain the story of that announcement.

Matthew, called to the Apostolate from the Capharnaum customs, wrote his Gospel with the intention of demonstrating to the Jews of Palestine that Jesus, in whom all the ancient prophecies were fulfilled, was the awaited Messiah. Mark, disciple of Peter, preserved in his book the memory of the living preaching of the Apostle to the Romans, in which the figure of Jesus Man-God is presented with enchanting freshness of details. Luke, Antioch physician and disciple of Paul, gathered together with sacred delight the materials, covering the words and actions of the Lord's life, most suited to the instruction and edification of the Christian communities converted from paganism. These first three Gospels resemble one another substantially in the general narrative plan of Jesus' life and also in their mode of treating the material. This property, which makes it possible to arrange the three stories in parallel columns so as to allow the eyes to take them in at a glance, has given rise to their name of Synoptics, i.e., "visible together" in the same glance. The Gospels of John, beloved disciple of Christ, depart sensibly from the plan and mode of presentation common to the three Synoptics. John gives greatest advance to the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus, not high-lighted by the other three, during which Jesus spoke more often and more clearly of His divinity.

The authenticity (q.v.) of the four Gospels is assured by an uninterrupted series of detailed and precise historical testimonies, beginning with Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia and disciple of the Apostles (first decades of the second century), and continuing from century to century consistently and without contradiction. In addition to statements of particularly authoritative writers, like St. Irenaeus (c. 140-202), bishop of Lyons and spiritual bridge between East and West, there are also official documents, like the list of the books of the New Testament, called by the name of its discoverer, the *Canon of Muratori*, written at Rome around a.d. 185. Both the authors and the documents are echoes of a tradition that goes back evidently to the first years of the Church and that has been weighed and sifted in the course of disputes with the heretics. In the second- and third-century writers, there is so great a number of quotations of the text of the four Gospels that these could be nearly reconstructed integrally therefrom. An implacable adversary of primitive Christianity, the Epicurean philosopher Celsus, writing about a.d. 178, recognizes in the four Gospels a work of
Jesus' disciples, and mentions the fact that the heretics had tried to lend them in support of their teachings, in order to avail themselves of such authoritative writings.

The internal examination of the Gospels — their language, the mentality they reflect, the customs they mention, their historical and geographical references, when confronted with the most recent and most certain discoveries — confirms the authenticity of these four books as unanimously affirmed by Christian Tradition.

As regards the date of the Gospels, it is an established fact that they were circulated widely and recognized in the second century in all the Christian communities of the East and West; they must, therefore, have been written in the first century. The historical testimonies, consolidated by internal textual examination, permit the conclusion that Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). More precisely, Matthew and Mark published their books before the death of Peter and Paul (A.D. 64 or 67); Luke concludes abruptly the narrative of the Acts in the year 62, and declares that his Gospel has preceded this second of his books (Acts 1:1). Because the ancient testimonies are nearly unanimous on the priority of Matthew and Mark over Luke, the first two Gospels must have been published before A.D. 60. Matthew, according to some scholars, goes back to A.D. 50.

The critical balance of the four biographers of Jesus has been transmitted integrally down to us is shown by the exceptional condition of privilege the text enjoyed. There are fully 1500 manuscript codices of the Greek text of the Gospels; two of them were copied in the fourth century, while some papyrus fragments go back to the third and second centuries. Many ancient versions in western and eastern languages afford an effective check on the Greek text as contained in its actual codices. Many thousands of text variants (different readings), none of which compromises the sense of the text in matters of faith and morals, allow us to state that the Greek gospel text read today is substantially identical with the original. In this connection, it is noteworthy that there is no manuscript of the Greek or Latin classics which goes back beyond the ninth century A.D., and even those prior to the twelfth century are extremely rare.

The historicality of the Gospels, i.e., their objectivity, is declared by the authors themselves (Luke 1:1–4; John 20:30 ff.; 21:24) and was a necessary postulate for their acceptance by the Church. Besides, no one would have dared to narrate things that were false, or to alter the facts, when there existed, on the one hand, jealous witnesses of these facts like the Apostles and, on the other, fierce enemies of Christianity, like the Jews, who had played leading roles in the life of Jesus and who would have found an easier way to blacken their polemics, had they been able to find the historians of the Nazarene in error. But the best the Hebrew literary tradition can do is to observe silence on the life and teaching of the Master of Galilee.

Non-Catholic criticism contests the historical value of a considerable part of the Gospels only because it contains supernatural facts. The efforts of this criticism which, from the eighteenth century, commits itself to the absurd task of explaining the life of Jesus to the exclusion of every supernatural element, have resulted in a "tower of Babel" (Loisy) of opinions that pulverize the texts without succeeding in drawing from them any possible organic meaning.
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**FOSTER**, "Gospels," CE. De Grandma-

The Vatican Council (sess. III, c. 1), teaches that God guards all the things He has created. The texts of Holy Scripture that speak of providence apply as well to divine government. In Wisdom 14:5 it is said explicitly: "Thy providence, O Father, governeth it." The Fathers of the Church exalt the wisdom of divine government in all creatures (cf. R/ under the word "Gubernatio").

The attainment of their end is the supreme perfection of created things; it is reasonable to attribute this attainment to God, to whom their first perfection, that of being, belongs (creation). The divine government is not exercised directly in everything, but God also uses second causes, either necessary or contingent, according to the effects He wishes to realize, without doing violence to nature or disturbing it. God in His wisdom acts fortiter, suaviter (strongly, sweetly) and reaches His ends infallibly, despite apparent creature reluctances or defections. Nothing escapes the control and the power of His wisdom and of His omnipotent will.
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*St. Thomas, Summa Theol., I, q. 103. See under providence, divine.*

**grace** (Gr. χάρις; root χαίρομαι — concept of pleasure, of joy; Lat. gratia, whence gratia). Both in the classic and modern usage it has various meanings, reducible to two aspects: (1) subjective (beauty, benevolence, favor, gratitude); (2) objective (gift, benefit). In the Hellenistic religious language χάρις had already come to mean an interior strength infused by the gods. In the Old Testament it is found the word "grace" (Hebr. חַּסֶּן, whence the name Anna) in the sense of benevolence (cf. Gen. 18:3). In the New Testament it is most frequent in Paul (110 times), and quite often used by Luke, John, and Peter, prevalently in the sense of a gratuitous gift of God to men (gratia Dei).

The doctrine of grace was extensively developed by St. Augustine against the Pelagians (see Pelagianism) who denied it, thus compromising the whole supernatural order. The Church magisterium on repeated occasions took up the matter of grace, especially in the Council of Carthage (418, DB, 101 ff.); II Council of Orange (529, DB, 174 ff.); Council of Trent (sess. VI, DB, 793–843); in the condemnation of Bainen-ism by Innocent X (DB, 1902 ff.). From these documents we draw the
The characteristic note of this grace is the infallibility of the effect. Testimonies of Holy Scripture are not lacking and they are all to the effect that God's dominion and power is absolute, and that no creature, even man endowed with free will, can resist it: "As the divisions of waters, so the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever he will he shall turn it" (Prov. 21:17; "I will cause you to walk in my commandments, and to keep my judgments, and do them" (Ezek. 36:27). An example of most efficacious grace is the conversion of Paul on the Damascus road.

St. Augustine, more than the other Fathers, develops amply the doctrine of efficacious grace, to which he attributes all the supernatural good of man. Molature, however, following Bellarmine, admitted that actual grace is a divine motion, at least for inliberate acts. Thomists: actual grace is a supernatural physical preformation, by which God moves the soul (in potency) to a salutary act. It is reduced to a fluent quality, preceding the act and moving to it (according to Bañez and his followers, to the point of determining free will specifically to this, rather than to that object). See concourse, divine grace.

But the controversy lingers on between Molinists and Thomists on the essence of efficacious grace. The Thomists defend intrinsic and absolute efficacy: efficacious grace is the supernatural physical predestination to which the human will is subordinate and which de facto it does not resist (although being able to resist, as the Council of Trent says). But for the Molinists grace is efficacious, not by itself, but dependently on the consent of our free will, which can always resist and leave the grace without fruitful effect. Between these two extremes there is, nowadays especially, a tendency toward a reasonable syncretism, which rejects physical predestination on the one hand, for it does not seem to fit even in the framework of St. Thomas' thought and in a certain sense compromises free will, and, on the other hand, abhors also the Molinistic concept of a divine grace that must go begging the consent of man. Such syncretism proposes an intrinsic, divine motion in the human will (of the natural or supernatural order, as the case may be) which moves physically and immediately to the act as regards the exercise of the act, but leaves the will free to determine itself with respect to the specification of the same act, through choice of the object made by the reason, on which, however, God exercises His influence by way of illumination.

But no system will ever be able to eliminate the mystery that lies in conciliating the internal and efficacious motion of God with the freedom of the will that is moved.

 grace, actual. The transient supernatural influence of God in the soul, moving it to the salutary act, i.e., to an act ordained to sanctification and eternal life. The existence of this grace, as distinct from habitual grace, is attested to by Holy Scripture, which speaks of illumination (Ps. 124:4), of impulse (Acts 9:5). Thus also Tradition: St. Augustine, who had to deal most with grace, speaks rather rarely about sanctifying grace, but continually about actual grace—or perhaps about both without distinction. The Council of Trent (sess. VI, c. 6, DB, 798) describes actual grace as disposing man to justification.

A great part of the systematic doctrine about actual grace, however, was developed immediately after the Council of Trent, on the occasion of Jansenism and Jansenism (q.v.), which crippled the concept of the supernatural influence of God with respect to human activity. A violent controversy flared up between Dominicans and Jesuits (see Jansenism and Molinism) about the essence of actual grace.

Molinists: actual grace is essentially the same as the supernatural vital act (e.g., salutary thought or deed), which comes at once from God in so much as it is supernatural, and from our faculties insomuch as it is vital. Some Molinists, however, following Bellarmine, admitted that actual grace is a divine motion, at least for indeliberate acts. Thomists: actual grace is a supernatural physical preformation, by which God moves the soul (in potency) to a salutary act. It is reduced to a fluent quality, preceding the act and moving to it (according to Bañez and his followers, to the point of determining free will specifically to this, rather than to that object). See concourse, divine grace.

The characteristic note of this grace is the infallibility of the effect. Testimonies of Holy Scripture are not lacking and they are all to the effect that God's dominion and power is absolute, and that no creature, even man endowed with free will, can resist it: "As the divisions of waters, so the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever he will he shall turn it" (Prov. 21:17); "I will cause you to walk in my commandments, and to keep my judgments, and do them" (Ezek. 36:27). An example of most efficacious grace is the conversion of Paul on the Damascus road.

St. Augustine, more than the other Fathers, develops amply the doctrine of efficacious grace, to which he attributes all the supernatural good of man. Molinists, however, following Bellarmine, admitted that actual grace is a divine motion, at least for indeliberate acts. Thomists: actual grace is a supernatural physical preformation, by which God moves the soul (in potency) to a salutary act. It is reduced to a fluent quality, preceding the act and moving to it (according to Bañez and his followers, to the point of determining free will specifically to this, rather than to that object). See concourse, divine grace.

But the controversy lingers on between Molinists and Thomists on the essence of efficacious grace. The Thomists defend intrinsic and absolute efficacy: efficacious grace is the supernatural physical predestination to which the human will is subordinate and which de facto it does not resist (although being able to resist, as the Council of Trent says). But for the Molinists grace is efficacious, not by itself, but dependently on the consent of our free will, which can always resist and leave the grace without fruitful effect. Between these two extremes there is, nowadays especially, a tendency toward a reasonable syncretism, which rejects physical predestination on the one hand, for it does not seem to fit even in the framework of St. Thomas' thought and in a certain sense compromises free will, and, on the other hand, abhors also the Molinistic concept of a divine grace that must go begging the consent of man. Such syncretism proposes an intrinsic, divine motion in the human will (of the natural or supernatural order, as the case may be) which moves physically and immediately to the act as regards the exercise of the act, but leaves the will free to determine itself with respect to the specification of the same act, through choice of the object made by the reason, on which, however, God exercises His influence by way of illumination.

But no system will ever be able to eliminate the mystery that lies in conciliating the internal and efficacious motion of God with the freedom of the will that is moved.

 grace, habitual. A divine gift infused by God into the soul, as something permanent by its nature. In the strict sense, habitual grace is that infused into the very essence of the soul, and is called also sanctifying and justifying grace, inasmuch as it confers holiness and makes righteous one who has been a sinner. In a broader sense, habitual grace includes, in addition to sanctifying grace, also the
grace, necessity of

The Scholastics, starting from the data of revelation, developed an abundant doctrine on habitual grace with the help of the Aristotelian theory about habits. But Luther, opposing this theory on account of his nominalistic mentality, rejected the entire traditional doctrine and reduced sanctifying grace to an extrinsic, divine favor or to an extrinsic imputation of Christ's sanctity to the sinner, who remains in himself intrinsically corrupt and incurable (see Lutheranism). The Protestants have followed in their master's footsteps up to our times, with however a few exceptions (Liddon, Sanday). Bay (see Bavinism) conceives grace dynamically, i.e., as not only actual, but identifying itself with morally good and salutary action, namely, with the observance of the divine precepts which, according to him, is possible only with grace, integrative element of the creature.

The Church has condemned both of these errors (Council of Trent, session VI, canon 11, DB, 821; Prop. 42 of Bay, DB, 1042), appealing to revelation (especially St. Paul and St. John), which manifests to us grace as a regeneration, a new life, a divine energy, diffused by the Holy Spirit and inherent in the soul. Hence the true theology of sanctifying grace is that grace is a divine quality (Catechism of the Council of Trent) or habitative inherent in the soul, upon which it confers a mode of divine being, a participation of the divine nature, according to St. Peter (see consortium, divine), adoptive divine filiation (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:5; John 3:1), and the right of inheritance to eternal life (Rom. 8:17). Tradition, in the East especially, is rich in concepts and developments with respect to sanctifying grace, boldly termed "divinization of man" (Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria).

Sanctifying grace is lost through mortal sin (Council of Trent, DB, 848), and is conserved and increased through good works, done under the influence of God, and by means of the sacraments duly received (Council of Trent, DB, 847 and 849). See indwelling of the Holy Trinity; justification.
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**grace, sacramental**. A supernatural gift added by the action of the individual sacraments to sanctifying grace (see grace, habitual). The theologians discuss the intimate nature of this addition to common sanctifying grace. Certain other theologians (Paludanus, Capreolus) believed it to be a supernatural habit, really distinct from sanctifying grace; many others (Caesarius, Soto, Suarez, Lugo) opined, on the other hand, that it consists in a simple right to special help in actual graces, to be obtained at the opportune moment; but the majority held with John of St. Thomas and the Salaminenses (Salamanca, and doctors of Salamanca) that it is an accidental modification and a reinvigoration of sanctifying grace.

Without going into a detailed discussion, we may observe that the three opinions referred to, although not intrinsically false, seem, however, to be one-sided because, while each illustrates a true aspect of the problem, none of them embraces it in its entirety. Accepting, therefore, the true substance of the various opinions and integrating it with other views — within the framework of St. Thomas' rapid sketch (Summa Theol., III, q. 62, a. 2) — we hold that sacramental grace is a new orientation of the whole supernatural organism toward the end to which the individual sacraments tend. The supernatural organism is constituted by grace (which is like the soul in the natural organism), by the virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit (which correspond to the soul's faculties) and by the impulses of actual grace (which correspond to the natural motions). Sacramental grace invests...
all these parts of the organism and adapt them to the particular end of each sacrament, and in this way modifies and reinforces sanctifying grace, augments and perfects those virtues and gifts which correspond to the particular end of the sacrament (like faith in baptism and charity in the Eucharist), cast finally the roots of a permanent right to have at the opportune moment all those helps of actual grace that excite, accompany, and bring to completion the supernatural acts, through the repetition of which the faithful attain the proximate end of the sacrament and the final end of salvation.

Thus, in particular, the sacramental grace of baptism gives to the faithful the orientation of son of God; that of confirmation disposes the adolescent to fight for the defense of the faith; the grace of penance and of extreme unction implores in the soul of the Christian a penitential attitude; orders and matrimony perfect the souls of God's ministers and of the married couple, respectively, by directing and strengthening them to perform their different duties of ruling, instructing, and sanctifying the faithful (orders), and of generating in chastity and rearing in mutual harmony the new members of God's family (matrimony).

The Eucharist, finally, perfects all these orientations and unifies them, directing them under the impulse of charity toward the final goal of the whole supernatural order which is union with God in Christ, here on earth in a veiled manner, then face to face in the beatific vision (see Communion, eucharistic).
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There is a divergence between Thomists and Molinists on the nature of sufficient grace in its relation to efficacious grace (q.e.). The Thomists hold a sharp difference and distinction between the two graces, because efficacious grace (predestination, or supernatural physical predestination) always and infallibly obtains its effect; sufficient grace, instead, confers only the potency or power to act, which power, however, never passes to act. The Molinists think that one same numerical grace is only sufficient, if man resists and frustrates the effect, and is efficacious if man consents to it by his free will and profits by it, passing on to the salutary action.

It is more correct to say that sufficient grace is also a motion to the act, like efficacious grace, but it is impeded; i.e., it is not of such kind as to overcome all internal and external impediments (passions, temptations, etc.), which exercise sinister activity on the will and render it more stubborn.
the Man-God, as living Love, which manifests itself in all the divine works, from the Creation to the Redemption to the Eucharist (the great gift for life on earth), and to the beatific vision (the supreme gift for life in heaven).
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heaven. See paradise.

hell. In the proper sense, it is the state and the place of the damned, i.e., of those who, having died in mortal sin, undergo an eternal punishment. At times, in Scripture and the Fathers, the meaning of hell is extended to limbo and purgatory (like the Hades of the pagans and the Sheol of the Hebrews). The gospel revelation, completing and developing the scattered elements of the Old Testament, throws a full light on this mystery. The description of the judgment made by Jesus Himself (Matt. 25) and His final sentence to the reprobate: "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire," would suffice to establish the existence of hell. Repeatedly the Saviour recalls the thought of hell under effective images (Gehenna of fire, exterior darkness, weeping and gnashing of teeth, burning furnace). Expressive too is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. The context of these and other passages precludes doubt on the prophecies of the word eternal (Gr. αἰώνιος).

Tradition is unanimous on the existence and the eternity of hell, if we except a few discordant voices between the third and the fifth centuries, influenced by the personal opinions of Origen, who thought that probably after long expiation all creatures would be purified and united forever with God. A few Fathers underwent his influence, but St. Augustine, re-echoing the protest of others, refuted these strange opinions in the name of Tradition and Holy Scripture. Origenism was condemned by Pope Victor (Synod of Constantinople, 543, and II Council of Constantinople, 553, DB, 230 ff.). Moreover, the Church's doctrine is clear and constant: Symbolum Athanasianum, IV Lat. Council, II Council of Lyons, Council of Florence, and Council of Trent (DB, 40, 429, 494, 693, 835).

Nature of hell: (α) pain of loss (poena damnii), which is the gravest punishment and consists in the privation of God, supreme supernatural end of man; (β) pain of sense (poena sensus), namely: that which comes from external things which God uses to afflict the devils and the souls of the damned (as well as their bodies after the resurrection).

The chief pain of sense is fire, not figurative but real, which torments the spirit per modum alligationis says St. Thomas, i.e., through a bond or link put by God between fire and soul. The pain of hell is substantially immutable; certain theologians admit an accidental mitigation, which is difficult, however, to prove. Nothing certain can be said about the place of hell (see damned; demon; penalty).
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heresy (Gr. ἀληθος — choice). Originally it meant a doctrine or doctrinal attitude contrary to the common doctrine of faith. It gave, thus, the concept of an elite, adjusting doctrine to its own will. In the New Testament the word is used several times; St. Peter aptly determines the sense of heresy, saying that through it the path of truth is desecrated, men are perverted and the Lord denied (cf. 2 Pet. 2:1).

Tertullian (De praescriptione, c. 6) explains heresy as an arbitrary choice of doctrines, without taking account of the common regulæ fidei (rule of faith) of the Church. St. Thomas reduces heresy to a type of positive infidelity, by which some have a certain faith in Christ without accepting integrity all the dogmas (Summa Theol., II-II, q. 11, a. 1).

Limiting our consideration to the objective aspect (the subjective aspect belongs to moral theology), we define heresy: "A teaching which is directly contradictory to a truth revealed by God and proposed to the faithful as such by the Church." In this definition two essential characteristics of heresy are brought out: (α) opposition to a revealed truth; (β) opposition to the definition of the Church magisterium. If a truth is contained in the deposit of revelation, but has not been proposed to the faithful by the Church, it is called a truth of divine faith; if the revealed truth is also defined and proposed for belief by the ordinary or the extraordinary magisterium of the Church, it is called a truth of divine-Catholic faith. Heresy in the full sense of the word is opposed to a truth of divine-Catholic faith. If the denial concerns a revealed truth which is clear and commonly admitted as such, but has not been defined by the Church, the one who denies such a truth is called proximus heresi (very close to heresy).

As regards the relationship of the heretic to the Church, see members of the Church.
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hermeneutics (Gr. ἰδιόπροφανος — to interpret). The art of interpreting texts, particularly the sacred texts of the Bible. Hermeneutics is to exegesis (q.v.) what logic is to philosophy, and in so far as the art of hermeneutics establishes the laws which exegetical science applies in order to find the true sense of the texts, like logic establishes the laws of correct reasoning.

The norms in use for the interpretation of ancient profane writings are not entirely adequate for the biblical texts, which present particular difficulties inherent in their divine origin and their religious-dogmatic character. Indeed, their human aspect subjects them to the common rules of interpretation, but at the same time their character of inspired writings demands also a code of particular norms (see inspiration). The objective of hermeneutics is threefold: (1) To determine the nature and the different species of the biblical sense, i.e., of the truth which God, principal Author of the Bible, intends to express through the words written by the hagiographer (q.v.), who is only the secondary author of the biblical text. (2) To establish the principles which regulate the interpretation of the
Bible. (3) To find the most convenient way of proposing, according to the various aptitudes of the readers, the true sense of the texts. Each of these three parts has its proper name, i.e., *nomina* (from *nous* — sense), *hierarchies* (from *de chloron* — I find), *prophorasthes* (from *prospho* — I propose).

Recent ecclesiastical documents, particularly the encyclicals *Divinum Afflante* (Sept. 30, 1943) and *Humani generis* (Aug. 12, 1950) have given hermeneutics a development equal to the progress of the profane sciences, safeguarding the perfect harmony between the rights of reason and the demands of faith.
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See under Bible.

heterodox. See orthodox.

hierarchy (Gr. ἱεραρχία — sacred authority). The body of persons participating in ecclesiastical power, which is divided into power of orders and power of jurisdiction.

The power of *orders* is immediately directed to the sanctification of souls through the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass and the administration of the sacraments. The power of *jurisdiction*, on the other hand, is immediately directed to the dispensation of the authoritative teaching of revealed truths (sacred magisterium), and through the promulgation of laws (legislative power), together with the authoritative decision of legal actions involving its subjects (judicial power), and the application of penal sanctions against transgressors of the law (coactive or coercive power). These last three powers are functions of the same sacred jurisdictional authority with which the Church is endowed as a perfect society.

The power of jurisdiction is divided into: (1) power of *forum externum*, when directed principally to the common good, in so far as it regulates the social relations of the members and produces public juridical effects; and *power of forum internum*, when directed principally to private good, in so far as it regulates the relations of consciences with God and is exercised per se secretly and with prevalently moral effects; (2) ordinary power, when *ex officio* or *jure* (by law) it is connected with an office, and delegated power, when it is granted to a person by commission or delegation. Ordinary power is further divided into proper, i.e., annexed to an office and exercised in one's own name (nomine proprio), and vicarious, i.e., annexed to an office but exercised in another's name.

Since sacred power is twofold, hierarchy is likewise twofold, and therefore we have in the Church the *hierarchy of orders*, constituted by the body of persons having the power of orders in its different grades (see *orders*, *holy*), and the *hierarchy of jurisdiction*, consisting in the series of those persons who have the power of teaching and governing.

In both hierarchies there are grades, i.e., the fundamental grades, which have their source in divine right (episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate in the hierarchy of orders; papacy and episcopate in the hierarchy of jurisdiction) and the secondary grades, which have been instituted by the Church.

The two hierarchies, although very closely related, are really distinct. They are distinct in their mode of origin (orders are conferred by the appropriate sacrament, while jurisdiction originates through canonical mission) and in their properties (the valid use of orders, in most cases, cannot be prevented, while jurisdiction is revocable). They are, however, mutually related, because jurisdiction supposes orders and, vice versa, the exercise of orders is moderated by jurisdiction; and also because both come from God and directly or indirectly lead to God.

Those members of the Church who belong to the twofold hierarchy are called *cleric* (Gr. κληρικοί — lot, portion, sort, i.e., in sortem Domini vocati — called to the lot of the Lord), while all the others are called laics, laymen, laity (Gr. α dadoi — the people). Since in its bosom the Church carries superiors and subjects, really distinct by divine right, it is an unequal society, i.e., a society in which the members do not have equal rights and duties.
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holiness (mark of the Church). See sanctity (mark of the Church).

holiness of Christ. See sanctity of Christ.

Holy Ghost. The proper name of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. The choice of this name is suggested by the idea of impulse proper to love, according to which the Holy Spirit proceeds. In the sense of "immortal" being the term `spirit` is attributed also to the other Persons of the Holy Trinity. The Holy Spirit is called also *Love*. In fact, Love is a motion or tendency of the will to good; but it is predicated of the Holy Spirit in a terminal and concrete sense, inasmuch as He is the term of divine volition.

Since the epoch of the Fathers (St. Augustine) there has been discussion on the nature of the second process, psychologically more obscure than the first. The Scholastics in particular have studied the question of the formal principle of the two processes. With reference to the Holy Ghost there are two opinions: (a) He proceeds from *mutual love* of the Father and the Son, as from His formal principle *quo* (School of St. Victor); (b) He proceeds from essential divine love (common to the three Persons). St. Thomas acutely explains: The formal, remote principle *quo* is the essential love, while the proximate principle *quo* is the mutual love of Father and Son; the formal principle *quo* are the two Persons, from which the Holy Spirit proceeds.

Finally the Holy Spirit is called *Gif*, according to the nature of love which consists in giving itself. The liturgy (cf. the Veni, Creator Spiritus) calls the Holy Ghost by several other names: Finger of the Right Hand of the Father, Living Source, Fire, Charity, Unction, Paraclete, etc.
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Holy See. By this name is designated not only the person of the Roman pontiff (see Roman pontiff; pope), but also the whole system of departments, tribunals, and offices through which the pope governs the universal Church (cf. CIC, Can. 7). With the expansion of Christianity and the progressive actuation of the supreme rights inherent in the primis sedes (primate see), the Bishop of Rome found himself quickly besieged with so enormous a work load of administrative and juridical matters that he could not take care of it personally. He was therefore constrained to entrust a part of it to certain members of his clergy (especially the deacons); hence the establishment of organized offices which were later called the “Roman curia.” After the Council of Trent, when centralization had reached its fastest pace, Sixtus V reorganized the Curia in a form responding to the new needs of the Church, by creating the Roman congregations. The Sixtine organization remained with little variation up to Pius X, who by the constitution Sapiens Consilio of 1908 introduced radical changes, which were systematized definitively in the Code of Canon Law (Cans. 242-244). According to this reorganization the Roman Curia is now composed of eleven congregations, three tribunals, and five offices. The congregations are made up of groups of cardinals set up permanently with the function of handing certain definite types of ecclesiastical matters. Their power is disciplinary and administrative. Here is the list of them according to the order established by the Code, together with a brief indication of their respective duties: The Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office is charged with the defense of Christian faith and morals. The Consistorial Congregation is so called because its duty is to prepare whatever concerns the holding of consistories, but its sphere of competency is much broader and includes the creation, conservation, and suppression of dioceses, the naming of bishops, etc. The Congregation of the Sacraments has charge of the administration of the sacraments and the celebration of the Mass. The Congregation of the Council is in charge of the discipline of the diocesan clergy and of the faithful throughout the world. The Congregation of the Religious supervises the regular functioning and discipline of the religious societies. The Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith presides over all the missionary activity of the Catholic Church. The Congregation of Rites occupies itself with matters of holy liturgy and the beatification and canonization of saints. The Ceremonial Congregation is in charge of the pontifical ceremonial and settles certain questions of precedence. The Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs deals with many questions, particularly matters in connection with civil laws and concordats negotiated by the Holy See with national governments. The Congregation of Seminaries and Universities supervises all that concerns the regime, the discipline, temporal administration, and the studies of seminaries, and directs the functioning of universities dependent on the Holy See. The Oriental Congregation is the most recent, having been constituted by Benedict XV in 1917, but it is a very important one in that it deals with the persons, discipline, and rites of all the Eastern Churches in communion with the Holy See.

The tribunals or courts of the Roman Curia are the Holy Penitentiary, for the internal forum (of conscience), and the Holy Roman Rota and the Apostolic Signature, for the external forum. Their respective duties are indicated in Canons 258-259.

The offices are the Apostolic Chancery, the Datary, the Apostolic Chamber, the Secretariat of State, and the Secretariat of Briefs to Princes and Latin Letters. As regards their respective duties, cf. Canons 260-264.
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Homoousian. See consubstantial.

hope. See virtue.


hylomorphism, sacramental. See matter and form (of the sacraments).

hyperdulia. See cult.

hypostatic union (Gr. ὑπόστασις—substance—supportum or subsisting subject, hence person). At the time of Nestorianism (fifth century), St. Cyril of Alexandria, in his effort to defend the truth and reality of the union of the human and the divine natures in Christ, repeatedly used the expression: έν ους καθ' ὑπόστασιν—union according to hypostasis or hypostatic union (as against the εν ους συχτηκαί κατα θέλημα—accidental, moral union, of Nestorius). The Cyrilian expression was incorporated in the acts of the Council of Ephesus (431) and of the following councils, always with the meaning of substantial, real union, with a leaning toward the signification of personal union, which was explicitly consecrated in the III Council of Constantinople (680), defining that the two natures converge in one sole person and in one hypostasis (DB, 290).

Starting from these positive data, the precise concept of hypostatic union is determined as a personal union, in which is effected the Incarnation of the Word in a singular way, completely different from the case of a mere man. The union in between body and soul is that of two incomplete substances and terminates in one nature and one person. The union proper to Christ is that of two complete and distinct natures (Council of Chalcedon) and terminates in one sole Person, that of the Word, already pre-existing at the act of Incarnation (Council of Ephesus).

The hypostatic union is a mystery of faith, which the theologians try to illustrate on the basis of the concept of personality (see person); but, unfortunately, this concept is not the same in the various schools. If we hold with some theologians that personality is constituted formally by subsistence, understanding subsistence as the proper existence of a substance, the hypostatic union is effectively illustrated by saying that the human nature of Christ, substantially complete and determined, did not have its personality because it did not have its own proper existence, but was elevated to participate in the divine existence of the Word, and, thus, in His divine Personality. There is in Christ, then, only one Person (the Word), because there is only one existence, only one subsistence, the Word's—a real, profound union, as the Council of Ephesus states; but, at the same time, a permanent distinction of the two integral and perfect natures, as the Council of Chalcedon defines (see Incarnation; person; Nestorianism; Monophysitism).
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iconoclasts (Gr. εἰκονοκλαστής — image, and κλάω — I break). Adversaries of images who in the eighth century, under the leadership of the Eastern Emperor Leo III, waged pitiless war on sacred images, forbidding their use and their cult. Some were adverse only to the cult of images (Iconomachi).

Politically speaking, it is not clear for what motive Leo III took on this struggle which, in addition to disturbing the faith, destroyed treasures of art; some think that the Emperor by so doing wished to please the Jews and Moslems who fought in great numbers in his army; others think that he was convinced personally of the orthodoxy of that aversion. Theologically, iconoclasm is a consequence of Monophysitism (q.v.). In fact, the Monophysites, admitting the transformation of Christ's humanity into the Divinity, logically had to disapprove of the iconographic representation of the Saviour in merely human forms. Pope Gregory II energetically resisted the imperial persecution; his successor, Gregory III, condemned the new heresy in a council held at Rome (731), defending the use and worship of images in the name of Tradition. Leo armed a fleet, which was sent against Ravenna, faithful to the Pope, but the fleet was destroyed in a storm. Constantine V Copronymus, successor of Leo III, intensified the persecution, making many martyrs; he assembled a Council at Hieria (753), which condemned the defenders of the worship of images, among whom was St. John Damascene. But in 787, under the auspices of Empress Irene, an ecumenical council was celebrated, the second of Nicaea, which solemnly condemned the heresy and defined the orthodoxy of the use and worship of sacred images.
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idealism. According to the most authoritative of modern idealists, it may be defined: "A conception which reduces the world to a spiritual act, namely, the act of thinking, by unifying the infinity of variegated Nature and man in one absolute unity, in which the human is the divine and the divine is the human" (G. Gentile, Teoria generale dello spirito). This is modern idealism carried out to its extreme consequences (Genitativismus, but the historical genesis of idealism goes back to Parmenides, who is said to have been the first to have looked on the true reality as pure thought. Certainly idealism is exaltation of the spirit or thinking subject, has its roots in the philosophy of Descartes († 1650). Subordinating reality to human thought, he inaugurated that subjectivism (q.v.) which, across the English school (Locke, Berkeley, Hume), reaches Kant and goes as far as to substitute the a priori categories of thought for noumenal reality, which is said to be unknowable in itself (see Kantianism). This is the starting point of German idealism, which gradually reduced all reality, even phenomenal, to the transcendental ego (panegyric of Fichte), or to the absolute (Schelling, or to the idea in continual flux of becoming (panlogism of Hegel). German idealism entered Italy through B. Spa venta († 1873), took strong root through Benedetto Croce, and triumphed with Giovanni Gentile. Italian idealism, the most radical, may be represented schematically as follows:

1. All reality resolves itself entirely and solely in the spirit as pure thinking act or thought (actualism).

2. Outside of this thought nothing is real, nothing transcendent; everything is immanent in it (immanentism-monism).

3. The spirit or thinking act is in continual becoming, i.e., produces itself through an immanent creative process (autotheosis), by which it puts itself into reality and at the same time surpasses itself, under different aspects (dialectical dynamism).

4. The Spirit runs a tri-phase cycle, unification-synthesis, in which the genesis of all reality lies. Croce distinguishes four grades or phases of the immanent activity of the spirit — two of the theoretical order (aesthetics, logic), and two of the practical order (economics, ethics). Gentile distinguishes three phases: (a) pure subjectivity (art); (b) objectivation (religion); (c) synthesis of the subject-object (philosophy).

5. Individual men are so many empirical egos, unified in a transcendental ego, the thinking act, in which all that is real (God and the world) exists in the flux of becoming.

Apart from other difficulties, idealism is absurd for the following reasons: (i) because it affirms that the spirit or thinking act creates itself, admitting thus the inconceivable principle of a thing cause of itself; (ii) because it identifies finite with infinite, contingent with absolute, and admits the possibility of an evolution of the transcendental ego, given as an infinite, eternal, and, hence, most perfect being; (iii) because it fails in explaining the distinction, the variety, and the contrariety of the individual consciences, coefficient elements and actors in the drama of human life; (iv) because it removes the distinction between error and truth, bad and good, and proclaims that the spirit in the act of thinking is always truth and goodness, and that evil and error are the past of the spirit itself.

Idealism, both as a pantheistic system and as a relativism in the field of morals, is irreconcilable with Christianity.
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idolatry (Gr. εἰκόναν λατερία — worship of idols). Consists in paying to false divinities the worship due only to God. Some Fathers call idolatry the gravest offense to God, as it robs Him of His honor by putting the Creator after creatures.

In its most vulgar form, it identifies the divinity (whatever this is) with the idol (material image); in this sense it is akin to fetishism (q.v.), which, however, rather than a religion is an ignoble sorcery of an individual and utilitarian character.

In a more elevated form, according to the opinion and teaching of the idol-worshipping priests and scholars, idolatry is said to represent the idol as an image of the divinity, to which the worship is properly directed. But it is historically proved that the idol-worshiping peoples hold
Illuminism (or Enlightenment). A philosophico-religious current which spread in the eighteenth century from England into France, Germany, and Italy. Illuminism took up the spirit of Humanism and of the Lutheran Reformation and affirmed the autonomy of reason released and emancipated from all civil and religious authority, openly hostile to all tradition, and destined to enlighten with its light the mysteries of the world and of life. The leader of this current was the Englishman Herbert of Cherbury (†1648), who professed a naturalistic religion reduced to a few fundamental truths in which all religions agree. There is a close connection between this theory and the deism (q.v.) of Tindal, Toland, Collins, and Bolingbroke. Illuminism also proclaimed the autonomy of the world of ideas and facts; neither religion nor civil laws can be sources of morality, but only the individual conscience by a kind of instinct (ethico-aesthetic sense). Individual ethics become social ethics by moderating egoism with altruism through sympathy (A. Smith).

English Illuminism passed into France, where it degenerated into materialistic and atheistic Encyclopedism (De la Mettrie, Holbach, Diderot, Voltaire). J. J. Rousseau, with his romantic naturalism, was influenced by French Illuminism. In Germany, Illuminism identified itself with Samuel Reimarus (†1768), who rejected all Christian revelation as an imposture, and still more with Ephraem Lessing, aesthete, littérateur, and dramatist, who drew all his inspiration from the principle that truth is a personal, personal conquest, and not a gift or immutable possession. In Italy, Illuminism had its influence on the Revival of the second half of the eighteenth century in the field of social and economic sciences (A. Genovesi, G. Filangieri, G. R. Carli, etc.). However, in this country, where Christian tradition was more tenacious, Illuminism did not in general undergo the ethico-religious degenerations it knew beyond the Alps.
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image. Usually means the drawn or sculptured reproduction of a person in his bodily likeness, e.g., a photograph. Philosophically, an image is a reproduction of a knowable object in the sensitive or in the intellectual faculty (sensible or intelligible species). In theology, image is of special interest in the question of worship (see cult). The Church from remote centuries onward and defended the worship of the saints and their images: in the II Nicerene Council (A.P. 787) the iconoclasts (q.v.) were condemned for opposing the custom of venerating images of our Lord, of the Blessed Virgin, and of the saints.

According to Holy Scripture, God created man to His image and likeness (Gen. 1:26 f.). Though the two words are synonymous in the Hebrew text, some Fathers make a distinction, referring image to the natural properties of man and likeness to the supernatural gifts with which Adam was enriched. Rigorously speaking, Holy Scripture affirms no more than a relationship of resemblance between God the Creator and man. This resemblance evidently does not refer to the body of man but to his soul, which really reflects in itself analogically certain divine perfections, like immateriality, intellect, and will with their respective operations. St. Thomas sees also in the human spirit an image of the Trinity, inasmuch as in God the Word is generated by the Father and from them both pro-

idolotry (thing offered to an idol, from Gr. ιδώλως θεός — I sacrifice to the idol). One of the most delicate cases of conscience for the first Christians was the lawfulness of eating meats offered to the gods by the pagans in their temples. At that time, Greco-Roman society was permeated with a religious consciousness, and every occasion of life, happy or sad, was marked with sacrificial offerings to the gods. The flesh of the immolated victims was eaten in places adjoining the temple, or in family banquets, or distributed to friends, or sold to butchers and entered into public use.

At the Apostolic Council of Jeru-

salem it was decided that Christians converted from paganism should abstain from meats of pagan sacrificial origin (Acts 15:20, 29) out of respect for their Jewish brothers, who felt an instinctive repugnance for the use of idolotries. In A.D. 56, six years later, the faithful of Corinth put the question to St. Paul in all its practical aspects: (1) May Christians buy meat from butchers who purchase their meat from the temples or who, in butchering it, practice religious rites? (2) May they accept invitations to banquets at which they suspect idolotries will be served? (3) May they participate in a sacred banquet of pagans for reasons of social obligation or convenience?

In his answer to these three questions (1 Cor., Chs. 8–10) St. Paul is guided by two principles: (1) an idol is nothing, and so it cannot make holy or unholy the meat offered to it; (2) animals were given by God for man's food. Accordingly, his answer to the first query is such that he also answers the second, except there be someone at the table who might be scandalized. The answer to the third query, however, is negative, because the grave scandal here implied cannot be permitted for any reason, since it is a question of direct participation in an act of idolatrous worship: one cannot drink from the "demon's cup" after having sipped the "Lord's chalice."
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illumination of the agonizing. See death; infidels.
ceeds the Holy Spirit, who is Love, and likewise in us there is a mental word or concept of the thing known, followed by a movement of love or inclination toward that thing. Trinitarian theology waxes eloquent on this relationship of resemblance between human psychology and the intimate life of God (see Trinity).

In a stricter and theologially more interesting sense, the term image is attributed to the Word according to St. Paul: "Who is the image of the invisible God?" (Col. 1:15). In fact, the Word (q.v.) is the term of the divine intellect, proceeding from the Father by way of spiritual generation: the son is born to the image of his father. The concept of image is even more profound in the Word, because He is not only like the Father, but also of the identical substance of the Father (see consubstantial). Less correctly can the Holy Spirit be called image of the Son (as some Eastern Fathers do), because the Holy Spirit proceeds through love, and love does not produce, but supposes resemblance.
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See under immanuel, Trinity, consubstantial.

**Immaculate Conception.** Solemnly defined in the bull, **Ineffabilis**, by Pius IX, December 8, 1854. It is, therefore, a truth of Catholic faith that the Virgin Mary from the first instant of her conception was preserved immune from original sin, in view of the future merits of Christ.

This singular privilege was not ignored by the *magisterium* of the Church before its definition; suffice it to mention that a liturgical feast of the Conception of Mary existed at least since the seventh century in the East and the ninth century in the West (first at Naples, then in England and Ireland and in the rest of Europe). In the Western Church this truth was obscured and made progress slowly against contradictions and difficulties, because from the fifth century onward the ecclesiastical writers were forced to defend against Pelagianism (q.v.) the universal transmigration of original sin, and hence the universality of the Redemption. But its champions were never lacking. Characteristic of this fact is the controversy that arose in the thirteenth century between Dominicans and Franciscans: the former, led by St. Thomas, denied that Mary was exempt from original sin, but admitted her sanctification in her mother's womb immediately after conception. The Franciscans, led by Scotus, maintained first the possibility and then the fact of Mary's privilege. However, St. Bonaventure, the great Franciscan, agreed with St. Thomas and St. Bernard. Apart from the anti-Pelagian preoccupations, imperfect knowledge of the theologians on the physiology of fecundation and conception sharpened and confused the issue. From Sixtus IV, who approved the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, down to Gregory XVI, who had the beautiful title of "Immaculate" inserted in the preface of the Mass and the lituric, the Church smoothed the way for the solemn definition of Pius IX.

The privilege of Mary is implicit in the text of Genesis 3:15, where the triumph of the Woman and her Offspring (Christ) over Satan is prophesied. Moreover, Mary, before the Incarnation, is greeted by the angel as "full of grace" (καταπληκτήματος — permanently full of divine grace), an expression in which the Fathers recognize perfect sanctity, without limit of time. The parallelism *Adam* Eve (slaves of Satan and ruin of mankind) and *Christ* Mary (victor

over Satan and salvation of men) is familiar to the Fathers (Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc.). Ephraem has vivid expressions on the incontaminated purity of Mary. St. Augustine, notwithstanding his fight against the Pelagians, does not dare to mention Mary when it is question of sin (De natura et gratia, 36, 42; RJ, 179).

**Theological reason:** It is repugnant that the Mother of Christ, victor of Satan and of sin, should have been subject to one and the other, even for one instant.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


**immanence (method of).** See apologetics; immanence.

*immanence*. A philosophico-religious system which, in its most rigid form, reduces all reality to the subject, which is said to be the source, the beginning, and the end of all its creative activity. It is basically that same subjectivism (q.v.) which began with Descartes as a tendency to start from the subject and progressively to absorb in it the whole object. This absorption is already accomplished in the substantialist monism of Spinoza with its definitely pantheistic character; in Kant it undergoes a slight limitation in so far as the *phenomenon* is admitted as objective reality, at least fundamentally. But with German idealism (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel), immanence becomes resurgent and reaches its apex in the Italian idealism of Croce and Gentile, according to whom all reality is immanent in the act of thought.

Besides this intellectual development, immanence receives a sentimentalistic one in the works of Schleiermacher. This current, closer to the religious problem, became so strong all through the nineteenth century as to threaten to eclipse the first. In the *pragmatism* (q.v.) of James, sentiment and action, no longer the idea, are the essence of religion. Finally, *modernism* (q.v.) steps in, making the divine gush forth from sentiment and religious experience (q.v.). The historical fact of revelation is in function of religious consciousness, in which God continues to reveal Himself in fact, and all religion becomes an individual, subjective, and personal matter. Consequences of this absolute immanence are: (a) God is no longer personally distinct from man and the world; (b) revelation and religion are not tied down to fixed truths and immutable dogmas, but they develop and are transformed according to the phases of sentiment and of religious consciousness. In view of these grave consequences, the Church has condemned immanence (cf. encyclical, *Pascendi*, against modernism).

But the method of *immanence*, adopted by Blondel and other Catholics in *apologetics*, is another thing altogether: it consists in starting from the subject in the defense of religion, i.e., in making man feel the discomfort and unrest of his mind, the need of God and of the supernatural which lies dormant in every heart, and thus orienting men to the true, revealed religion, to Christ's Church.
immensity. See infinity.

immolation. See Mass; sacrifice of Christ.

immortality. Immunity from death. As regards the immortality of the body, together with other gifts to Adam and Eve, see integrity.

Here we shall consider only the immortality of the soul, which is at once a truth of faith and reason. Divine revelation is wholly ordered to eternal life, the supernatural destiny of man. In Holy Scripture, life on earth is termed a pilgrimage to a country above (Gen. 47:10; Heb. 11:13–16). Ecclesiastes states the same explicitly: “before...the dust return into its earth from whence it was, and the Spirit return to God, who gave it” (12:7); the allusion is to the creation of man, when God made of body formed from the earth and soul infused directly by Himself into the body (Gen. 2:7).

In the Gospel Jesus refutes the Sadducees by reminding them that God is the God of Abraham and of the other Patriarchs, who cannot be altogether dead, because God is the God of the living, not of the dead (Matt. 22:31 ff.); and in another place He admonishes: “Fear ye not them that kill the body: but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell” (Matt. 10:28). Traditionally, immortality is understood on the doctrine, and that is why the magisterium of the Church has never felt the need of defining a truth which has always been apparent in the conscience of the faithful: only the V Lateran Council spoke up against the audacious denial of certain neo-Aristotelians (DB, 728).

Thus the immortality of the soul is a truth of faith. But it is also a truth of reason. The best of the old philosophers admitted and proved it: a famous dialogue of Plato, perhaps the most beautiful he wrote, the Phaedon, is a celebrated demonstration of the immortality of the soul. The soul of its very nature is immortal: Christian philosophy and theology prove it with the following arguments:

1. The human soul is spiritual, as demonstrated from the fact that its specific operation, intellection and volition and consequently its being, is independent of matter. Now, spirit is of its nature simple, i.e., not composed of parts, and so, not corruptible, not subject to decomposition, like matter.

2. Man naturally aspires to immortality: witness history and human institutions. Now, this aspiration which is rooted in the conscience of mankind cannot be a mere idle aspiration.

3. Man conceives truth, which is eternal, timeless, and spaceless. But he could not conceive it unless he were of the same make-up, for there must be proportion between conceiving and conceived, between subject and object.

4. No adequate sanction is had in this life for man’s goodness or malice, God’s wisdom and justice demand such a sanction; hence, there must be another life.
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immutability. Excludes all passage or motion of being from one to another terminus; hence it is the opposite of any development or evolution. Immunisement and idealism, since they identify the world and God by reduction of both to the act of thinking, of necessity conceive God as being in continual evolution. On the contrary, divine revelation declares the absolute immutability of God in contrast to the ever becoming of the universe: “With whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration” (James 1:17).

St. Paul (Heb. 1:10) repeats the words of Psalm 102: “They [the heavens] shall perish, but thou remainest; and all of them shall grow old like a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art always the same, and thy years shall not fail” (27–28). The IV Lateran and the Vatican Councils comment on the expression, Deus immutabilis (DB, 428, 1782).

Reason confirms and illustrates this truth: the being that changes and develops, and thus passes from “the less” to “the more,” has to be imperfect, has to be potency that becomes act, that acquires something it did not have before, something new. Now all this is opposed to the concept of being per essentiam (whose essence is to be) and to the concept of act, pure, simple, perfect, infinite (see Act, Pure; similitude of God; perfection; infinity). Therefore, evolutionism of God is anthropomorphism, and advances the absurdity of an Infinite-Finite.
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impeccability. Impossibility, physical or moral, of sinning.

It is a doctrine of faith that Jesus Christ not only had immunity from all sin (i.e., immacuation—absence of sin, de facto), but also impeccability in the real and true sense of the word. Jesus Christ Himself challenges His enemies with these solemn words: “Which of you shall convince me of sin?” (John 8:46.) St. Paul had proclaimed Christ: “High priest, holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners” (Heb. 7:26.). St. Peter and St. John both attest categorically that in Christ there is no shadow of guilt. So, too, the Fathers, whose thought is summed up energetically by St. Cyril of Alexandria: “They are altogether stupid who say that Christ could have sinned.”

The reason for Christ’s impeccability is in the hypothetical union; the Person in Christ being only one (i.e., the Word of God), only one also is the subject to which the divine and the human actions are attributed. If, therefore, there should be even the slightest sin in Christ, it would have to be attributed to and predicated of the Word of God, which is absurd. Secondary causes of this impeccability were also the beatific vision, the fullness of grace and the supernatural gifts which enriched the soul of Jesus Christ. All things considered, the impeccability of Christ, though belonging to the moral order, has a metaphysical foundation.

Impeccability is predicated also of Mary on account of her superhuman dignity as the Mother of God, on
impenitence. The opposite of penance, which is a virtue inclining the free will to be sorry for the sin committed and to form the intention of never again offending God. Essentially the virtue of penance tends, as St. Thomas says (Summa Theol., III, q. 85, a. 2), to the destruction of sin itself as it is an offense against God. Such destruction is not physical but of the moral order, consisting in a reversal of the mind which repudiates evil by detaching itself from it and directing itself to good. In the Gospel this salutary disavowal is efficaciously expressed by the word perdon — a change of mind (cf. Matt. 4:7). Impenitence, on the other hand, is persistence in the state of sin and, therefore, of separation from God. This persistence may be a mere state of fact (e.g., if the sinner does not repent of negligence), or it may be a bad disposition of the will which refuses to repent and make reparation for the offense against God.

Impenitence is distinguished into temporary and final, just as perseverence (q.v.): temporary impenitence is the persistence in sin for a certain period of one's life. If it is voluntary and malicious it constitutes a specific sin by itself, it is even a sin against the Holy Spirit (Summa Theol., II-II, q. 14, a. 2). It is, therefore, of interest to the sinner and his duty to raise himself up after the fall, returning contrite and humiliated to the heart of God. Not to do so out of malicious intention constitutes an additional guilt, as has been said; to fail to do so out of neglect does not constitute a new sin, unless particular circumstances demand such repentance. Christian perfection requires that penance follow immediately after sin, but perfection is not commanded. The Church obliges all faithful to receive the sacrament of penance once a year; however, independently of such law, there is a moral obligation of repenting at least in danger of death and before receiving the sacrament of the living (as Communion, confirmation, matrimony).

Final impenitence refers to the last moment of life; it is equivalent to death in the state of sin. It can be a mere condition of fact, as in the case of a man who died in the state of sin because he had no means or time to do penance. But it is also possible that a man refuses obstinately to repent while he is living, and, moreover, that he resolves not to repent at all the moment of death, refusing in advance all religious help. This would be a case of final impenitence, as a direct sin, which aggravates, before God's tribunal, the condition of the sinner hardened in his guilt.

Obduracy in sin and blindness to sin, which are obstinacy in evil (removable, however, with God's grace and good will), dispose the sinner to final impenitence.
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imposition of hands. This expression, which the Greeks translate by χειροτονία or χειροτονία, signifies the simple and spontaneous gesture of placing the hands on the head or any other noble part (e.g., the eyes, the forehead) of a person or even of an animal (as in the Jewish ceremony of the scapegoat) for the purpose of producing an effect (e.g., a blessing, a healing), or of conferring a power. It may be said that the use of this rite is threefold: biblical, liturgical, sacramental.

In Holy Scripture, particularly in the New Testament, we find the imposition of hands often practiced by Christ, the Apostles, and the first evangelic missionaries, in order to produce a healing. In the various liturgies it is used quite frequently during the ceremonies that precede or follow the administration of certain sacraments, e.g., of baptism. In Christian antiquity it took on singular importance in the reconciliation of penitents and heretics. Probably in the sacrament of confirmation and certainly in holy orders (q.g.), the χειροτονία is a constitutive and, therefore, indispensable part of the sacramental sign (matter and form of the sacrament).

The equivalence of the two terms, flesh and man, is consecrated officially in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, which says that the Word was χειροτονητός (imposed) and ἐκπαιδευτόρος (made man). The Incarnation is also called in Holy Scripture: manifestation (of God) in the flesh, epiphany (manifestation), annihilation, economy. The Incarnation is understood in two different meanings: (a) As a divine action, forming in the womb of the Virgin Mary a human nature and uniting it to and making it subsist in the Person of the Word. This action is common to the three divine Persons, since it is an action ad extra. (b) As the term of that divine action; it is the mysterious union of the divine nature and of the human nature in the Person of the Word. The incarnate Word is Jesus Christ.

Necessity: The Incarnation was not absolutely necessary, because God could have repaired in various other ways the ruin caused by Adam's sin. But it was hypothetically necessary, i.e., the supposition granted that God demanded a reparation according to the requirements of justice. That God actually did so demand is implicit in the sources of revelation. Therefore, since no creature could repair an offense against God, being morally infinite, a Man-God was necessary, who is capable of dying and of offering an infinite reparation.

Purpose: The theological schools are not in agreement. The Scotists hold that God willed the Incarnation for itself and independently of Adam's sin, and that the Word would therefore have become incarnate even if Adam had not sinned. The Thomists, on the contrary, teach that the Incarnation was ordered or directed to the Redemption as to its principal end; if, therefore, original
incorporation, mystical. See Mystical Body.

indeffability (of the Church). That prerogative of the Church in virtue of which it will endure to the end of time, keeping inviolate the deposit transmitted to it by its divine Spouse (therefore, it implies also infallibility). This prerogative, too, flows from the very nature and purpose of the Church; since, in fact, the Church is to take over and continue Christ's work, it must last as long as there is a soul to be saved on earth. Moreover, the Saviour has explicitly promised: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world... and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it [the Church]." (Matt. 28:20; 16:18). St. Ambrose, echoing Christ's words, compares the Church to a ship "which is continually buffeted by high seas and storms, but which can never be sunk because its main mast is Christ's cross, its skipper is the Father, its prow keeper the Holy Spirit, its rudder are the Apostles". (Liber de Salvatore, Ch. 4).

History has fulfilled the divine promise. Each age has put to the test the stability of the Church: the persecutions of the first centuries, the Trinitarian and Christological heresies from the fourth to the eighth centuries, schisms in the East and Nicholas in the West, the pope-emperor struggle of the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the French Revolution—all these storms have buffeted the temple of God, which has remained immovable in the midst of crumbling empires, institutions and civilizations, that had seemed to defy the ravages of time. Stat crux dum volitatur orbis.

The Vatican Council affirmed, therefore, that "the unconquered stability of the Church is a great and perennial motive of credibility and an irresistible testimony of its divine mission, whereby like a sign lifted among the peoples (Isa. 11:12), it convicts the infidels to itself and assures its sons that the faith they profess is based on the most solid foundation" (DB, 1794).
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"Index" (of prohibited books). An official list of books prohibited by the Church as erroneous or dangerous in matters of faith or morals. From the first centuries the Church has always been on the alert against the circulation of writings that might endanger in any way the salvation of souls. Suffice it to recall, e.g., the Gelasian Decree (496), by which certain books of a religious content were denounced and prohibited. But the discovery of printing compelled the Church to even stricter vigilance. Paul IV is the author of the first official Index (1557 and 1559), to which the Council of Trent added a preface of guiding principles and rules, sanctioned by Pius IV (1564). Gradually the Index was amended, extended, and brought up to date by Popes Clement VIII, Alexander VII, and Benedict XIV. It underwent an integral and quasidefinitive systematization in the Index of Leo XIII, with the Constitution Osservariurn in unum (1896), and the annexed Decretum Generalium. In 1910 the official Index appeared in an edition brought up to date, which was re-edited in 1929 and 1938.

Paul IV had instituted also a Congregatio Index (Congregation of the Index) with the function of watching over the press; under Benedict XV, this congregation was completely absorbed by the Holy Office (1917), which has a Section for the Censorship of Books, to which matters regarding the Index are entrusted. A book may be placed on the Index either by virtue of an apostolic letter or of a simple decree of the Holy Office. This insertion prohibits to all the faithful: publication or reprinting (without authorization) of the book, reading of it, possession, sale, translation, communication to others of its contents. Those who read or keep with them books expressly prohibited by apostolic letter incur excommunication reserved in a special way to the Holy See (CIC, Can. 2318).

The Church has the right and the duty to prohibit those books which can do harm to souls, as is obvious from her divine mission. Nor is this prohibition injurious to freedom, but is rather a valid help of this most noble human faculty, directing it to good, which is its natural object, and preserving it from evil, its ruin. Even civil governments adopt at times press censorship.

As regards books prohibited even independently of the Index, see CIC, Canons 1385-1405. The faithful who must read prohibited books for reasons of research can obtain permission from the Holy Office.
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indifferentism. Systematic attitude toward the various forms of religion, for which no interest is shown (negative indifferentism) or which are held to have all the same value (positive indifferentism). The position that all religions are false is called irreligious indifferentism; the belief that all religions are good and useful for this life and the next is termed religious indifferentism. A particular form of this tendency is known as social-political indifferentism, characteristic of liberalism (q.v.), which leaves the religious question to the individual conscience and holds that society and the State should be nonconfessional (nondenominational, nonsectarian), i.e., without any religion, and grant full liberty and equality of treatment to all kinds of cult.

In the eighteenth century, Illuminism (q.v.), putting aside divine revelation and reducing religious doctrine and practice to a few rational principles, inaugurated naturalistic religious indifferentism (akin to deism), which spread extensively in the past century with the help of the autonomous moralism of Kant. From the breakdown of Protestant-
indissolubility. See divorce.

Indulgences. In Imperial documents of the Christian epoch (cf. Codices of Theodosius and of Justinian) indulgence meant amnesty or condonation of penalty. Since the IV Lateran Council (1215), the Church has used indulgence in the sense of the remission of penalty due for sin after the guilt of sin has been remitted. The precise concept of indulgence has been fixed by the Code of Canon Law in these terms (Can. 911): "A remission, before God, of the temporal punishment due for sins already remitted with respect to their guilt, which the ecclesiastical authority, drawing from the treasure of the Church, grants to the living after the manner of absolution, and to the dead after the manner of suffrage." An indulgence is, therefore, a payment for the penal obligations of sinners made before God out of what may be likened to a public treasury, namely, the Church treasury (infinite merits of Christ, merits of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints).

The indulgence is an extrasmagmatic act and, as such, belongs exclusively to the jurisdictional power (pope and bishops), which, for a just cause, may grant to the faithful, on determined conditions, the benefits of the treasury of the Church, by way of a partial or total condonation of the temporal punishment due for sins already remitted (as to guilt), a punishment for which the Christian would have to give satisfaction either in this life with good works or in purgatory for a determined time. The Church customarily attaches indulgences to various good works (prayers, pilgrimages, almsgiving), which are not causes, but mere conditions of the fruit of the indulgence. For the souls in purgatory, indulgence works per modum suffragii, in the sense that, since the Church does not have jurisdiction outside of this world, it presents to God the merits of Christ in order that in view of them God may condone their penalty. The exercise of the Church's power is direct in the case of the living, indirect in behalf of the dead. Such power is based on these dogmatic foundations: (a) the Communion of Saints (q.v.), which makes possible the interchange of spiritual merits and goods among the members of the Mystical Body of Christ; (b) the "power of the keys" granted to Peter and his successors, through which the Roman pontiff, and, subordinately, the bishops, can draw from the infinite treasury of the Church, and apply its goods to souls, efficaciously in the sight of God.

In the course of the centuries, many were the abuses and misunderstandings in the matter of indulgences, but the Church has always deplored and condemned them.
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See under liberalism.

Indwelling of the Holy Trinity. By virtue of sanctifying grace all the Trinity comes to dwell in the soul of the just. This indwelling, attested to by the Gospel, is connected with an invisible divine mission (see mission, divine) and does not present difficulties, but is rather in full harmony with that theological principle according to which God is present where He acts and more intimately present where He acts more intensely (see presence of God). But in the seventeenth century a controversy was kindled on account of an opinion of Petavius, followed by Thomasin. These theologians thought that sanctifying indwelling should be attributed to the Holy Ghost, as something proper to the third divine Person which, in a manner analogous to the hypostatic union of the Word, unites itself ineffably and personably to the soul of the just. Not a few modern theologians have adopted this opinion. However, it involves serious difficulties. Indeed, grace which constitutes the title of indwelling is the effect of an ad extra operation (see operation, divine), and therefore it belongs equally to the three Persons. Hence, one cannot see how indwelling can be proper to the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the traditional doctrine does not recognize any hypostatic union except that of the Word.

However, it must be recognized that the work of sanctification (and, therefore, habituation or indwelling), being a work of love, refers more remarkably to the Holy Spirit (at least in the line of exemplary causality) than to the Father and the Son. But this reference may well be reduced to a simple appropriation (q.v.), without going so far as to...
inerrancy of the Bible

Inerrancy of the Bible. The immutability of the Bible is a dogma of faith (cf. EB, 433). 
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Inerrancy of the Bible. The immu-

nity from all possibility of error 

and from all error de facto, which 

belongs to the Holy Scriptures by 

virtue of their divine inspiration. St. 

John affirms: "The Scripture cannot be 

broken [contradict itself]" (10:35), 

and Christian antiquity, despite its 

various exegetical tendencies, has 

always unanimously maintained the 

inerrancy of the sacred texts. 

Leo XIII, in his encyclical Providentissimus Deus, affirmed: "So true is it that no error may lurk under inspiration, that inspiration not only excludes every error, but it is necessary that it exclude and repel every error, as it is necessary that God, the Supreme Truth, be not the Author of any error" (EB, 109).
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are ignorant of divine revelation, and thus of Jesus Christ and His Church. Without revelation faith is impossible, and without faith salvation is impossible (St. Paul and the Council of Trent). And the traditional adage still aggravates the situation: *Exsul Ecclesiastum nulla solus* ("Outside the Church, no salvation"). The theologians try to solve the problem in various ways: (1) God wants all to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4 ff.) and so gives to all the means and the grace sufficient for them to be saved, even outside the Church, when they are ignorant of its existence. (2) God can bring to the infidel some trace or spark of revelation to make it possible for them, under the impulse of grace, to make an act of faith, as a starting point in their salvation. (3) Whichever, under the influence of grace, makes an act of faith and then attains sanctification by adhering to God and His will, does already belong in some way to the Church. Since he has an implicit desire of baptism, he belongs to the Church in voto. (4) The infidel who would die with only original sin, and without any personal sins, would go to limbo and not to hell.

At any rate, salvation is more difficult for an infidel than for a Christian. Hence the importance and the necessity of the missions.
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**Infini**. The absence of limits or terms. Such indetermination may be taken in two senses: (a) as the privation of a determination that a thing should have naturally; e.g., the prime matter, devoid of any form; (b) as the negation of a determination which a thing neither has nor requires, e.g., a form without matter. Evidently, the privation infinite implies imperfection, while the negative infinite involves real and true perfection, on which account it may also be called positive: it excludes limits because it implies fullness. Act and form, negatively and positively infinite of themselves, are limited by potency and matter in which they are received, and so their infinity is only relative, because circumscribed by a genus or a species; if, however, an act transcends all genera and species, as being does, then it is the absolute infinite. Only God is such, because only God is essentially Being, subsisting Being itself (see essence, divine). This positive and absolute infinity of God does not exclude, however, His determinateness or concreteness, which implies personal distinction, not limitation.

From the divine infinity there derive two other attributes: immensity and ubiquity. God is immense because infinity excludes all limits and measurements; hence God is everywhere and no creature can escape His presence. The formal reason of this ubiquity (omnipresence) is the action that God exercises on the universe to maintain it in being and move it to its multifarious operation. Thus is solved the question of the relationship between the finite and the Infinite without falling into pantheism: In a certain sense God is immanent in the world, and the world in God, but without the absolute distinction between one and the other remaining, as between cause and effect.
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**Influence, divine.** See concourse, divine.

**Infusion.** See baptism.

**"Ingenius" (Incarnate, Unborn).** See Father.

**Innocence (state of).** The condition in which God placed Adam and Eve as soon as He created them. This state, called also original justice, implies sanctifying grace with the result that the love of virtue and gifts (supernatural order), as well as certain privileges integrative of human nature (preternatural order). The state of innocence is entirely a gratuitous gift of God, to which man had no right and no active capacity (see obediential potency). God could have left man in the state of pure nature, i.e., of nature in its own proper order and condition, with its final destination to a natural end. In the state of innocence, the body and the sensitive life (passions) were subject to reason through means of the gift of integrity (q.v.); the soul was subject and united to God, by the supernatural gift of grace, which made man fully holy and just. Since, therefore, in our first parents was difficult, but not impossible, because they were not confirmed in grace nor did they, like the blessed in heaven, see God directly in His essence. Our first parents sinned in fact, and their sin was proportionally as great as the light and the grace they enjoyed.

Admitting, as revelation demands, the fact of primitive innocence or original justice, the theologians discuss the essence of this justice; some think it adequately distinct from grace and reducible, as St. Anselm says, to a natural rectitude of the will. But the best opinion is that of St. Thomas, who rightly maintains that: (a) original justice is a gratuitous gift added to human nature by the divine liberality; (b) this justice implies perfect subjection of the soul to God through sanctifying grace, which is the formal element of the justice itself; in addition, it implies subjection of the passions, especially of concupiscence, by means of the gift of integrity, which is its material element; (c) grace is the cause and root of both subjections.
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**Inquisition (Latin inquisitio— inquiry, search, investigation).** Juridically, it refers to a new procedure introduced in the beginning of the thirteenth century. According to Roman law, all the acts of a criminal trial were completely public; the Church held to this principle throughout the twelfth century. It was Innocent III († 1216) who, observing that public prosecutions had become weak and gave an easy opening to cruel vengances, established that some acts of the canonical procedure should be carried out in secret. To these procedural acts the name "inquisition" was given.

Historically, it indicates the famous tribunal instituted by Gregory IX, about 1231, in which a special judge called inquisitor haereticae praestantis (inquisitor of heretical crime) functioned, distinguished from ordinary
judges by the following characteristics: (a) he enjoyed a jurisdiction which was variable as to territory, and limited, as regards matter, to cases of obstinate heresy only; (b) he had a permanent pontifical delegation; (c) such delegation, however, did not annul the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishops over the same matter. The inquisitor and the bishop were two parallel judges in questions concerning heresy.

The specific character of the inquisitorial trial was not constituted by the crime, or the procedure, or the torture, or the penalty (death by burning at the stake)—elements all more or less common to all civil and ecclesiastical trials of the time, but by the fact that the inquisitor was an exceptional judge, although having a permanent delegation.

The motive that induced the Pope to create this exceptional court was the religious policy of Frederick II who, before Philip the Fair, attempted to usurp the rights of the Church, making himself an arbitrary judge of heretics. Gregory IX, with the new tribunal, determined the limits of imperial competency in religious matters and introduced a sharp division between the responsibilities of Church and State.

The procedure of the Inquisition manifests its intimate nature: as soon as the inquisitor had assumed his office he published a time of grace, consisting in a preaching period that lasted one month. The guilty who confessed were, in exchange for their promise and guarantee to renounce heresy, free from all further prosecution.

The charges against heretics were briefly and then communicated to the accused, without the names of the witnesses—to avoid reprisal. The accused was invited to defend himself personally, but could not use an attorney (in deference to the preceding law which prohibited attorneys to defend the causes of heretics); but he had the right of appeal to the pope, which was a real escape valve.

The penalties were most varied. The gravest was excommunication (separation from the body of the Church) and consequent handing over to the secular arm, which nearly always meant death by burning at the stake; the secular power condemned the heretic on its own authority, considering him a criminal who, by the profession of false theories, was trying to sever the religious unity of the State and so disturb the public order. The Inquisition functioned as described up to 1542, when Paul III, with the spread of Protestantism, reorganized the ancient institution and centralized everything in Rome (Roman Inquisition) establishing new inquisitors who had the right to decide in propriis instante all appeals against the procedure of the delegates.

Altogether different was the Spanish Inquisition instituted at the request of Ferdinand and Isabel by Sixtus IV (1478) to proceed judicially against apostates (Hebrews, baptized and recidivist). It quickly became a political instrument in the hands of the Spanish kings. There have been enormous exaggerations in the attribution to this tribunal of crimes and misdeeds for which, even were they true, the Church could not be blamed. Too easily forgotten is the fact that, thanks to the Spanish Inquisition, Spain was first freed from internal enemies of her faith and then preserved from the invasion of Protestantism. Moreover, as Landriex rightly remarks, however grave the excesses of the Spanish Inquisition are pointed out, they are nothing in comparison to the atrocious persecutions and the orgies of cruelty which Luther unleashed in Germany, and, after him and because of him, Calvin at Geneva, Henry VIII and Elizabeth in England, Christian II in Denmark, Gustaf Wasa in Sweden, Jeanne d'Albret in Navarre, and the Huguenots and Jacobins in France. On this point the incomparable apologist, Joseph de Maistre, has cleverly ridiculed Voltaire, in his fourth letter on the Inquisition.
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inspiration (Latin inspirare—breathe into; infuse, in a figurative sense, said especially of sentiment). In the ecclesiastical sense inspiration is, in general, an influence or motion of God in the soul, and, more strictly, in the will. But the theologians usually indicate by this term a charismatic impulse that moves men to communicate to others what God wishes them to communicate. When the communication is oral, we have prophetic inspiration; when it is written, hagiographic or biblical inspiration. St. Paul (2 Tim. 3:16-17) affirms that "All the Scripture [is inspired by God," and St. Peter (2 Pet. 1:21) points out the nature of such inspiration: "The holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost.

Leo XIII, in his great encyclical on biblical studies, providentissimus Deus (Nov. 15, 1890), defined inspiration: "A supernatural action through means of which God excited and moved the Sacred Writers to write, and assisted them in writing, in such a way that they would conceive rightly in their thought, they would want to write faithfully, and they would express appropriately and with infallible truth all that He wanted them to express" (EB, 110).

According to the constant and explicit declaration of the sources of revelation, God is the Author of the Holy Scriptures. He is not, however, the only and direct author, as if He had produced the holy books as they are, but He is the principal Author, upon whom goes back all the responsibility for the books; however, for their compilation and editing God used men, who are the secondary and instrumental authors. But since man is not a blind, but a conscious and free instrument, he writes in his own proper action, which is manifested in the external form of the writing of the book. In this way we speak of the style of Isaias, Jeremias, Matthew, Paul, etc.

The inspirative action of God in man includes: (a) an enlightening of the mind, by which the sacred author perceives correctly what he is to write and judges infallibly its truth or falsity; (b) a movement of the will, by which God influences the hagiographer to decide to write what he has conceived and judged; (c) assistance of the executive faculties in order that, in the choice of words and expressions, the hagiographers be protected against errors or deviations that could compromise the manifestation of the divine thought.

It should be noted that God's action on the hagiographer's mind is not a revelation proper, because the hagiographer can have information of his own, deriving, e.g., from direct participation in the events he narrates, or acquired in advance through divine revelation. Revelation, however, is necessary when man must communicate for God truths of the supernatural order, of which the
integrity (gift and state). A property of every being inasmuch as it has all that its specific nature requires. From this natural integrity is distinguished a preternatural integrity that God added to the natural perfection of Adam. In this sense integrity is a gratuitous gift of God, and establishes man in the state of integrity by which nature, in addition to its properties, is enriched with privations that complete and elevate its perfection. These privileges are reduced to three: (1) immunity from concupiscence (q.v.), i.e., from the disorderly inclinations of the sense appetite; (2) immortality of the body as well as the immunity from sickness and other sufferings; (3) infused knowledge, proportionate to the ordinary life of man.

The first privilege is attested to by Holy Scripture, which tells us that our first parents were both naked and did not blush, but as soon as they sinned they realized they were nude and tried to hide and cover themselves. Psychologically speaking, blushing on account of nudity is provoked by the insouciance of the senses, which man is no longer capable of controlling and dominating. The second privilege is implicitly contained in the divine threat: “What day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die” (Gen. 2:17). Actually Adam did not die when he sinned; the sense, then, of the divine words are: “You will become mortal,” as, moreover, St. Paul explains: “By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death” (Rom. 5:12). Death is a natural law for all bodies, but God had established exemption from death for the human body: with sin the natural law comes back into play, with the addition of a penal or punitive character. The third privilege is dimly alluded to when Holy Scripture says Adam, hardly issued from God’s hands, was able to give appropriate names to all the animals and to determine the intimate nature of matrimony (Gen. 2:21-22). This could not be an acquired knowledge, and, therefore, it was infused by God (cf. Ex. 37:15).

The first two privileges belong to the defined doctrine of faith (Council of Trent, DB, 792 and 788).
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intelllect. See gifts of the Holy Ghost.

intellectualism. Holding to the obvious sense of the word, we would understand it as a system in which the intellect predominates, just as in voluntarism (q.v.) the value and function of the will are stressed. But the vicissitudes of history have rendered the meaning of the word intellectualism equivocal. Subleties aside, we can say that there is a heterodox and an orthodox intellectualism from a philosophico-theological viewpoint. Thomistic-Aristotelian philosophy is the orthodox intellectualism, affirming the primacy of the intellect and defending the capacity of human reason—however subordinate to faith—both in the field of natural truth and also in the supernatural order as regards the intelligibility and illustration of dogma and hence the value of the dogmatic formulas by which revealed truths are expressed. All the scientific elaboration of theology (q.v.) around the data of revelation is the proof that justifies that intellectualism which has been accepted into the bosom of the Church.

There is, however, an exaggerated and heterodox intellectualism that subordinates everything to human reason of which it proclaims the full sufficiency and absolute domain, even with respect to supernatural facts and truths. Intellectualism so understood coincides with rationalism (q.v.), and the Church rightly condemns it, assigning certain limits to the capacity of reason, as when the Vatican Council defines the moral necessity of divine revelation for the knowledge of the sum total of ethical-religious truths (of the natural order) capable of decisively orienting human life toward the supreme end. Likewise the Church has condemned (Encycl., Pascendi; DB, 2071 ff.) the modernists (q.v.), who, adhering to anti-intellectualistic and agnostic systems, undervalue reason and adopt in its stead the sentimental movements of subconscious religious experience (see experience, religious).

Between the two extremes, absolute rationalism and agnosticism, there is a gradation of systems oscillating between the primacy of the intellect and the primacy of the will. The Church leaves this middle zone to free discussion (Thomism-Scotism), so long as neither faculty is excluded, but merely stressed at the expense of the other. It is undeniable, however, that Thomistic intellectualism is the Church’s favorite, as is clearly shown in official documents (cf. Leo XIII, Encycl., Quas primas; Pius X, Motu proprio, Doctoris Angelici; CIC, Canon 1358; Pius XI, Encycl., Divini illius aedificii; Pius XII, Encycl., Humani generis; etc.).
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Garrigou-Lagrange, Le saint commun (Paris, 1932), Ron lieutenant, I, Intellecualisme de Saint Thomas (Paris, 1948); “Intellectualisme,” D. 4. intention (of the minister of the sacraments). In general, an act of the will by which one determines to do something: in the case of the minister, the will to administer the sacrament.

The minister, being human, is a free instrument, and that is the real reason why his intention, at least virtual, to act as the representative of Christ in the administration of the sacrament, is absolutely necessary—whereas the moral dispositions (faith and the state of grace) are not required—in order that the sacrament produce the grace. It depends, in fact, on the free act of will of the agent, as man is, that in each and all cases he commit himself as an instrument in the hands of Christ. Besides, only the intention of acting ministerially can determine ad unum the sacramental meaning of the external rite, susceptible per se of multiple significations.

The Council of Trent in defining against Luther and Calvin the necessity of intention in the minister (DB, 854) determines also its object: faciedi quod factis Eclesiae (“The minister must intend to do what the Church does”). In this expression, which sums up and sanctions a century-old theological formula, is indicated the relationship of dependency.
of the minister on the Church. The harmony of the plan of salvation chosen by Christ, the manifestation of the spiritual in the corporeal (Ter- tulian: caro salutis cardo, i.e., “the flesh is the hinge of salvation”), demanded that the activity of the minis- ter be in a direct relationship of dependency on the visible society, the Church, which is the perennial mani- festation of Christ. In fact, only in de- pendence on the ministerial power of the Church, indefeasibly faithful to the mandate of its Founder, do men of all times and places find the guaran- tee of the continuity of the means of salvation established by the Redeemer.

The Church, moreover, is a well- organized body, in which every vital movement, linked to an external rite, must depend in some way on the visible head. It is necessary, therefore, that every infusion of new vital energies, caused by the sacraments, be in some way dependent on the visible head of the Church and on her hierarchy, which is the pope’s co- adjutor “in ministering the blood of the Lamb for the universal body of the Christian Religion” (St. Catherine of Siena).

We purposely say: “it must de- pend in some way,” because this de- pendence can be various and from a maximum can descend to a minimum necessary to preserve the bond of reference. In fact, it can be explicit in the Catholic priest who solves the penitent, and implicit as in the infulin who, ignorant of the Church and her rites, is induced to administer baptism ad intentionem petentis (according to the intention of the one asking); it can, moreover, be direct, as in all ministers having communication with the Apostolic See, or indirect, as may be found in heretics and schismatics, who by the very fact that their respective sects or churches keep and repeat what Rome intercession (of the saints). An ancient custom of the Catholic Church, invoking the saints and commending oneself to their intercession with God. The Cathars, the Waldensians, Wicliffe, Luther, and more recently the modernists attacked the legitimacy of that usage, rejecting it as idolatrous, as derogatory to the worship due to Christ (the one Mediator, ac- cording to St. Paul, between man and God), and as a sign of little confidence in God’s mercy. The Council of Trent (sess. 25, DB, 984), outlining the reasons of the ancient custom, declared its legitimacy and utility and reproves the contrary teaching as impious: “The Holy Synod orders all the bishops, and all the others having the duty and charge of teaching, that — according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, in force since the first times of the Christian religion, and according to the consensus of the holy Fathers of the Church and the decrees of the Councils — they instruct accurately the faithful especially about the intercession of the saints. . . . teaching them that the saints, ruling together with Christ, offer their prayers for men to God, and that it is good and useful to in- volve them suppliantly and to have recourse to their prayers and to their powerful help in obtaining benefits from God through Jesus Christ, His Son our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour. Those who do not admit that the saints, blessed in heaven, should be invoked, or who say that the saints do not pray for men, or that . . . their invocation is idolatrous, or . . . is contrary to the dignity of the mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ, or that it is stupid to supplicate with voice or thought those who reign in heaven: all these do think impiously.” In this decree, is found the solution of all aspects of the question.

1. The saints can intercede for us in imitation of Jesus Christ, who (as Man) is always alive to intercede for us with the Father (Heb. 7:25).

2. The prayer we address to God is an act of laetantia (cult in Latin) because we believe that the omnipotent God can fulfill all our desires. The prayer made to the saints, on the other hand, is an act of mere dulia, because we expect the fulfillment of our desires not from their power, but from their intercession with God, who can grant us a grace directly in view of their prayers and their merits, or can also work a miracle through means of them.

3. The saints see in the beatific vision our conditions and our supplications.

4. The intercession of the saints is directed to Christ the Mediator, through whom all heavenly favors descend upon us.

5. God sees our needs and could provide directly, but it pleases the divine Wisdom to communicate His gifts through intermediaries. After Jesus, Mediator between God and man, Mary, the Mediatrix of all graces, excels over the angels and the saints, and so the Church addresses supplications to her in a special way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


interdict. A censure or medicinal penalty, by which the faithful (lay and clerics), though remaining in the communion of the Church, are de- prived of certain sacraments and other sacred things. It differs from excommuni- cation, which severs from communion with the other faithful, and from suspension, which is inflicted only on clerics. The interdict is dis- tinguished as follows:

1. Personal, if it strikes a de- termined person.

2. Local, if it strikes di- rectly a territory.

3. Total, if it prohibits the use of all the sacred things.

By force of a general, local interdict, limiting our consideration to the most common form of interdict — are prohibited, in a certain territory, the celebration of any rite and the solemn administration (in forma solenni) of any sacrament (except on Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and the Assumption). The following ceremo- nies are permitted, only in the cathedrals and parish churches: (1) celebration of one daily Mass; (2) ad- ministration of baptism, Communion, penance; (3) keeping of the Blessed Sacrament; (4) assistance at the celebration of matrimony, but without the nuptial blessing; (5) obsequies for the dead, without solemnity; (6) blessing
of the oils and of the baptismal font; (7) sacred preaching; (8) administration of Viaticum in private form. In all these ceremonies bells are never rung, nor is the organ played, and all external pomp is avoided.

This penalty is traced to the first centuries of the Church, but acquired its greatest development and its proper characteristic marks in the Middle Ages, when it was applied with full rigor, occasionally striking whole kingdoms, like France and England. Later the pope mitigated its consequences, permitting the administration of some sacraments in private form. In recent times it seemed to have come into disuse, when suddenly it was applied, with happy effectiveness, by Pope Pius X, on Adria (1909) and Galatina (1913).

The current discipline is established in the Code of Canon Law (Cans. 2258–2277).
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**investiture.** A ceremony having a juridical effect. Three elements are distinguished in the conferring of an ecclesiastical benefice: (1) **Designation of the person**—this gives the right to the thing (**ius ad rem**). It can be performed by the parishioners and the patron with respect to the parish priest, by the cathedral chapter with respect to the bishop. (2) **Canonical institution** (**institutio canonica**) performed by the legitimate superior — this confers the right in the thing (**ius in re**), namely, the real right over the benefice and the actual spiritual jurisdiction. (3) **Investiture**, namely, the installation, by which the beneficiary takes actual possession of the benefice either personally or by proxy.

These clear-cut ideas emanated from the bitter fight on investiture, which took place in the Middle Ages. In the eleventh century the emperor, because of a complexity of historical circumstances, arrogated to himself the right not only of presenting the person of the bishop or the abbot, but also of conferring on him—at the moment he invested him with the feuds annexed to the bishopric or the monastery—the spiritual power as well, by the consignment of the ring and crosier. Moreover, the sovereign’s great care and interest was to choose, as his candidates, persons with good managerial and vassal qualifications, rather than good priests. In this way the Church was threatened with becoming a large, imperial chef. Hence the firm opposition of the popes, especially of St. Gregory VII. The long struggle, after many vicissitudes, was finally ended by the Concordat of Worms (1122), in which a clear distinction was made between the spiritual jurisdiction and the temporal power, and between the designatio personae and the institutio canonica.

If we consider the many difficulties surrounding this struggle, as well as its tenacious bitterness due to the material interests at stake, the victory of the Church, splitting the leading lid that weighed down on it, is for us one of the proofs of its indefectibility.
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**Irenaeus.** See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 301); **Roman pontiff**.

---

**Jesus Christ**

**Jahweh.** See Tetragrammaton.

Jansenism. The heresy of Jansenius (Jansenii, † 1638), a Dutchman who lived a long time at Louvain, where the memory and teaching of Balsus (Bay) was still prevalent. Jansenism is a development of *Baianism* (q.v.). It gained strength and was disseminated through political-religious maneuvers and intrigues, in which Duvergier, Abbé de St. Cyran, and later the turbulent Arnauld played particularly important roles. Quenelle followed in their footsteps. From its inception the heresy took on a polemic tone, not always dignified, mainly against the Jesuits who, by affirming their *Molinism* (q.v.), at Louvain, had attacked Balsus, and covertly against the Roman Curia and the Holy See by contesting their right to intervene in theological questions.

From the doctrinal viewpoint, which alone is of interest here, Jansenism may be synthesized as follows: (a) It holds in its entirety the fundamental principles of Baianism on original justice, on the act of God and the consequent intrinsic corruption of human nature, etc. (b) In particular, Jansenius develops the relationship of grace with free will, by following, as he says, the footsteps of St. Augustine: Adam, before sin, was free and could sin because he had only sufficient grace, which St. Augustine called *auxilium sine quo non*; after sin, with freedom lost, man needs for every good act an efficacious grace (*auxilium quo* which determines the will infallibly; this intrinsic determination is not opposed to freedom. (c) The twofold love of Balsus is reduced in Jansenius’ thought to the twofold conquering *delectation* (*delectatio victrix*): one earthly, which determines to sin, the other heavenly (efficacious grace), which determines to good and therefore to eternal life. Man is a slave of one or the other of these delights. (d) In the actual state of man, sufficient grace is no longer granted, but only efficacious grace exists, and man cannot resist it. (e) God predestines to hell or to heaven prior to any consideration of merit; Christ died only for the predestined, who alone receive efficacious grace (see Calvinism).

**Conclusion:** Such doctrine contains a dark and gloomy pessimism, which the Jansenists have tried to mitigate with the idea of resignation, without being able, however, to overcome terror and desperation. Jansenism had great influence on Christian thought, art, and life. It is a credit to the Society of Jesus to have fought Jansenism with *Molinism* in dogmatic theology and with *probablism* in moral theology.

Jansenius, who had become a bishop before he died, left his chief work, the *Augustines*, the teaching of which was condemned after the death of its author. See the Propositions condemned by Innocent X, DB, 1902 ff.
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**Jerome.** See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 302); *Vulgate*.

**Jesus Christ** (Jesus: Hebr. *Iēshuâ* — Saviour; Christ: Gr. *Χριστός* — Anointed, i.e., Messiah). The Son of God made Man.

The Gospels enable us to reconstruct the picture of Christ’s life and understanding His teaching with perfect adherence to the framework of historical reality that preceded and ac-
companied them. The period of the infancy of Jesus constitutes a complete and well-defined cycle. Polarized about the two small villages of Bethlehem in Judea and Nazareth in Galilee, the events of those early years had few spectators. A silence of thirty years followed the sudden light of the birth of Christ and the episodes of His recognition in the Temple of Jerusalem by Simeon and Anna. But whoever attentively meditates these facts will be convinced that in them are found all the premises and signs of His future public manifestation.

At the age of about thirty years Jesus appeared suddenly on the banks of the Jordan. For some preceding months John, having come from the desert, had been urging the crowds of Judea to moral renovation in expectation of the imminent appearance of the Messiah whose Precursor He declared himself to be. Jesus, too, wished to receive the baptism of penance, and a voice from heaven identified in the “carpenter’s son” the only-begotten Son of God. After a forty days’ retreat in the desert, Jesus began in earnest His public ministry, and John retired humbly into the background, directing the crowd and six of his best disciples to join the new Master. During His life, Christ limited His teaching and work to the children of Israel, of that chosen people who awaited the fulfillment of the Messianic promises made by God to their Fathers. After His death, when Israel had shown a complete ignorance of the fulfillment of its own time as the chosen people, the opportunity was extended to all peoples.

After a brief sojourn in Galilee, Jesus moved — about the beginning of the year 29 — toward Jerusalem, the heart of the Jewish nation. An act of authority in the Temple — expulsion of the profane — drew the attention of the leaders and of the crowd upon Him. The leaders immediately showed themselves hostile to one who declared Himself Master and attributed to Himself an authority which put Him above all human measurement and set Him against the whole tradition of thought and pieté zealously guarded by the Doctors of Jerusalem and by the members of the Sanhedrin, the supreme tribunal of the nation.

The crowd was enthused by the new preaching and the miracles accompanying it, but was inconstant and unable to believe with conviction. Jesus made some isolated conquests even among the personalities of the Sanhedrin. On the way back to Galilee, Samaria recognized Him as Messiah and Saviour of the world, but this episode, because of its restricted circumstances, did not have any general repercussions. During His first year of ministry Christ labored in Galilee, making Capharnaum His headquarters; He called definitively in His service twelve disciples, among whom were eleven Galileans, and began His teaching by tracing the broad lines of the new moral law. The crowd was bewildered and the Pharisees scandalized because Jesus claimed for Himself the authority of perfecting and of interpreting definitively the Law of God. Numerous miracles confirmed His words and provoked a vast popular movement in the region. Toward the end of the year, Jesus began to speak of the kingdom of God (q.e.) veiling His teaching in parables, in order to avoid the misunderstanding of His doctrine of a spiritual kingdom by a nationalistic crowd which dreamed of the reconstruction of the earthly kingdom of Israel. The first year ended with a brief excursion to the eastern territories of the Lake of Tiberias where the pagan population predominated. The Pharisees of Jerusalem followed Jesus into Galilee and made several attempts to stir up controversies with the secret hope of putting Jesus outside the law.

The second year of ministry — A.D. 29 — opened with the sending of the disciples on a brief mission which gave them their first experiences in the apostolate. The crowd made concrete efforts to revolt for the purpose of investing Jesus with regal dignity. The Master insisted, however, that their attention and efforts be turned to the kingdom of God, but He was constrained to withdraw from the crowds and take refuge in the near-by pagan territories. He devoted intense care to the formation of the disciples and, when at Caesarea, Peter declared the faith of the apostolic college in His Messianic dignity and in His divinity, He revealed His intention of founding on the Apostles His Church. From this moment, His detachment from the Synagogue became more evident. The old religion began to crumble on itself, while on its ruins the new house of God began to rise, which would be open to all peoples. Jesus began to speak of His Passion and devoted Himself to a more careful formation of the disciples in preparation for their hours of darkness. The Transfiguration preceded the death on the cross to signify that such death will not be the fall of Christ to His enemies, but the spontaneous acceptance and execution of a planned design.

Jesus resolutely marched to Jerusalem. The Feast of the Tabernacles (September-October) and that of the Dedication (November-December) of A.D. 29 found Him in the capital, in the Temple, winning over enemies and friends with the marvelous of His teaching and miracles. The Master spoke more openly of His Divinity, fighting the Pharisees and Sadducees on their own ground and unmasking their voluntary blindness and hypocrisy, the cause of the moral failure of the whole people. The Sanhedrin did not forgive Him and convinced itself of the necessity of suppressing Him, but they feared the crowd.

The beginning of the third year of ministry — A.D. 30 — found Jesus in Trans-Jordan, and later in Galilee.

Toward February of the same year Jesus returned to Jerusalem for the last time, knowing that He was going to suffer His violent death.

The miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus, in the immediate vicinity of the capital, precipitated events. The Sanhedrin awaited a propitious occasion to have Him put to death. For the third time Jesus spoke in a detailed way about His Passion. The Sunday preceding the last Easter (March-April), He did not prevent, as on former occasions, the crowd from acclaiming Him Messiah and accompanying Him into the Temple, filling it with their enthusiastic songs. Tuesday was the propitiation and threats directed against the Pharisees, traitors of God; that same day Jesus pronounced the great discourse in which He announced the end of that city which soon would become the murderers of God, and spoke of the end of the world which will see Him as inescapable Judge and uncontested Ruler. Wednesday Judas arranged the price of betrayal.

Thursday evening, during the traditional Paschal banquet, Jesus instituted the Eucharist and abandoned Himself to intimate confidences. Well into the night He was arrested at Cenacle, after His human nature in a painful agony felt the huge weight of a redemption that demanded bloody immolation. At dawn the Sanhedrin condemned Christ as a blasphemer, because He called Himself Son of God. In an effort to obtain the Roman procurator’s consent, to whom the death sentence was reserved, they attempted to put the trial on a political basis, but feeling Pilate’s
resistance, who was convinced of Jesus' innocence, the Sanhedrin finally disclosed its real charge: self-attribution of divine sonship, a charge not within the judicial power of Pilate. The death sentence was pronounced, the penalty being that of wretches and rebels: the cross.

At three in the afternoon of Friday, the crime was consummated, but Jesus' death was accompanied by prodigies which shook to the depths the conscience of many. Sunday at dawn the sepulcher of Joseph of Arimathea, in which Jesus was placed in burial, was found empty, but the Crucified returned that same day in the midst of His own, offering many proofs of the reality of His resurrection. During forty days He completed the work of instruction and formation of the disciples; then, disappearing from their sight, He ascended into heaven, having given them the command of dispersing into the world and preaching to all the Gentiles, communicating to all the benefits of the Redemption, and of awaiting in Jerusalem the coming of the Holy Spirit.

The teaching of Jesus is both ancient and new; it presupposes the knowledge of the ideal and historical promises which constitute its base. The ancient, divine revelation had been made and entrusted to the people of Israel which was, in the fullness of time, to transmit it to the whole world. Christ came to justify and confirm the revelation of the Old Testament and to complete it definitively. For this reason, during His earthly life, He did not step outside the borders of Israel, though He preached and died for all men. Jesus has revealed the mysteries of the intimate nature and life of God: That same God who had revealed Himself to the Fathers of old as the "One God" essentially, is also "Trine" personally. He has an only-begotten Son who became incarnate — the Christ — in order to fulfill the will of the Father who wished to be reconciled forever with man in the blood of His Son which would cancel efficaciously Adam's offense. The third person is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father and Son will send after the death of the Redeemer to complete His work by the bountiful distribution of supernatural gifts.

Jesus proved that in Him were realized the ancient prophecies, by declaring Himself the Messias and the Son of God, heir of the "eternal" throne of David for the foundation of a kingdom "not of this world" in which all men would be admitted with equal rights. That kingdom is the Church, and its "glory" consists of the supernatural riches with which Christ has endowed it. The sacraments are the channels of grace which redeems and revivifies man by conferring on him a participation of the divine nature which makes him "Son of the Lord," intimately united to Him. A mysterious bond holds all the believers among themselves together with Jesus who is "but one thing" with His faithful in the unity of a vital organism: the Mystical Body. The Eucharist is the supreme gift which perpetuates for each and all the offering that Christ made of Himself, because the marvels of the Redemption are the fruit of His bloody immolation. The law of the kingdom is summed up in the precept of love, and the true religion consists in actuating truth in love; it does not play itself out in the external observance of precepts, but it is a living of love and, therefore, of sacrifice; it is an imitation of the Son; it is being Christlike.

The enemy of the kinfolk is God's own enemy — Satan, whom Jesus defeated forever by rescuing man from slavery to evil. The divinity of the Messias, His sorrowful passion, the supernatural character of His kinfolk, the union of all men without distinction in a new organism wherein circulates the vital fluid of grace, a religion of freedom and of the spirit, i.e., of love — these were the rocks on which Israel ran aground. Misled by heads and by religious sects incapable of rising above the fictitious framework of thought and action, created by a substantial misunderstanding of the authentic revelation of God; incapable of breaking from the concept of a Mesocratic kingdom confined to the borders of their own nation and limited to material prosperity; obsessed with an external religious practice weighed down and vitiated by a parasitical excrecence of human precepts, the people of Israel showed themselves incompetent to the task and failed to attain the goal set for them by God. The millenial divine plan, however, did not fail, nor were the ancient promises frustrated. The Apostles are the authentic Israel through which the message of the Redemption and its gifts are given to the world.

The story of divine revelation and of human redemption, patiently prepared by God during thousands of years of waiting, culminates in the teaching and the work of Christ which is of all times. The new Adam repairs the sin of the first Adam and reconciles all men with God. Thus there is a return to primitive unity and happiness; in the poverty of time it is possible for us to garner eternal riches, and in the suffering and melancholy of the world we prepare our happiness in the eternal possession of God.
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John of St. Thomas. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 593).

judgment, divine. The accounting for one's own life, which every man must render after death to God, Lord and supreme Judge, to receive reward or punishment according to his merits. Judgment is twofold: particular and universal.

1. Particular judgment will take place immediately after death, as is proved (a) from Holy Scripture: the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, of whom the first dies and goes to hell, the other to Abraham's bosom (paradise), two places eternally separated by an impassable abyss; St. Paul, close to death, yearned for the "crown of justice," which Christ the Judge will give him and those who will have lived like him (2 Tim. 4:8); elsewhere he says explicitly: "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment" (Heb. 9:27).

(b) Tradition, after some wavering as to details, declares itself clearly and explicitly from the fourth century: St. Hilary: "The day of judgment is the eternal retribution either of felicity or of punishment." St. Augustine distinguishes the judgment that follows death immediately when the souls have gone out of their bodies (de corporibus extinctis), and the universal judgment which will take place after the resurrection of the bodies.
The Church magisterium confirms this truth especially in the II Council of Lyons (1274), in a bull of Benedict XII (1335), and in the Council of Florence (DB, 454, 530, and 693). Reason recognizes the necessity of a divine sanction and, therefore, of a divine judgment on the use made of the gift of life and its powers (cf. the history of all religions).

The discussion and the proclamation of the verdict in this judgment take place by way of internal mental illumination.

2. Universal judgment is a truth of faith (cf. the Creed: "[Christ] will come to judge the living and the dead"). In Matthew, Chapter 25, we find a lifelike description of it. St. Paul, on several occasions (2 Cor. 10; Rom. 14:10; 2 Thess. 1-2, etc.), refers to it. St. Augustine expands systematically the traditional doctrine (De Civitate Dei, XX, 50): The judge will be the Man-God, who will appear on the clouds of heaven, accompanied by the angels, and will manifest, confirming them, the verdicts of the particular judgments—in this case too, most likely, by way of internal illumination.
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**jurisdiction.** See hierarchy.

**justice.** (Lat. justitia from ius—right). It includes essentially the concept of right which, subjectively, is the inviolable moral power of having or doing something in one’s own utility, and objectively, is that which is due to another. It is evident that "right" implies a relationship of alterity (i.e., distinction) between two persons, so that to the right of the one there corresponds the duty of the other. Justice, as an act, consists in giving each his own, i.e., what is due to him; as a virtuous habit, it is defined as the constant and perpetual will to give to each what is his, i.e., what by right belongs to him. Applying this concept to the relationship of man not only toward his fellow men, but also toward God, we have justice in the broad sense, which is equivalent to holiness, as we see in the language of the Bible, in which the holy man is the just man. But in the strict sense justice is a relationship between men and can be distinguished in: (a) commutative, in so far as it regulates the relations between single individuals; (b) distributive, between superiors and subjects; (c) legal, between the individual and society. The first two are included under the name of particular justice, because they regard the private good; the third is called general justice, because its object is the common good. Strictly speaking, the true justice is the commutative justice, in which is verified the concept of perfect correspondence (the right-duty equation), which is the basic element of justice.

So-called social justice, which, strictly speaking, refers to the relations between the individual and the social organism, is generally reduced to general-legal justice. Among the moral virtues (prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance), justice holds the primacy, because the other virtues have regard to the good of the individual in himself, while justice looks to the good of one’s fellow men; namely, to the common good, which transcends the individual good. Cicero (De Officiis, I) correctly writes that man’s goodness is measured principally by his justice. In the natural order this virtue is a habit acquired through exercise of the will in respecting the rights of others. But, according to Catholic doctrine, with sanctifying grace God infuses into the soul and its faculties the theological virtues, the gifts of the Holy Spirit and with them the cardinal virtues, among which is justice. In the supernatural order, therefore, justice is a habit infused by God in the soul, which inclines the will to give to each his own, according to the various relationships examined above.

Justice, like every other virtue, enters into the Christian categorical imperative: declin a malo et fac bonum ("decline from evil and do good"); and, therefore, it implies not only the obligation to do good to others, but also that of not imposing or injuring the rights of others.
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**justice, original.** See innocence (state of).

**justification.** The passing, under the action of divine grace, from the state of injustice or aversion from God to the state of justice (in the biblical sense, holiness).

This divine work is likened by Jesus Christ to a regeneration (John 1 and 3); St. Paul calls it a "new creation in Christ" (kata xrisi; 2 Cor. 5:17). It is precisely St. Paul who develops more copiously the doctrine of justification with an abundance of motifs that all converge on the same concept of an interior transformation, whose term is the homo novus. The Lutheran interpretation does St. Paul an evident injury by claiming to reduce this thought to the theory of an extrinsic justification (imputation of Christ’s holiness to the incurring man). Some modern Protestants have abandoned this extravagant exegesis and have approached the traditional Catholic interpretation (Sanday, Jülicher, Zahn, and others).

The Council of Trent, sess. VI, assembles and determines in clear and concise expressions the traditional doctrine (cf. especially chapters 7, 8, 9, and corresponding canons). Justification in newborn babies is effected through baptism instantaneously, but in adults (ordinarily at least) is effected in two phases: (1) Preparation: under the influence of actual (exciting) grace, the sinner begins to turn toward God by acts of faith, sorrow, and love (Council of Trent, sess. VI, can. 6). (2) Information: in the subject, so prepared, God works the supernatural renovation, which consists in a single act, having two aspects, one negative (the remission or real destruction of sin), and the other positive (the infusion of sanctifying grace with the virtues and the gifts that accompany it) (cf. Council of Trent, sess. VI, can. 7, 8). This is the divinization of man of which the Eastern Fathers often speak (cf. Cyril of Alexandria).
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**Kantianism.** The philosophical system of Emmanuel Kant (born at Königsberg in 1724, † 1804), which dominates modern thought in all sectors, not excluding the religious.
Kant's starting point is the critical problem, namely: the value of knowledge. He rejects empiricism, which claims that all knowledge comes from sense experience only, and criticizes rationalism, which holds that knowledge is built with universal concepts. For these two systems, the natural order is a sure presupposition (dogmatism), while for Kant it exists in function of the act of knowledge, i.e., it is formed by our knowing faculty under the stimulus of sensations. Therefore, according to Kant, knowledge is not only a synthesis (deriving from experience), or only an analysis (deriving from the knowing subject), but is a synthesis a priori (deriving from experience and at once from principles a priori and subjective forms, which organize and give value to the experiential data). We must distinguish the phenomenon (the external thing as it appears to us) from the noumenon (thinkable, namely the thing in itself). Only the phenomenon is known through means of the impressions the external thing makes on our senses; but it is not possible to grasp the thing in itself, in its ontological reality, namely the noumenon; however, we fill this lacuna by attributing to the thing our a priori concept (Kantian category), which renders it thinkable but does not assure us that it really is the way we think it (critical agnosticism).

There are three knowledge phases or functions:
1. Sensibility (transcendental aesthetics), in which the material elements are the impressions of the external world, and the formal elements are the two pure intuitions “space-time” under which are disposed and classified the data of sensations.
2. Intellligence (transcendental analyitics), of which the material element is the fruit of the first phase (perceptions), and the formal element are twelve a priori forms or categories, reducible to four fundamental ones: quantity, quality, relation, and modality.
3. Reason (transcendental dialectics), of which the material elements are the judgments formulated in the antecedent phase, and the formal elements are three ideas: ego (soul), world, God.

Thus Kant in his Critique of Pure Reason saves only the phenomenal aspect of objective reality, substituting a priori forms and principles for the substantial reality of the things in themselves. God, therefore, is thinkable, but not demonstrable. But in his Critique of Practical Reason he attempts to re-integrate the reality of God, of the world, and of man by way of will and faith. Consequently what we have here is a playing down of the value of reason, incapable of getting to external things in themselves. Science and metaphysics are based on a priori synthetic judgments, in which the formal element is subjective. Reason, shut up in itself, is declared autochthonous, creative, as if it were, of reality, and autonomous inasmuch as everything is immanent in it and nothing can be imposed on it from outside. Whence the autonomous ethics with its categorical imperative erupting from and immanent in the rational subject; whence the abolition of revealed religion, of worship with rites and prayers, God being a subjective postulate of reason. If Kantianism, from a philosophical standpoint, encounters many difficulties, theologically considered it compromises the very bases of Catholic doctrine, as appears from modernism, which has adopted Kantian immaterialism (qq.e.).

kenosis (Gr. κένωσις, from κενός — I empty, void). A term derived from the text of St. Paul's letter to the Philippians (2:7), where it is said that the Word favous κένωσις (ἐξισοπημενη semiticism, according to the Vulgate version — emptied himself). This passage has given rise to the kenotic theory, started by Luther in the sixteenth century and developed in the past century by certain German Protestants (Thomasius and Gesen) and by many Anglicans (Sanday, Gore, Mackintosh, etc.). According to Luther, the Word is said to have transmitted His divine properties to the assumed humanity (omniscience, omnipotence, ubiquity, etc.), but Christ the Man, except for one or another circumstance of a rather private character (like the Transfiguration), did not use them openly. According to some contemporary Protestants, the Word in His Incarnation stripped Himself of certain divine attributes by a sort of self-limitation.

This whole theory: (a) is absurd in itself, since it is based on the erroneous thesis of the possibility of a mutation or a real limitation in the divine nature; (b) it does not follow from the text of St. Paul, which Catholic exegetes explain adequately in this sense: The Word seemed to strip Himself of His divine glory when He lowered Himself to the point of taking on human nature (forma servi accepti — “taking the form, i.e., the nature of a servant”) and of mingling as Man among men, and, furthermore, of living a life of privations and undergoing the humiliations of an opprobrious passion and death.

This sound interpretation is the general one of the Fathers of the Church.

Kingdom of God. A central concept for the understanding of the economy of salvation, constituting the primary object of Christ's preaching.

In the Old Testament God, as Creator, is the King of the universe and, in a particular way, of Israel, "His" people. The kingdom of God is extended into the future with the foundation of the Messianic kingdom — universal, spiritual, and eternal.

A "kingdom of God" is frequently mentioned in the Gospel; St. Matthew calls it also "kingdom of heaven" — by obvious substitution of the name of "God," according to the Hebrew fashion. The notion of the kingdom of God is complex. It expresses a present and a future reality; present and in continual becoming and progress, pending the future kingdom which will be in the total and perfect possession of beauty in heaven. It is both internal-visible, i.e., the kingdom of grace in the souls, and social-visible, inasmuch as it coincides with the Church founded by Jesus Christ on earth.
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Kingdom of Christ. With the encyclical of Pius XI Quas primas (1925), the Kingdom of Christ was incorporated in the universal liturgy (Feast of Christ the King) and into the category of truths declared revealed by the solemn magisterium of the Church. This truth, however, goes back to Old Testament times, in —
which the future Messiah was prophesied as King (Psalms 2:4f.; Isa. 9:6ff.; Dan. 2:44; 7:13ff.). In the New Testament, the Archangel Gabriel says to Mary: “And of his kingdom there shall be no end” (Luke 1:33; cf. John 18:37). St. Paul says: “For he hath put all things under his feet” (2 Cor. 15:26); St. John: “And he hath on his garment and on his thigh written: King of kings and Lord of lords” (Apoc. 19:16). St. Augustine synthesizes patristic tradition (De Consensu Evangeliorum): “Christ as man has been constituted King and Priest.”

Reasons: (a) Christ is King by birthright, because He is Son of God, even according to His humanity which subsists in the Person of the Word; (b) by acquired right, because He has exalted by His blood mankind from the slavery of sin, which weighed on all creatures, as St. Paul (Rom. 18:19) says; (c) Christ is King because He has the threefold power — legislative, judicial, and executive, as the Gospel attests (Matt. 5:21; 28:18; Mark 16:16; Acts 10:43, etc.). The kingdom of Christ is of a spiritual nature, but does not exclude extension, at least indirect, to temporal things; it is also social, not only individual.

The royal powers of Christ have been communicated to the Church and to the Roman pontiff, who is her visible head: “As the Father hath sent me, I also send thee” (John 20:21).
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knowledge, divine. See science, divine.

knowledge of Christ. See science of Christ.

ecclesiastical law is sacred, intimately connected as it is with the divine law; sacred also is civil law, based on a power that derives from God: Non est potestas nisi a Deo (“There is no power but from God”; Rom. 13:1).

Civil law is binding in conscience, according to the best opinions, provided it is not in conflict with divine or ecclesiastical law. Neither divine nor human law is voluntary deliberately without guilt, which is measured according to the matter or content of the law itself and the will to oblige on the part of the legislator. However, if a law is merely penal, transmission involves penalty but not guilt. The subject may be dispensed from the observance of the positive law by the superior who has power of jurisdiction over him. A privilege is a special favor granted against or outside the common law.

Law, the remote rule of morality, must become the proximate rule of moral action, through the medium of conscience.
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learning Church. See “Ecclesia discens.”

lectorate (Lat. lector — reader). The second of the four minor orders (see orders, holy), by which is conferred the power of reading the Holy Scripture aloud in Church, before the priest or bishop explains its content.

From earliest antiquity mention is made of the lector or reader: St. Justin refers to him and Tertullian speaks explicitly of him. In the fourth century admission to the lectorate was the ordinary way of initiating young men into the ecclesiastical life.

The lectorate is the only minor order of the Latin rite now in use in the Greek Church.
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Leo the Great. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 302); Etichieanism.

liberalism. A doctrinal current, quite complex and changeable, which has had various interpretations and practical applications, not easily definable. The basic concept of liberalism is liberty, taken in the meaning of autonomy and independence of man, society, and State, from God and His Church.

Born of Encyclopedism, liberalism finds a philosophical justification in Kantianism (q.v.), and gains strength with naturalism and rationalism (q.v.); with the French Revolution it enters the sociopolitical field and manifests itself as exaggerated democracy (sovereign people), as separatism with respect to the relations between Church and State (“A free church in a free State”), as indifferatism in matters of religion and worship, and as abstentionism (noninterference) of the State in economics (“Leave everything to private initiative”).

In the first half of the past century this dangerous and erroneous current made great inroads among Catholic ranks, assuming a more moderate form and insisting especially on the separation of Church from State and on broad-mindedness with regard to a liberal spirit. Characteristic in this connection was the Catholic-Liberal movement in France, led by Félicité de Lamennais, and followed enthusi-
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liberty. See freedom.

liberty of Christ. See will, divine; will of Christ.

liberty of thought and inquiry. See free thought (free inquiry).

Liebermann. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 393).

limbo (Lat. limbus — border, hem of a garment). According to the present teaching of the Church, it is a place adjoining hell, where the just who died in the grace of God before Christianity dwelled until they were liberated by Christ, and where babies who die without baptism dwell and remain forever. Holy Scripture speaks of Abraham's bosom as sojourner of the just (Luke 16:22), but not of a place for babies who died without baptism. Tradition begins, especially with the Greek Fathers, to differentiate between adults who die in personal sin and infants who die with original sin, who cannot enter the heaven of the blessed and yet cannot share the fate of the damned in hell. Reactions against Pelagianism, which denied the transmission of original sin and its consequences, St. Augustine, endeavoring to defend this truth, held that babies who die without baptism will be subjected to the pain of fire, albeit very slight, on account of original sin. This opinion later on influenced some theologians, but it did not hinder the course of the other more correct and more benign opinion, according to which babies who die without baptism will suffer only privation of the beatific vision. This opinion was defended and developed by St. Thomas, and from then on prevailed in the schools. We find it in a letter of Innocent III to the archbishop of Arles, and in the Constitution Autorum fidei with which Pius VI condemned the Synod of Pistoia (DB, 1526).

The babies in limbo will not enjoy the vision of God, but will not be unhappy on this score, since the beatific vision is a supernatural good of which they have knowledge. Some theologians (Bilott) think that limbo is the eternal residence not only of babies and abnormal adults who did not have the use of reason, but also of certain classes of men of low-grade civilization, who are comparable to babies in the lack of development of moral consciousness.

A strange opinion has recently gained favor in the teachings of Protestants and Orthodox Schismatics who, by abusive interpretation of some gnostic expressions (Matt. 12:34; 2 Pet. 2:18; 4:16), hold that all pagans are evangelized in limbo after their death and given the possibility of conversion and salvation. This opinion is critically untenable.
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liturgy (Gr. λειτουργία, from λειτον ἱερεύω — public office or ministry). The official worship the Church renders to God, or, to describe it more extensively, the complex of the acts by which the Church, in union with Christ, her Head, and externally represented by His ministers, offers to God the homage of adoration and of praise (ascendent mediation) and communicates to souls the divine gifts of grace (descendent mediation).

According to this concept, the liturgy includes essentially the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the attached official prayer (recitation of the Breviary) and the administration of the sacraments with the annexed use of the sacramentals (q.v.).

Since the homage paid to God and the infusion of grace into souls must be perennial, in application of the merits acquired by Christ by the acts of religion emanating from Him from the first instant of the Incarnation, the liturgy, on the one hand, renews daily the offering of the Mass and repeats the administration of the sacraments, and, on the other hand, establishes an annual cycle in which are repeated the mysteries of the birth, death, and glorious life of Jesus Christ, from which Christian worship draws all its value. "The Church renews each year her youth, like an eagle, because in the liturgical cycle she is visited by her Spouse in proportion to her necessities. Each year she receives Him, as a baby in the crib (Advent and Christmas period), as fasting on the mountain (Lent), as immolating Himself on the cross and as risen from the sepulcher (Paschal cycle), as founding the Church, instituting the sacraments, sitting at the right hand of the Father in the act of sending the Holy Spirit (period of Pentecost). The whole cycle is studied with saints; by contemplating them we know the way that leads to Christ. Above all shines Mary, offering herself as a mirror of justice wherein is reflected all holiness pos-
sible in a simple creature” (Guéranger, L’Année liturgique, Préface Générale).

For twenty centuries the Church, like an industrious bee, has been working on her liturgical books, which may be divided into two classes: (1) The Missal and the Breviary, containing the formulas and the rites necessary for the celebration of the Mass and the recital of the Psalms, the “sacrificium laudis” (books referring to ascendant mediation). (2) The Pontifical and the Ritual, containing the formulas and rites for the administration of the sacraments and the sacramentals (books referring to descendant mediation).

The study of the origin, development, and content of these books constitutes liturgical science, while the learning of the ceremonies accompanying the use of them is called liturgical practice.
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“loci theologici” (theological sources). The expression has become classic, following the work of Melchior Cano, O.P. (+1560), entitled De locis theologici, which, on the road of theology, is likened to a milestone: the end of a long stretch and the beginning of a new journey faithfully traveled by posterity. According to Cano’s definition, which re-echoes ideas familiar to Aristotle (róvos), to Cicero (sedes et domicilia), and to Rudolph Agricola, skillfully adapted, however, to the altogether particular nature of theology, the theological sources or loci are: tamquam domicilia omnium argumentorum theologorum, quibus theologorum omnes suas argumentationes sive ad confirmandum sive ad refutandum inventiuntur (“the building or arsenal, a storehouse of all theological arguments, in which theologians find all their arguments either to prove or to refute”; M. Cano, De locis theologici, l. 1, c. 3). Since theology is founded on revealed truths contained in Holy Scripture and Tradition, the interpretation of which is entrusted to the living magisterium of the Church (q.v.) manifested through the definitions of the councils, the decisions of the popes, the common teaching of the Fathers and the theologians, Cano distinguished seven loci theologici, in the strict sense of the word: Holy Scripture, Tradition, the magisterium of the Church, the councils, the decisions of the popes, the holy Fathers, and the theologians. He added three more, as not proper, or annexed, namely: human reason, philosophy, and history.
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Logos (Gr. ἴδιος—thought, word; Lat. verbum). The term with which St. John designates the Son of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity (Gospel, Prologue; Apoc. 1:13). In all the New Testament only St. John uses this designation in a personal sense. For this reason many rationalist critics have maintained, and some still maintain, the thesis of the derivation of the Prologue of St. John from Hellenistic philosophical teachings, flourishing in Alexandria at that time, and more precisely from the Jewish philosopher Philo, who was imbued with Hellenism.

As a matter of fact, the word Logos and the doctrine relative thereto are found in Stoicism and Alexandria-Neoplatonism. The Stoics admitted a Logos immanent in the world as the rational principle of all things, which manifests itself as energy of cohesion and life, as thought and will. This Logos, divine principle and soul of the world, is well fitted in the pantheistic conception proper to Stoicism (q.v.).

The Neoplatonists, on the other hand, developed the theory of the Logos from the concept of the Demiurge, which Plato placed as intermediary between the transcendent God and the material world. Thus the Logos of Plato was not God, but something between God and men, a craftsman who molded pre-existing matter into imitations of subsisting ideas. Philo adopted and merged together the two antithetic conceptions, formulating a hybrid doctrine of the Logos, which for him became now the divine wisdom, now the image of God, now one of His angels, or again the high priest, or a law and vital force of nature. It is quite difficult to draw a precise concept from the Philonian writings, due in part to the fact that the author frequently makes use of symbolism and rhetoric.

St. John’s Logos certainly had nothing whatsoever to do with Philo’s, at least for these two obvious reasons: (a) while the gospel Logos is a living person, the historical Christ, Creator and Redeemer of the world, the Logos of Philo has no personal features, but is reducible to a vague allegory, variable as the mythological Proteus; (b) the gospel Logos is God, truly and properly, while that of Philo is called divine, at times called even God, but in a metaphorical sense, as the author himself declares. For these and other motives, serious criticism no longer speaks of derivation of one doctrine from the other. The true sources of St. John’s Logos are the sapiential books of the Old Testament and thechristological doctrines of St. Paul, who applies to Christ the vivid personifications and attributes of the divine Wisdom, which at times is called also Logos in those books of the Old Testament. See Word.
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“lumen gloriae” (light of glory). A supernatural gift bestowed by God on the intellect of the blessed to render it capable of seeing intuitively the divine essence. In Holy Scripture there are only a few minor traces of this light, as in Psalm 35:10: “And in thy light we shall see light”; in Apocalypse 22:4 ff., it is said that the blessed will see the face of God without need of light, because God Himself will illuminate them.

The Fathers, commenting on these texts, mention a divine help which makes the human intellect capable of seeing God. Thus Irenaeus, Adv. Haereses, I, IV, c. 20; Epiphanius, Adv. Haereses, 70, 7.

Toward the end of the thirteenth century the Beghards and the Beguines (see Beghards), a pseudo-
spiritualistic sect, went around preaching that man with his own powers can attain beatitude, even in this life, without any divine aid. The Council of Vienne (1311-1312) condemned, among other errors attributed to them, the following: “The soul does not need the light of glory to see God and enjoy beatitude” (DB, 475).

The Church magisterium thus declares the existence of the “light of glory,” without entering into the question of its essence. The theologians have developed a whole teaching about the lumen gloriae, based on those data: all agree, especially after the Council of Vienne, in admitting its existence, but all do not agree on determining its nature.

Some taking inspiration from nominalism, speak of the beatific vision as of an ineradicable actuated by God’s power in the blessed soul which remains simply passive: thus the light of glory would be God Himself, inasmuch as He illumines the soul. This theory is antipychological because it does not take into account that cognition, whether in the natural or the supernatural order, is a vital act and, therefore, must spring forth from the powers of the soul and remain in the soul as its own act. St. Thomas, coherent in his analysis of the beatific vision and the principles of human psychology, teaches that, since the created intellect is not proportionate to the immediate intuition of the divine essence, it must be disposed and prepared for it by an inherent and permanent force or energy. To put it more clearly, he reduces the lumen gloriae to a habitual quality (similar to a virtue) infused by God in the intellect of the blessed to elevate it operatively to the immediate vision of the divine essence. This infused quality forms one sole operative principle with the intellect, so that the vital act of the beatific vision proceeds in its entirety from both, the intellect and the lumen, under diverse aspects. This teaching has now become the common one.

The lumen gloriae (id sub quae — that under which the vision proceeds) does not exclude immediacy of the vision, and it is more or less intense according to the degree of sanctifying grace in which the soul is found at the moment of death.
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Lutheranism. This term can be taken: (1) as a religious sect, one of the many swarming from the so-called Reformation of Martin Luther; (2) as a doctrinal system, created by Luther and propagated by him and by his first disciples in opposition to the Church and to the Catholic doctrine. This second acceptance of Lutheranism is the one that interests the theologian.

Luther (1483-1546) was born at Eisleben, but lived most of his life in Erfurt and Wittenberg in Germany. His childhood was saddened by oppression of stern discipline at home and in school. He was extraordinarily talented, but had exuberant emotions and violent passions, always in conflict with his religious education, which was not devoid of superstition. He became an Augustinian friar, after experiencing a great fright during a thunderstorm. He studied in an environment dominated by the nominalism of Ockham (which played down human reason) and Augustinianism (which discounted human freedom and activity under the action of God).

In the monastery he showed himself at first scrupulous in the observance of religious life, but gradually began to succumb to the concupiscence of the flesh, whence the violent drama of his spirit frightened by the thought of damnation. As professor of Holy Scripture at Wittenberg in 1515-1516, he expounded St. Paul’s Letter to the Romans, which speaks of original sin and the problem of justification. In St. Paul he believed he found the greatest principle of his system; namely, that faith without works is sufficient to justify and sanctify man. The moral and intellectual shipwreck of his spirit was already accomplished when, in 1517, the occasion presented itself to make it evident; it was the preaching of the indulgences entrusted to the Dominicans, against which Luther vigorously protested (not without motivation of jealousy), fastening his 95 theses against the doctrine of indulgences (q.v.) to the door of the Church of the Castle of Wittenberg. In 1520, Leo X issued against Luther and his errors the bull, Exsurge Domine. Thus began the Lutheran rebellion which was to sever so great a part of Europe from the true Church of Christ.

Outline of the Lutheran doctrine:
(1) Original justice (q.v.) was con-
natural to Adam, like sight to the eyes.
(2) Original sin (loss of original justice) has, therefore, corrupted intrinsically human nature in such a way that man is no longer capable of doing any good at all.
(3) By original sin man’s reason has degenerated and free will no longer exists.
(4) Therefore, man is no longer responsible for his acts, especially since he is tyrannically dominated by concupiscence, which is intrinsically sinful even in its instinctive movements.
(5) Man, fallen through original sin, is incurable, so deeply that not even God can heal him any more. Therefore the Redemption (q.v.) is entirely a work extrinsic to us, a work done by Christ, who substitutes Himself for us in order to pay the penalty of our sins to the divine justice (penal substitution). Human justification is done extrinsically—in a negative way, i.e., by covering up sin (not by removing it), and in a positive way, i.e., by attributing (imputatio) to us the holiness and the merits of Christ.
(6) There is no habitual grace in us; actual grace is not a power or a quality of the soul, but is God Himself working in us.
(7) The only good act man can do is the act of fiducial faith or abandonment of self to God, by which He confides in His mercy and trusts that His sins have been pardoned. (8) Consequently, the sacraments have no longer any raison d'être: Luther keeps baptism, penance (by which the remission of sins is declared but not effected), and the Supper (which is no longer the Mass). The bread and the wine in the Eucharist remain as they are, but Christ makes Himself present in
Macedonians. Name derived from Macedon, bishop of Constantinople (A.D. 360), who, however, does not seem to have professed the erroneous doctrine of the so-called Macedonians. This teaching, already proposed by Arius and Eunomius, consisted in the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, who was held to be a creature of the Son. Therefore, these heretics are more properly called Pneumatomachists (enemies of the Spirit) or Maronists, from the name of one of their leaders, Maron, bishop of Nicomedia. Informed of this new error, the last one influenced by Ariusanism, St. Athanasius, from his retreat in the Egyptian desert, wrote three letters to Bishop Serapion to refute it. The heresy was condemned by the I Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381); Pope Damasus ratified its decisions in the Council of Rome in 382.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


magisterium of the Church.

The power conferred by Christ upon His Church and strengthened with the charism of infallibility, by which the teaching Church (Ecclesia docens) is constituted as the unique depository and authentic interpreter of divine revelation to be proposed authoritatively to men as the object of faith for their eternal salvation. That this teaching power is of divine institution can be perceived clearly from the words with which Christ, on the point of leaving this earth, entrusts to the Apostles the mission of evangelizing the world: “Going therefore, teach ye all nations” (Matt. 28:19); “Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16:15). The means, therefore, established by Christ for the propagation of His teaching is not writing, but oral preaching, living magisterium to which He assures His personal assistance to the end of the world, saying in the sequence of the text quoted from St. Matthew: “Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.” These words prove also that the magisterium founded by Christ is perpetual and infallible (see infallibility). Entrusted to the Apostolic College (Apostles as a body) after the constitution of Peter’s primacy, foundation, and supreme pastor of the Church (Matt. 16:18; John 21:15 ff.), this teaching authority resides primarily in Peter and his successors as its source, and then in the Apostles and their successors, the bishops, subordinately to the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

Tradition, from St. Ignatius to St. Irenaeus and St. Augustine, recognizes this hierarchical constitution, and against doctrinal and moral aberrations makes constant appeal to the teaching of the Roman Church and its bishop, in whom St. Peter lives along with his primacy (see primacy of St. Peter). St. Augustine, picking up the voice of Tradition, goes so far as to say that he would not even believe the Gospel if the Church magisterium did not propose it to him to believe (Contra ep. undam., c. 5, PL, 42, 176).

According to Catholic doctrine, therefore, Holy Scripture and Tradition are only the remote rule of faith, while the proximate rule is the living magisterium of the Church, which resides in the Roman pontiff and in the bishops, to whom as they are subject to and united with him. The Vatican Council (sess. 4, c. 4, DB, 1873) has sealed this truth by defining that in the primacy of Peter and his successors is included the supreme power of teaching, which is veritas et fidis numquam deficiens charisma (“the charism of never failing truth and faith”). Luther dared to impugn this truth that had been lived for fifteen centuries of Christianity and, denying the magisterium of the Church, proclaimed in its stead Holy Scripture, entrusted to the individual interpretation of the faithful, as the one sole rule of faith. But even to prescind from its open contradiction to revelation, this theory shows itself false by its own fruits matured over a period of four centuries: the innumerable Protestant sects with their characteristic doctrinal confusion and degeneration are evident proof of the failure of that principle and its falsity (see Protestantism: articles, fundamental). Reason itself sees the necessity of an easy and sure guide for the life of faith, considering the difficulty, for a great part of mankind, of the study and interpretation of Holy Scripture.
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Maldonatus. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 303).

man.

man. In the light of Christian doctrine the concept of man reposes on principles which have to do with the natural sciences, philosophy, and theology. Supposing the scientific and philosophical treatment, we set forth the statements of revelation and of the ecclesiastical magisterium on the nature, dignity, and end of man.

1. Man is a being composed of matter and spirit. This truth is guaranteed by the account of Genesis and by the whole traditional teaching of the Church, which defends the grandeur and immortality of the soul (IV Lateran Council, Council of Vienna, V Lateran Council, Vatican Council), and with it the dignity of the body (cf. the sacramental liturgy, the matrimonial legislation, the funeral rite, the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh).

2. The soul, superior to the body because of its intelligence and free will (image of God), is not, however, in conflict with it, but is its substantial form (Council of Vienna), so that soul and body constitute one sole being, or individual, or person.

3. Man's personality is sacred: through it we conceive human rights and duties, through it we understand equality and fraternity, above all differences of sex, of race, of social and cultural position. For the Church there are no castes, but only persons,
Manichaeism. A religious doctrinal system founded and diffused in the second century by Manes or Manet (Mana — spirit of the luminous world), a philosopher of Persian descent, born in the Babylonian region. The childhood of Manes is rich with legend. Many sources are lost and, therefore, it is difficult to reconstruct the history of Manichaeism and its founder. Certainly, the new sect spread with surprising rapidity in Europe, in the Near and the Far East, despite persecutions and hostility of all kinds. In those times Chaldea was a concentration point for nearly all the religions of the West and the East; thus, it was easy for Manes to elaborate a syncretism of various elements.

From the fragments of Manichaean writings and still more from indirect sources, first of which is St. Augustine, a Manichaean before being converted to Christianity, we can reconstruct in synthesis the doctrine of Manichaeism, which, moreover, had its liturgy and its asceticism. The fundamental principle of Manichaeism is dualism between spirit and matter, light and darkness, good and evil. The principle of good is God, identified with the light; the principle of evil is Hyle (matter), which the people identify with the devil (Satan). The origin of the world and of man is complicated with mythology, which reminds us of Gnosticism (q.v.). There is talk of original sin, of the slavery of the soul which Jesus comes to liberate (Redemption). Man, like the world, is a mixture of good and evil; to be saved, he must observe strict mortification in words and in works, especially in the struggle against sensuality. Pasts, vegetarian diet, abstinence from marriage and from sensual pleasures form the austere moral code, at least of the Elect (the real faithful). Greater liberty is granted to the Auditors. Manichaeans' eschatology draws from the Christian teaching and other sources. A Manichaean Church with its hierarchy was founded, which administered two sacraments: baptism and eucharist (bread and water, consecrated).

St. Augustine refuted the various aspects of Manichaeism in a series of works. However, it was not completely disbanded, but continued to exist or less subreptitiously here and there. It reappeared strong and threatening after the eleventh century with rejuvenated form in the heresy of the Cathars (Albigenses in Southern France), against whom Innocent III had to promote a crusade, such as the audacity and profound corruption of this sect (see Albigenses). The IV Lateran Council (1215) in its definitions aims at the Albigenses together with other religious sects (DB, 428 ff.).

Marathonians. See Macedonians.

Gnostics (see Gnosticism), but was not a Gnostic. He took, on the contrary, an anti-Gnostic position, because he preferred to the proud science (gnosis) a rigorous and practical asceticism, proposed as the one means of salvation. In considering the differences between the Old and the New Testaments, Marcion came to the conclusion that the Gospel is the antithesis and the indictment of the Old Testament. The Apostles failed to understand Christ and, what is more, they adulterated His thought. Only St. Paul understood thoroughly the divine Master when he condemned Judaism. In the Old Testament God is the God of justice and severity, sowing sorrows and tribulations in mankind; the God of the New Testament, on the other hand, is the God of goodness and love who manifests Himself in Jesus Christ, Saving Spirit, man only in appearance, who dies for us to free us from the tyranny of the Hellenism (God of the Old Testament). We adhere to the Saviour by mortification of the flesh, by abstaining from pleasures and luxury, and by suffering willingly, even martyrdom.

Expelled from the Christian communities, Marcion established an ecclesiastical organization and hierarchy of his own. He attracted many followers, especially by the example of his austere life. His immediate follower, Apelles, however introduced some real changes in the master's system. The Eunomites (q.v.), who condemned marriage, hark back to Marcion. It cannot be denied that Marcion was animated by a sincere desire of ascetical perfection for himself and others, but he committed the grave error of repudiating the doctrinal wealth of Christianity and the genuineness of the apostolic Church, the work not only of the other Apostles but of Paul as well, whom...
Marcion arbitrarily set against the others. The opinion of some scholars (cf. E. Bueno, Storia del Cristianesimo, I), who love to see in Marcion a providential reformer and even a martyr to the official church, is an evident exaggeration and error in the evaluation of historical data. In the bosom of the true Church Marcion would have found satisfaction for his ascetic tendencies, coupled with a providential check on his aberrations.
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marks of the Church. The characteristic signs which distinguish the Church, as the real and true institution of Christ, from the many religious societies which claim that honor.

According to the common teaching, confirmed in great part by the Vatican Council (DB, 1794), the marks (noae — notes) of the Church are the four qualities or endowments which the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol attributes to the religious society founded by Jesus Christ: unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity (q.q.s.). It should be noted, however, that these properties constitute the identification and individual marks of the true Church, not in that they have their origin in the supernatural and hidden principle that rules the ecclesiastical organism, but inasmuch as they are manifest externally and visibly to the eyes of all as the effect of that mysterious force. For example, unity is a mark of the Church not because the souls are spiritually united through faith, grace, and the Holy Spirit, to the one Head, Christ, but because from this invisible and real communion of spirits there results, externally and experimentally, contact in dogmas, in liturgy, in hierarchy; the unity of millions of men, professing the same faith, frequenting the same sacraments, obeying the same pastors.

Those who can be classed as Christians are divided into three large groups: Protestants, Schismatics, Catholics.

It is clear that Protestantism (q.q.s.), considered in its various sects, lacks unity, since each sect is independent; it lacks sanctity, because in five centuries of existence it has not produced any masterpiece of grace, like the canonized saints of the Roman Church; it lacks catholicity, because none of its sects is present in a really conspicuous way and at one time in all the world; it lacks apostolicity, because it has rejected the power of orders (in Protestantism all are priests!) and the power of jurisdiction, by detaching itself from the apostolic stock.

Analogous observations hold for the Schismatic Churches, which surely lack unity, by constituting independent and national patriarchates (autoccephalous), and catholicity, because they are limited to definite Eastern localities.

The Roman Church, on the other hand, appears as clearly individualized by these four marks, which are like four refugial jewels, attracting upon her the eyes of the infidels and assuring Catholics of her divine mission (cf. Vatican Council, DB, 1794).

The unity of this Church is evident, completely centered in the pope, that very vigilant custodian of dogmatic, liturgical, and disciplinary unity. Virtue visibly flourish in her and the fruits of sanctity are seen maturing so conspicuously and in such great numbers as to require, to record them, a society of scholars like the Bollandists. Evident, too, is the fact of the original, simultaneous, progressive universality of this Church, which unfolds her tents from one pole to the other. Finally, the apostolicity of her origin is proved visibly in the uninterrupted succession of popes in the Apostolic See, to which all the others are united.
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martyrdom (Gr. μαρτυρίαν, from μαρτυρέω — witness). The martyr is one who testifies to Christ and His doctrine by voluntarily undergoing death or at least sufferings inflicted on him precisely out of hatred toward Christ and His religion.

This concept is already in the Gospel: Jesus Himself prophetically exhorts His disciples to be the witnesses of His life and His words (John 15:27; Luke 24:26). He even predicts in detail their lot: they will be chased from the Synagogue, betrayed by their own relatives, accused and hauled before kings and governors and put to death for His name (Matt. 10:17, 24; Luke 21:21). The Apostles protest before the whole world that they are the martyrs, the witnesses of Christ, and are not afraid of death (Acts 21:13; 1 Pet. 5:1).

The martyrdom of the Apostles and of their earliest associates is a bloody seal of the historical reality of the Gospel, considered as a fact, and of its truth, considered as the teaching of our Saviour. Those martyrs attested by their blood what they had seen, had heard, and what they believed, whereas the martyrdom of the martyrs of the following centuries, who died because they believed, has rather a moral than a historical value.

Martyrdom, taken as a whole, constitutes an apologetic argument, or motive of credibility, for the truth of the Christian faith. The sacred name of martyr belongs only to one who renders testimony to the divine truth, which is only in Christ and His Church; this generous testimony of blood, founded on the faith, is such, according to Christian doctrine, that it substitutes for baptism and renders the soul of the martyr worthy of immediate entrance into heaven. The Church prays to the martyrs, but has never prayed for the martyrs.

Outside the Church there is no true and proper martyrdom: a heretic in good faith, who dies for Christ, perhaps may be counted among the martyrs; but a contumacious heretic who dies for his sect is not a martyr because he does not testify to the divine truth but to a human teaching.
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Mary (Hebr. Miriam, of doubtful etymology, probably meaning lady). The scarcity of prophetic texts and historical gospel data on the Mother of Jesus embarrasses only a superficial and overcurious reader; actually, we have at our disposal all the essential elements for a complete judgment on the personality, greatness, and mission of Mary. She is in the foreground of the divine plan of salvation as outlined in the Old Testament and realized in the New. In the tragedy of the first sin, in contrast with Eve, the Mother of the Messiah takes her stand beside Him in the definitive victory over Satan (see protosangeumian). There is a consciousness of her presence in the successive centuries of Messianic expectation. In 734 B.C. the striking announcement of Isaiah (7:14; cf. Matt. 1:22) reveals her as Mother-Virgin of the
Emmanuel (see virginity of Mary), and the contemporary Michæas (5:1–2) shows her giving birth at Bethlehem. In the sixth century B.C., the prophet of Israel’s tragedy sees in her “the new prodigy” and “the woman who protects the hero” (Jer. 31:22).

In the gospel story Mary dominates the accounts of the infancy of Jesus, which, as even non-Catholic critics recognize, go back through Luke to her own testimony. The mention of her name, her descent from David (Luke 1:26–37, 32, 69), her condition of fiancée about to conclude marriage with Joseph, of the House of David, provide us with the framework for the narrative of the annunciation of the divine maternity, which is for the perfect understanding of the modern psychology and the personality of Mary. Conscious of the gravity of the angelic proposition, she accepts only after asking explanations on the circumstances of the event (Luke 1:32–38). The tumult of thoughts and feelings that wells up in her heart moves forth in the Magnificat, which shows how very familiar Mary was with the sacred texts and how very much in harmony her Messianic expectation was with the most authentic prophetic tradition (Luke 1:39–56).

From then on Mary appears as an instrument of choice graces. At her voice the precursor in Elizabeth’s womb becomes aware of the presence of the Lord. The intimate tragedy of Joseph, confronted with the mysterious maternal condition of his wife, is resolved by the revelation of the great mysteries fulfilled in her (Matt. 1:18–24). The account of Jesus’ birth gives Mary the leading role (Luke 2:16), while the Magi, first fruits of paganism around the Messias’ crib, find Jesus in her arms (Matt. 2:11).

The troubles following Bethlehem’s joy’s outline for Mary a path of persecution and sorrow, which is explicitly revealed to her in the prophetic words of old Simeon (Luke 2:22–35); the future awaiting her during the whole life of Jesus. The long interlude of the calm life at Nazareth is broken by the episode of Jesus missing and found in the Temple, which gives us an insight into both Mary’s delicacy of heart, anxiously looking for her Child and the silent faith with which she accepts the mysterious remark, made by Him, that His mission is independent of any human bond (Luke 2:41–52). The thirty years Mary lived intimately with her Son, whom she knows is the Son of God, in an altogether normal life and without any extraordinary event to reveal to her eyes or to the people of Nazareth (cf. Matt. 13:55; Mark 6:3) the divine nature and the power of Jesus, constitute the exact measure of the depth of her faith and virtue.

Mary may be considered materially absent during the public ministry of Jesus; however, at Cana of Galilee, the first miracle of Christ is exhibited as an exception made through His mother’s intervention. This incident shows how well she knows her Son and how sure she is of His omnipotence. The discretion and the decision of Mary’s intervention with her Son are matched with the respect Jesus shows her before men, addressing her with the solemn title, Mutter — “Woman” (John 2:1–11; cf. 10:26).

Twice Mary meets her Son in His apostolic journeys (John 2:12; Matt. 12:46, and parallel texts), but her presence is not stressed. Twice Jesus speaks of His Mother (Matt. 12:49–50, and parallel texts; Luke 11:27) and His words, while apparently hard, are nevertheless the best praise of her. Jesus says: “Whosoever shall do the will of my Father that is in heaven, he is my mother”; and, in answer to the woman who had exalted the Master’s mother, calling her “blessed,” He affirms: “Rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it.” In both cases, far from refusing praise to Mary, He holds her up as a perfect model, for He means that men ought to know that Mary was great not only as the Mother of Jesus, but also because she reacted to that gratuitous privilege with all her capacity of love, obedience, and sacrifice.

Mary reappears during Jesus’ passion. Recognizing Mother under her Son’s cross, who entrusts her to His beloved apostle (John 19:25–27) as the sign and pledge of a wider maternity.

The historian of the primitive Church shows Mary at the head of the disciples assembled in expectation of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:14), Mother and Mistress of the Church.

In an absolutely normal, exterior life Mary was able to keep closed up in her heart the most secret mysteries of God. At the time of the annunciation she was about twelve years old. We do not know how old she was at the time of her glorious passage, but we can say that she lived a full life. (See Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; Co-redemptrix; Immaculate Conception; maternity, divine; maternity, spiritual; virginity of Mary.)
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Mass (Lat. missio — dismissal; from the fourth century the whole body of the ceremonies of the Eucharistic Sacrifice received its name from the ceremony of dismissing the catechumens before the Offertory of the Mass). The Mass is the Sacrifice of the New Law. The supreme act of cult could not be lacking to Christianity, which is the perfect religion, and therefore Christ enriched His Church with the unbloody sacrifice that it might be the perpetual commemoration and perennial application of the merits acquired in the bloody sacrifice of the cross. Indeed, the Mass is the repetition of the Last Supper, according to the Lord’s command: “Do this for a commemoration
of me.” Now, the Last Supper was a true sacrifice because the expressions used by Christ: “This is my Body, which is given for you” (Luke 22:19), “This is my Blood of the new testament, which is shed for many unto remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28), according to biblical style, are properly sacrificial terms (cf. Gal. 1:14; Eph. 5:22; Lev. 17:5; 1 Pet. 1:18). This conclusion is efficaciously confirmed by the prophecy of Malachi 3:10–11, which predicts a sacrifice whose characteristics of holiness and universality are verified only in the Mass, and by Tradition which, by its liturgical praxis and open testimonies of the Fathers, assures us of the will of Christ to institute a real and proper sacrifice to endure to the end of the world (1 Cor. 11:26). From these data of revelation the Church has an excessive store of reasons to oppose, in the Council of Trent (sess. 22), the Protestants who absolutely ostracize the sacrifice of the altar.

Theologians questioned for a long time how the liturgy of the Mass, which is accomplished in the three great acts of Offertory, Consistence, and Communion, realizes in itself the true essence of sacrifice. In all real sacrifices, offerer, victim, and sacrificial act are to be considered. This act includes two elements: the one material, i.e., oblation, the other formal, i.e., immolation.

All are in agreement, after the declaration of the Council of Trent, in recognizing that Christ is the Priest and the principal Victim that is offered and immolated in the act of the double consecration of bread and wine. But the agreement is sharply split when it comes to explaining in just what the sacrificial aspect of the double consecration essentially consists.

Leaving aside the opinion of Bellarmine, Suarez, and Franzelin, who affirm a physical immolation in the Mass, which seems excessive, as that of De la Taille and Lepin, who are satisfied with the oblation alone and, therefore, err on the short side, it would seem best to hold to the traditional teaching that represents the sacrifice of the Mass as a real oblation and immolation of a mystical and sacramental order. This teaching begins as it were, from the original datum of the double consecration: the body alone being under the species of bread by virtue of the words (ei verbum), and only the blood being in the same way under the species of wine, it follows that the body of Christ, not in itself but only as contained under the appearances of bread, is separated from the blood as contained under the distinct appearances of wine; thus we have a true, but mystic, immolation, such as is realizable now, given the imposability of the glorious body of the Redeemer. This teaching, which is in perfect alignment with the Council of Trent (DB, 938, 940), is supported by the most beautiful testimonies of Tradition, from the Nazianzen to St. Augustine, and by the authority of great theologians, from St. Thomas to Bilott.
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Patristic contributions to the debate include:


Mastrius. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 303).

Materialism. See pantheism.

maternity, divine (of the Blessed Virgin). The foundation of all the greatness and the privileges of Mary. The title, De Divinis, Deipara: Mother of God, God-bearing, expressed this truth in the common language of the faithful from the first centuries. Theodoro of Mopsuestia and Nestorius (fifth century; see Nestorianism) were the first to impugn that title, maintaining coherently with their Christological error that Mary gave birth to the man Jesus of Nazareth, in which the divine Word dwelt, Mary, therefore, according to Nestorians, is mother of Christ (man), not mother of God; and that is also evident from the fact that the eternal God cannot be born in time. St. Cyril of Alexandria opposed this heresy with the weight of centuries of Tradition as well as the force of theological reasoning based on the mystery of the hypostatic union (q.e.). The Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorianism (a. 431), affirming, together with the true divinity of Christ, the divine maternity of Mary; it was called, for this reason, “Mary’s Council.”

Holy Scripture several times calls Mary Mother of Jesus in the proper sense of the word (Matt. 1:18; John 1:25). Elizabeth even greet her as mater Domini mei (“Mother of my Lord”). In order to prove theologically this truth of faith, a simple reasoning will suffice: Christ is the incarnate Word, i.e., a divine Person subsisting in both the divine nature and the assumed human nature. Now Mary gave birth to Christ in His personal integrity, although through the line of human nature; therefore, she is truly mother of the Word, i.e., of God. It would be impertinent to object to the fact that the Word with its divine nature does not derive from Mary, before whom it existed: St. Cyril answered this by saying that our human soul is infused by God and does not derive from our parents; nevertheless none of us hesitates to call himself son of his own mother as to his whole being. We should remember that the Word is the term of an eternal generation from the Father and of a temporal generation from His Mother; two generations, two births, but not two filiations (relationships of son). Christ is the Son of God and remains such even when He assumes human nature: no change, no new relationship in the immutable Him. He is also truly the Son of Mary, but the mutual relationship is real (i.e., is a relatio reals in the philosophical meaning) only in the direction Mother to Son, not in the direction Son to Mother. Finally, no son is so much his mother’s as Jesus is Mary’s, since she conceived Him without insemination from man.
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Terrien, La Mere de Dieu et la Mere des hommes.
matrimony, spiritual (of the Blessed Virgin). Mary, true Mother of the Son of God (see matrimony divine), is the spiritual mother of the whole human race, in whose salvation she co-operated with the Redeemer. This truth is foreshadowed on Calvary when the dying Christ entrusted the Blessed Virgin to John, and John to her: “Woman, behold thy son!” Then he says to the disciple: “Behold thy mother” (John 19:26-27). Origen commented that Christ lives in every perfect Christian, who, therefore, is called son of Mary. The Fathers draw a parallel between Eve, mother of sin (the dead), and Mary, mother of life (the living) (cf. Justin, Irenaeus). Besides the testimony of the dying Jesus, there is a profound theological reason touched on by St. Augustine (De Virginitate, 5:6): Mary is the Mother of all men because she is the Mother of Christ, of whom men are mystical members. Pius X: “In the most chaste womb of His Mother, Christ took His flesh and with it a spiritual body, composed of the future faithful. Therefore, in a spiritual and mystical way we are called sons of Mary and she is the Mother of us all” (encycl. Ad diem illam).
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matrimony (Lat. matris munus—office of mother). The sacrament which prepares new candidates for the kingdom of God. In the first pages of Holy Scripture (Gen. 2:23 ff.; cf. Matt. 19:4 ff.) the structure of matrimony is sketched as a natural contract (officium naturae). Its elements are: (1) It is instituted indirectly in the constitution of the two sexes, which attract each other by natural instinct, and directly by the positive intervention of the Creator, narrated in Genesis. (2) It is constituted, in each instance, by the mutual consent by which a man and a woman unit for the purposes intended by God. (3) It is characterized by two basic qualities, i.e., unity and indissolubility: “two in one flesh.” (4) It is ordered to procreation, as its principal end: “increase and multiply” (Gen. 1:27-28); to mutual help, as its secondary end: aditusorium simile sibi (“a helper like himself,” Gen. 2:18); and to the discipline of the disorderly instinct of the flesh, as an accessory end. (5) It has a sacred character, recognized by all peoples in the religious ceremonies with which it is surrounded, and openly revealed by God in the New Testament when He called matrimony the symbol of the future union of Christ with the Church (Eph. 5:32). From the fall of Adam to the time of the Redemption this primitive unity and indissolubility was not always observed. Not only were the pagans hardened to divorce and polygamy, but even the chosen people, on account of their hardness of heart, so to speak, a sort of dispensation from God Himself, and very quickly degenerated to that low moral level from which Christ came to free the world.

First of all, Christ restored marriage to its primitive purity, putting back into effect the law of unity (Matt. 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18), sanctioning that of indissolubility with the well-known Quod Deus constituit, homo non separa (“Let no man sever what God has joined together,” Matt. 19:6). He then elevated the institution of matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament. This elevation, foreshadowed in Christ's manner of acting, suggested more clearly by St. Paul (Eph. 5:20-32), and openly taught by Tradition, transferred the officium naturae into the supernatural order and put it in the light of the union of Christ with the Church, from which it receives its proper physiognomy. Indeed, as the union of Christ with the Church (1) is born of that generous self-giving, (2) through which Jesus Christ in the effusion of His purest love gives Himself forever (indissolubility) to one Spouse alone (unity), (3) to make her spiritually fruitful, till His Mystical Body is completed; so Christian marriage, (a) finds its genesis in mutual self-giving expressed externally in the words of the contract (the sensible rite of the sacrament), (b) which produces between the man and woman a bond which is one, because exclusive of a third party, and indissoluble, because lasting till death, (c) for the principal end of fecundity, that is of multiplying citizens in the kingdom of God, to which is added the secondary purpose of mutual help and comfort and the accessory end of moderating the movements of concupiscence.

For the attainment of these ends marriage asks God for and produces ex opere operato sanctifying and sacramental grace, which establishes a particular and constant orientation of the supernatural organism of the husband and the wife, to which is annexed a spirit of uprightness in the prosecution of the offspring of reciprocal justice and charity in bearing the family burdens, and in carrying out the difficult task of raising the children in a Christian way. By reason of its supernatural elevation, matrimony is withdrawn from the interference and put under the vigilance of the Church, which determines the conditions of validity of the marriage contract, establishes the impediments thereto, and judges all matrimonial cases referring to the sacramental bond (cf. Council of Trent, sess. 24). Pius XI issued his splendid encyclical, Casti Conubii (1930), on the dignity of Christian marriage and the remedies against modern abuses.
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ologists penetrate further in their analysis of the sacramental composite.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, having exactly determined the sacramental septenary (see sacraments, number of), the theologians were able to state in the abstract that all the sacraments are composed, in their sensible sign, of things (res) and words (verba); however, spurned on by a profound spirit for systematization, they were not only content to state the fact, but also endeavored to illustrate the manner in which this is accomplished by adapting to the sacramental world the hylomorphic theory (Gr.  ὕλη—matter, and  μορφή—form), which, following in the steps of Aristotle, they had very successfully applied to the physical world.

The simple reasoning that motivated them is: if in the physical composite the potential and indeterminate element is called  matter and the determining and actual element is called  form, in the same way, in the sacramental composite the indeterminate element may be called matter and the determining one, form; now, it appears that in the rite of the sacrament, e.g., of baptism, the thing, i.e., the water, being indifferent as to indication of cooling or of purification, is determined to signify purification by the words which clearly express it: "I baptize thee, i.e., I wash thee in the name of the Father, etc." It is, therefore, fitting that the water be called matter and the words, form.

Certain non-Catholic writers (Harnack, Tertullian) have been slandered by such doctrine, as if theology had been made the slave of Aristotelian philosophy.

The reason given above shows sufficiently the opportuneness of the hylomorphic terminology applied to the sacraments; it is, indeed, the proper function of the theologian, according to the teaching of the Vatican Council, to illustrate dogma ex eorum quae naturaliter cognosci ratio—analoga ("through the analogy of those things that it naturally knows") DB, 1796).

Moreover, the Church, to which Christ not only committed the duty of guarding the deposit of revelation but also the power of formulating and adapting it to the capacity of the faithful, has for seven centuries been using such terminology in several documents of her solemn magisterium (cf. DB, 692, 695, 914, 1963). Therefore, the Catholic theologian has every right to use a formula which, besides being consecrated by many centuries of ecclesiastical use, helps him to clear up many obscure points of sacramental doctrine.
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mediation. Physically, it is the condition of one who finds himself between two extremes from which he is distinguished, although having something in common with them. Morally, it is the action of one who endeavors to unite and conciliate the extremes between which he finds himself.

It is a truth of faith that Christ is the perfect Mediator between God and men. St. Paul, in I Timothy 2:5, says: "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ." Thus also the Fathers and the Church magisterium (cf. Council of Trent, sess. 51, DB, 790).

Reason: Christ, as God-Man, finds Himself in the conditions required for physical mediation between the Divinity and humanity. Also the perfection of moral mediation is to be attributed to Him, because the Word became Incarnate precisely to reconcile mankind with God (see Incarnation). The Word, as God, is equal to the Father, and so cannot be mediator: He is mediator, however, as Man, according to His human nature, which made it possible for Him to suffer and die and make reparation for us. His human actions and sufferings have a redemptive value in that they are proper to the Word, who sustains and directs the assumed nature. Christ, therefore, is Mediator according to His human nature, but not independently of the Divinity. St. Augustine (Sermon XII, 21): "Behold the Mediator: the Divinity without the humanity is not mediator; the humanity without the Divinity is not mediator; but between the Divinity alone and the humanity alone, the human Divinity and the Divine humanity is mediator" (RI, 1500).

Mary, as Mother of the Word Incarnate, participates subordinately in the mediation of Christ with God, and is also Mediator between Christ and men. Her mediation consists principally in praying in order to obtain for us the application of the fruits of the Redemption, but it cannot be restricted to this office, because the Blessed Virgin, associated with Christ, co-operated with Him in the great work of the Redemption, contributing to the acquisition of the fruits of salvation (see Co-Redemprix).
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who nurture doubts on such a truth; the apostates, who reject as false the truths of the Christian faith; the schismatics, who refuse submission to the Roman pontiff and do not have relations (communio) with the other members of the Church (CIC, Can. 1325, § 2). These are the members separated and bereft of the organism of the Church.

4. The Catechumens who accept the Christian faith and are disposed to obey its pastors, although spiritually belonging to the Church, juridically cannot be called members of it, because they have not yet received baptism which is the act by which a man enters the ecclesiastical society as a member (CIC, Can. 87). The infidels belong to the Church only in potestas.
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Mennonites. See Anabaptists.

merit. The right to a reward due for a morally good action. Merit can be **de condigno** (condign; adequate), if there is an equal proportion between the good act and its reward, and **de congruo** (congruous; of convenience) if, in the lack of such proportion, there intervenes some reason of convenience or of benevolence that moves the rewarder.

**Supernatural merit** is that which arises from an action performed under the influence of divine grace, and thus in relationship with the supernatural end: the beatific vision. Five conditions are required for supernatural merit: (1) state of mortal life (status viatoris — state of the wayfarer), because death is the end of the test (see death); (2) state of sanctifying grace, because sin renders relationship impossible with God; (3) free will, without which there is no responsibility and, therefore, no reason for reward or punishment; (4) good work, since evil deserves punishment; (5) divine agreement or consent (accepting and ordering the good work to its reward), because the supernatural order is absolutely gratuitous and no creature can acquire a true and proper right with reference to God, without His own divine disposition in this regard. Man, fulfilling these conditions, can merit, even condignly **(de condigno)**, the increase of grace and life eternal, called a “crown of justice” by St. Paul.

Christ, during His mortal life, merited for Himself the glorification of His human body (His soul already enjoyed the beatific vision), and for the whole human race He merited, especially by His passion and death, all supernatural gifts and life eternal. His merit, like His satisfaction, has an infinite value, and this value is, more probably, according to the rigor of justice (i.e., implies the proper and full concept of justice), because it is the merit of the Word of God Himself, who is the operating subject in His assumed nature. Mary has merited **de congruo** for us all that Jesus merited **de condigno**.

Lutheranism, holding human nature intrinsically corrupted by original sin to the point of the loss of free will, denied all possibility of merit in man. The Council of Trent condemned this error, ascertaining both free will and, under the influence of grace, merit (DB, 809 and 842).
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Messias (Hebr. Maschiach — Anointed; Gr. Xpóo—Christ). The name is derived from the anointing with which the kings were consecrated in the Jewish theocracy. The title at one time was common to all the kings of the Jews, but afterward was reserved for the supreme King who was to bring eternal salvation to the people.

Messianism is the body of the Old Testament prophecies relative to the person, origin, and qualities of the Messias, and the spiritual kingdom He would come to found.
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Metempsychosis (Gr. μετά — between, after, and ψυχή — soul). The theory of the transmigration of the human soul from one body to another (of man or of animal) for the purpose of purification from guilt. Modern spiritualists and theosophists prefer the term *reincarnation* (restricted to human bodies only).

Traces of metempsychosis are found among primitive peoples under the influence of animism (q.v.). India, however, is the classical home of metempsychosis. It was Buddha who adopted and spread it as an element in the solution of the problem of evil and of suffering. The guilty soul must free itself from the stain of sin by an equal compensation of virtuous actions for the sinful ones: this is the famous law of the Karma, which regulates mechanically the expiation of guilt. After a series of transmigra-

Methodists. A Protestant sect widely diffused, which numbers today more than eleven million members. Methodism (from method, to which much
attention is given by this sect) was founded in the sixteenth century by John Wesley, an Anglican priest disguised with dissipation and spiritual aridity of Anglicanism who, following upon his reading of the Imitation of Christ, first dedicated himself to a life of intense piety, and then to a fervent apostolate of preaching and works of charity that took him from one end of the globe to the other. Wesley drew up a set of general rules to assure the duration of his renewal movement, trying to keep it within the Anglican Church; but Methodism was bound to drift away and organize itself into a separate community, with its own statutes, ministers and assemblies. Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke, sent by Wesley to America, became the first bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church organized in 1784.

The Methodist doctrine is substantially Protestant, based on the 39 Anglican articles; but Methodism is characterized by a lively piety, mortification (with systematic fasting), struggle against evil and sin, and zeal for the salvation of souls. Like the Protestant movements, Methodism split into various sects: Methodist Episcopal Church, Methodist Protestant Church (which denies the episcopate), etc.
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**millenarianism** (or chiliasm) (Gr. χιλιας—a thousand). A theory of Jewish origin developed on the stock of the Messianic traditions. The prophets preached a kingdom of the future Messias as a golden age rich in glory and happiness. Enlarging on this concept, the Rabbis delighted in describing that kingdom in vivid colors, stressing its material character and fixing its duration at 1000 years, after which will come the universal judgment and the end of the world.

St. John, in the Apocalypse (Chap. 20), used the images and the language employed at that time in Jewish circles to express Christian thoughts and mysteries on the future of human and of the Church of Christ. Literally, the sacred text speaks of a defeat of Satan, relegated to the abyss, and hence of a triumphal reign in which the souls of the martyrs and the saints, priests of Christ, will rule with Him 1000 years. This glorification of the saints is called the first resurrection. After that period, Satan will be freed for a short time and will take up a great fight once more to seduce men, but in the end he will be conquered together with his minister, the Antichrist, and then the end of the world will come with the universal resurrection and judgment.

Some Fathers (St. Irenaeus, St. Justin, Tertullian), interpreting this text literally, admitted two resurrections (that of the saints and the universal one) and between them the millenary reign of Christ on earth. Other writers (Cerinthus, Apollinaris) perverted the concept of that reign, representing it as a period of frenzied sexual extravagances. Protests immediately followed (Caius, a Roman priest, and Origen) and finally St. Augustine interpreted the Apocalypse in the symbolic and allegoric senses, eliminating, once and for all, millenarianism from the field of orthodoxy. The millenary kingdom, St. Augustine explains, is that the Christian era in which Satan is relatively defeated under the sanctifying action of the Redeemer and His Church. He will be definitively conquered at the end of the world after a brief struggle. That first resurrection of which St. John speaks is but the glorification of the holy souls who reign in heaven with Christ, and, in a way, even on earth by the light of their example.

The Church has tacitly remained on the line traced by St. Augustine, adopting his teaching and never looking with favor on the opposite opinions. In July, 1944, the Holy Office declared that millenarianism may not be sustained, even in its mild form (AD, 1944, sec. II, Vol. XI, n. 7).
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**minister** (Lat. minister—helper, servant, etc.). The person legitimately appointed (see orders, holy) to distribute grace by means of the sacraments and to offer the Sacrifice of the New Law, Jesus Christ, having determined the Sacrifice and instituted the sacraments, did not choose to assist, like an ordinary spectator, at the carrying out of his work, but remained at the center of the Sacramental and sacrificial economy, invisibly but eternally operating; it is He who offers the sacrificial oblation and sanctifies through the sacrificial symbols. Therefore, having established a plan of redemption in which the invisible always manifests itself in the visible, consistency and harmony demanded that His activity, veiled under the sacrificial rite and the sacramental symbols, should in some way be rendered perceptible to the senses through a human minister. In fact, Christ did choose among His disciples (cf. Luke 22:19; John 20:21–23). 1 Cor. 11:4; 2 Cor. 5:18–20) visible ministers to whom, in imitation of His Father who really communicates to creatures the dignity of efficient causes, He transmitted a real participation of His sanctifying power. This power, however, is connected with and subordinate to Christ's own action of principal cause, so that the ministers are but an irradiation of His priesthood and an exterior manifestation of His activity of eternal Pontiff, the "long hand," as it were, through which He operates.

In an economy in which the efficacy of the sacraments depends totally on the sanctity and the mysterious action of Christ, it is easily understood that neither faith nor state of grace is required in the minister for their validity and efficacy.

In the first Christian centuries lively polemics were waged between Catholics (St. Cyprian, Martyr against Pope St. Stephen), and later (fifth century) between St. Augustine and the Donatists who obstinately maintained that sacraments administered by heretics and sinners are not valid because nemo dat quod non habet ("no one can give what he does not have"). The ability and holiness of the Bishop of Hippo succeeded in weakening the age-old schism and in clarifying the Catholic teaching, according to which, sacramenta sancta per se, non per homines ("the sacraments are holy of themselves, not by the virtue of men"), because Christ is the principal Distributor of their graces, while the ministers are only instruments channeling the waters flowing for the enrichment and fruitfulness of the field of souls; it does not matter whether a pipe be of gold or silver, of iron or lead, provided it conveys the water. However, for valid administration, the ministers must have the intention of doing what the Church does (see intention of the minister of the sacraments).
The minister, ordinarily, is a homo viator (wayfarer or pilgrim, in regard to them), and it is generally one marked with the character of the priesthood (see orders, holy). He is distinct from the subject or receiver of the sacrament, except in the Eucharist, when the priest administers communion to himself, and in matrimony, in which man or woman is at once partial minister and subject of the sacrament.
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**miracle** (Lat. miror—I wonder). In a broad sense, it is an extraordinary thing which calls attention and excites wonder. St. Augustine, speaking from a subjective viewpoint, calls the miracle a difficult and unusual happening, above the power and the expectation of the observer, whose possibility and realization has been prepared by God. St. Thomas, in his work on man, adds the objective notion of an extraordinary intervention of God, and he defines (Summa Theol., I, q. 110, a. 4): “A miracle is that which is done by God outside the order of all created nature.” The theologians explain and specify this definition: (a) done by God as principal cause—He may use any creature as instrumental cause; (b) done in the world; (c) outside or above the natural order, i.e., in a way superior to the forces of all nature; (d) outside or above, but not against the natural order, because the miracle is not a violation of the laws of nature or an exceptional happening brought about by a special, divine power that intervenes in created things, producing an effect superior to their natural power. The possibility of the miracle rests chiefly on the absolute dominion of God as first and free cause of the universe, whose laws are subordinate to Him and cannot limit either His freedom of action or His power. Only the absurd and the sinful are impossible to God. A miracle may surpass the power of nature’s forces (a) as regards the substance of the event, e.g., the resurrection of the flesh; (b) as to manner, e.g., certain instantaneous cures. Finally, some miracles are the object of faith and thus are outside the order of sense experience; others are external happenings or facts, tangibly evident, and are intended by God to prove a truth of faith. It is last that the Vatican Council (sess. III, c. 3, DB, 1750) calls: “Most certain signs of divine revelation signs adapted to the intelligence of everyone.”
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**missal.** See liturgy.

**mission, divine** (Lat. mittens—to send). The procession of the divine Person from another with respect to a particular effect produced in a creature, in which the Person becomes present in a certain new manner. Divine mission includes two essential characteristics: (a) that the Person sent proceed from the Person sending Him; (b) that a new effect be produced in the creature. The mission may be visible or invisible.

1. Visible mission. The Son sent by the Father to take upon human nature (Incarnation): “When the fullness of the time was come, God sent his Son” (Gal. 4:4). The Incarnation of the Word is a new effect, which, as an action ad extra (see operation, divine), is common to the three Persons, but terminatively (as regards its term) is exclusively of the Word, who alone becomes incarnate. The relationship, however, between the Word and the assumed nature (see Incarnation) does not add anything to the Person assuming, who remains unchanged; this relation is a real one (relatio realis) on the part of the assumed nature to the Person, but only a relation of the mind (relatio rationis) in the direction from the Person to the assumed nature. Another visible mission is that of the Holy Spirit under the form of a dove (in the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan) and of tongues of fire (in the Cenacle). These figures or forms were signs indicating the presence and the action of the Holy Spirit; as extrinsic effects they are attributed to the three Persons together, but as signs they have reference only to the Holy Spirit. There is evidently a great difference between the visible mission of the Son, who makes a human nature His own, and the mission of the Spirit, who only uses signs to manifest Himself.

2. Invisible mission. This is more difficult and complex. It is actuated only in the infusion of sanctifying grace, by which God communicates Himself, giving Himself to the human soul, which becomes His living temple, according to the Gospel: “We will come to him, and will make our abode with him” (John 14:23). Strictly, this invisible mission is of the Son or of the Holy Ghost, to whom grace has reference as light or as love; in a wider sense this mission is also of the Father, inasmuch as He gives Himself together with the other two Persons. Some wish to attribute this divine indwelling in the sanctified soul to the Holy Spirit in a very special way (see indwelling of the Holy Trinity).
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**missionology** (or missiolog). The science of Missions for the conversion of the infidels. The missionary problem, always alive in the Catholic Church, has in recent times had an extraordinary development under the impulse given to it, especially by Benedict XV and Pius XI, who, in their respective encyclicals Maximum illud (1919) and Rerum Ecclesiae (1926), traced the lines of a new missionary program. In order to stress progressively the great importance of the missionary problem and adequately to prepare the souls called by God for this great undertaking, Pius XI decided to establish missionological institutes, of the university type, with an organic program of studies. Missionology includes a theoretic section, divided into doctrinal (dogma, moral theology, canon law, biblical and patristic theology) and descriptive (historical, geographic); and a technical section (pastoral, medicine, languages). Many auxiliary studies.
modalism. A complex Trinitarian heresy which arose in the East at the end of the second century and afterward was spread widely in the Western Church. It defends monotheism rigidly up to the point of conceiving the Trinity of the divine Persons as three modes of being and of self-manifestation of the one God: The same divine Person, in so far as it creates and generates, is Father; in so far as it is generated and redeems men, is Son (Christ); in so far as it sanctifies, is Holy Spirit. There is, therefore, no real distinction of divine Persons, but only one Principle of everything, i.e., the Father, who has created, has become incarnate, has died, has risen. Hence the names of monarchianism (one sole Principle) and Patrispassianism (passion of the Father) given to the modalistic heresy. Its first author was Noetus, who was condemned by the Presbytery of Smyrna, where he preached his false doctrine; his disciples, Epigen and Cleomene, came to Rome to spread their master’s teaching. Hippolytus wrote against Noetus. A similar doctrine was held at Rome by a certain Praxas, who was vigorously opposed by Tertullian. Later on, at the beginning of the third century, another Easterner came to Rome, Sabellius (hence the other name, Sabellianism), who refined monarchianism by reducing the divine Persons to simple transitory modalities: God is now Father, now Son, now Holy Spirit, according to His mode of acting. Thus the Trinitarian dogma was radically eliminated. Pope Callixtus excommuni cated Sabellius. Paul of Samosata professed also Sabellianism, together with adoptionism (q.v.). Later Sabellianism underwent considerable development and modification.

modernism. A heresy, or rather a group of heresies, which have arisen in the very bosom of the Church at the beginning of this century under the influence of modern philosophy and criticism, with the pretense of elevating and saving the Christian religion and the Catholic Church by means of a radical renovation. Leaders of the movement: in France, Le Roy and Lois; in England, Tyrell; in Germany, Scheffel; in Italy, the authors (anonymous) of The Program of the Modernists, who have no originality, but repeat the ideas of others; E. Buonaiuti is another ob stinate follower and defender of modernism in Italy. Pope Pius X issued two documents against modernism: The Decree of the Holy Office, Lamentabili (July 3, 1907, DB, 2001 f.), and the encyclical, Pascendi (Sept. 8, 1907). The decree consists of a list of 69 condemned propositions; the encyclical is a lucid and deep analysis of these modern theories in conflict with sound philosophy and the patrimony of the entire Christian doctrine. To get an exact idea of modernism it suffices to read this pontifical document which, despite the protests of the modernists, has, with the passing years, progressively shown itself to be objective and efficacious.

In brief outline, the encyclical declares modernism to be a hybrid amalgamation of verbal Catholicism with real naturalistic rationalism, based on three philosophical systems: (1) agnosticism (from Kantianism), which combines subjectivism, phenomenalism, and relativism, depre cating rational knowledge; (2) immanentism, according to which human consciousness bears in itself, virtually, every truth, even divine, which is developed under the stimulus of the religious sense (from the doctrine of Kant and Schleiermacher); (3) radical evolutionism, according to which true reality is not being, but becoming, both within and outside man (from Hegel and, still more, from Bergson).

Consequences of a religious character: (a) Impossibility of demonstrating the existence of a personal God, distinct from the world. (b) Religion and revelation are natural products of our subconsciousness, dogma being its provisional expression, subject to continual evolution. (c) The Bible is not a divinely inspired book and, therefore, must be studied critically like any human book, subject to errors. (d) Science has nothing to do with faith: the critic, as such, can deny things he admits as a believer. (e) The divinity of Christ does not derive from the Gospels, but is the result of Christian consciousness. (f) The expiatory and redemptive value of Christ’s death is merely the opinion of St. Paul. (g) Christ did not institute the Church or the primacy of Peter, passed down later to the Roman pontiffs; the ecclesiastical organization of today is the result of human circumstances and is subject to continual change. (h) The sacraments were instituted by the Apostles, who believed they were thus interpreting the instructions of the Master. These sacraments are useful only for keeping alive in men the thought of the ever beneficent presence of the Creator. (i) The rigid dogmatism of the Roman Church is irreconcilable with real science, which is bound up with universal evolution and follows its conditions.

Pius X rightly concludes that modernism, by virtue of these deleterious principles, leads to the suppression of all religion and, therefore, to atheism (see immanentism; pragmatism; sentiment; religious; subconsciousness).

Molino. See Molinism.

Molinism. A theological system linked with the name of Louis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit and theologian of the sixteenth century. Taking occasion from a dispute which arose in the University of Salamanca since 1582, regarding a thesis of the Jesuit Prudentio de Montemayor on the freedom of Christ, Molina endeavored to delve into the question of the relationship between freewill and divine knowledge, predetermination and grace. He published, therefore, a book entitled Concordia, in 1588, with the purpose also of fighting Lutheranism and Calvinism which denied man’s freedom. The Dominican Bañez (see Banesianism) censured several propositions of the book, thus inciting the famous controversy between the Dominicans and the Jesuits, which is still unsettled.

Fundamental principles of Molinism: (a) God conveys in the action of every creature, even in the free, human act, with a general and in-
Molinosism. The pseudomythic system formulated in Italy and diffused throughout Europe by the Spanish priest Michael Molinos (†1669), who came to Rome in 1664 on the occasion of a beatification cause and, remaining there, wrote the Spiritual Guide. The volume is divided into three books: the first treats of the obscurities, aridities, and sensations with which God purifies souls, then of interior recollection and acquired contemplation, the second speaks of the spiritual Father and of internal and external penances; the third discusses the means by which God purifies souls, of infused contemplation, of annihilation of the spirit, and of interior peace. The Guide, confused and emphatic but not lacking warmth of feeling, was published with ecclesiastical approbation and, at first blush, made a good impression, due partly to the author’s good reputation and zealous ministry and due also to the protection of Cristina of Sweden, of Cardinal Azzolini, and even of Pope Innocent XI. But some attentive readers quickly discovered the poison in the Guide; the first to point it out were the Jesuits, then Archbishop Caracciolo of Naples. The rumor having grown to sizable proportions, Molinos was reported to the Holy Office and put in prison (1685). After careful examination, 68 propositions were extracted from the work and condemned by a Holy Office decree and by the bull, Coelestis Pastor, of Innocent XI (1687). The reading of these propositions, recognized as his own by Molinos, affords a measure of the gravity of the false and harmful mysticism, of which the author had become a teacher, followed enthusiastically by not a few souls, including the Oratorian of Iesi, Pier Matteo Petrucci, afterward a cardinal, who defended Molinos and the Guide with writings, which were put on the Index of Forbidden Books.

The fundamental principles of Molinosism are reducible to the following (cf. the condemned propositions in DB, 1221–1288): Man must mortify his faculties and his free will to attain a sort of mystical death, in which the soul merges with its Creator, as into one sole thing. Prayer must be a habitual abandonment to God, without words, without petitions, without works. Immersed in God, the soul no longer worries about what happens in the body: the devil may work the most obscene actions in the flesh, without the soul’s contracting any guilt. What is more, God humiliates souls this way, by subjecting them to gravest sensual disorders by means of the devil, in order to purify them. It is not necessary to repent or to confess these sins, as it is not necessary to do penances and undergo voluntary mortifications. In a word, the Christian soul should be like a corpse, in which only God operates as He pleases. In this monstrous theory it is easy to identify the consequences of genuine Lutheranism, which had denied free will and man’s activity in order to affirm the inevitability of sin and the necessity of abandonment to God, who sanctifies not by removing guilt but only by concealing it.

monarchism. See modalism.

monergism (Gr. μοιον—alone, and ἑνεργεία—activity). An error launched, after the condemnation of Monophysitism at the Council of Chalcedon (451), by some stubborn Anti-Chalcedonians, particularly by the clever Severus of Antioch, who in his work Philalethehigh endeavors to prove that—whatever opinion one may have on the two natures in Christ and their union—it is certain that the Man-God is one, sole-operating subject and, consequently, His activity can be only one (theandric). This principle of dynamic unity in Christ was developed by others and prepared the way for the heresy of Monothelitism, logically connected with monergism. The question of theandric operation (g. s.) is also a part of the error of Monothelitism.
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monism (Gr. μοιον—sole, unique). A term first used by Wolff to mean a system opposed to dualism. Classical dualism distinguishes the world of spirit from that of matter to the point of asserting the eternity of both (Plato); or it is the Aristotelian system of matter and form (hylomorphism), united, however, harmoniously in the so-called synthesis (the whole, the composite being), while in the Platonic conception the soul is a prisoner of the body by violence. Consequently, we distinguish a spiritualistic monism (all is spirit) and a materialistic monism (all is matter).

An example of spiritualistic monism is the substantialism of Baruch Spinoza (†1677), which reduced all reality to one, sole substance (divine) manifested in two modes (corresponding to two of the infinite attributes of God): thought, which constitutes the
world of spirit, and extension, which constitutes the world of matter. The one and the other, however, are immanent in the one, divine substance. With this static conception is connected idealistic-dynamic monism (see idealism), which resolves everything in the idea (Hegel) or in the act of thought (Gentile): this is the evolutionary monism of "becoming." Opposed to this is materialistic monism, which had a notorious champion in Ernest Haeckel († 1919), who celebrates in his work the triumph of matter to the point of a kind of religious apathy. Outstanding scientists, however, have uncovered the impostures of Haeckel, who contaminated science with trickery for propagandistic purposes.

Beside these well-determined forms of monism are others less definite, in which the monistic tendency dominates one sector or another of thought, nature, or human life: such is humanism, or sociological, or biological monism. If these partial forms may at times be admitted without encountering difficulties of the moral or religious order, certainly absolute monism, either spiritualistic or materialistic, is irreconcilable with Christian thought and Catholic doctrine because it necessarily implies pantheism (q.v.), i.e., confusion of God and the world, and the denial of creation. But monism is evidently false also from the philosophical and scientific viewpoint.
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**Monotheism** (Gr. μονοθεισµος—sole, and θεος—God). A religious system which, in opposition to polytheism (q.v.), admits one sole God. Monotheism par excellence is the Christian religion, which in the Old and New Testament offers the highest concept of the one God possessing a variety of attributes, which do not violate the absolute unity of His infinite essence. New Testament revelation represents God in three Persons: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; also in this mystery of the Holy Trinity, which the Church magnificently expresses with the formula "one nature in three Persons," monotheism remains intact (in an absolute, substantial sense), because plurality of persons is affirmed only in a relative way. Monotheism, wonderfully preserved in the Jewish tradition which converges into Christianity, was the primitive religion; polytheism is but a degeneration, as most recent studies of the comparative history of religions have demonstrated.

**Monotheoletism** (Gr. μονοθεολετισµος—sole, and δεισις—I will). The last of the great Christological heresies, which puts in Christ only one will (the divine), thus mutilating the human nature assumed by the Word, as Apollinarianism and Monophysitism had done before (qq.v.).

Monotheoletism stems from Monophysitism, bridged by the subtle theories of Severus of Antioch on the activity (εισπραχθει) of Christ (see monergism). From the asserted unity of operation it was easy to pass to unity of will; this passage matured slowly from the sixth to the seventh centuries. Political circumstances favored the development of this heresy. Heracleus (+641) wanted religious peace in the Empire, while discord was still alive on account of the numerous Monophysitic sects. Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was also more than Churchman, endeavoring to satisfy the Emperor's wish by composing a series of nine anathemas (633), in which Catholic doctrine was reconciled with Monophysitism through means of a compromise—Monotheoletism. Protests from vigilant Catholics were not lacking. Sergius tried to draw Pope Honorius I to his side, writing to him a deceitful letter in which, among other things, he tried to make the two wills in Christ was scandalous, seeing that the faithful immediately concluded that the two wills are discordant. Pope Honorius, while remaining on the orthodox terrain of the two wills, acquiesced good-naturedly to Sergius' viewpoint, admitting the moral unity of Christ's will. Sergius used the Pope's reply abusively in order to propagate his error. Two champions of the faith rose up against him: St. Maximus, Confessor and St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who in various letters and writings uncovered the Monotheoletic error.

Martin I, in a Council at Rome (649) in which St. Maximus took part, condemned the heresy and, with it, the "Type" with which Constans II tried to impose silence on the controversy issue. The Pope and St. Maximus were mistreated and exiled. Only under Constantine IV Pogonatus, Agaton being pope, could the VI Ecumenical Council (the 3rd of Constantinople) be assembled (680–681), which repeated and developed the decisions of the Roman Council of 649, defining that the will is the property of the nature, and that since in Christ there are two natures, there are also two wills, always in agreement, because directed by one sole agent, the Person of the Word. Thus was reinforced and perfected definitively the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon on the integrity of Christ's two natures and their respective, distinct properties, wills, and activities. The Council deplored also the action of Honorius I, in that he had imprudently favored Sergius' error (DB, 262 ff., 289 ff.).
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**Montanism**. A heresy of an ascetic nature dating from about a.D. 170. In Phrygia (Asia Minor) a certain Montanus (whence Montanism), converted to Christianity, began to have ecstasies and other strange phenomena, as if he were inspired. Two ladies, Priscilla and Maximilla, followed him, and had like experiences. Quickly a movement jelled, following the Prophet, who, among other things, preached that the end of the world is approaching, and, with it, the second descent of Christ on earth.

Montanism, unlike Gnosticism, is an ascetic praxis, a rigorous discipline or mode of life, rather than a doctrine. Montanus claimed he was inspired and moved by the Paraclete, who had descended upon him and inspired him to start a more rigid Christianity (prohibition of second marriages, prolonged fasts, austere mortifications, etc.). From the East the Montanist heresy spread widely and reached Rome; even Tertullian succumbed
to it, later dying as a heretic outside the Catholic Church. Several bishops took measures against Montanism, which was finally condemned by Pope Zephyrinus.
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Mopsuestenus (Theodore of Mopsuestia). See Nestorianism.

**mystic** (divine, demystic). See concourse, divine.

**mystery (Gr. μυστικός, from μυστήριον — to close; cf. Lat. mystica).** A hidden or secret thing, particularly of a sacred character (cf. the Eleusinian mysteries of Cybele, of Isis, etc.). In Holy Scripture, the word mystery means, in addition to secret thing in general, the divine things of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 13:11), and in St. Paul, the revelation of the salvation of the world through Christ and the Redeemer (Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:26, etc.).

In the past century, the Church has fixed definitively the meaning of the term (Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII). The Vatican Council (sess. 3. c. 4, DB, 1785 ff.) gives the definition: “The divine mysteries of their very nature transcend the created intellect that, when revealed and believed, they still remain veiled and obscure during this mortal life.”

In the strict sense, therefore, a mystery is a truth, whose essence can be known by human reason only by way of revelation, while its essence cannot be properly and fully understood, even after revelation. Thus, e.g., the mystery of the Holy Trinity. In a broad sense we call it also a truth known only through revelation but comprehensible by reason once it has been revealed, e.g., the creation of the world in time. Human reason cannot demonstrate a mystery taken in the strict sense, but can illustrate it and defend it from objections. The contradiction between a mystery of faith and the principles of reason can be no more than apparent, since supernatural and natural truth both derive from the same source, God, who is substantial Truth.
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**Mystical Body.** The expression goes back at least to the ninth century (cf. Ratramnus and Paschasius Radbertus); in the Fathers (cf. Ambrose), we find the term “mystical Head” referred to Christ; some ecclesiastical writers speak of “mystical members of Christ, of the Church” (cf. Bede).

In the Gospel of St. John, Christ likens Himself to the vine, of which men are the branches or tendrils (Ch. 15), and in the prayer at the Last Supper He insists on the concept of unity and mutual immancence of Himself in men and of men in Him (Ch. 17). But it is St. Paul who develops extensively this theme and represents Jesus Christ as an immense organism, a body, of which He is the Head and men the various members (cf. Epistles to the Corinthians, Colossians, Ephesians, and Romans). Here is a synthesis of the teaching of St. Paul: Christ, incarnate Word, is the new Adam, Head of humanity which is redeemed in Him, and He constitutes with it a Body, which is the mystical Body. This Body in a large sense embraces all mankind, because Christ died for the salvation of all; but in a strict sense it is the Church, which man enters through baptism, to be ingrafted onto Christ and thus to participate in the supernatural life, which flows from the Head into the members by the action of the Holy Spirit, who is the soul of the Mystical Body. The unity of this organism is so real and deep that St. Paul does not hesitate to say (Gal. 3:28): “You are all one in Christ,” i.e., as St. Thomas translates, you are with Christ one sole mystical person. Here “mystical” is not opposed to real, but stands for a supernatural reality, although not of the physical type. “Christ in us” is for St. Paul the great mystery that God reveals in the Gospel: through it we live in Christ, who continues in us His passion, death, and resurrection (solidarity). On this mystery, as on their base, rest the Redemption and the Church (qq.v.).

The Fathers develop the thought of St. Paul either in a rather strict ecclesiastical sense (Ignatius, Cyprian) or in a wider soteriological sense (Irenaeus, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom). St. Augustine harmonizes the two tendencies. The recent encyclical, “Mystici Corporis” of Pius XII, is a profound and erudite doctrinal commentary of this truth of faith. In the light of the Mystical Body it considers first the relations between Christ and His Church, of which He is Head, Supporter, and Saviour; then the relations and bonds of union between the faithful and Jesus Christ, condemning the exaggerations of false mysticism, which tends to absorb man and his personality in Christ to the point of fusing and identifying them in one physical person.
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**mysticism (Gr. μυστικός — I close the mouth).** Mystics in a practical sense is a mode or condition of intense supernatural life, implying a spiritual and quasi-experimental knowledge of God, accompanied often by extraordinary psychic phenomena (ecstasies, stigmata, etc.). In the theoretical sense, mystics is the science that studies this elevated spirituality either from a theological viewpoint (mystical theology) or from a psychological viewpoint (psychology of mystics). The essential part of mystics is that savage experimental knowledge of God, which goes also under the name of contemplation (q.v.); it has its roots in grace and the infused virtues, especially in faith and charity, and also in the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Begun in the human spirit with man’s co-operation, it reaches its apex when it is acted unexpectedly by divine influence, without human co-operation, determining both internal and external phenomena which can hardly be analyzed or explained. St. Teresa reduces the degree of mystical contemplation to four: (1) quiet, in which the spirit reposes quietly without freeing itself entirely from every distraction; (2) fulness, in which the sense of God’s presence is lively and every distraction is conquered; (3) ecstasy (q.v.), in which the use of the senses ceases, as does every bodily motion; (4) transforming union or spiritual nuptials, in which the soul relishes...
the presence of God and feels itself sharing His divine life.

There are various opinions and systems of classification about the phases and phenomena of the mystical life. According to the common opinion, the mystical life consists essentially in an act of the highest knowledge of God, which must be classified between faith and the beatific vision which is immediate, and in an act of love which accompanies that knowledge. The psychic phenomena are a repercussion, as it were, of those two essential acts.

Mysticism is a mystical tendency or system. It is found outside of Christianity in the mystery religions (e.g., Orphism) and in philosophical teachings like that of Plotinus. In Christianity, outside of the orthodox mysticism lived and professed by great souls like St. Bernard, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Catherine of Siena, St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa, and St. Paul of the Cross, there have been sporadic uprisings of degenerated mysticism, which the vigilant Church immediately condemned, e.g., Molinism (q.v.). There is, moreover, in many psychologists and physiologists a superficial prejudice against mysticism. They would like to reduce all forms of mysticism to morbid manifestations (hysteria, neurosis, etc.), but they fail to consider that, according to Catholic teaching, mysticism is primarily an intense, supernatural life and, secondarily, a manifestation of extraordinary psychic phenomena, which must be in harmony with the holiness and the moral equilibrium of the mystic.
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human nature to the supernatural order by grace. Human nature, however, with respect to this supernatural order, has neither exiguity nor active capacity, but merely a passive capacity, called obediential potency (q.v.).
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neophyte (Gr. νεόφωτος — new plant). Used by St. Paul (1 Tim. 3:6) to indicate figuratively a new convert. Moreover, the Apostle in another place (1 Cor. 3:6–7) compares the work of the gospel worker to that of a farmer. The word neophyte has passed into ecclesiastical language to designate the newly baptized. In the passage just mentioned St. Paul recommends to Timothy not to ordain a neophyte as bishop. The old canon law, adopted afterward by the Decretales, established the "defectus fidei conformatora ("the lack of confirmed faith"), proper to those who were baptized after becoming converted to the true faith in advanced age, as an irregularity or impediment to ordination. The new Code of Canon Law has suppressed this irregularity, but puts the neophytes in the category of those who are "simpliciter impediti" until, in the judgment of their ordinary, they have been sufficiently tested (CIC, Can. 987, § 6).
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Nestorianism: One of the great Christological heresies of the fifth century, which broke the personal unity of Christ by positing in Him two subjects, one divine and one human. The principal author of this heresy is Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, and former disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Antiochian School. A realism with naturalistic tendencies was dominant in that school: they considered the two elements in Christ, the divine and the human, as real entities, concrete, standing by themselves, united only morally.

Faithful to his master, Nestorius developed his teaching in these fundamental points: (a) Christ is a perfect Man like one of us; His human nature has, therefore, its own subsistence, its own autonomy and, therefore, its own personality. (b) In Christ the Man, however, is present the Word, Son of God, who dwells in the assumed humanity as in a temple. (c) Christ Man and the Word are in themselves two distinct subjects, but form morally one sole thing (prosopon unioneis), like a king and his legate. (d) Since the union between the two subjects is only accidental, it is not allowable to attribute to the one the properties of the other. (e) The Virgin Mary is not properly the Mother of God (hēiôs), but the Mother of Christ Man (see maternity, divine). (j) Only Christ Man is Redeemer, Priest, and Victim, not the Word who is in Him. Moreover, Nestorius shows himself at least favorable to Pelagianism (q.v.). He is obscure and reticent on the intrinsic character of justification (q.v.), and, coherently with his Christology, he denies transubstantiation (q.v.), although admitting the real presence of the Word in the consecrated bread (impanation). Cyril of Alexandria fought against Nestorius; the aspersion of the struggle was increased also by the impression of the terminology, especially of the words οἶκος, φῶς, ἀπόστασις (essence, nature, hypostasis or person). But the fight was more than a discussion of terminology: Cyril knew and demonstrated that he was defending the real unity of Christ against the dele-
terious dualism of Nestorius. The heresy was condemned in the Council of Ephesus (431), which defined the divine maternity of Mary and the real, true, substantial unity of the divine element and the human element of Christ in the one person of the Word (see hypostatic union).
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nomastics. See senses of Scripture.

nominalism. A philosophical current with wide repercussions in theology, inaugurated systematically by Roscelin (eleventh century), continued by Abelard, and developed in the fourteenth century by Ockham and Biel. Nominalism is one of the solutions given to the problem of the universals, to which the Scholastics devoted themselves energetically from the beginning. Supposing that sensation or phantasm (with its individual, particular character) is distinct from concept or idea (with its universal character, e.g., Socrates as man), the question arises as to what is in general the value of universal concepts, e.g., humanity. Against the exaggerated realism of Platonic origin, which made of those concepts so many real and subsisting forms, the nominalists hold that they are pure words or names which we use to indicate individuals resembling one another. The universal concept has no reality outside of the mind: the only extramundane reality is the singular thing, the individual (this flower, Peter, Paul, etc.).

With Abelard, nominalism became conceptualism (the universal is not only a word, a name, but also a true concept). Ockham inquired further into the relationship between concept and reality, concluding that the concept has its subjective reality in the soul (ideal objectivity), but in no wise outside the soul (prelude to Kantsianism). Nominalism in this last form reduces a great part of metaphysics to logic and depreciates the capacity of human reason, prefiguring the way for later skepticism. In theology, the denial of the real distinction between nature and person compromises the Trinitarian and Christological doctrine; the negation of habit upsets the doctrine of grace, and approaches Lutheranism (q.v.). St. Thomas solved the problem of universals by teaching a moderate realism: the universal exists formally in the intellect, but has a real foundation in things outside.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

notions, divine. Distinctive marks by which the individual divine Persons are recognized. There are five of such marks: inaccessibility (impossibility of being generated); paternity, proper to the Father (q.v.); filiation, proper to the Son (q.v.); active spiration, proper to the Father and the Son together; passive spiration or simple procession, proper to the Holy Ghost. To the notions correspond the notional acts, which are two: generation and spiration (considered actively and passively, according to the terms). The two notional acts coincide with the two processions, which are, precisely, the generation of the Word and the breathing or spiration of the Holy Spirit, the first procession being by way of knowledge and the second by way of love.

The nine proper names—Father, Principle, Unbegotten, Son, Word, Image, Holy Spirit, Love, Gift—are usually called notional.
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obediential potency. The capacity of a creature to be elevated by God to a state and action above its nature and its natural potency. According to the Thomists (who claim to express faithfully St. Thomas' mind), it is reducible to a sort of nonimpossibility (nonrepugnans). According to the Scotists and the Suavisians, it includes also a disposition and a tendency, although such tendency cannot reach its object without an intervention of God. The question is quite delicate, because on its solution depends the gratuitous nature of the supernatural order (see supernatural). If the Scotistic opinion is pushed too far, the supernatural order becomes the term of a natural tendency and hence is no longer undécé, as Catholic doctrine teaches it to be. If the Thomists' position is stressed, the supernatural may appear too extraneous to nature, and one does not easily understand how it can be inserted in nature and bring nature to its perfection.

Blondel's philosophy harks back to the Scotistic position, putting in hu-
and is constituted by habitual adherence to a past serious sin, which renders reception of the sacrament fruitless, but not sacrilegious, since good faith excuses from sin.
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oblation. See sacrifice.

Oecolampadius. See Presence, Real, Eucharistic (fact).

oils, holy. See extreme unction.


omnipotence. Potency in the passive sense is capacity to receive the action of others; in an active sense, it is the power to act and produce. Passive potency is contradictory in God (see Act, Pure), but active potency or power is rightly predicative of Him, provided it be purified of all imperfection.

It is a truth of faith that God not only is potent, but omnipotent (cf. Apostles' Creed, Vatican Council, DB, 1782). The sources of revelation are rich in testimonies (Gen. 17:1; Tob. 13:4; Apoc. 4:18; the Fathers). St. Thomas affirms that the divine potency or power is founded in His being, for a being is potent inasmuch as it is in act, and a higher being is in act, and therefore is more potent. Now God is being of His very essence, i.e., infinite; therefore, He has infinite power of acting. Omnipotence is the power of doing anything, except what is impossible or "not-doable" in itself, i.e., what is opposed to the very nature and formal reason of being, like sin and evil, which are rather non-beings (see evil). Thus, also, God cannot do what is metaphysically absurd, e.g., that what is passed has not been (a contradiction). The omnipotence of God considered in itself is termed absolute power; considered in reference to the other attributes and to the present order in creation it is called ordered power. God could, e.g., destroy the immortal soul (absolute power), but He does not do it on account of His wisdom, and, in this sense, actually cannot do it (ordered power).

Leibniz held that God could not create a better world than ours (optimism). Catholic doctrine recognizes the relative goodness of this created world, but teaches that the divine omnipotence could do more and better, according to divine freedom (see freedom).
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Only-Begotten ("Unigenitus"). Said of the Word (q.e.) because He is the only one of the term of the divine generation by way of interjection. The Holy Spirit does not proceed by generation but by inspiration and, therefore, is not called Son. The word Only-Begotten (Unigenitus) is read in St. John (Ch. 1:14, 18, 19), who considers the Word in Himself; St. Paul, on the contrary, considers Him with respect to creatures and calls Him Firstborn (Col. 1:15; Primogenitus: πρωτόγενος). The Arians abused this expression (see Arianism) to make the Word the first of all the creatures. But St. Paul, like St. John, excludes absolutely this sense in the passage mentioned and elsewhere, because he asserts energetically that through the Word all things have been created and that the Word was prior to them, subsisting in the divine nature (Phil. 2:6). For St. Paul Firstborn means generated before creatures, which have not been generated by God, but made and created. The Synoptics use the expression τὸ διάβασθαι (loved son), which, according to sure documents in the Greek dialect of the time, meant only-son (only-begotten).

The profound reason why there is only one Son in God stems from the nature of His procession, which takes place according to divine interjection; the act of divine interjection is only one, being identical with the unique essence of God and, therefore, cannot have more than one term. In the generated Word is all the divine nature, as thought in an infinite way, which does not admit of plurality.
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ontologism (Gr. ὄν = being, and λόγος = discourse, science). A systematic view of the being of God as a being which is not the result of the creative act of God, but which is in itself the object of God's thought. The concept of ontologism was developed by the Italian philosopher Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and was later developed by other philosophers, such as the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804).

The concept of ontologism is closely related to the concept of the divine essence, which is considered as the object of God's thought. According to the concept of ontologism, the divine essence is not created by God, but is in itself the object of God's thought. This concept is closely related to the concept of the divine simplicity, which states that God is one and indivisible.

The concept of ontologism has been controversial in the history of philosophy, and has been criticized by some philosophers, such as the French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650), who argued that the concept of ontologism is incompatible with the concept of the creative act of God.

The concept of ontologism has been influential in the development of modern philosophy, and has been used by many philosophers to develop their own theories of the nature of reality and the nature of God.
of the Holy Office, 1887; DB, 1891 ff.) it has rejected the concept of Rosmini, whose ontological character is evident from the first seven propositions. Theologically, ontologism is erroneous because it eliminates the supernatural character of the intuitive vision of God, making it a natural heritage of our present life. Philosophically, ontologism, by confusing being in general with God, leads toward pantheism; moreover, it is not justified but is contradicted by psychological experience, in which there is no trace of intuition of God.
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operation, divine. As being or existence is distinguished from essence in creatures, so operation is distinguished from nature or substance and is reducible to an accident (actio). But God, who is essentially being (esse, divine), is essentially action: in Him operation is identified with substance, which, therefore, is essentially dynamic. On account of His highest simplicity, it is impossible to distinguish really in God several operations by specific or numerical distribution: one sole, most simple act is all His activity (knowing, willing, acting).

A distinctio rationis raeticamatæ (distinction not wholly of our reason but based on the object reasoned on), however, is legitimate (see attributes of God) between the various operations, which are customarily attributed to God and from which spring the divine relations, constitutive of the Persons (see Trinity). Especially important is the distinction between operation ad intra and operation ad extra. The first is immanent in the absolute sense (i.e., formally and virtually); the second is immanent formally, but is virtually transient. In fact, every action in God, being identical with His essence, has to be immanent; but it is called transient in a certain way in that its power places a real effect outside of God; such is, for instance, the creatural act. The principle of the ad extra operation is the Trinity, the whole Trinity, which necessarily acts as one, with the same omnipotent will; on the other hand, the ad intra operations are exclusive to this or that divine Person, e.g., generation and spiration (see notions, divine).
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operation, theandric. See theandric operation.

orders, Anglican. See Anglican orders.

orders, holy (Lat. ordo = order, rank). The sacrament by which priests of the New Alliance are appointed. Christ, by right of nature and by divine vocation, is the High Priest of the New Testament. But, because He was to withdraw His visible presence and wanted to render visible and perpetual (as human nature requires) the application of His saving work, from the first days of His public life Jesus selected disciples whom He lovingly trained at His school. To crown, as it were, this divine training, He instituted the sacrifice of the Mass and, as by a supernatural investiture expressed in the words: "Do this for a commemoration of me" (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24), He transmitted to the Apostles the priestly power of renewing the unbloody offering in perpetual commemoration of the bloody immolation of Calvary, thereby constituting them representatives of men to God (ascendant mediation). On the day of the Resurrection, and on that of the Ascension, He conferred on them the power of remitting sins (John 20:20-23) and the threefold power of teaching, ministry, and government (Matt. 28:18-20), thus establishing them representatives of God with men (descendant mediation).

Number of orders. Just as He constituted a hierarchy of jurisdiction by conferring on Peter (John 22:15-18) primacy over the other Apostles, Jesus, in the days He passed with them after His Resurrection (loquax de regno Dei ("speaking about God's kingdom"), must have given opportune instructions for a parallel hierarchy of orders (see hierarchy), for, immediately after Pentecost we find this hierarchy constituted in three grades: the episcopate, the priesthood, and the diaconate (orders of divine institution; Council of Trent, sess. 24, Can. 6). Only later (fourth and fifth centuries) did the Church add lower grades to the hierarchy: subdiaconate, acolyte, exorcist, lectorate, and ostiariate (orders of ecclesiastical origin).

The conferring of orders of divine origin was always reserved to the bishop, while the collation of the other orders (except subdiaconate, in the Latin rite) may be done by a simple priest (cardinal, abbot, vicar apostolic), in accordance with the holy canons. According to a distinction, which in past centuries entered into ecclesiastical language, the episcopate, priesthood, diaconate, and subdiaconate are termed major orders and the one receiving them is said to be in sacris, while the orders of acolyte, exorcist, lector, and porter (ostiariate) are called minor orders by the Latins. The Easterners, on the other hand, consider as minor orders the subdiaconate together with the lectorate (the only orders of ecclesiastical origin admitted by the Eastern Church).

The rite of ordination. In conferring orders on the Apostles Christ did not use any sign, but right after the Ascension we see the action appear which remains the essential rite in the collation of major orders: the laying on of hands together with a prayer (cf. Acts 6:6; 13:13; 2 Tim. 1:6). The tradition or consignment of the sacred instruments and all the other rites are venerable and suggestive ceremonies of a complementary kind, and were introduced gradually in the practice of various churches and finally incorporated into the Roman Pontifical.

The effects are the character and grace. The character of orders is: (1) The most perfect participation of the priesthood of Christ, because it confers immediate power over the body of Christ in the act of making it present through the words of transubstantiation and of offering it in acceptable sacrifice to the Father (ascendant mediation). He who can act on the Head has also the right to exercise influence over the body, and hence the priest who consecrates the physical body of Christ acquires a direct power over the Mystical Body, which He teaches, sanctifies, and governs. (2) The greatest right to grace, for in transmitting the most perfect participation of the priestly office it demands a correspondingly more intense reproduction of the feeling of victim in the priest's soul, according to the priest-victim equation of the New Economy (sacerdos suae hostiae et hostia suis sacerdotii — "priest of his own victim and victim of his own priesthood"). Then again, since the character makes the priest the living ciborium of the Divinity, it demands that he be adorned with the most precious jewels of the rarest virtues. (3) The conferment of a pre-eminent
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position in the ecclesiastical society, because, it makes of the priest the leader, the father, and the teacher of the people.

The *sanctifying grace*, which this sacrament increases *ex opere operato*, is like the final touch that assimilates the soul to Christ. To it is added the sacramental grace which involves an increase of all those virtues and gifts which we may call professional: the gift of piety and the virtue of religion, for the worthy offering of the sacrifice; the gift of wisdom to instruct; and the virtue of prudence to govern.

The Council of Trent defends this doctrine against the denial of the reformers (see 23, DB, 938–968).

Three great documents on the dignity of the priesthood were promulgated: *Exhortatio ad clerus catholicum* (1608), by Pius X, and the encyclicals, *Ad catholici sacerdotii* (1935), by Pius XI, and *Menti nostre*, by Pius XII.
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Original Church (Congregation of the). See Holy See.

Origen. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301); Origenism.

Origenism. A collection of errors attributed to Origen, but not always with sufficient reason. In his vast works, Origen endeavored to give scientific expression to the truths of faith, putting to use the flower of Hellenic culture. More than any other writer he felt the influence of Platonism and, therefore, while holding firm to the basic principles of faith, he let himself be led into erroneous or very disputable interpretations, phrases, and opinions. His disciples (some of them at least) attached more attention to the growth of his teaching than to its substance, and so they developed a number of errors on the divine procession, the angels, the soul, and especially *exegesis* (q.v.).

This is the so-called *Orthodoxy* which was condemned as a whole by the II Council of Constantinople (A.D. 355) under Pope Vigilius.
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original justice. See innocence (state of).

original sin. See sin, original.

orthodox (Gr. ὁθόδοξος — right, and ὁθόνα — opinion, statement). In the theological field it means that which corresponds perfectly to the doctrine of faith (antonym, heterodox). But the term has a historical importance due to its abusive employment, by way of usurpation on the part of the Byzantine Church, after the schism attempted by Photius (nineth century) and consummated in the eleventh century by Michael Cerularius. The so-called "Orthodox Church" applied this name to itself, as if it were the custodian of the true faith.

If we preclude from the primacy of the pope, the so-called "Orthodox Church" does not present real dogmatic divergences from the Roman Catholic Church, especially in the beginning. In the course of centuries, however, certain doctrinal or liturgical disagreements have been stressed, or even created, by reaction against the definitions of the popes or of the ecumenical councils. But the true and fundamental reason of the Eastern Schism and, therefore, its principal error is the negation of the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, as successor of St. Peter.
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ostiariate (Lat. ostiarius — porter). The lowest of the four minor orders (see orders, holy). The office of the porter or ostiarius is indicated in the exhortation of the ordination: "He is to ring the bells open the doors of the church and the sacristy, prepare the book for the preacher" (Romans Pontifical).

Its origin is explained by the ancient practice of putting some person in charge of guarding the sacred edifices. The Church adopted this practice from the earliest days of the persecutions, because, occupying buildings dedicated to worship, it felt the need of guarding them and of anticipating, inasmuch as possible, enemy attack. The first mention of this order goes back to the third century.
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Pantheism. See infidels.

Pain. See penalty; suffering.

Palmites. See vision, beatific.

Palmieri. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

Pantheism (Gr. πᾶν — all, and θεός — God). A doctrine which consists essentially in drawing together the world and God up to the point of identifying them. There is a rude form of pantheism which holds the cosmic elements or brute matter to be the Divinity; hence idolatry, fetishism (q.v.). But there also is a scientific pantheism, deserving closer attention, which offers an organic and scientific conception of all reality, the world and God together. In other words, this systematic pantheism presents itself as an absolute monism (unitarian concept of reality); and monism is either materialistic, like Haeckel's (+1910), or spiritualistic, like that of Spinoza or of Gentile.

Materialistic monism, which denies spirit and spiritual values, thus reducing everything to matter, closely approaches crude pantheism. It is contradictory in itself and deserves little consideration. Spiritualistic monism is at once more elegant and insidious, reducing all reality, even material, to spirit, and its activity. It first came to life with Spinoza as a substantiation (reality is one, sole substance manifesting itself in two modes: extension and thought, hence as matter and as spirit, which is God and world at once); then it took the form of idealism, i.e., of an idea in perennial becoming (Hegel), or of an absolute ego (Fichte), or of a thinking act (Gentile). Immanenism...
neither Jesus nor the Apostles would have thought of founding and organizing a Church which would last only for a very short time. And such has been the conclusion of a large sector of non-Catholic scholars, of which Loisy is the best-known representative. The Church has intervened with official documents condemning the eschatological theory in general, defended by the modernists (DB, 2033), as well as their interpretation of the texts of the apostolic Epistles (Decr. of the Biblical Comm., June 18, 1913).

Since Jesus is the Son of God, and the Apostles, as hagiographers, are inspired by the Holy Spirit, it is obvious that they could not have been mistaken about the time of the end of the world. Nor can we think that the Apostles expressed only their personal views with respect to the imminence of the Parousia, without thereby compromising biblical inspiration, since in the Bible it is not possible to introduce a distinction between ideas and words of man and ideas and words of God (see inspiration). Jesus refused to reveal the time of His Second Coming and the end of the world (Mark 13:22 ff.), while He commanded the Apostles to spread the Gospel and the Church to all the world, promising to assist them with His presence and power: "unto the consummation of the world" (Matt. 28:20). Paul puts the Thessalonians at ease, who were worrying about the proximate return of Jesus Christ, by telling them that before that time a great apostasy will have to take place, and the Antichrist will have to show himself (2 Thess. 2:3-4); there is no sign of apocalyptic phrenesis in St. Paul, who is busy founding churches, organizing them, giving regulations to his successors for the development and propagation of Christ's message.

Since it was a question of future events, both Jesus and the Apostles, in speaking of the Parousia, employed the prophetic style, characteristic of which is the lack of tense distinction and the presentation of far-removed events as close and united to one another.

Each man's death is followed by his meeting with Christ his Judge; when, therefore, the Apostles exhort to vigilant in anticipation of the coming of Christ, they are referring to this private judgment. Moreover, they had lived with Christ not much longer than two years and had only fully understood Him after He had risen and returned to heaven. The intense desire of Him, of seeing Him again, had its influence on the Apostles who, returned to the thought of the glorious return of Christ whom they had seen Victim of the hatred of men.

paradise. A word of Persian origin, παράδεισος, which the Septuagint used to translate the Hebrew בֵּית גֶּן (garden, park). In the Vulgate we read paradisum voluptatis, in accord with the original Hebrew בֵּית גֶּן. The word paradise is otherwise, means, pleasure, delight, and has been taken in the Vulgate with this meaning. But the Septuagint took the word eden as the proper name of a region and translated παράδεισος in Εδέμ (park in Eden). This interpretation is more probable. But the Hebraic etymology of Eden and the futility of our First Parents have made of Eden the place and symbol of enjoyment and perfect delight. The word paradise has come to be used in the same way. In the Old Testament, paradise was rejected to mean the place in which God put Adam and Eve and from which He expelled them after their sin. In the New Testament and in Christian literature the earthly paradise, in the ancient sense of the word, is distinguished from the heavenly paradise, in the sense of a place where the blessed enjoy the vision of God. Thus understood, paradise, also called heaven, is, foremost, a state or condition of beatitude (q.v.), in which the vision and fruition of God are the source of eternal happiness.

But paradise is also a place, as is demanded by the presence there of the humanity of Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Virgin, assumed into heaven corporally, and of all the glorious bodies after the general resurrection (q.v.). Nothing can be said about the location of paradise.

Parousia. The word παροικία, presence, coming, return, it means the return of Christ, as Judge of the living and the dead, at the end of the world. Christ spoke in His great eschatological discourse of this second and glorious coming; the Apostles, especially Paul, mention it frequently in their epistles.

The chief difficulty of the New Testament texts, relative to the Parousia, comes from the impression they seem to give that Jesus and the Apostles held the triumphant apparition to be imminent. If this were so, participation. See analogy.

Pasch (or Passover). One of the three great liturgical solemnities, together with Pentecost and the Feast of the Tents (or Tabernacles), by which the Jewish people commemorated the benefits received from God whether in the order of nature or of grace in the course of its unsettled history. The Hebrew name for Easter is Pesach; in Aramaic, Pashāh, whence the Latin Pascha and the English Pasch. The verb root Pšh (Pāšāḥ) means "to hop over," "pass beyond" (hence the English name Passover), the festival having been instituted in memory of the survival of the firstborn of the Hebrews during the tenth plague in Egypt, when the exterminating angel "passed over."
possibility of Christ. See Docetism, propounded.

passion of Christ. The pains and sufferings, taken as a whole, sustained by Christ in His soul and body, especially in the last days of His life, which terminated in the tragedy of the cross.

Errors: Docetism, from the first century, which denied the physical reality of Christ's body by reducing it to an appearance. Aphthartodocetism (in the fifth century) of Monophysite origin (qq.v.), which predicated of Christ an incorruptible body. Based on these theories, many thought that the passion and the physical pain of Jesus were a miracle. The Theopaschites went to the opposite excess by attributing passibility to the Divinity Itself. The Church, condemning all these errors, has always taught, on the basis of revelation that the Redeemer's humanity is altogether like our own, sin excepted, as St. Paul says (Heb. 2:14; Phil. 2:6 ff.), and therefore: (a) like us, He had sensible passions, except for any disorder in them (see propositions); (b) He felt real and proper pain and sufferings of the flesh, i.e., had a perfect passibility; (c) although the passion of the humanity is proper to the Word, it does not at all affect the Divinity, which remains absolutely impassible.

To prove the truth and reality of the pain and of all the passion of Christ, it suffices to read the Gospel which speaks in realistic language of His weariness (John 4:6), His hunger and thirst (Matt. 4:2; John 17:1), His mortal sadness to the point of sweating blood. In the Old Testament, the Messias was prophesied as the "Man of sufferings or sorrows." St. Thomas demonstrates that the suffering of Jesus Christ, proportionately to His infinite love, was maximum both extensively and intensively; nevertheless, His soul, even during the passion, continued to enjoy the beatific vision in the intellective faculty, like a mountaintop that basked in the sun while the roaring tempest battered its flanks.
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Patristicism. See modalism; monarchianism.

Pelagianism. A great heresy of the fifth century, diffused chiefly in the Western Churches by the Briton monk, Pelagius, who came to Rome about 400, where he met Ruffinus, a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia (see Nestorianism) and a dissembler of the transmission of original sin (q.v.). Quickly Pelagius followed this trend, helped in the propagation of his ideas by his loquacious disciple Celestius.

The Pelagian heresy can be reduced to a naturalistic system on the anthropological level, to the prejudice of the supernatural: it has also a Stoic tint in its exaltation of man's moral strength against evil. Its basic principles are: (a) The sin committed by Adam injured or harmed him alone and in no wise is it transmitted to his descendants by generation. (b) Babies are born in the identically same condition in which Adam was before his sin: hence they are innocent and friends of God. (c) Babies, even unbaptized, reach eternal life. (d) Man, with his natural forces and his free will, can avoid all sin and win the beatific vision. (e) Grace, as an entity intrinsic to man, does not exist, nor is it necessary; grace is Christ's example, the law, and free will itself. (f)

The Redemption is not a regeneration of man in his soul vivified by grace, but is rather the call for a higher life to be won by one's own efforts.

Pelagianism is bent on destroying the whole supernatural order. St. Augustine immediately saw the gravity of the danger and joined battle without truce for the defense of the Christian truth, first against Pelagius and Celestius, who had gone to Africa, and then against Julian, Bishop of Eclans, who had systematized the Pelagian error. Through the work of St. Augustine the heresy was condemned in 418 in a great Council at Carthage, approved by Pope Zozimus, who briefed its definitions in an "Epistula tractoria," which was sent to all the churches. Julian of Eclans, together with seventeen other Italian bishops, refused to endorse the pontifical letter, and went in exile into the East, to join Theodore of Mopsuestia. Pelagianism was condemned also in the Council of Ephesus, together with Nestorianism (431), and in the II Council of Orange (529, DB, 101 ff., 126 ff., 174 ff.).
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penalty (Gr. πατωμένος). The privation of a good which the rational creature undergoes involuntarily on account of its sins. Penality is therefore an evil (malum praeconatum), which stems from another evil (malum culpae). Although evil (q.v.), being a priva-
tion or lack of good, follows naturally the lot of every finite good, yet we know from revelation that God had created man in such a state that, had he not sinned, he would not have suffered evil.

As a consequence of original sin, evil has invaded the world under the form of sin and of punishment. Punishment is divided into *concussion* and *infliction*: the former stems naturally from guilt and accompanies it, e.g., remorse or loss of honor; the second is imposed by the judge (God or man) in relationship to guilt. Moreover, the punishment inflicted may be *medicinal* or *vindicutive*, according as the judge threatens to inflict it (*poena comminata*) to keep man away from guilt, or actually inflicts it to re-establish the violated order. In theology, the punishment inflicted by God on man who has offended the divine majesty is called the *penance* in grave guilt is subdivided into *poena damni* (pain of loss: loss of God) and *poena sensorius* (pain of sense: positive suffering inflicted by God) (see *hell; damned*). Justice forbids that punishment be inflicted for guilt that is not voluntary on the part of the individual's own will: therefore babies who die unbaptized are deprived of the beatific vision (*poena damni*), but will not be punished positively like the demons and the damned (*poena sensorius*).

Juridically, the penalty is in proportion to *crime*, which the CIC (Can. 2105) defines as: “an external violation, morally imputable, of a law provided with a canonical sanction, at least undetermined.” The penal sanction belongs to the coercive power of a perfect society such as is the Church. The penalties established by the Church are multiple and all aim principally at the good of the delinquent and at the common good of the Christian family. In the old discipline there were corporal penalties also. Nowadays the spiritual penalty prevails. There are three categories of ecclesiastical penalties:

1. *Medicinal* penalties or censures are inflicted especially on the con- tumacious for the purpose of bringing about their repentance. They are: (a) *excommunication*, by which one who is guilty of an external crime is separated from the communion of the faithful; (b) *interdict*, which is inflicted on persons and things and which involves privation of some sacraments, or in general of some sacred things; (c) *suspension*, which is inflicted on clerics only and involves privation of an office or benefice.

2. *Vindicative* penalties are inflicted for the purpose of *expiation*, e.g., privation of Christian burial, deposition or degradation of a priest.

3. *Penal remedies and penances*, like warning, surveillance, the recitation of certain prayers, spiritual exercises.
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penance (Lat. poscitore — to repent)

The sacrament in which the priest, the representative of God, remits sins committed after baptism. Jesus Christ instituted it on the day of the Resurrection when, breathing on His Apostles, He said: “Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained” (John 20:22–23). The expression “forgive sins” signifies a total pardon of sin, in so far as sins are an offense against God. By virtue of these words of universal character, the Church has defined that the power conferred by Christ is not only all inclusive, i.e., having no limitations of any kind either with respect to the number or to the gravity of the sins (against the Montanists of the second century, and the Novatians of the third century), but is also unsusceptible of being twined in any way from its natural meaning or connotated to signify the power of preaching and baptizing (against Luther), or of declaring sins remitted (against Calvin), or of extinguishing their punishment (against the Anglicans). CT. Council of Trent, sess. 14, DB, 894, 912, 913, 919, 920.

From the same words it is deduced also that the power conferred on the Apostles and their successors is of a *judicial nature*. Since, in fact, this power can be applied in two positive and opposite acts (the act of remitting or the act of retaining), it involves the knowledge of the cause of the delinquency and a *judgment* on the subject, whereby the power may be, in a concrete case, determined either to the one or the other of the two acts, to which it is of itself indifferent. Hence, this judicial power can be exercised only by the pronouncement of a sentence after an objective evaluation of the penitent’s cause and in accord with divine law, which establishes that pardon be granted to the sincerely repentant sinner who confesses his sins and agrees to make condition satisfaction for it. Therefore, the elements constitutive of the sacramental rite of penance are the sentence of the judge or *absolution* (form) and the three acts of the sinner: contrition, confession, satisfaction (matter) (*qq.v.*).

The absolution, which determines sacramentally the three acts of the penitent, restores sanctifying grace to him. In other words, the sinner recovers in this sacrament adoptive sonship, the benevolence of the Father, who, having put on him again the “first robe” of justification, readmits the new prodigal son into His house, restoring his lost rights to him. However, the measure of this restitution of primitive rights, i.e., the reviviscence of merits (*iura ad premiatum gloriae*), corresponds to the fervor with which the penitent rises from his fall, according to the axiom “God gives Himself in proportion to the fervor He finds in us.” Connected with the restoration of the supernatural organism is the new orientation which the *sacramental grace* impinges on it: an increase of the virtue of penance and of the helps of actual grace, through which the penitent’s soul finds itself under the constant impetus of an inclination (the spirit of penance) which, if supported by his docility, is able to make him ascend to the highest peaks of sanctity. The ascent toward the reconquest of spiritual integrity is rendered easier by the readmission of the healed member to the participation of the goods of the Communion of Saints. Furthermore, the Church, like the mother who is more merciful according to the greater need of her child, showers more abundantly the treasures of the merits of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints, on the spiritually more needy member, especially, by the granting of indulgences (*qq.v.*).
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perfection. Etymologically, perfect stems from the Latin perfercere (finish, do through to the end), and means "completely done." But, if we preclude from action, which renders a thing perfect, perfection may be considered simply as full possession of act, i.e., as actuality in opposition to the potential or the virtual state.

In this sense God is infinitely perfect, because He is Pure Act. Being subsisting by essence, which does not admit of any limitation or any evolution to further acquisition.

Every perfection is a mode of being; where there is subsisting being, all perfections are in act. Since goodness is that to which beings tend as to their proper perfection, the most perfect Being, God, is the highest Good. Goodness itself, source and end of all finite good. St. Thomas (Summa Theol., I, q. 4, a. 4) writes: "All things are said to be good with the divine goodness, because it is the exemplary, effective, and final principle of all goodness." Plato asserted the primacy of goodness, hence the dialectics of love (cf., e.g., the Symposium).
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Perrone. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

perseverance, final. A great gift of God by which man, at the moment of death, is in the state of sanctifying grace and, therefore, is saved. Actually, perseverance refers primarily to the process of living under the influence of God's grace. Man, clad with sanctifying grace, given the weakness of his nature marred by original sin and the devil's attacks, is always in danger of losing God's friendship by succumbing to temptation, notwithstanding his resolution to the contrary. There is not in this life a fixed state of the soul in grace that, as in the case of the blessed, makes relapse into sin impossible. With fine psychological sense, St. Thomas (Summa Theol., I-II, q. 109, a. 5, q. 9) presents the explanation: As sanctifying grace heals the mind but does not nullify concupiscence, there arise in man sudden and unexpected movements of the passions, which the mind—not always vigilant and alert—is not always successful in dominating for a continuous tension is psychologically impossible. Hence guilt, which returns from time to time; we resist for a time, but soon grow weary of watching and fighting and finally capitulate deliberately.

The Council of Trent expounds (sess. 6, c. 22) that man, already adorned with sanctifying grace, cannot persevere in holiness without a special help from God. Even more—according to the same Council (c. 16), sanctified man needs a particular, divine help for final perseverance, which is the magnum donum (great gift) veiled by the mystery of predestination (q.v.).

The gift of final perseverance is complex, since it supposes the state of sanctifying grace and requires, in addition, a continuous influx of efficacious actual grace for the whole life, and especially at the hour of death, bristling with psychological difficulties and temptations. Besides, that gift includes timely dispositions of divine providence, joining the state of grace with the exact instant of death, on which depends man's eternal status. Surely man must collaborate with God by co-operating freely with His grace, in order to merit eternal salvation; but it is also certain that such a decisive moment, on which converge so many diverse elements, must lie in His hands. Man cannot be sure of final perseverance.

Neither can he merit it in the true sense of the word (see merit); but he can, according to a happy expression of the Fathers, merit it by prayer (supplieior merce).
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Soleri. "Perseverance (Final)," CE.

person. Boethius defines it as the "individual substance of a rational nature"; St. Thomas, more concisely and exactly, as the "distinct being, subsisting in an intellectual nature."

The best pagan philosophy (e.g., Aristotle) never explored fully the problem of person. The concept of "person" is almost exclusively Christian, for it developed in the light of the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. These mysteries suggested the distinction between nature and person, which was the first conquest of Christian thought. The Scholastics, following in the steps of the Fathers, elaborated a rich doctrine with varied positions. The person is a whole, of which the nature is the basic part; in addition to the nature, it includes "individualizing principles" which stem from matter, accidents, and individual existence. Putting the individuated nature outside of its causes and in the world of reality. If this individuated and distinctly subsisting nature is rational, it is called a person; if irrational or even inanimate, it is termed a suppositum. Which of these elements, however, is formally and definitively constitutive of person as such? This problem has been given various solutions: subsistence has been called the formal characteristic of person, but the schools differ as to the negative or positive mode of interpreting this subsistence.

1. Negative: Scotus maintains that subsistence or personality is incommunicous (a nature in that it does not communicate with another); Tiphanius, taking up again this opinion, tries to give it a positive content by saying that subsistence is the totality, or state of completeness, of a nature in itself.

2. Positive: Some theologians (Cajetan, Suarez) reduce subsistence to a substantial mode, which would terminate the nature; others (Capreolus, many moderns) reduce it to the actual existence, i.e., to the very act of existing, proper to a substance. This last opinion is preferable on account of its simplicity and greater adherence to the definitions of the Church magisterium. For example, in the Incarnation the human nature of Christ is not a person, because it does not have its own existence or act of existing, but subsists by virtue of the divine act of existence of the Word, thus participating in the Word's divine personality. Modern philosophy tends to hold that person is constituted by self-consciousness; against this opinion there are both philosophical and theological difficulties. Consciousness of the ego presupposes existence of the ego; consequently it reveals the ego, but does not constitute it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

St. Thomas, Summa Theol., I, q. 29, a. 1-3.

Geddes. "Person," CE.

Peter Parente, La geneesi cristiana della personalità (Rome, 1933); De Verbo Incarnato (Rome, 1938). Purnell, Dogmatic Theology.

II The Divine Trinity (St. Louis, 1946), pp. 220-228; IV Christology (St. Louis, 1946), pp. 129-132.
degenerations have their roots in the sentimentalism, objectivism, and anti-historical character of Pietism, antithetical and antihierarchical. However, Pietism had efficacious influence on the various sectors of intellectual and civil life: two great musicians, Bach and Handel, drew artistic inspiration from it in their musical compositions. In the eighteenth century Pietism was revived in the Confraternities of Herrnhut of Nic. Lud. Zinzendorf, with a Lutheran base.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


piety. See gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Pneumatomachists. See Macedonians.

Polycarp. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301).

polytheism (Gr. πολυθεία — many, and θεός — god). A religious system which admits more than one deity. It is the antithesis of monotheism (q.v.).

Many controversies have flared up among students of the history of religions, especially in modern times, about the origin of polytheism. The work of Max Müller, who is considered the founder of the scientific study of religions, is noteworthy. In the first phase of his research he thought he could tie up the origin of polytheism with a linguistic phenomenon, polynomya, i.e., plurality of names, of genders, of endings, which would have favored personification of various divinities. Later he connected the origin of polytheism with three sources: (1) the physical source (natural things, like stones, rivers, trees, stars, etc.); (2) the psychological source (domestic and social relations); (3) the psychological source (consciousness of the ego in relationship to the infinite). To these speculative theories are added those of fetishism and animism (q.v.), as well as astral mythology, totemism (relation between tribes and animals), Magism, etc. All these theories are in general agreement in asserting that the primitive religion was polytheistic and mythological, and that the progress of civilization has led to its degeneration.

But a direct and accurate study of the facts has led to the discovery of a worship of a supreme being, which is found more or less in all primitive peoples. The supreme being or god is represented as creator of all, even of inferior spirits or divinities, as omnipotent, omnipresent, just. This fact, quite constant and uniform in the most ancient peoples, shows that monotheism is prior to polytheism, and that the latter is a degeneration of the former.

This truth is also contained in the Holy Scripture (cf. Wisdom, Romans), which describes the guilty aberration of man, who, although knowing the Supreme Being, dared to turn his mind and heart from Him and form for himself absurd divinities, personifying objects, plants, and animals.
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pontif, Roman. See Roman pontiff.

"Pontifical, Roman." See liturgy.

pope (Gr. πάπας — father). The name tradition has reserved for the Bishop of Rome, who, as successor of St. Peter, is the heir of the primacy over the entire Church (see primacy of St. Peter; Roman pontiff). By virtue of this prerogative, for twenty centuries the pope has been the greatest reality at the center not only of Roman but of world history (Urbis et Orbis). "After Constantine turned the Roman eagle around and made him fly counter to heaven's course" (as Dante expresses it in the Divina Commedia, Paradiso, 6, 1–2), transferring to the Bosphorus his glorious nest, Rome, having become the coveted objective of so many barbarians, adventurers, and conquerors, would quite soon have become a rubble heap of proud ruins, had not her Bishop made himself her defender. From St. Leo the Great to the present Holy Father, the pope, by spontaneous and universal recognition of the nations, has been greeted as the "pontifex orbis" (pontiff of the world, City).

The world (orbis), in its turn, consciously or unconsciously gravitates around the Vicar of Christ. The Christian world is constituted, strengthened, and defended by the papacy. From Rome, as from a luminous focus, beam forth the rays which dispel the darkness of paganism and barbarism and extend the zone of divine influences. Ireland (truly the first-born of the Church), the Franks, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Slavs enter the luminous orbit of the cross because the pope entrusted to Patrick, to Boniface, to Angar and Willibrord, to Cyril and Methodius, the missio cannica which made them authentic heralds of the Gospel. Having made Europe Christian, the pope unified and stabilized it by creating the Holy Roman Empire, which even in its degeneration served to assure the sense of unity and universality to the world of the Middle Ages. When the Moslem threat, the arrogance of rebel princes, and the seething heresies fixed the wedge to split the great
block of Christianity, the pope declared Crusades, fulminated excommunications, assembled councils. After the fever of nationalism and the rebellion of Martin Luther (real paralysis of Christianity) threw Christian Europe into confusion and disorder; after Jansenism and Gallicanism did their best to split the inner structure of the Church, the hierarchy, in addition to its strong condemnations of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, convinced the Vatican Council for the purpose of neutralizing once and for all the last germs of dissent from ecclesiastical unity. Thus, entirely centered in its visible head, the Church, having given all she could to the Christian world, now, never again turns her maternal eyes toward the world of paganism, confidently hoping for an abundant compensation for the defection of so many among her children.
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**portor's office.** See ostiariate.

**positivism.** Rather than a system it is a tendency of thought, which developed in the past century as a reaction to the currents of idealism. Against the subjectivist constructions of idealism and sentimentalistic dreams of romanticism, its ally, there arose toward the end of the nineteenth century a positive current of thought which preferred experience to theory, sensation to abstract concept, and fact to principle. It was a strong

summons to minds to come down from lofty speculations to the concrete reality of nature and human life, under the impulse of the practical sciences, which had an extensive development in that epoch. Positivism has its remote roots in English empiricism of the seventeenth century (Locke) and in the French senility of Condillac, but its proximate roots are found in Kantian criticism; it had depreciated knowledge in the metaphysical zone (nomen en) to the advantage of the empirical or phenomenological zone. Confining themselves to the fact and the world of senses, the positivists draw close to materialism, but detach themselves from it by admitting the possibility of a supersensible reality, e.g., God. The materialist denies it; the positivist is an agnostic in that he says he is ignorant as long as he is not able to demonstrate it empirically.

The founder of positivism in France was Auguste Comte (+ 1857), a man of genius but lacking balance, who pivoted his system on the theory of the three stages: the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive, which mark the steps in the progress of humanity from naive imagination, to abstract reasoning, to the direct knowledge of nature, in which dominate the phenomena with their laws—object of experience. Human life itself is reduced to a complex of phenomena and of social and individual physical laws. There is no God above nature, but only humanity, the great being, to which worship should be given.

In England, positivism takes on a more scientific and practical cast with Herbert Spencer (+ 1913), who adopts the evolutionary theory and applies it to cosmology, anthropology, sociology, and ethics. According to Spencer, there is in the universe an unknowable which science and religion must respect, containing them-
certainty, of life and religion. The starting point of pragmatism is the devaluation of the theoretical world of ideas; ideas have no value of themselves, but are considered only in function of action. In order to act and accomplish, man needs a conviction, a belief: the ideas must, therefore, converge toward a belief which is to become the principle of action. If in the course of action it is seen that an idea helps, then it will be said that it is true. The truth of an idea depends on its practical verification. This is the so-called scientific method of the pragmatists in opposition to the intellectualistic methods in the search of truth. Thus it appears clear that for the pragmatists there exists no immutable or eternal truth: truth, on the contrary, develops itself and is in continual flux of becoming, like action itself, which is the purpose of life.

In the religious field pragmatism rejects all external revelation of truth and all conceptual systems, limiting itself to the consideration of individual religious feeling and consciousness, called by the technical term of religious experience. Through this experience the individual feels the divine and elevates himself to God by an act of faith, which is pure will to believe (not adhesion of the intellect to revealed truths) and tendency to verify the utility and advantage of believing. This act of faith may appropriate to itself even a previously formed religion such as Christianity, but only provisionally and in so far as such religion proves itself useful and efficacious in practice. Theoretic discussions of principles are useless in the field of religion just as they are useless in philosophy. Pragmatism is an anti-metaphysical system because it is anti-intellectualistic (basically it is, sensism, which goes back to the English empiricism of Locke and Hume). Viewed as a critique of knowledge, it falls into disastrous relativism by denying the first logical principles and the stability of truth with correspondingly disastrous repercussions in the moral field. Goodness and truth become something subjective, subordinated to convictions of the individual and his experimental tests.

From a religious viewpoint pragmatism is a radical denial of all revealed religion and makes God's very existence conditioned by psychological experience, which is an exaltation of the will against reason. Pragmatism stems especially in the matter of religion, from the Lutheran principle of fiducial faith (see Lutheranism).
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prayer. Commonly defined as an elevation of the soul to God in order to express to Him our feelings and our petitions. Psychologically, prayer is an act of the intellect, whereas devotion is an act of the will, which gives itself readily to God's service; both appertain to the virtue of religion, which inclines man to render due reverence and honor to God (St. Thomas). In a broad sense, any movement toward God or work done for Him can be called prayer. But, strictly speaking, prayer is elevation of the mind to God (subjective aspect), and request or petition (objective aspect).

A divine model of prayer is the Pater Noster, dictated by Jesus, who has given an example of the continuous use of prayer and who has exhorted us to pray always. Prayer, as an act of religion, is a duty; but it is also a need of the soul, which feels its own infirmities and indulges and turns in humility and confidence to the One who can help it. Prayer can be mental (silent) or oral (vocal). The sound of the word does not serve to communicate with God, who knows all things, but to excite our own affections. Those who admit universal fatalism or determinism deny the value of prayer, rejecting the concept of a provident God. But, even when divine providence is admitted, a vexatious question can arise: prayer, if effective, would seem to change God's plan (which is immutable). St. Thomas maintains that ab aeterno divine providence has disposed that certain effects should be conditioned by prayer and subordinate to it, and so prayer enters together with the other elements in the design of God.

The terminus propter of our prayer is God alone, the Triune God! But we pray also for the Blessed Virgin and for the saints that they may intercede for us. The efficacy of prayer depends on the divine mercy, but ordinarily it is proportionate also to the dignity of the one praying. Mary's power of intercession is significantly called by the Fathers omnipotens supplex. Jesus Christ as Man prayed on earth and, according to St. Paul, He continues to intercede for us in heaven. Even the sinner can and should pray that God hears him and answers his prayer not in justice but in mercy.

The entire Christian liturgy bears witness to the usefulness, beauty, and necessity of prayer (see contemplation; mystics).
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predestination. A doctrine derived from a misunderstanding of some expressions of St. Augustine concerning the gratuity of grace and the weakness of our free will as a consequence of original sin (q.v.). The first predestinarian was the French priest Lucidus (fifth century), who, fighting the Semi-Pelagians (qq.v.), fell into rigorism as regards the doctrine of predestination. His error was repeated in the ninth century by the monk Gottschalk, and later by Wicillf and Hhus.

Luther, Calvin, and Jansenius (see Calvinism; Jansenism) accentuated the pessimistic tone of this heresy, which may be summarized as follows: (a) through original sin, man has lost his liberty, becoming a slave of concupiscence; (b) God does not will the salvation of all men, but only of some who are gratuitously predestined; (c) to cooperate with grace; (c) the acts of the predestined are necessarily good, while the acts of those who are not predestined are necessarily infected with sin; (d) the divine decree, which determines the eternal fate of men, precedes all consideration of merits or demerits, because God creates some men for heaven and others for hell (Calvin, Instr. relig. christ., i, 3, 21); (e) Christ did not die in behalf of all men (Jansenius).

The Church has condemned such errors on several occasions (cf. DB, 316, 320 f., 816, 827).
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See under predestination.

predestination. The general meaning is to prearrange in view of an end. In a theological sense, predestination
is the order or plan conceived by God to bring the rational creature to its supernatural end, which is life eternal (St. Thomas).

1. Holy Scripture: St. Paul speaks of it most insistently (Rom. 8: 1-7), employing the term προοίμιον to indicate a plan of God, which envisages as a whole the Christian salvation of mankind (cf. Lagrange, Comm. on the Epistle to the Romans), to be effectuated through grace and the heavenly gifts, human co-operation, however, not being excluded.

2. Tradition culminates in St. Augustine, who, against the Pelagians, developed amply the thought of St. Paul, conceiving the idea of a category of men, whom God, according to His will and choice, helps in such a way as to assure their salvation. To other men God grants some help, but not as efficacious as to the predestined; in fact, these are not saved. The immanent nature of predestination is a mystery, but none can accuse God of injustice, since original sin has made humanity a “mass of damnation,” and God, out of His sheer goodness, selects in it a group of souls predestined infallibly to eternal life. Moreover, no one is damned without his own guilt (cf. De praedestinatione sanctorum; De gratia et libero arbitrio).

3. The Church has defined gratuitousness of predestination to grace and glory, but has condemned the predestination of Gottschalk, Hux, Wickliffe, Luther, and Calvin, who put those predestined to paradise and those predestined to hell on the same footing, independently of merit or demerit.

4. The theologians: St. Thomas adopts substantially the teaching of St. Augustine, but smoothens some of its rough angles and tempers the question, taking into account all its elements.

In the sixteenth century a violent controversy concerning the divine concourse and knowledge flared up between Dominicans (Bannesians) and Jesuits (Molinists), which was brought before the pope, but without definitive results (Congregatio de Auxiliis). Naturally the question involved, later on, the problem of predestination, especially on the following point: in predestining to eternal life does God, in His mind, take account of the meritorious co-operation of man? The Bannesians say “No” (predestination ante praevia merita); some Molinists say “Yes” (predestination post praevia merita), whereas still other Molinists (the Suarezians), stand rather for the “no” of the followers of Bañez. This point, however, is not the only one contested. In any system the mystery remains and perhaps consists in the complex multiplicity of the elements (grace, divine knowledge, free will, etc.). Christian doctrine, however, insists on two things: (a) to be saved we must co-operate with grace; (b) no one is damned unless it be through his own fault (cf. II C. of Orange, C. of Kyris, C. of Trent: DB, 192 ff., 316 ff., 826-827, 850).
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predestination. See concourse, divine; grace, efficacious; Bann- eism.

premeditation. See concourse, divine.

premation. See concourse, divine.

prescience (foreknowledge), The knowledge of future things attributed to God. Future is that which is contained virtually in its own cause with a relationship or tendency to be realized by it. This relationship to real existence is not found in the concept of “possible.” The “future” is: (a) necessary, if it depends on a cause determined by fixed natural law, e.g., an eclipse; (b) contingent, if it depends on a cause not determined necessarily, as is the free, future act, proper to the human will; (c) absolute or conditioned, according as it is independent or dependent on a condition. If man’s freedom determines that it will never happen—though possibly it could—the future is called hypothetical or futurable; e.g., if Christ returned to earth to preach again before the judgment, the whole world would be converted.

A famous controversy flared up in the sixteenth century between the Dominicans and the Jesuits on the divine foreknowledge. We must distinguish the fact from the manner. (1) First of all, it is a definite theological principle that the creatures are not the cause of God’s knowledge, but rather the divine knowledge is the cause of the creatures—taken, however, in co-operation with the divine will. (2) It is an article of faith that God knows all things, including any kind of future events whatever (Vatican Council, sess. 3). St. Augustine, in De Civitate Dei, 5, 9, affirms: “Who does not know in anticipation all future things surely is not God.” (3) The mode or manner according to which God knows
the future is mysterious and draws its particular difficulty from the general difficulty of the relationship between the Infinite and finite, eternity and time.

The greatest difficulty lies in conciliating divine presence with human free will. Thomism (see Bonnesianism) starts from God and defends His dominion even over human acts, which He foresees inasmuch as He determines them with His omnipotent will, physically moving the human will to do what He wills. Thus, the mystery vanishes as far as God is concerned, but it grows on the human side (see concourse, divine). Molinism (q.v.) starts from man and defends free will in regard to the influence of grace and divine pre-science, adopting the so-called middle knowledge (scientia media) in which God would know, before His will comes into play, what a man would do in this or that creatable order of things. The mystery vanishes in man, but grows in God.

The Church permits discussion in the matter. Perhaps the truth is partially on both sides. The mystery lies in the complexity of the elements in play: free act, which involves intellect and will, divine knowledge (exemplary cause), divine will (efficient cause), presence in the strict sense (see eternity).
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presence of God. It may be considered with reference to place or to time. In regard to place, God is present contemporaneously everywhere because of His infinity and immensity (see infinity). But, as St. Thomas remarks (Summa C. Gent., IV, 68), God is everywhere not in the way a body extends itself into the space, i.e., having one part here and one part there, but by reason of His simplicity He is in the entire universe and entirely in each part of it. The base or reason of this omnipresence is His action: God is present in every creature inasmuch as He acts (conserving its being, moving it in its operation). And since the action and the essence of God are identical, where He acts, there He is, wholly and essentially. With reference to time, God is actually present to all its moments (past, present, future) because He is eternal (see eternity), and as such He transcends and dominates all time. This is His natural omnipresence, expressed by the Scholastics in three formulas: per potentiam, in so far as He operates in all things; per praesentiam, in so far as He is eternal and sees all things, according to the words of Holy Scripture omnia nuda et aperta sunt oculis eius (He 4:13); per essentiam, because in Him action and essence are identical.

In addition to this presence which is called subjective, God is present objectively in every intellect which knows Him and in every will which loves Him. Finally, God makes Himself present in a special way in the human soul sanctified by grace (supernatural presence), which becomes, therefore, the temple of God (St. Paul). But even here the basic reason of His presence is a divine action in the creature. It is, however, undeniable that God makes Himself present in the sanctified soul also as the object of supernatural faith and love, pending in preparation for the beatific vision, of which the life of grace is a prelude (see mission, divine; indwelling of the Holy Trinity).
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See under indwelling of the Holy Trinity.

Presence, Real, Eucharistic (fact). A dogma of Catholic faith that under the species of bread and wine, once consecration has been performed, the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ are really present. This truth, being above the powers of reason and foreign to experience, can be admitted only on the basis of divine revelation.

God has revealed this mystery to us in three facts narrated in the New Testament which are forged together like the rings in a chain: the promise, the institution, and the celebration of the Eucharist in the nascent Church. The promise is related by St. John. Jesus, climesas, as it were, the three miracles He had just wrought (the multiplication of the loaves, the walking on the waves, and the pyramidal landing of the boat), by elevating the thoughts of His audience to a spiritual bread, which is identical with His own flesh, not subject to nature's law, and which, when eaten, has the effect of bringing souls to the portals of eternal life. The most salient words are: "Amen, amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed" (John 6:54-56).

Jesus spoke so clearly that the disciples declared they could not accept the content of His words, whereas St. Peter, as spokesman for the Apostles and expressing, in its germ as it were, the faith of the whole Church, cried out: "We have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John 6:69).

Engraved upon the souls of the Twelve, the words of the promise are the natural background against which the scene of the Last Supper (the institution) is set. When Christ took the bread and said: "This is my Body," and holding the chalice of wine in His hands, added, "This is my Blood" (Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-23; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor. 11:24-25), the Apostles in the actions and words of their Master immediately recognized the fulfillment of the promise made at Capernaum. Obedient to His command "Do this for a commemoration of me," the Apostles immediately after Pentecost began the celebration of the Eucharist at Jerusalem (Acts 2:42), at Tarsus (Acts 20:7-11), at Corinth; it was precisely in this last city that those disorders came about which provoked St. Paul's letter, in which the faith of the nascent Church is, as it were, photographed in the act of its normal exercise (cf. 1 Cor. 10:14-21; 11:23-24).

Tradition walks firmly in the path traced by the Apostolic faith: the first Christian generations adhered to the Real Presence as to the fundamental cell of dogma and piety. The Doctors of the fourth and fifth centuries made it the subject of their catecheses, homilies, and discussions, and used it as a foundation and sure premise in settling Trinitarian, Christological, and ecclesiological controversies, which were then stirring in the bosom of Christianity. From the sixth to the tenth centuries the Church transmitted to the new peoples regenerated under Christ the torch of eucharistic faith, which was taken up with such sincere enthusiasm that when, in the eleventh century, Berengarius (7-1088) impugned, for the first time in history, the Real Presence, the faithful rose in a body up against the heretic and constrained him to abjure his error. But while
presence, real

Berenarius' denial provoked a strengthening in Eucharistic faith and increased the gravitational pull of medieval civilization around the central mystery of the Eucharist, the heresy of the Protestant sacramentarians (Zwingli, Carlstadt, Oecolampadius), who reduced the Eucharist to an empty symbol of the body of Christ, and the heresy of Calvin and the Anglicans, imagining the sacrament of the altar as a bread permeated with a mysterious force emanating from the body of Jesus present in heaven only, turned many from the profession of this dogma. Against these errors the Council of Trent (sess. 13) defined that in the Eucharist "is contained truly, really, and substantially the body, the blood, the soul, and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," and condemned those who asserted the sign or figure or only virtually (DB, 885).

As regards the way, mode, and condition of the Real Presence, see transubstantiation; presence, real, eucharistic (mode); eucharistic accidents.
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preternatural

preternatural. That which surpasses nature, its laws and its active and passive potency or capacity. According to the Catholic doctrine, we distinguish between a natural and a supernatural order (q.v.). The supernatural has various gradations: the absolute supernatural, which transcends all created nature, and is, in the line of substance, God Himself; in the line of accidents, e.g., grace (q.v.); the relative supernatural, which transcends only one sector of created nature, as, e.g., infused knowledge which transcends human nature but is natural in the angels; and finally, the preternatural, which, although surpassing the natural conditions of a being, is only an extraordinary perfectioning of it, as, e.g., immortality of the body, which does not transcend absolutely human nature since it is but the extraordinary prolongation of the life already existing in the body.

In the state of original innocence (q.v.) sanctifying grace and the infused virtues (supernatural gifts) must be distinguished from an aggregate of preternatural gifts, which constitute the integrity (q.v.) of human
nature (bodily immortality, infused knowledge and immortality from concupiscence).

A miracle (q.v.) belongs to the supernatural world when the happening is miraculous in its substance, and to the preternatural world when it is miraculous only in the mode or manner in which it is performed.

Finally, preternatural is customarily termed that which cannot be explained by the commonly known laws of nature, e.g., certain hypothetically diabolic phenomena, among them, according to some authors, spiritualistic phenomena (see spiritism).
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**priest.** See presbyter.

**priesthood of Christ.** The Latin word for priest is sacerdos (sacra dans — giving holy things) and his state or office is called sacerdotium. The priest or sacerdos in the proper sense of the word is a mediator, divinely constituted, who offers to God a true sacrifice in recognition of His supreme dominion and in expiation of human guilt, thus procuring for men the appeasement and friendship of God. "Priest" and "sacrifice" are correlative and are found in every religion.

It is a truth of faith that Jesus Christ is a perfect Priest (Council of Ephesus and Council of Trent, sess. 23, DB, 132). Revelation is clear: "The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech" (Ps. 109:4). St. Paul in his commentary on this text (Epistle to the Hebrews) develops amply the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, showing its excellence in comparison with the priesthood of the Old Testament, which is surpassed and abrogated. Christ is the holy and immaculate Pontiff who, by offering the sacrifice of Himself on the cross one time only, has wrought for all time the redemption of humanity from sin.

Theological reason also proves that Christ is truly a Priest, because He is a perfect Mediator (see mediation) and has offered a real sacrifice (q.v.). The theologians discuss the formal constitutive reason of Christ's priesthood. The most probable opinion is that Christ is Priest because of the hypostatic union, which makes Him a true Mediator. We may consider, as integrative elements of the same priesthood, sanctifying grace, which is in Christ as individual Man and as Head of the Mystical Body of the Church, as well as the designation or vocation of Christ by the Father (Heb. 5). The Catholic priesthood is a participation of the priesthood of Christ, the one true Priest, living and operating in each of His ministers.
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**priesthood, participated.** See orders, holy.

**primary of St. Peter.** The power of jurisdiction (see hierarchy) — not of simple directive authority or of excellence or of honor — conferred by Jesus Christ on the Prince of the Apostles, by force of which he became supreme head and ruler of the whole Church.

The Vatican Council, defining this point of doctrine (DB, 1832), merely interpreted authentically the words of Christ, whose historicity is admitted even by the rationalists.

The primary of Peter, indeed, is insinuated in the changing of his name, promulged in the colloquy at Cesarea of Philippi, conferred after the resurrection on the banks of the Lake of Tiberias, and exercised in the nascent Church.

Jesus imposed on Simon the name Peter (Matt. 16:17; Mark 3:16; Luke 6:14; John 1:42). According to biblical customs, change of name had great significance: when God wished to establish the patriarchate, He chose Abram to be head and center of that institution and changed his name to Abraham; when He instituted the Synagogue He chose as its head another great patriarch, Jacob, and changed his name to Israel. The mysterious meaning of the new name was revealed by the Master in the memorable scene that took place at the foot of Mt. Hermon: "Jesus saith to them [Apostles]: But who do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock 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 on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. 16:15-19).

In these words the Saviour spoke to Peter in terms of the future; it is the promise! The conferring of that power comes after the resurrection near the Lake of Tiberias; Jesus now speaks in the present: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs. He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs. He said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he had said to him the third time: Lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my sheep" (John 21:15-17).

Representing His Church with the image of an edifice, of a kingdom, of a flock, Jesus makes Peter the foundation, the key bearer, the shepherd. "In the first comparison, that of the building, stability of doctrine is more particularly brought out, in the second the power of governing is more stressed, and in the third especially envisaged is pastoral care and affection; but in each comparison the primary of St. Peter is abundantly and perfectly portrayed" (Card. Capcelletto). The history of the infant Church shows the son of Jona had full consciousness of being "pastor" (shepherd) not only of the lambs but also of the sheep — of all Christ's flock; in fact, immediately after the Ascension, Peter acted as the supreme head of the Church. It was Peter who proposed in the Cenacle that a substitute be named to take the place of Judas Iscariot in the Apostolic College; it was Peter who was the first to preach on Pentecost; it was Peter who received the first pagans into the bosom of the Church at Cornelius' home, although Paul is par excellence the missionary of the Gentiles; it was Peter who questioned and reproved the couple guilty of lying; it was Peter who, like a president, was the first to speak at the Council of Jerusalem.
Priscillianism. An assortment of errors attributed to Priscillian (fourth century). Sulpicius Severus, in his Historia Sacra (beginning of the fifth century), speaks of the life and the errors of this man of Spanish descent, of his quick genius, austere habits, and strong inclination to asceticism. Priscillian soon became the head of a religious sect in which women were the predominant element. Bishop Idacius of Emerita condemned the errors of Priscillian in the Synod of Saragossa (380). Priscillian, however, was not discouraged. On the contrary, he had himself ordained a priest and later consecrated Bishop of Ávila. Finding Spain too hostile, he and his fellow bishops attempted to seek refuge in Rome under Pope Damasus, but the Pope refused to receive them, and so did St. Ambrose in Milan. Finally he was accused before Emperor Maximus at Treves and condemned to death. His followers, however, continued to spread their errors with fanatic zeal, until the Council of Braga (593) formed anathemas against Priscillianism.

The Priscillians, according to these anathemas, taught the following errors: (a) Sabellianism (q.v.) by denying the real distinction of the three divine Persons. (b) Arianism (q.v.) by denying the existence of Christ before His birth by Mary. (c) Docetism (q.v.) because they attributed to Jesus an apparent body. (d) Pantheism by asserting that the angels and souls are emanations of the divine substance. (e) The demon, derived from dark chaos, is essentially bad. (f) Matrimony and bearing of offspring are diabolical works. (g) Corruption of the holy text of Sacred Scripture.

Modern critics, after accurate study, hesitate to attribute all the above-named errors to Priscillian. Up to what point he taught or paved the way to so many errors, in part already condemned by the Church, cannot as yet be determined. It is certain, however, from the fragments of his works, that Priscillian had a predilection for the Apocrypha (q.v.) and used ambiguous expressions about the Trinity; at times he leans to Gnosticism or Manichaeism, at least in his expression. It may be that his disciples misunderstood and exaggerated his doctrine.
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The Church has defined as a truth of faith that the Son proceeds from the Father (Deum de Deo) and the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son (Qui ex Patre Filioque procedit).

First Procession: The eternal generation of the Son from the Father. Holy Scripture calls the term which proceeds Son, Only-Begotten, First-born; but calls Him also Word (Logos, ho). From this we conclude that the Son proceeds by way of intellectation and, therefore, of spiritual generation. In fact, our intellect consists in conceiving and, as it were, generating an idea, which is the spiritual reproduction of the thing known.

Second Procession: Actuated by way of volition and, therefore, of love. God, knowing Himself in the Word, contemplates and loves Himself by an adhesion of Self to Self. The doctrine of faith teaches that only the first procession is generation which gives origin to but one Son (Only-Begotten). The Holy Spirit is not a Son, but simply the term of love-procession, and He proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one, sole principle (Council of Florence, DB, 691).

The Schismatic Greeks do not admit the origin and derivation of the Holy Spirit from the Son (see "Filioque").
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Propaganda Fide (Congregation of). See Holy See.

propagations. The name for the sensitive passions of Christ's humanity: love, desire, hope, fear, sadness, etc. Of themselves these passions are an integral part of human nature, as functions proper to concupiscible and irascible appetite. When subject to reason, they are lively forces for good: but, as a result of original sin, the passions become rebellious to the point of beclouding reason and weakening free will. This rebellion, however, is not such as to eliminate free will and responsibility for one's own actions, as Luther pretends. The Church has defined (Council of Trent, sess. 5, DB, 792) that concupiscence comes from sin and excites to sin, but is not a sin per se (in itself) nor can it be harmful to one who resists with the grace of God.

As there was a real possibility in the body of Christ, so also there were true passions in His soul. Moreover, the Gospel itself attests their existence: "The Son of man must suffer great things, and be rejected of the elders and the chief priests and scribes and be killed, and after three days rise again" (Mark 8:31). "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me" (Luke 9:23). "My soul is sorrowful even unto death" (Matt. 26:38), etc. But the passions of Christ were devoid of all disorderliness and absolutely subject to reason, because in Him there was no original sin, even no possibility of sinning (see improcacity). This is the reason why theologians call the passions of Christ propensions, in so far as they are irreprehensible (St. John Damascene). St. Thomas explains: the passions of Christ differ from ours because they could not incite to evil or influence His reason or will in any way.
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prophecy (Gr. προφητεία—speak for another, in the name of another). In general, it means "interpretation." In a narrower sense, it is the manifesta-
tion of things hidden from men, and is, more specifically, "the certain and determined prediction of a future event not knowable from natural causes."

Being a miracle of the intellectual order, prophecy, together with the true and proper miracle, is an external criterion for the knowledge and recognition of revelation.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


See under prophet.

**prophet** (Gr. προφήτης, derived from the verb προφησα — speak in another's name). In Old Testament history the prophets appear as the supreme and authentic teachers sent by God, who speak in His name, are zealous for His honor, communicate to men His will with respect to the conservation, explanation, and realization of the Pact made with the people through Moses, and to the preparation of the New Pact, which Christ was to seal with His blood.

Called directly by God, without class distinction and without preparation, prophets are thrown into the tumult of social and political life to extend to all, both king and subjects, their activity and authority.

God communicates with them by means of visions or, more rarely, of dreams. In the visions the object could be represented to the external senses or to the internal senses under the form of images or symbols, or God could impress directly on the prophet's intellect intelligible species and elevate it by supernatural light in order to render it capable of seeing into the mysteries of divine providence. It is certain that the prophets were conscious of the divine communications, but they did not necessarily understand all they saw or said, since their minds, being an instrumentum deficiens (deficient medium), could not attain an exhaustive knowledge of God's full intentions in His communications (St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, II-II, q. 173, a. 4).

Prevision of the future by the Old Testament prophets could be exercised either on facts contained within the limits of their time or on Messianic events, relative to the future salvation of Israel and of the world (see Messiah). In this second case the prophecies are of highest value and interest and give the measure of the divine origin and eternal actuality of the Old Testament.
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**Protestantism.** A word originated in the second diet of Spires (1529) which defended the freedom of practice of the Catholic cult in the countries ravaged by Lutheranism, especially with respect to the celebration of the Mass. Five princes and fourteen cities, adhering to the Lutheran heresy, presented a protest (Protestants) against these claims.

Today Protestantism signifies all the religious sects, Churches, and doctrines stemming from the current of the so-called Reformation started by Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Henry VIII. The number of these sects is so vast (more than 200) that it is not easy to make a synthesis of them. Disintegration, begun right under Luther's eyes, is the fatal law proper to and characteristic of Protestantism. There are three principal trunks, from which new ramifications are constantly sprouting forth:

1. **Lutheranism.** Up to the end of the eighteenth century, it gave birth to various doctrinal evolutions more or less bound up with the principles of Luther; it experienced the radical transformations of Lessing († 1787), as well as of sceptical or pantheistic philosophies (Spinoza) and, more recently, of rationalistic criticism (Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Von Hartnack). Gradually the conservative tendency opposed these innovations, especially in the ascetic-liturgical field.

2. **Calvinism.** (Franco-Swiss Protestantism.) Harassed since its beginning by the Socinian schism, it was revived in the early century as Unitarianism (q.v.), and then by the Arminian schism in the Netherlands. In France, great conflicts developed in the nineteenth century between the conservative current and the liberal current, which is becoming older and increasingly radical.

3. **English Protestantism.** This is the most prolific in sects (numbering more than 200): Presbyterians (divided into various sections), Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, Methodists (founded by John Wesley), Irvingians (by Ed. Irving, † 1834), Darbys (by N. Darby, who expects an early return of Christ), etc. Anglicanism, the most predominant form of English Protestantism, is today divided into: (a) High Church, conservative right-wing party (closest to Catholicism); (b) Low Church, moderate left-wing party, democratic, basically truly Protestant and, therefore, anti-Roman; (c) Broad Church, radical, left-wing party, open to modernism and to all the new currents to a point of compromising the most basic truths of faith. Various efforts have been made to recapture that unity which, on the other hand, is the force and life of the Catholic Church.

See Anglicanism; Adventists; Methodists; Pietism; Puritanism; Quakers; quietism.
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**protoevangelium.** See Canon of the Bible.

**protoevangelium.** The first announcement of the Redemption, contained in Genesis 3:15, is designated by this term. After the sin of our first parents, God judged and condemned them, and having turned to the tempting serpent, said: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel." The woman is not Eve personally, because she has already been defeated by Satan; it could be Eve insomuch as she represents the whole feminine sex of which she is the first parent and unique exemplar. The "seed" signifies the descendants; but the prophecy of victory is fulfilled only in Christ (who, in so far as He is man, is of the descendants of Eve), because all other men are unable, except through the grace merited by Him, to triumph over the enemy. Consequently the woman in Hebrew the definite article is used — it is Mary, who, being the only creature conceived without original sin, is the only woman who can say that she never yielded in the struggle with the serpent. Since the "seed" of Satan indicates also the wicked ones domi-
nated and instigated by him (John 8:41-44), we can see in the progency of the woman the faithful partakers in Christ's victory. The "enmity" is concluded on Satan's part by an ineffective attack and on the part of Christ by a definitive triumph.

The Vulgate (q.v.) translation "she shall crush thy head" puts "the woman" in the foreground, whereas the original text of the prophecy stresses the victory of the "seed of the woman," i.e., of Christ. The older Latin versions had the masculine "huam," and the author of the Vulgate, St. Jerome, knows this is the exact translation, but out of deference for the traditional interpretation which saw the Blessed Virgin in "the woman," St. Jerome gave preference to the feminine "she." The biblical argument for the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (q.v.) is not taken from the expression "she shall crush thy head," but from the implacable "enmity" between the woman and Satan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CEDDEN, De Profectione (Rome, 1523).

PROVINCIA, divine (Lat. providere or praevidere — to see in advance). The plan conceived in the mind of God, according to which He directs all creatures to their proper end. It is a part of prudence and refers mainly to the means to be chosen with reference to the end; it resides in the intellect, but presupposes the willing of the end; it precedes the government of the will, which is the practical execution of providence.

Against the materialists, fatalists, pessimists, and deists of the eighteenth century, the Church defends divine providence (Vatican Council, DB, 1784), which shines out in the pages of Holy Scripture (cf. Wisd. 14, Matt. 6), and in the writings of the Fathers (cf. RI, Index, "Providentia").

Reasons: (a) There is in the world an order and a tendency to the end; but this order, like all cosmic reality, must pre-exist intentionally in the mind of the First Cause. (b) God is not only the Efficient Cause, but also the Final Cause of all things, and as such must have conceived the means of directing back to Himself, as to their supreme end, all created things.

No creature escapes this providential order, since providence is bound up with divine causality and, like it, is universal. Therefore, free will also is subordinate to divine providence (Matt. 6:30), which does not disturb the order of nature, but conserves and directs it, using necessary causes to produce necessary effects, and contingent causes, as human wills are, to obtain contingent and free effects. Physical and moral evil, which we see in the world, is not opposed to divine providence, if we consider: (1) that it is permitted, not caused directly by God; (2) that it depends on the deficiency of finite being; (3) that it is to be examined not in an isolated and particular way but in the framework of the universal order, which may demand the sacrifice of this or that particular being (see evil).
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PRUNIA, divine (Lat. pruduit). Walker, "Providence (Divine)," CE.

PUNISHMENT. See penalty.

Purgatory. Place and state in which the souls of the just who died in venial sin and with the debt of temporal punishment for grave sins remitted, are subjected to purifying sufferings until, having paid their debt, they are worthy of paradise. The existence of purgatory is a truth of faith defined by the Council of Trent (sess. 25, DB, 983).

Holy Scripture: "It is . . . a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sin" (2 Mach. 12:46). St. Paul (1 Cor. 3:9-11) speaks of those who, having some remnants of sin mixed with good works, will be saved in the next life quaerit ignem (through fire).

Tradition: In the first centuries there was no explicit doctrine on purgatory, but they had the liturgical usage of prayers for the dead, reflected also in the epigraphy of the Catacombs. From the time of St. Augustine the doctrine of purgatory was developed, which continues substantially unchanged in the East and the West. The Scholastics treat of purgatory as something belonging to the doctrine of faith. Luther and Calvin were wrong, therefore, in rejecting purgatory as a diabolic invention.

The Church, while defending the existence of purgatory, has not defined explicitly what its pains are: incidental mention is made of fire in the Catechism of the Council of Lyons, in a Letter of Clement VI (DB, 456 and 579 ff.). Certainly there is in purgatory a temporary pain of loss (poena damnii — privation of the vision and possession of God), mitigated by the sure hope of entering paradise after due expiation. A pain of sense (poena sensus) commonly is admitted by the Fathers and theologians; fire not excluded. Purgatory will last only to the day of judgment.
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See under exegesis.

Puritanism. Rather than a sect, it is a rigoristic tendency of Protestantism, similar to Jansenistic rigorism. Puritanism is rooted especially in Calvinism and is based on two fundamental principles: faithfulness and exclusive attachment to the Bible as the only rule of faith, and the consciousness of being in the number of the predestined. Hence a proud piety, joined with contempt of life's pleasures and sense satisfactions, which reminds us of the attitude and the style of the Pharisees. This tendency is generally encountered wherever Calvinism is dominant, but is developed especially in England from the start of Anglicanism down to our times. The term puritan appears for the first time in 1564, under Elizabeth, to indicate those Episcopalians who wanted to purge the common book of prayers (Prayer Book) from its residues of Catholicism. The Queen, with the help of...
Archbishop Whitgift, unleashed a fierce persecution against the Puritans, who sided with the democratic Presbyterianism in opposition to the Episcopalians. James I stated two famous principles: the divine right of kings, and the divine right of bishops. The Puritans lined up against both, with the result of a civil war. Politically, Puritanism favored patrimonialism, which prepared the way for modern democracy. On religious grounds, it accentuated the aversion to Roman papism, infiltrating the Low Church. Psychologically, it has made the individual a self-salvationer, a presumptuous builder of his virtue and his fortune.
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Quakers (Eng., to quack). A Protestant sect founded in England in the seventeenth century by George Fox, a poor shoemaker and visionary, who spent his life between imprisonments and persecutions. In one of the trials he stood, Fox threatened the judge, exhorting him to quack for the wrath of God; then the judge called him ironically the "Quaker": hence the name of the sect.

Quakerism carries the religious individuality of Protestantism to the extreme. Luther offered the Bible as source and rule of faith: Fox and his followers recognize no law of religious life except internal divine illumination. No teaching authority, no worship, no sacraments—but prayer and meditation to feel the divine in oneself, to taste and savor the light of Christ in the innermost soul. This quietistic teaching was overcome by the Quaker, Elizabeth Fry, heroine of evangelical charity toward the poor, the imprisoned, the outcasts of fortune. Today the Quakers number about 150,000, most of them in the United States. They are characterized by their aversion to war, which they consider the fruit of wickedness exclusively.

quietism: A pseudohedonistic tendency developed within the Church which placed spiritual perfection in prayer and contemplation, conceived passively as abandonment to God. The soul, in giving itself completely to God, renounces its free activity and in the control of the flesh and passions to the point of conciliating the least sensuality with mystical adhesion to God. This attitude of the spirit implies the scorn of ascetics understood as a laborious co-operation with grace for the conquest of perfection, and of all the other traditional means suggested by divine revelation and the experience of the saints. Quietism spread in several countries under various forms. In Spain we find the sect of the Alumbrados (Enlightened) since the sixteenth century. In France, there was a double quietist current: the one moderate, restricted to the method of contemplative prayer and abandonment to God, described in the writings of Boudon, Surin, Epiphane, and especially of Fénelon (attacked by Bossuet); the other bolder and more compromising, headed by Madame Guyon, a fanatic who joined sensual mysticism to contemplative mysticism by the theory of the passivity of the soul in temptations and in sins of lust. In her shady venture, the Barnabite Fr. La Combe was involved, perhaps in good faith. Morbid quietism raged in Italy more than in any other place, chiefly through the work of Miguel Molinos, a famous pseudomystic (see Molinosism). To have an idea of moderate quietism it suffices to read the propositions extracted from a work of Fénélon (Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie interieure), condemned by Innocent XIII in 1699 (DB, 1327-1349). But no one developed the quietistic theory to its extreme consequences as Molinos did in his famous Spiritual Guide, which contains the 68 propositions condemned by Innocent XI in 1687 (DB, 1221 ff.).

**Rationalism**

In general it is the tendency to appreciate the value of human reason, applying it preferentially for the solution of all life's problems, not accepting religion. In this sense, rationalism is intellectualism, and is opposed to voluntarism, mystical sentimentalism, agnosticism, skepticism, pragmatism, and all irrational or extrarational currents. This healthy and dignified rationalism does not conflict with faith; on the contrary,
Kant rationalism reached its critical systematization; in the eighteenth-century it resumed its development to the most antibiblical consequences, such as absolute idealism and materialistic humanism.

With regard to the religious problem, rationalism runs the gamut from a vague deism to pantheism and, finally, atheism (qq.v.). The Catholic religion has withstood the attack of rationalism throughout the centuries, enduring the whole of four hundred years and bearing the passage. The phases of this struggle are pointed out in the Syllabus of Pius IX and in the definitions of the Vatican Council (cf. DB, 1760 ff., and 1781 ff.).
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Real Presence. See Presence, Real, Eucharistic (fact and mode).

Rebaptizers. See Donatism.

Redemption (Lat. redirem — buy back, redeem). In ancient literature redemption signified ransom, i.e., liberation of slaves or goods in bond through payment. In the religious field redemption is understood with reference to sin, which is an offense against God and a moral slavery, i.e., it has an objective and a subjective aspect; therefore, redemption involves at once a reparation or expiation or satisfaction (objectively) and a ransom or liberation or reintegration (subjectively). These two meanings are well expressed in the German Erlösung (ransom) and Versöhnung (expiation). The term "redemption" is enriched by Christian religion, which is essentially a message of salvation, a soteriology centered in Jesus, whose name, according to the Hebraic etymology, means precisely Saved.

An outline showing approximately the rich content of the Catholic concept of Redemption could be expressed in the following terms: Man by sinning has offended God and made himself a slave of sin and of the devil who suggested it to him. Since man is incapable of repairing so great a destruction, the Word of God becomes incarnate, binding humanity to Himself (the Mystical Body), expiates and makes reparation to the offended God in the place of the son (vicarious satisfaction) by merit for all reconciliation with God and liberation from slavery to Satan and sin. Lutheranism has exaggerated the objective aspect, reducing Redemption to a penal substitution of Christ in the place of man, who, on his own part, has to do nothing (extrinsicism). The Scholastics, Liberal Protestants, and modernists on the other extreme, reduce Redemption to an individual work of man himself, to which Jesus Christ contributes by the moral influence of His example (subjective morality). But Catholic doctrine, based on divine revelation, avoids excess and harmoniously tempers the various elements and aspects in an organic system: Christ the Redeemer substitutes Himself for us in expiation, but we are in Him by the solidarity and dependence proper to the Mystical Body; He redeems us by His whole life on earth, and particularly by His death, which is an expiatory sacrifice, having physico-moral efficacy. But man, in order to actuate in himself the salvation wrought by Christ, must adhere freely to Him by faith and charity and by the use of the sacraments. These concepts are drawn from Isaiah, Ch. 53 (the soteriological poem of the 'Servant of Jehovah'); Synoptics (Matt. 20:28; 25:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 19:10; 22:20); John (1:29; 10:15; Apoc. 5:8; 1 John 2:2); Peter (1 Pet. 1:18; 2:21); and especially from St. Paul, who stresses particularly the redemptive value of Christ's death (cf. Rom. 3:24; Eph. 1:77; 5:2; Tit. 2:14; Col. 1:23; Heb. 9:15; passim, etc.). Even the rationalists recognize that all of St. Paul's teaching is a lively realistic and complex soteriology, animated by the concept of the Mystical Body, through which Christ's passion, death, and resurrection become our own, as Adam's sin became ours.

All the constitutive elements of the Redemption are found more or less developed in the Fathers, according to the various periods or schools. Some, the Westerners especially, stress Pauline realism; others (Easterns), Joannine mysticism (redemption: delification of man through the incarnate Word, Light-Life). At times they have recourse to vivid metaphors and allusions to illustrate more effectively this mystery to the people, as, e.g., Christ "disurses" His blood to Satan in order to free man from his tyranny; God fools the devil, who vents his fury on the innocent Christ, in the belief He was really a sinner, and by this fatal mistake Satan loses his right to torment men any longer. The rationalists were wrong in trying to represent these oratorical expedients of the Fathers as a real Christian mythology. The Council of Trent set down explicitly and carefully the chief points of the Catholic doctrine of Redemption against the Lutheran errors (ss. 5 and 6, DB, 781 ff.).
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relation, divine. According to Aristotle and St. Thomas, relation is one of the nine accidents, and its formal definition is "Order of one thing to another" (ad eiper ad eiper). It involves a subject (e.g., father), a terminus (son), a foundation or reason on account of which the subject has reference to the terminus (generation, between father and son). Differently from the other accidents, relation, more than a perfection in the subject, is a reference to the terminus, and its essential characteristic lies precisely in that reference (esse ad), while its inherence in the subject (esse in) is secondary, and may be real or only logical. Thus paternity lies wholly in the relationship of one individual to another by virtue of generation; thus also the intelligible object implies a real relation to the knowing intellect, but such relation does not add anything to that object.

It is a truth of faith that in God there are real relations, because in revelation we find correlative terms, such as Father and Son. This doctrine stems also from the divine processions (q.v.): a divine procession is inconceivable without a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem in relationship between themselves. Since the processions are two, the terminuses are four and the relations between these are four, as may be illustrated in the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>paternity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F —— S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st procession
These relations are distinct from the divine nature only by a distinctio rationis ratiocinatae (a distinction of reason with foundation in the thing itself; see attributes of God), but are really distinct between themselves, since they are in opposition (paternty-filiation) in an irreducible way and, therefore, require distinct subjects of attribution (paternity in the Father and filiation in the Son). Only active spiration is not in opposition to paternity and to filiation, and so it has as subject both Father and Son; but it is in opposition to passive spiration, which, therefore, demands a distinct terminus (the Holy Spirit).

Of the four real relations in God, three are numerically distinct and, thus, constitute the three divine Persons: the Father, who is subsisting Paternity, the Son, who is subsisting Filiation, and the Holy Spirit, who is subsisting Spiration of Love. According to the esse in, the Persons subsist by force of the one divine being with which They are really and absolutely identical; according to the esse ad, They are distinct ratione ratiocinata (by a distinction of reason with foundation in the thing itself) from the essence, but really distinct among Themselves. This real mutual distinction, being purely relative, does not violate the absolute unity of God. religious claim to be revealed, man has the obligation of seeking the true revelation by means of external criteria (miracles and prophesies) and internal criteria (lotliness and nobility of doctrine and precepts in harmony with the purest aspirations of the human heart).

See revelation; cult.
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ST. THOMAS, Summa Theol., I, 311. 312 DB, 240: "Both the repugnate and the elect will rise with the bodies, which they now have, to receive according to their bad or good actions... etc.” The resurrection is one of the articles of the Creed. This truth is explicitly revealed in both Old and New Testament: Job 19:23; Isaiah 26:19; Ezekiel 11:14; Daniel 12:23; 2 Macabees 7:17-13; 12:39-46. In the New Testament we find many clear and definite texts, especially in St. Paul (1 Cor. 15:1 Thess. 4, etc.), who puts our resurrection in close relationship to that of our Lord (cf. also John 5:28). Tradition is unanimous in upholding this doctrine (from Didache to Tertullian, who wrote De Resurrectione Carnis, and to St. Augustine, who insisted on the identity of the mortal and the risen body). Reason cannot demonstrate, but can see the convenience of this supernatural truth. St. Thomas maintains that the perfection of man is the soul and its own proper body: as the body has been associated with the soul in mortal life, so it is just and right that it be united to the soul in eternal life and share with it the joy or the punishment merited.

The resurrection is universal for all men and it implies the individual identity of each risen person. To have this identity it suffices that the soul take on again at least one part of the matter with which it was substantially united before death. This principle eliminates many difficulties. St. Thomas answers with sobriety a few curious questions on the conditions of the risen body (cf. Summa contr. Gent., IV, 80-85, and Summa Theol., Suppl., q. 75-86). St. Paul (1 Cor. 15) describes the qualities of the glorious body, which the theologians reduce to four: impassibility, subtility, agility, and splendor. The body will thus feel and reflect the beauty and virtues proper to the blessed soul.
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Resurrection of Christ. That Jesus Christ rose from the dead to new life is a truth, historically attested by all the Evangelists and by Paul, which from the first days of Christianity has formed not only a part of the gospel message, but its very basis and soul, as well as the central element of the doctrine and liturgy of the nascent Church.

Note: The image contains text that is not fully visible or legible, making it difficult to extract meaningful information. The text appears to be discussing religious and philosophical concepts related to the resurrection of Christ and the identity of the resurrected body with the implications of this truth. The text references works by St. Thomas Aquinas and other theologians, as well as biblical and patristic sources. The discussion touches on the distinctions between active and passive spiration, the relations among the persons of the Trinity, and the theological implications of the resurrection of Christ.

---

religion: Lat. religare — read over, think over [divine things]; or religare — bind [to God]; or religere — choose again [God lost by sin]. Generally speaking, it is a bond, a moral union between God and man, as is evident from the history of religions and from the consideration of the natural relationship of the rational creature to the Creator. Subjectively, religion is a voluntary disposition of the soul to recognize God as the supreme Being and Lord of the universe, and to pay Him due worship. Objectively, it is the whole of truths and principles, by which our life is ordered and directed to God, supreme End.

In both senses religion invests the whole man: intellect, will, practical activity. Religion is not, therefore, the cult of duty immanent in autonomous reason (Kant); or the consciousness of the divine immanent in us, followed and surpassed by philosophical synthesis (idealisists); or an instinct of the subconscious (modernists); or a provisional substitute of the science of natural phenomena (positivists). Religion accompanies the human race constantly in every phase of its intellectual, moral, and civil evolution: therefore, it fills real needs of human nature.

Religion is natural if it flourishes spontaneously in the soul from the thought of a God, Creator and Lord, and implies a tendency to the natural end, proportionate to the human intellect and will. It is supernatural if it is based on a positive revelation of God, which involves speculative truths to be believed and rules of conduct to be followed with reference to the attainment of an end transcending the proper powers and exigencies of human nature. Such is the Christian religion, wholly oriented toward the beatific vision, an absolutely supernatural end. Given the existence of a personal God, man cannot rightly refuse to render Him external and internal worship; and since various religious traditions have different understandings of this concept, it is important to consider the historical development and the implications of this idea within the broader context of religious and philosophical thought. The text references various biblical and theological sources to support its arguments, including the New Testament and works by St. Thomas Aquinas and other scholars.

---

Reformation. The Renaissance brought a new vitality to the Church, which responded with a renewed emphasis on the Scriptures. This movement, known as the Reformation, was characterized by a growing critical attitude towards the Church's traditions and a desire to return to the literal sense of the Scriptures. The Reformation was not a single event, but a series of related movements that took place in various parts of Europe, but particularly in Germany. It began in the 16th century with the work of Martin Luther and his followers. Luther's ideas were not immediately accepted by all, and the movement split into various branches, including the Anglican, Calvinist, and Lutheran churches. The Reformation had a profound impact on Western society, shaping the development of modern Christianity and influencing the course of European history.
Modern criticism has utilized all possible means to destroy the historic reality of this fact: fraud of the Apostles, theory of hallucination or of merely apparent death of Jesus, etc. But up to the present time none of these contradictory attempts has succeeded in seriously solving the problem. Catholic exegetes, against all the assaults of criticism, old or new, from Reimarus to Loisy, set down these firm points: (1) The real death of Christ and His burial is narrated by the Evangelists with wealth of detail and decisive circumstances. (2) Christ’s return to life in all His physical reality, testified to by unimpeachable persons, like Peter and Paul, in public, in presence of the Jews, who would have contradicted them if at all possible. (3) Before the Evangelist’s account, we have the energetic testimony of St. Paul (between A.D. 53-55), who saw Christ on the way to Damascus and went to Jerusalem, where he conversed with Peter and James, from whom he could get detailed information on Christ’s Resurrection, which for him was the raison d’être of the faith and of the apostolate. And St. Paul attests it in a quasi-ritual language that echoes the original catechesis of the first Christian community the day after the Ascension of Jesus. (4) The psychological phenomenon of hallucination was impossible in unsettled and bewildered minds, as the Apostles were; so true is this that at the first apparition of the risen Christ they were afraid and Jesus had to persuade them of the reality of His body by eating and drinking and having them touch Him. (5) The time between Jesus’ death and the first testimony of His Resurrection is so brief as to be absolutely insufficient for the formation of a legend. (6) If the Evangelists had wished to invent a legend and deceive others, they would have gotten together on their narratives, which, on the contrary, present a variety of detail and richness of individual style that proves precisely the truth and objectivity of their testimony. (7) Reducing to fraud or hallucination the change wrought by the Resurrection in the Apostles, so timid and cowardly before, as well as St. Paul’s conversion and work, is altogether absurd.

The Resurrection is not only the supreme proof of Christ’s divinity but also the reason for the blazing of faith, apostolate, and martyrdom, which characterized the earliest days of Christianity.
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**Revelation** (Lat. *revelare* — remove the veil; equivalent to manifesting an obscure thing). Theologically, revelation is the act by which God manifests Himself primarily in the creation of the universe, which reflects analogically the divine attributes invisible of themselves (cf. Rom. 1:19): this is natural revelation. But God has manifested Himself in a particular way by means of the prophets and of Jesus Christ: and this is supernatural revelation, which transcends the natural order, either by reason of the object of revelation (mystery) or only on account of the mode or manner in which a truth, natural in itself, is manifested (e.g., immortality of the soul). Formally, supernatural revelation is a gratuitous, oral teaching given by God to men with reference to salvation and eternal life.

**Possibility:** Revelation is possible on the part of God, because He is the Source of all truths and, therefore, can teach His creature, limited in being, in intelligence and in knowledge. It is possible on the part of men, for if man can learn from other men, a fortiori he can learn from God. Revelation is, therefore, both possible and fitting, even in the case of mysteries, the imperfect knowledge of which in the ideal order is none the less fruitful in the practical order.

**Necessity:** Divine revelation is absolutely necessary in order to know truths transcending the power of human reason, as is evident; it is morally necessary for the human race in its actual state to know easily, with firm certitude and without admixture of error, the sum total of natural religious truths necessary for the right orientation of our life (Vatican Council, sess. 3, c. 2, DB, 1786).

Rationalism and modernism either pervert the meaning of revelation, deny it in the name of the autonomy of reason, or reduce it to a progressive consciousness of the divine. Naturalistic systems, like Pelagianism, do not recognize any necessity of revelation. See sentiment, religious; subconsciousness.
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**Reviviscense of merits.** Human works, with reference to eternal life, are termed: *dead* if performed while in the state of mortal sin, *live* if performed while in the state of grace, *mortified* if performed while in the state of grace but presently deprived of their efficacy of leading to their reward on account of a subsequent fall into mortal sin.

What happens to mortified works at the moment of justification? Scripture and the Fathers explicitly assert that, in restoring His friendship to the sinner, God readmits him to the enjoyment of the spiritual goods acquired before his straying from the paternal home. It is therefore acontestable fact that the merits require their efficacy with reference to the attainment of the eternal reward. But in what measure? Opinions disagree on this point. Suarez maintains integral restitution, while St. Thomas teaches that merits are given back to the penitent in proportion to the fervor of his conversion, according to the principle that God “gives Himself to the extent of the arduous He finds” (Dante, Pars 6, 15, 70). The first opinion exalts God’s mercy, the second — very severe at first blush — is more consonant with theological principles and more capable of exciting fervor in penitents. Regarding other nuances in the teaching of St. Thomas, pointed out by his disciples, cf. Boyer, *De Poenitentia* (Rome, 1942), pp. 275-277.
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**Reviviscense of the sacraments.** If a sacrament, validly received but unproductive of grace on account of an impediment or obex (*q.e.v.*), is later
rectified by removing the obex, it is said to revive, producing grace
by virtue of the rite formerly applied.

From this description it appears that reviviscence requires certain con-
ditions: (1) On the part of the subject, the removal of the impediment is
necessary. (2) On the part of the sacrament, the requirements are: (a)
that it be valid but without fruit or inform (without the supernatural
form of grace), because if the sacra-
ment is invalid it does not exist, and
if it does not exist it cannot act; (b)
that the external rite be past, be-
cause if it still exists we cannot speak of
revival but of normal conferring of
grace; (c) that the external right leave in the recipient some effect,
because reviviscence involves a causal
influence on the part of the external
rite, which would be inconceivable
if it did not leave a real imprint of
its passage. (3) On the part of God,
finally, the requirement is the will of
conferring the sacramental grace even
in this extraordinary way.

Those sacraments effectively revive in which the foregoing conditions are
met. Three of these conditions are
met in all the sacraments, except
penance: the removal of the imped-
iment, the sacrament valid but inform,
the passing away of the external rite.
It remains only to inquire if the other
two conditions are fulfilled: the per-
mance of some sort of effect and
God's will to bestow grace extraordinarily.

The permanence of a real effect, i.e., of the character, is found in
baptism, confirmation, and orders; also, the positive will of God is de-
duced from the fact that otherwise
original sin could never be removed in one who receives baptism un-
worthy, and that the faithful who
received confirmation and orders un-
worthy would be forever deprived of
the corresponding sacramental
graces which are so extremely neces-
sary for the fulfillment of the duties
to which they are deputized. Also as
regards extreme unction and mari-
mony, while, on the one hand, we
find permanence of an interior unctio
and of a vinculum (bond), on the
other, we deduce the divine will from
the fact that here, too, the faithful
would remain deprived of the sacra-
mental helps so efficacious in over-
coming the final temptation of the
death agony and in facing successfully
the difficulties of married life.

Only penance and the Eucharist do
not revive, the former because it can-
not be at the same time valid and
inform, according to the doctrine of
many theologians, and the latter be-
cause it would be counter to the prin-
ciples of divine action. In fact, in the
hypothesis of reviviscence of the
Eucharist, one who all his life made
daily sacrilegious Communions would
only have to make a simple act of
contrition in the sacrament of penance
to receive as many increases of grace
as the sacrilegs he has committed. It
is truly repugnant to think that God
may wish to put such a reward on sin.
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**rite** (Lat. *ritus* — religious observ-
eance). In ecclesiastical usage it is
the total amount of ceremonies (bows,
benedictions, signs of the cross, im-
plosion of hands, anointments, etc.) and
formulas (prayers, hymns, antiphons,
verses, etc.), of which the liturgical
acts are composed.

Of these rites, some are essential,
i.e., constitute the very essence of the
sacrifice of or of the sacraments (*matter
and form; q.v.*), have a divine origin,
and remained unchanged throughout
all the vicissitudes and transforma-
tions of the liturgy in its two thou-
sand years of development. Others are
accidental, i.e., they compose the frame
into which are fitted, developed,
and illustrated the essential rites; these
are of ecclesiastical origin and are
enlarged, changed, and at times dis-
appear under the influence of his-
torical incidents and according to the
diversity of temperaments and reli-
gious environments. This variety of
accidental rites, within the basic unity
of the Christian cult, has given rise to
the different liturgical families, which
have been flourishing in the Church
since the fourth and fifth centuries:

_The Antiochian rite,* embracing the
Greco-Jewish, the Syro-Maronite,
the Chaldean, and the Byzantine
liturgies (this last, called of St. John
Chrysostom, is the most widely dif-
fused, being used in Turkey, Greece,
Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, and
Russia)_.

_The Alexandrian rite,* from which
stem the Greek liturgy of St.
Mark, the Coptic, and the Ethiopian
liturgies._

_The Gallican rite,* which included
the Ambrosian, the Mozarabic, the
Celtic, and the Gallican liturgies._

_The Ancient Roman rite,* (to which
the African was kindred). In the
Carolingian Age a kind of liturgical
osmosis between the Roman and the
Gallican rites took place, giving
origin (at least in its basic physis-
gnomy) to the present Latin liturgy,
which is predominant in the Catholic
world._
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See under cult; liturgy.

**Rites (Congregation of).** See _Holy See._

_“Ritual, Roman.”_ See liturgy.

**Roman pontiff.** The successor of
St. Peter, i.e., the heir of his primacy
over the entire Church (see _primacy
of St. Peter)._ The supremacy conferred on
the son of Jona was not a personal
privilege, since the Church, being an
ecclesia, a kingdom, a shepherd
destined to last unto the consum-
ption of the world, always has
need of its foundation, its key bearer,
its pastor; the primacy, therefore, had
to be perpetuated through the cen-
turies, and St. Peter had to live in
his successor, the Roman pontiff (cf.
_DB, 1825)._ But why in the bishop of
Rome and not in another? Why in the
bishop of Rome and not rather in that
of Jerusalem where Jesus died? Be-
cause the Redeemer, who had pre-
aranged all human history for the
end of salvation, selected Rome, the
great metropolis, as center of His
Church. He chose it by inspiring the
Prince of the Apostles to locate defini-
tively his seat in that city, so that
the bishops who succeeded him in
that see would inherit *ipsa facta*
the privileges of the primacy.

Clear testimonies and indisputable
facts in the nascent Church dem-
strate that from the beginning both
the bishop of Rome and the faithful
of the world have full consciousness
of the high pre-eminence of the
Roman Church. In the beginning of the second century, St. Ignatius of Antioch greets the Church of Rome as προκαλεθήσας τῆς ἀγάπης (Rom., Prologue). The most natural meaning of this expression, as Duchesne observes, is that the Roman Church presided over all the churches taken as one body. As the bishop of a particular church presides over the works of charity in that church, so the Roman Church presides over those same works in all Christianity. At the end of the same century, St. Irenaeus of Lyons writes these famous words: "It is necessary that every church be in agreement with it [the Roman Church], on account of its more powerful principality [propter potiorum principialitates]; this means that all the faithful scattered throughout the world must be in agreement with it, because in it has been always conserved intact the tradition which had its origin from the Apostles" (Adv. haereses, III, 3, 27). In the middle of the third century St. Cyprian exalts Rome as the "Principal Church whence piously unity has had its origin" (Ep., 12, 4). There is much factual evidence to accompany these documents, proving the practical recognition of the Roman primacy. The first century had not yet ended when Pope Clement in imperitive tones recalled to obedience the rebellious Christians of Corinth (Ep., 44, 3-45, 46, 12). In the second and third centuries the bishop of Rome appears as arbiter of ecclesiastical controversies, which he settles authoritatively, especially those concerning the faith; even the heretics have recourse to all sorts of intrigues to gain the confidence of the Holy See and procure for themselves the favor of the Chair of Peter.

The primacy, according to the Vatican Council definition (DB, 1831), involves an ordinary, immediate, universal, supreme, full, judicial authority over the flock of Christ, in matters of both faith and discipline.

The sixteenth-century reformers did their utmost to defame the texts on Peter's primacy, his coming to Rome, his heritage transmitted to his successors (the three truths forming one block). Modern Protestants explain everything through evolution: a unique center of Christianity, they say, is the last thing to be formed; such a center is not at the base but at the vertex of the pyramid. At first the Christian communities are amorphous, later they organize in small oligarchies (collective government by priests); afterward comes the monarchical episcopate. But many years will have to pass before the bishops scattered throughout the world recognize the bishop of Rome as their head. This easy theory is freely contradicted by the texts quoted above and by many others that could be adduced.
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**Sabellianism.** See modalism.

**Sacramentals.** In a broad sense, they are all those rites and ceremonies which accompany the observance of the divine cult and the administration of the sacraments; in a narrow sense, they are "certain rites, actions, or parts of the sacraments according to which the Church customarily uses, in imitation of the sacraments, in order to obtain, through her intercession, certain effects, especially of spiritual character" (CIC, Can. 1144).

Their origin goes back to the nascent Church, since the ancient ecclesiastical writers speak of them as common practice among the faithful. They are instituted by the Church and produce their effects not ex opere operato, but ex opere operantis, Ecclesiæ, in as much as the Church, because of her dignity and in virtue of her powerful intercession, obtains from God, although not infallibly and for those who worthily receive the sacrament, the spiritual effect for which it was instituted.

The sacramentals are divided into two classes: exorcisms and blessings or benedictions.

Exorcisms consist in the imposition of hands and the recitation of certain prayers for the purpose of expelling the devil from the soul and body of the believer. They are applied to irrational creatures as well, so that the devil may not use them abusively to harm man.

Benedictions are divided into constitutive and invocative. The constitutive benedictions are applied to men and to irrational creatures to consecrate them to God (e.g., blessing of the virgins, consecration of chalices). The invocative are imparted to man for the purpose of obtaining some divine benefit (e.g., blessing of St. Blaise), and to irrational creatures that their use may be beneficial to man's soul and body (e.g., blessing of the table).
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**Sacramentarians.** See Presence, Real, Eucharistic (fact).

**Sacraments (Congregation of the).** See Holy See.

**Sacraments, institution of.** To institute a sacrament (see sacraments, nature of) means to attach to a sensible rite the efficacy of producing the signified grace.

Christ who, as God, had the absolute and independent power (potestas auctoritatis) of uniting to proper material elements the power of causing grace, as Man also, obtained from the Father so great a dominion over grace, in view of the merits acquired in His passion, that He was constituted the dispenser of all supernatural goods. Armed with this power (potestas excellenteriae), the Redeemer was free to transmit grace either immediately or through means of sensible rites. Revelation assures us that He, while retaining the power of influencing souls in extraordinary ways corresponding to His infinite wisdom (non enim aliudavit gratiam ssum sacramentum), chose the second way. Indeed, Scripture and Tradition describe the direct intervention of Jesus Christ in determining for His Church the use of the various rites communicative of grace: baptism (John 3:7; Matt. 28:19); confirmation (Acts 8:14; 10:6); Eucharist (John 6:51-72; Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20; 1 Cor. 11:23-25); penance (John 20:21-23); extreme unction (James 5:13-15); orders (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:26); matrimony (Matt. 19:4-6; Eph. 5:22-23).
These critically verified testimonies, strengthened by statements of the most ancient ecclesiastical writers, not only show that the repudiation of five sacraments by the reformers of the sixteenth century is unjustified, but also lay bare the prejudice of those liberal Protestants who subscribed to the following statements of Harnack: "For us there is no sadder spectacle than these transformations of the Christian religion, which from what originally was, namely, the adoration of God in spirit and truth, becomes the cult of symbols. It was to destroy this form of religion that Jesus Christ suffered crucifixion, but here it comes back to life under the mantle of His name and His authority."

The Gospel, on the contrary, assures us that Christ, far from having the iconoclast spirit of destroying religious rites and symbols, freely undertook death to transform them from infirma et egena elementa ("weak and needy elements") to means of resurrection and life.

Based on the New Testament documents and the Fathers, the Church, although allowing freedom of discussion on the mode of institution, has solemnly defined in the Council of Trent the fact itself, i.e., that Jesus Christ has instituted all the sacraments actually in use (DB, 844).
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**Bibliography, number of.** The Council of Trent defined (DB, 844) that seven sacraments, neither more nor less, were instituted by Jesus Christ, namely: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony.

Actually, Holy Scripture and the Fathers speak of seven rites, in which are verified the distinctive elements of a sacrament; therefore, the sacraments instituted by Christ are seven. We grant that neither the Bible nor Tradition enumerates in an abstract and exclusive way the septenary number, and that it is only in the fourth century that we are able to find such formal enumeration of the seven sacraments. But that does not mean that the ancient writers did not know the fact; it merely indicates that, although they admitted and used the seven rites, they had neither the occasion nor the means to list them as such.

They did not have the occasion both on account of the lack of errors in this matter with the corresponding lack of stimuli to profound doctrinal analysis and abstract expression, and on account of the practical nature of these institutions which was conducive rather to stressing their right use than to constructing their theoretical synthesis. They did not have the means; they knew, indeed, that baptism, confirmation, etc., consist of a symbolic rite with the power of producing that which they signify, but their knowledge did not extend beyond the mere fact. Even when Origen and St. Augustine began the process of abstraction, following the Neoplatonic philosophy which was wont to stop at symbolism rather than to sound out the mysteries of causality, they found it easy to apply the notion of sign to our rites, and had no incentive to developing in their respect the idea of cause. Thus appeared the abstract concept of sacrament as a sacrament, a concept so vague and indeterminate as to allow placing in the same category all the symbols with which the liturgy overflowed. Only when the Scholastics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, favored by the Aristotelian philosophy, added to the idea of sign a differentiating characteristic, that of cause, did it become easy to reserve the name "sacrament" to those sacred signs which at once were cause of what they symbolized, and to group under one heading and label the seven rites productive of grace.

On the other hand, the fact that the list of the seven sacraments, once formally determined, was unanimously accepted by the theologians and immediately accepted throughout the Catholic world tends to prove...
that the list was merely an expression of what the Church had been always practicing and explicitly teaching. Such practice and doctrine are efficaciously supported by the ancient heretical sects (Nestorians, Monophysites, Jacobites, etc.) who, though separated from the Catholic Church from the fifth and sixth centuries, professed the sacramental septenary. Therefore, even in those remote times, the tradition of the seven sacraments was deep rooted, for, had there been any doubt about the Apostolic origin of such doctrine, the heretics would have capitalized on such doubt by abandon-

ing the sacramental septenary in order to create a deeper moat between them and Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
St. Thomas, Summa Thoel., III, q. 65, Bittel, De Numero Sacramentorum Septen-

Sacrifice, Eucharistic. See Mass.

sacrifice of Christ. A sacrifice, in general, is the offering and the real or equivalent destruction of a material thing, performed by a legitimate minister and directed to God for the purpose of recognizing His Lordship and expiating human guilt.

There is no religion without sacrifice, which is the most solemn act of worship. Sacrifice stems from the feeling of one’s dependence on the Creator, to whom man owes all, even his very life. In order to express recognition of this submission, man offers to God things necessary to life, if not life itself, as happened more than once. To the feeling of subjection is added the consciousness of guilt and the desire of expiation in order to regain God’s friendship. It is a truth of faith that Christ’s death was a real and proper sacrifice (Council of Ephesus and Council of Trent, DB, 122, 938, 939). Indeed, in the Gospel Christ’s death is often referred to in technical, sacrificial terminology: hostia (hostis), victima propitiatoria (propitiatórum), etc. Christ is called the Lamb that takes away the sins of the world, the Lamb slaughtered (Apoc.


With the sacrifice of the cross is intimately connected the sacrifice of the Mass, which draws its value from it (see Mass). Christ is Priest and Victim in both.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
St. Thomas, Summa Thoel., III, q. 48, a. 3. Donzo, De Eucharistia, Vol. 2 (Mil-
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sanctification. The transforming action which makes man holy. San-
tification, therefore, implies essential reference to the concept of sanctity or holiness. Holy (Hebr. ἡγγάζει from ἡγάζει — to separate) means that which is separated from profane things and consecrated to God. Sanctity, in fact, has a negative aspect (withdrawal from sin) and a positive aspect (friendly union with the Divinity). In the Old Testament, despite its motives of interior holiness, there gradually prevailed a kind of extrinsic and legal sanctity, which reached its apex in Pharisaism. Christ kindled the flame of true sanctity, representing it as a regeneration, a new life, nourished principally by love to the degree of a mysterious participation in the very life of God. Its negative aspect (purification and liberation from sin) is developed particularly by St. Paul, while its positive aspect (vital communication and mutual immanence between God and man), more particularly by St. John and Peter, who speak of a participation of the divine nature in redeemed man (see “consortium,” divine). These precious elements of written revelation, elaborated by the Fathers and the theologians, concur to form the theology of sanctification, sealed by the magisterium of the Church.

Sanctification has three phases: genetic, static, and dynamic. Ge

netically, sanctification in the present order is the passage from a state of sin to friendship with God by grace. (As regards such passage, see justification.) Static, sanctification is the condition of man elevated by sanctifying grace and its annexed gifts. It may be called sanctity in its being or essence. Dynamically, sanctification is the supernatural activity of the sanctified man, who tends to win an increasingly intense life of union with God by practicing virtue and by assiduously struggling against the passion and temptation.

History records two opposite errors with respect to sanctification: Pelagianism (q.v.), which rejects original sin and the necessity of grace, attributing to nature the work of sanctification (naturalism); and Lutheranism (q.v.), which, at the other extreme, exaggerates original sin, denies the possibility of man’s regeneration and collaboration with God, reducing our sanctification to an external imputation of the divine sanctity. The Church has condemned both errors, teaching, in harmony with revelation, that sanctification is the work of God, who infuses grace but requires man’s free co-operation both at the time of the acquiring of grace and afterward in the keeping and the increasing of God’s gift. Sanctified man must struggle and work continuously to progress in holiness, especially under the impulse and by the exercise of charity (q.v.), which is the measure of true sanctity.
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Sanctity (mark of the Church). Sanctity or holiness is the second characteristic endowment or distinguishing mark which the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed attributes to the Church and which stems from its intimate nature. If, indeed, the Church is “the union, in social form, of Christ with man,” it must be holy, like all that is in contact with God.

The Bible represents sanctity as a characteristic attribute of the Church: “Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it: That he might sanctify it . . . [and] present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; . . . [that] it should be holy, and without blemish. . . . He chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unsullied in his sight” (Eph. 5:25-27; 1:4). “Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and might cleanse to himself a people acceptable, pursued of good works” (Tit. 2:14).

The holiness of the Church is threefold: sanctity of principles, of members, and of gifts. Sanctity of principles consists in the fact that the Church is endowed with means which are suited to produce sanctity in men (active sanctity). Truly, the dogmatic
sanctity of Christ

and moral doctrine of the Church (magisterium) is the leaven that raises the human mass from the darkness of earth to the splendor of heaven, its sacraments (ministerium) are the channels which transmit sanctifying grace, and its authority (imperium) is directed solely to guiding the faithful along the way of perfection.

Sanctity of members (passive sanctity) is obvious in the continuous spectacle, that has been going on since the beginning of Christian history, of the very many faithful living according to the commands of the Gospel (common sanctity) and especially of the many others who, by following the evangelical counsels, have reached the arduous heights of heroism (perfect sanctity), which is usually approved and certified by canonization. The entire history of Christian peoples, from St. Paul to St. Benedict, from St. Francis of Assisi to St. Teresa of Jesus, from St. Vincent de Paul to St. John Bosco, is crisscrossed by luminous wanes of heroic sanctity.

The holiness of gifts (signs of sanctity) emerges from the gift of miracles, through which the Holy Spirit is accustomed to manifest His presence in the whole Mystical Body (miracles are, indeed, gratiae gratiae datae, i.e., graces gratuitously given for the edification of the Church), as well as in certain singularly virtuous members of the Church, since, ordinarily, God employs the souls nearest to Him for the working of His marvels.
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De POULEFFRE. L'Eglise (Paris, 1927).

Sanctity of Christ. Generally speaking, holiness signifies association with the Divinity. In a concrete and Christian sense, it involves a certain participa-

BIBLIOGRAPHY


satisfaction of Christ (Lat. satisfactione). In Roman law satisfaction meant the compensation for a debt to be paid or for an offense to be expiated (the Wergeld of Germanic medieval law). Tertullian used this juridical term to signify the penitential works enjoined in the penitential discipline. Consequently the term passed into the liturgy (first the Mozarabic) to signify the works and intercessions of the saints in behalf of sinners.

St. Anselm applied satisfaction to Christ, the Redeemer, developing a whole doctrine which was later incorporated in the framework of scholasticism. In his work, Cur Deus Homo ("Why the God-Man?") he insisted on the concept of satisfaction as an objective reparation for the natural order disturbed by guilt, so as to establish a juridical proportion between guilt and satisfaction. St. Thomas integrated this concept with the moral element of Christ's passion (love, obedience) and with the principle of the solidarity between Christ, the Head, and men, the members of His Mystical Body. An adjective was later added to the term, and vicarious satisfaction was used to indicate the substitution of Christ for men in satisfying the divine justice and in liberating them from the slavery to the devil and sin. This satisfaction offered by Christ, especially through His passion and death, has an infinite value, because it is proper to the Word (see theandric operation). According to St. Thomas, three elements concur in its constitution: love, justice, pain. The first is the formal and most important element; the second is the guiding or directing reason; the third is the material element (see Redemption).
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satisfaction, sacramental. The voluntary acceptance of works requiring sacrifice (prayer, alms, mortification) in order to expiate the temporal punishment or penalty which remains after the remission of sin. Holy Scripture teaches us (Wis. 10:12; Gen. 3:17; cf. Num. 2011; 2 Kings 12:13-14) that God does not always remit, together with the guilt and the external penalties, all the temporal punishment. The priest, therefore, when giving absolution imposes works of satisfaction (penance), which the penitent must accept. The effects of satisfaction are: compensation, according to the rules of justice, for the outrage of God's honor caused by sin, the healing of the forces of wounded human nature, and the reparation of the scandal of sins committed in the presence of the brethren.

The Protestants objected, claiming that satisfaction is proper only when there is equality of nature between the guilty and the offended person, whereas the distance between God and man is infinite. What could a creature ever do that might satisfy his debt toward God? The Council of Trent reiterated: "Satisfaction is not so much our own, but of Christ and through Him, in whom we live and move and satisfy, and do worthy and fruitful penitential works, which have their value from Him, are offered to
God by Him, and are accepted by the Father through Him" (scc. 14, c. 8 ; DB, 954). Our works through their sacramental application made by the priest, the imprint of the blood of Christ. Man, as a living member of the Mystical Body, receives the influence of the Head, lives of His life, His works, His merits, His satisfaction; the current of the divine life of Jesus propels, as it were, the tiny boat of human life toward the banks of eternity.
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schism (Gr. σχισμα — separation, division). The crime of one who separates himself from the Catholic Church. This is a sect formed, a sect under the pretext that the Catholic Church errs or approves disorders and abuses. Schism is distinct formally from heresy, because heresy breaks the dogmatic bond by professing error, while schism breaks the social bond by the refusal of obedience to the legitimate pastors. However, in the long run, schism falls totally into heresy, because it eventually denies the authority and the infallibility of the Church.

The history of Christianity is marked by flighty and proud minds that rebel against the legitimate authorities and became autonomous, forming dissident sects. The chief schisms were those of the Novatians in the third century and of the Donatists in the fourth and fifth centuries. The saddest one, however, is the Greek Schism, started by Photius (ninth century), which keeps apart from the bosom of the true Church so many Christian peoples who at one time counted among their number outstanding saints and doctors.

Schismatics are members wrenched from the body of the Church, dried up branches, as it were. If they are in bad faith they cannot be saved, because, as St. Augustine says, foris ab Ecclesia constitutus et separatus a compagno unitatis et vinculo caritatis, acerno supplicio puniatur, etiam pro Christi nomine vitus incendatur ("Constituted outside of the Church and separated from the sinews of unity and bond of charity, you will be punished with eternal torture, even should you be burned alive for Christ’s name"). Ep., 173, ad Donatum.
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Schools of Alexandria and Antioch. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301); Arianism; Monophysitism; Nestorianism.

science, divine. Science is the knowledge of things not only in themselves but also in their proper causes. It is a perfect intellectual knowledge, and in this sense science is properly predicated of God.

Divine revelation exalts the wisdom of God. St. Paul gathers its most ancient testimonies in the exclamation: "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!" (Rom. 11:33.) The Church defines (Vatican Council, sess. 3, c. 1; DB, 1782) that God is endowed with an infinite intellect. The concept of divine omniscience is familiar to all Tradition for these reasons: (a) Intellectuality is the highest perfection of the human and angelic creature; but created perfections must be in God in an eminent way (see analogy). (b) The order and finality of the cosmos reveal an intelligent Cause. (c) Intellectuality and, therefore, knowledge are connatural properties of all spiritual beings; to know means to receive "intentionally" in oneself the forms of external things without altering or losing one’s own form: this is possible only to spirit, which, while remaining identical with itself, is able to become all things by knowing them. Since God is spiritual in the highest sense, He is supremely intelligent; what is more, by reason of His simplicity, His intellect and knowledge are identical with His essence and, therefore, His knowledge is most perfect and infinite, as is His essence. God knows, above all, Himself (primary object), then all creatures present, past, and future, and all possible things. The Scholastics distinguish: scientia visionis, for real things, and scientia simplicis intelligentiae, for possible things. The Molinists add the scientia media (see Molinism; prescience).

There is discussion among theologians on the mode of God’s knowledge of creatures; the best opinion is that which holds mediate knowledge: God, by knowing perfectly His essence, knows it also all things real and possible, for all things are actual or potential imitations of the divine essence. If God knew things directly, i.e., outside of Himself, they would in a certain way actuate and modify the divine intellect, which is repugnant. Knowing all things by a most simple act, which is identical with His essence, God does not reason, like we do, by passing from one known object to another, but grasps intuitively and exhausts with one single act all the intelligibility of His own nature and of all created or creatable beings.
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science of Christ. The total knowledge which Christ has both as God and as Man. As God, the Word has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit that act of divine intelligence which is identical with the divine essence and through which the Triune God knows Himself and all things possible and real (past, present, and future). This truth is based on the true divinity and on the integrity of His divine nature (Council of Chalcedon). It is rejected by Monophysitism, Aionism, and the theory of kenosis (q.v.).

This divine knowledge of the Word, being infinite, could not be communicated formally to the assumed soul of Christ, which, instead, had to have those kinds of knowledge that are possible to the intellectual creature, namely: the beatific vision, infused knowledge, and acquired knowledge. (a) The beatific vision is proper to the blessed; it could not, therefore, be lacking to Christ, even during His life on earth, on account of the hypostatic union, which is a much greater perfection than the beatific vision. (b) Infused knowledge is a gift of God, consisting in the infusion of intelligible species in the intellect which is thus enabled to understand things without the conourse of the senses; this knowledge accompanies the beatific vision in the blessed
and the angels and, therefore, was also in Christ, Head of the angels and King of the blessed. (c) Acquired knowledge is that which the human mind obtains by means of abstraction of species or ideas from the phantasm of sense cognition; Christ, as perfect Man, must naturally have this knowledge, in which only He could make progress according to the Gospel (Luke 3:25). Therefore, the kinds of knowledge, being of different character, can exist together in the same soul, and Christ uses one now, one another. Nor are they superfluous, since they have different gradations of luminousness.

Divine knowledge, as well as the threefold human knowledge of Christ, exclude from Him any ignorance whatever; if Jesus says (Mark 13:34) that He does not know the day of the final judgment, this expression must be understood in the sense that He cannot manifest it (thus the Fathers). Cf. Decree of the Holy Office, 1918, DB, 2183-2185.
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Scotus. See Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology (p. 393); analogy; person.

Scripture, Holy. See Bible.

Seal of confession. The most grave obligation of keeping secret all that has been absolved in the sacrament of penance, and whose revelation would render that sacrament onerous and odious. The primary subject of such obligation is the confessor; the secondary subject, all those who, either by accident or design, legitimately or illegitimately, have heard something pertaining to confession. Obviously the penitent is not held to secrecy. The object of the secret is: (a) all mortal sins, generally or specifically, and all venial sins confessed specifically; (b) all that might constitute damage or hardship on the penitent, if it were revealed. Hence, virtues, supernatural gifts, etc., do not come within the object of this secret. Even when the confessor denies absolution he is held to the secret, for as the IV Lateran Council teaches, Radix unde sigillum ensururum non est absoluto sed penitentiae judicium ("The root whence the seal arises is not absolution but judicial judgment," i.e., the fact of submitting one's sins to the confessor's judgment in the sacrament).

This obligation is founded on: (a) Natural law, because the penitent manifests his sins on condition of secrecy; a quasi-contract is stipulated between penitent and confessor. (b) Positive divine law; in fact, since Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of penance in the form of a judgment, which requires the revelation of sins, He implicitly imposed the sacramental seal. Indeed, if it were not included in the penitential judgment, confession would become odious, harmful, scandalous; things our Saviour, infinite Justice, Sanctity, and Mercy, absolutely could not permit. (c) Ecclesiastical law, as is obvious from the severe canonical legislation. It is apparent, therefore, that this secret is so strict that it cannot be revealed, except by the penitent's permission, even when the confessor's life or the public good is at stake. Historically, it is a fact that there exists a special action of divine providence insuring the keeping of this secret. With few exceptions, the ministers of God have always merited the confidence reposed in them by the faithful, at times even sealing it with their blood.
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Semi-Arians. Originating from Arius (q.v.), the Semi-Arians attempted through insidious subtleties to sabotage the Nicene definition concerning the Logos (consubstantial, said of the Word with respect to the Father). The chief Semi-Arian sects are:

1. The Anomoian (Gr. ἀνομοιος — dissimilar), founded by Aeicius and Eunomius, the closest to Arianism. Insisting on the concept of ἀνομοιος (unborn) as proper to God, they denied the divinity of the Word and His consubstantiality with the Father, for the reason that the Word is generated, the only-begotten Son. St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa fought them vigorously (see Anomoeanism).

2. The Omoeans (Gr. ὁμοιος — similar), also called Aciacians (from Acacus of Carthage, † 366). The Word, according to them, is not consubstantial with the Father, but only similar to Him (see Aciacians).

3. The Homoiohoi (ὁμοιοπαθης — of like substance), the largest among the Semi-Arian sects, called also Basilians (from Basil of Ancyra, † 366). They reject the ἀνομοιος of Nicaea and hold that the Word is not of the same substance of the Father, but of a substance similar to that of the Father. St. Athanasius and the Cappadocians (St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory Nazianzus) tried, as best they could, to follow a conciliatory course in the midst of so many aberrations, which consisted not in sacrificing the substance of the Nicene definition, but in abstaining from stressing the disputed expressions, even the word ὁμοιος. This was a prudent measure and not a retraction of the doctrine they had defended, as some modern critics have unjustly insinuated, speaking of them as Neo-Nicenists.
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Seminaries (Congregation of). See Holy See.

Semi-Pelagianism. A mitigated form of Pelagianism (q.v.), sprung up on the occasion of certain expressions of St. Augustine (before he became bishop) on the beginning of faith and good will (cf. De libero arbitrio; De Diversis Questionibus, 85, especially question 86). The chief authors of the movement were John Cassian, of St. Victor, near Marseilles, Gennadius of Marseilles (from whom the Semi-Pelagians are called also Marielius), Faustus, Bishop of Riez, and Vincent of Lerins, who wrote the famous Commonitorium, in which he evidently opposes St. Augustine, without naming him. St. Augustine, close to death, was informed of the new heresy by two good laymen, Prosper Aquitanus and Hilary, and wrote two works against it. Later Prosper composed a poem De Ingratatis (i.e., on those who do away with grace) against the Semi-Pelagians. Another defender of St. Augustine was St. Fulgentius, who attacked Faustus especially.
sentiment, religious. Skilled psychologists, both ancient and modern, discuss the nature of sentiment without being able to define it. Some hold that sentiment derives from an active or emotive faculty, distinct from both the volitive (motivae) and the perceptive-intellecctual faculties. Some reduce sentiment to psychological phenomena, while others consider it as a representative or intellectual function.

The Scholastic theory, formulated by St. Thomas, who followed Aristotle, presents the surest guarantees of truth, despite its age. According to this teaching, there are in man only two kinds of psychic faculties: the cognitive and the appetitive, each being distinguished in sensible and supersensible or spiritual. We have, therefore, the zone of the senses with the corporal organs, the passions which belong to the body and to the soul that imparts the body. From this interior zone we pass to the spiritual zone, in which function the material faculties of intellect and will. Sensation, proper to the sense faculties, is originated from a passive impression of the external world on the senses, which becomes a perception of the object and its representation (phantasm-image); hence follows in the appetitive faculty a movement toward the object perceived, namely, an impulse, accompanied by physical emotion, which is usually called passion (love, hate, joy, sadness, etc.).

As the sense appetite has its passions subordinate to sense representations, so the rational appetite, i.e., the will, has its affections subordinate to intellectual representations (concepts-ideas). Sentiment is placed among these affections of the will, which, residing in a spiritual faculty, has repercussions in the sense zone and, like sensation, has both an active and a passive character, inasmuch as it may be termed an impression directed to an action. The gamut of the sentiments is indefinite, but love is its fundamental note.

The religious sentiment is born from the knowledge of God the Creator, which inspires man with humble submission, devotion, or fear. According to Catholic doctrine, religious sentiment does not precede but accompanies and follows the knowledge of God, and it is a precious energy for the development of piety and spiritual perfection. But from the rise of Lutheranism, sentiment has become for many the unique or the chief source of religion, which is reduced to a mere psychological experience (see experience, religious). This is also true of Schleiermacher, the founder of sentimental theology, and of the Pragmatists (see Pragmatism), who furnish modernism (q.v.) with its theories. Psychological sentimentalism, consisting in an exaggeration of sentiment, becomes in religious matters a source of error and confusion which lead unconsciously to pantheism and atheism.

septenary, sacramental. See sacraments, number 0.

"sigillum sacramentale." See seal of confession.

sign. An intermediary between the thing known and the cognitive faculty. A sign manifests something distinct from itself either because it is the perfect image of that thing (e.g., a photograph, a species expressa), in which case it is called formal sign, or because it is so intimately connected with the thing signified as to recall it spontaneously, in which case it is called instrumental sign. The bond between the thing
simplicity of God

signified and the instrumental sign may have its foundation either in nature, e.g., smoke with respect to fire (natural sign), or in the human will, e.g., a flag with respect to the country (conventional sign), or, finally, in both, e.g., the eagle by the daring of its flight has a special aptitude to signify acuteness of intellect, but that, in a concrete case, the eagle signifies St. John the Evangelist perfectly. St. Peter is the will of the Church, which has chosen this symbol (mixed sign), following a prophetic vision of Ezekiel. All our life with its multiple social relations is based on signs and symbols; words, which are the most important factor in human fellowship, are purely conventional signs. Consequently, the Founder of the perfect religion, which is an elevation and orientation of our life to God, could not neglect this element. In fact, our Lord institutes sacramental signs, which not only recall to mind the most wonderful realities of the supernatural order (grace, the character, etc.), but inaugrate in them with divine efficacy on the soul of the believer (see sacraments, nature of).

The Church, faithful imitator of her divine Founder, has surrounded the seven sacraments with many other holy symbols (the sacramentals), and has ornamented the ecclesiastical liturgy with multiple rites which help the Christian to understand and, as it were, to experience the realities sealed up in the invisible world of grace.
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St. Thomas, Summa Theol., III, q. 60.
Dekker, De sacramentis in genere (Milwaukee, 1946), Index Analyticus: "Signum."

sin, original

The sin committed by our first parents, as is narrated in Holy Scripture (Gen. 2 f.), God enriched Adam and Eve with gifts (see innocence; integrity) and placed them in the earthly paradise, full of every material good. He wanted from His creatures a very simple proof of fidelity, and in order to do so, forbade them to eat of the fruit of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil," threatening most severe punishment if they disobeyed. Satan, under the form of a serpent, tempted Eve who, excited by his words, picked the fruit and tasted of it. She, in turn, handed it to her husband who, to please her, did not hesitate to eat of it, despite the divine prohibition. Immediately guilt darkened their minds and upset the harmony of their whole being. They felt their senses rebel and became ashamed of their nakedness, trying to flee from God by hiding behind the trees. God, as He had warned, exacted the penalties of the first sin and expelled the guilty from paradise, who ingrate for themselves and all humanity after them the unending punishment of suffering, miseries, and tribulations.

Holy Scripture often recalls this tragic event: "From the woman came the beginning of sin, and by her we all die" (Eccles. 25:33); "By the offense of one, many died. . . . By the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners" (Rom. 5:12, 19). St. John recalls the role of the devil: "He was a murderer from the beginning" (John 8:44). Tradition is unanimous on this doctrine. Some traces of the event are found in the religious mythologies of the pagan world, which, however, appear as deformations in comparison with the dignity and the dramatic sobriety of the biblical narrative.

The rationalists deny the historicity of the sacred narrative, alleging incongruities or absurdities of detail (an apple the cause of such ruin, a serpent speaking to the woman, etc.). Our exegetes have answered these objections adequately: (a) God, after so great generosity, had a right to impose a test; (b) in His infinite goodness, He is satisfied with a very little one; (c) He manifests clearly His acceptance and its sanctions; (d) the sin of our first parents was the eaten fruit, but formally was pride and rebellion against God, for the devil suggests to Eve that if they eat of the fruit they will not die, but will become similar to God; Adam prefers his wife to God, and both Eve and He disobey through their proud desire of becoming gods. Their sin thus became grave, so much more so because they were rich in spiritual light and strength, thus having no excuse, no pretext to adduce in atonement of their guilt, which was pure malice. Besides, if divine justice struck, and rightly so, divine mercy and goodness intervened immediately with the promise of the Redeemer who will crush the evil serpent.

Consequences of original sin in the first parents themselves are: (a) privation of both supernatural gifts (grace and the infused virtues) and of preternatural gifts (integrity); (b) state of sin with accompanying guilt and stain (see sin, personal); (c) debt
of eternal punishment; (d) wounding of nature, on account of which the passions rise in rebellion against reason, hamper the free exercise of the will, and make good difficult.

The Church has defined (Council of Trent, sess. 5, DB. 788) that Adam’s whole being through sin was in detersum commutatum ("changed for the worse"); but she condemned Lutheranism (q.v.), which maintains the intrinsic corruption and incapability of nature after original sin (DB, 792 and 815 ff.). See transmigration of original sin.
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Sin, personal. A willful transgression of God’s law. More technically it may be defined: Aversion from God, the last End, by a voluntary admission to a finite good. Aversion (i.e., turning away) from God is the formal element of sin, while the disorderly admission to the created good (in which such aversion is implicit) is the material element.

Certain moralists contrived a distinction between theological and philosophical sin: the former would include the knowledge of God and His law and, therefore, the consciousness of offending the Creator; the latter would be an act morally evil in itself, but not offensive to God, in the sense that it did not entail the knowledge of God and His law. The Church has condemned this opinion (DB, 1290); he who sins, indeed, feels that he acts against a law which echoes from the depths of his inner being, independently of any human influence, and in such law there is always an implicit knowledge of a supreme Legislator, who is God Himself. The infraction of the law is, therefore, a conscious offense against God, and sin is necessarily theological.

Sin is personal, if it is committed voluntarily by the individual; it is original, if it belongs to the human race and therefore, is called also sin of nature (see sin, original). Moreover, the act of sin is distinguished from the state of sin that follows as its consequence, and which is usually called habitual sin. In this last, two aspects are considered: the reatus culpae (guiltiness) and the macula peccati (stain of sin). The reatus culpae is the state of aversion from God caused by the sinful act; the macula peccati is the degradation of man’s grace, light and beauty of the soul. In the present order, aversion from God always coincides with privation of grace, and so, in concreto, the reatus and the macula are one and the same thing.

Willfulness is an essential element of sin: it must be present in the sinful act. The sinful state, on the contrary, is involuntary on account of the willfulness of the act from which it stems. Finally, it should be noted that the real sin is the mortal sin, which kills the soul by severing it from God; venial sin is called sin by analogy, because it does not imply aversion from the ultimate end, but only a slackening in its pursuit.
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Skepticism (Gr. σκέπτομαι — I look, I consider). A doctrine and a tendency which subjects to discussion and rejects partially or entirely the objective value of human knowledge and, therefore, its certainty. Skepticism had its origin with the Sophists, who for oratorical and political reasons taught to demonstrate, by various arguments, the truth of a thesis, and at once, by the same device, the truth of its antithesis. Socrates fought energetically against these disturbers of the mind by stressing the value of universal concepts, which are a solid basis of truth and certainty. But the founder of skepticism as a system of universal doubt was Pyrrho of Elis († 275 BC): from him, skepticism took the name Pyrrhonism in opposition to Stoic dogmatism. The Platonists, who depreciated experimental knowledge, reducing it to the rank of mere opinion, underwent skepticism in the influence of the middle and the new academies (Arcesilaus, † 241 BC, and Carneades, † 166 BC). But systematic skepticism had forceful disciples in two philosophers, Enesimnus of Crete († AD 130) and Sextus Empiricus (second half of the second century AD), who wrote the famous Hypotheseis in defense of the Pyrrhonian principles.

Skepticism crept over here and there with its corrosive doubt throughout the centuries, as in the teaching of Descartes (methodical doubt), in the phenomenalistic system, and also in Kantianism (q.v.), which compromised the objective value of knowledge, denying to reason the capacity of reaching the noumenon, i.e., the thing in itself. All anti-intellectualistic systems are tainted with skepticism: thus the ideism of the Neo-Kantians, the pessimistic voluntarism of Schopenhauer, the pragmatism of James.

Skepticism has a sort of original sin which vitiates its entire structure: it doubts the capacity of reason to attain truth and certainty and rejects the value of knowledge. The logical result of this is that no truth or theory is certain and sure, even that of the skeptics! The human intellect, made naturally for truth as the eye is made for light, can be mistaken sometimes, per accidens, but not always, per se; otherwise nature would be an absurdity. Modern philosophy which, from Descartes to Kant, has attacked the dignity of nature and the natural capacities of the human mind, has fallen into a skeptical maze, which idealism unsuccessfully has tried to overcome. The one remedy is the moderate realism of Christian philosophy which, together with the best Greek philosophy, constructs science and metaphysics on the postulate of a natural relationship or equation between being and thought, nature and mind.
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Solidarity. See Mystical Body; satisfaction of Christ.

Son. The proper name of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, derived from the very nature of the first procession (q.v.), which is a true spiritual generation (see Only-Begotten). Also the name Word (q.v.), belongs properly to the Son, because He is the term of the divine intellect. It should be noted that intellect, as well as volition, is common to the three Persons, who know by virtue of the one and unique intellective act which is identical with the divine essence. But only the Father, by under-
standing, says the Word (cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, 1, q. 34, a. 1, ad 3).

In addition, the Son is called Image, according to the testimony of St. Paul: "Who is the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15). The reason for this title lies in the peculiar character of the mental word, term of intellect; in fact, the word is the faithful image of what the intellect has conceived in itself and assimilated. In the Word, the Father contemplates, as in a living likeness, Himself, the whole divine nature and through it all created and creatable nature. Jesus Christ calls Himself Son of God, in the proper sense, and also Son of Man, a Messianic expression which harks back to Daniel.
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St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, 1, q. 34:3-5.


See under Logos; Word.

**Sophronius.** See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 302); Monotheism.

**soteriology** (Gr. σωτηρία — salvation, redemption). The doctrine of the spiritual salvation of man. The history of religions and of religious philosophies brings out two psychological elements, which are more or less dominant in all systems: the consciousness of sin and the yearning for liberation. From the brokenhearted accents of the most ancient penitential hymns of Babylon to the pessimistic meditations of Buddha on the evils of human life and the necessity of averting them; from the suggestive pages of Plato (cf. the *Phaedon*) on the emancipative character of death to the spiritual drama of the initiated in the *Mysteries* of Dionysia, Isis, and Mithra, paganism is pervaded by the consciousness of sin and the desire to be healed from it. Hence the expiatory character of the sacrifices (see expiation). These sentiments are more vivid and pure in the books of the Old Testament, especially in the prophecy of Isaiah, which speaks of a mysterious Servant of Jehovah, who by his sufferings and his immolation will free men from the slavery of sin (Ch. 53).

These obscure aspirations, disseminated in the consciousness of the peoples, are a providential preparation for Christianity, which is essentially a message of salvation, a soteriology in act. This soteriology is centered in Christ; the very name of Jesus in Hebrew means Saviour, and the Gospel explains the reason why this name was given to Him by the angel: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, For he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). The Precursor of Jesus prepared the way by preaching penance (Matt. 3:2). Jesus Himself declared He had come into the world to give His life as the price of redemption for men (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45); and in the Last Supper He celebrated the Eucharistic Sacrifice of His body and of His blood poured forth unto the remission of sins. These motifs of the Synoptics return with greater vividness in St. John, who calls Jesus the "propitiation" for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2).

St. Paul, especially, developed this soteriological doctrine. The rationalists, with evident exaggeration, say that he is the creator of it. Certainly St. Paul, who had experienced in himself the dramatic change from the death of sin to the life of grace, speaks with incomparable expressions of the interior torment of man, slave of guilt and of the passions of corrupt nature, and then of the way of liberation and salvation which is in Christ the Redeemer by His bloody immola-

**soul.** A spiritual substance which, together with the body, constitutes man. Sound philosophical systems have always admitted the existence, the spirituality and the immortality of the human soul, endowed with the faculties of intelligence and will, and their proper spiritual operations which are the noblest among human acts and which manifest the specific nature of man. This philosophical doctrine is amplified and enriched by the combined lights of revelation and theology.

1. Holy Scripture. (a) The soul is created by God and was directly infused in the body of Adam: "And the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth: and breathed into his face the breath of life: and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). (b) In his soul man resembles God and reflects His image in a particular manner (Gen. 1:26). Such affirmation implies that the soul is not something material (cf. Eccles. 12:7). (c) The soul is immortal; the Gospel gives ample testimony to this truth (cf. Matt. 10:28); as regards the Old Testament, see particularly Wisdom 2:23; 3:1; 4:10; Psalms 48:15-16, etc. (d) From these texts it is also proved that the soul is the formal element of man, the vital and rational principle on account of which man is man, i.e., a living animal specifically distinct from the brute.

2. Tradition generally repeats and develops the written revelation concerning the nature and properties of the soul. However, Tertullian propounds the strange theory of a corporeal traducianism, teaching that the soul of the child is generated through the seed of its parents. Later St. Augustine, although rejecting Tertullian's opinion, seemed to lean toward a spiritual traducianism (the soul of the child generated by the soul of its parents, as light from light), in order to expound more efficaciously against the Pelagians (see *Pelagianism*) the transmission of original sin. However, the holy Doctor did not exclude creationism, i.e., the creation and immediate infusion of the individual souls into their bodies.

Scholastic theologians discussed more subtle questions, for example: in what moment does God infuse the soul (modern theologians commonly answer: in the very first moment of conception). More important is the question of the union of the soul and of its nature as the substantial form of the body. Plato denied the substantial union of the soul with the body and divided the soul itself into three elements (trichotomy). Some rare traces of such theory is found also among Scholastic doctors. The Franciscan, Peter John Olivi, distinguishing in the soul the essence and its three elements or grades (the rational, the

spiritism. A doctrinal and practical system which claims to be living men in communication with the spirits of the other world. The evocation of the dead and of the spirits of the other world was in practice among the ancients, but in the past century as a consequence of a strange episode that happened in the Fox family at Hydesville in the United States (1847), evocation of, and communication with, spirits became a spreading fashion and was systematized under the specious name of spiritism to the point of becoming a new religion. Today spiritism is a very complex and garbled affair by reason of the confused superimposition of numerous elements added to the simple experiences of the Fox sisters. No longer merely the moving tables with typtology (tap language), but mysterious writings, luminous phenomena, levitation, formation of images and their materialization, divination, etc., together with the various theories of magnetism, hypnotism, somnambulism, telepathy, perspirit, od, reincarnation, etc., have been added in an effort to give a scientific character to phenomena which on account of their very extravagance provoke suspension and distrust. The principal actor in spiritism is the medium, connecting link between the spirits and the mortals. Famous mediums were Florence Cook, who worked with the scientist Crookes, and Eusapia Palladino. It is proved that fraud and imposture have played a great role in spiritistic phenomena; to the fraud of the mediums should be added the credulity and suggestibility of the public. There remains, however, a nucleus of real facts, which can be explained by natural forces (magnetism, muscular vibration, telepathy).

From a moral viewpoint, spiritism offers a clear case of disorientation of conscience and the loss of mental balance determined by its frequent practice. From a theological viewpoint, the alleged communication with the dead and the spirits, not to mention the frauds of spiritism, cannot be sustained. In the Bible and in Christian hagiography we come across cases of deceased persons, of angels, and of demons appearing to the living to warn, help, tempt, or punish them. Such communications, however, always take place in a sober atmosphere, in which rules the will of God who arranges or permits them. In spiritism, on the contrary, we find a spectacle of exhibitionism, often grotesque, which is repugnant to the sanctity of God and to the dignity of the angels and the disincarnate spirits. There remains only the possibility of diabolical intervention for those phenomena which could not be given a natural explanation.

From this we can understand why the Church, abstaining from any statements on the nature of the various phenomena, allows, within the limits of prudence, the use of magnetism and hypnotism, while it opposes any participation whatsoever in spiritistic performances on account of their superstitious character and the dangers to which the faithful may be exposed in such games and morals.

(Cf. Decree of the Holy Office, April 24, 1917, AAS, 1917, June 1, p. 268.)
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State and Church. The concept of State is complex and, therefore, the term is not always used in the same sense: some understand by it rather the authority, the power, the government; others, rather the social organism, the nation. We may say that the State consists of the authority, as the formal element, and of the multitude, as the material element. From this we can form an approximate definition of the State as being a stable union of families and of individuals in a determined territory, under the same authority, for the purpose of procuring the common good. The concept of nation includes unity of race and history, which is not a necessary element of the politically constituted State. Varied and contradictory are the opinions about the origin of the State as a civil society and about the nature of the State as a supreme authority.

1. Contractualism (Hobbes, Rousseau): Civil society originates from a contract or convention of primitive men who, motivated by the desire of eliminating individual strife and disorders, have renounced the fullness of their private liberty by subjecting themselves to a "general will" personified in the sovereign State. This conception is fantastic and without historical foundation.

2. Absolutism: The State is all, and the individual is for the State. This concept is dominant in paganism, and in various forms was adhered to by Plato and Aristotle. But absolutism has gained strength in modern times through the idealistic theories of Hegel and his followers, who consider the State as something divine, as a religion, as an absolute will, which absorbs the life and liberty of the human person: such is State worship with a pantheistic background, which has been used in support of totalitarian, despotic regimes of our time. Theories of this kind, which represent a regression to abandoned pagan conceptions, are refuted, if not otherwise, by their evil consequences.

3. Liberalism (q.v.): In harmony with the principles of the French Revolution, liberalism affirms the sovereignty of the people and the perfect equality of citizens in the exercise of their proper rights. The State (the authority) is a delegate of the people, with the function of maintaining public order and of regulating by legislation the harmony and the equilibrium of the individual freedoms. This is the theory of the "gendarmerie state," to which Kant also contributed, by separating ethics and law, leaving the former to the autonomy of individual reason, and the latter to the protection, rather negative than posi-
tive, of the State. The liberal State is agnostic not only politically and economically, but also with reference to the problem of religion and to the Church.

4. Positivism (q.v.): Basing itself on evolutilivist theories, positivism explains the origin and the nature of the State after the fashion of the natural development of an organism, without the influence of immutable principles or of free will, but according to a determinist law.

These and other theories, although having some true points, sin by way of exaggeration: they concede too much either to nature, or to the human will, or to the authority of the State, or to the individual. But their greatest fault is absolutism, which makes of the State an idol to which the sacred personality of man must be immolated. It seems strange that democratic trends, such as socialism, are inspired also by this same concept, attributing to the State direct and immediate interference in the interest and in the private life of the individuals.

With respect to the problem of religion, all these theories are either deficient or erroneous, because they suggest either the disinterestedness of the State (liberalism), or the absorption of religion in the very life of the State declared to be divine, ethical, religious (idealist absolutism), or the open persecution and elimination of every positive religion, of the Catholic Church especially (atheistic communism and socialism). Against such doctrines, which bear poisonous fruits in the political-social field, stands the Christian doctrine with its classical traditions, with its human and divine principles, drawn from reason and revelation. Recently, this doctrine has been summarized, illustrated, and proclaimed by Leo XIII, especially in the encyclicals Immortale Dei, Libertas, and Rerum Novarum; by Pius XI in his Quadragesimo Anno; and by Pius XII in various allocutions. From these and other documents of the ecclesiastical magisterium we can draw the following fundamental outline of Christian doctrine with respect to civil society, the State, and the relations of the State with the Church:

1. Society, like the family unit, has a natural origin, because man is social by nature (Aristotle) and insufficient unto himself. He needs the organized help of his fellows to be able to develop his aptitudes and to attain his end. Since it is natural, society has God Himself as its Author.

2. The end of society and of the State is the common good of the temporal order, distinct from and superior to the private good. The pursuit of this end requires juridical protection, which defends rights and assures justice in the relations of subjects among themselves, and positive assistance or help to all kinds of private initiative: economic, industrial, cultural, etc. In pursuing the common good, the State cannot impede, but must, on the contrary, facilitate for citizens the attainment of the supernatural end itself (proper to religious society), to which all men are destined.

3. The authority of the State comes from God; the people by their will, explicit or implicit, have only the function of designating the person or the subject of the authority.

4. In view of the objective subordination of the temporal order of man to his supernatural end, it is evident that the Church, as a religious society instituted by God precisely for the supernatural end, cannot be independent on the State. The State, on the contrary, must be indirectly subordinate to the Church, by avoiding interference in spiritual things concerning the Church and also by avoiding such legislation and action in temporal matters which would impede in any way the exercise of religious authority over the faithful, respecting in the faithful the right of religious freedom.

5. The State has the duty of recognizing and professing religion, because the State, like the family and the individual, derives from and depends on God. Consequently, the State, in strict logic and in strict justice, has the obligation of defending the Catholic Church and of prohibiting other religious cults. Only as a prudential measure may it tolerate them.

6. In order to avoid harmful conflicts with a State which does not follow these principles, the Church negotiates a concordat, which is a bilateral agreement on rights and duties, reservation always being made of the principle of the superiority of the Church.
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Suarez. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 303).

subconsciousness. A term brought into current use in the second half of the past century, especially by Myers, who believed he discovered (1886) outside the periphery of human consciousness a psychological substratum, vague and obscure in itself, but rich in perceptive and emotive resources, which he called precisely subconsciousness. W. James adopted the theory and applied it to religious experience (q.v.). According to these authors, a "conscious ego" exists in us, clear and normal, which is our ordinary personality; but in the depths of our mind there is hidden a "subconscious ego," a called also subliminal, in which are elaborated institutions and vague sentiments unknown to us, but which gradually group themselves, merge, and suddenly erupt into the zone of the "conscious ego," where they determine new aspirations, new directive ideas, a new life. In the obscure, subliminal consciousness is elaborated especially the sentiment of the divine, which is the root and source of religion. The real revelation is not in the Sacred Books, does not come from the outside, but springs up from the depths of the subconscious self. The magisterium of the Church takes up such religious sentiments of the collective consciousness and formulates them into dogmas, which are not immutable truths but provisional expressions, of a practical-symbolic nature, of religious experience (see dogma; symbol; pragmatism).

This theory of James, through Le Roy, has passed into modernism (q.v.), upsetting the concept of revelation, of the Church, and of the whole Christian religion.

In Protestant circles, more precisely in the Anglican theology, the theory of the subconscious has been applied to Christology, to explain the personality of the Man-God. According to one of the foremost representatives of that theology, W. Sanday (Christology, Ancient and Modern, 1910; Personality in Christ and in Ourselves, 1911), Christ was a perfect man in whose subconscious conscience, however, there developed a sentiment of union with the Word of God, which gradually passed into His clear consciousness, where it determined the persuasion of a personal fusion between Christ the Man and the Son of God. Christian consciousness has
translated this experience and sentiment of Jesus into the dogma of the hypostatic union (q.v.).

All this theory of the subconscious, founded on an exaggeration and arbitrary interpretation of obscure sentiments (which can be given a much simpler explanation), is in conflict with sound psychology, which asserts a hierarchy and gradation in the faculties of the spirit (intellect, will, sensibility); it is also unacceptable from a religious standpoint, because it perverts the sense of revelation and dogma by eliminating the historical value of Christianity, and because, in Christology, it tends to a Nestorian solution of the personality of Christ (see Nestorianism).
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subdiaconate (Gr. ὑποδιάκονον — un-der-servant). The lowest of the major orders (see orders, holy). The sub-deacon, as his name indicates, is essentially the servant of the deacon, whom he helps in his multiple duties, which at present are reduced to pouring the water in the chalice, washing the feet of the bishop, assisting at the altar by presenting the chalice, and three men, washing the corporal and the other sacred linens.

The most ancient documents which speak of this order are the epistles of St. Cyprian and the letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch (A.D. 261).

At Rome there were seven sub-deacons, as there were seven deacons. Afterward, there is mention of the obligations of chastity and of the right of the curial of the Breviary as annexed to this office, which only at the end of the twelfth century was placed among the major orders in the Western Church. In the Eastern Churches it is still considered as a minor order.
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See under orders, holy.

subjectivism. The tendency to exaggerate the value of the knowing subject to the point of absorbing objective reality in him. Subjectivism has been characterized of modern philosophy since the time of Descartes. Descartes, by his famousCogito, ergo sum ("I think, therefore I am"), began to subordinate being to thought, inverting the order followed by the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy which defines truth as an adequate representation of the intellect and the thing, and subordinating thought to being. Even in the zone of sens knowledge Descartes began to deny the objectivity of certain sensations. English empiricism pushed similar denials (Locke) to the point of eliminating the reality of matter (Berkeley) and of reducing all reality to a flux of subjective sensations (phenomenalism of Hume). Kant (see Kantianism) was able to save only a phenomenal reality, sacrificing the objective reality of things to the subject (the noumenon). Idealism (q.v.) did the rest, rejecting all reality outside of the thinking subject (Fichte, Schelling) and of the idea (Hegel) or the act of thinking (Gentile).

Thus was finally affirmed the absolute immanence of the object in the subject, denying all transcendence, i.e., all reality extraneous to thought and outside of it. Nowadays a reaction has begun against this subjectivist immanence by a return to that moderate realism, which is proper to the Christian philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


subordinating. Heretics of the second and third centuries who prepared the way for Arianism (q.v.) by teaching that the Word is not God in the proper sense, but rather a most excellent creature intermediate between God and the world (cf. Demurage of the Platonists and the Azon of the Gnostics). The Word is, therefore, subordinate to the true God. The consequence of subordinationism is the denial of the divinity of Jesus Christ, held to be not the natural but only the adoptive Son of God (see adoptionism). At the end of the second century Theodorus the Elder at Rome, and Paul of Samosata, at Antioch in the third century, spread subordinationism and adoptionism. Both were condemned by the Church. Subordinationism passed to Arius through Lucian of Antioch.

In the first-century apologists (Justin, Athenagoras, Tatian, Origen, and especially Tertullian), there are some phrases which suggest subordinationism (Word — God in the second place, minister of God in creation, etc.). But, after thorough study of the texts and their context, the apparent difficulty vanishes: these writers were the first to attempt to illustrate with human language the relationships of the divine Persons, and they hazarded various phrases, somewhat unlucky and ambiguous, in attempting to express the procession of the Word from the Father. The defect is only in the words, which may be interpreted benignly, in view of the general doctrine of these apologists, which is sound and affirms substantially the equality of the three Persons.
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substance. See hypostatic union.

substance (Lat. substantia, Gr. ὑπόστασις)—that which is under, a quasi-substratum. In the scholastic language it is defined: that which of its nature can exist in itself and does not require a subject of inherence in order to exist. It is opposed to accident, which cannot naturally exist unless in a subject that sustains it, like the color on the wall. Substance, thus understood, and accident are the supreme categories or predicaments that divide real being: everything that exists is either substance or accident. It is necessary to distinguish a created substance, which is that defined above, from the uncreated substance (God), which exists not only in se (in itself) and per se (by itself), but also a se (from itself, as it were, not from another). Substance is not the object of the senses, as are accidents, but of the intellect, nor by this fact is it less real than accidents. Sensism, which is the basis of empiricism (q.v.) and of phenomenalism, has induced the negation of the substance of things (Locke, Hume). Along with this current go the positivists (q.v.) and the so-called actuallists, who reduce substance either to the series of events or phenomena or to the very activity of things (Taine, Ribot, Paulsen, Huxley).

Against such negation it suffices to appeal to the testimony of consciousness, which attests the permanence of one single subject, of one single "ego," notwithstanding the continuous succession of mutations and phenomena. Catholic doctrine stands for the reality of substance, really distinct from its accidents, on which basis it illustrates the mystery of transubstantiation.
suffering, by which the substances of bread and of wine are converted into the body and the blood of our Lord, while the accidents or species of the one and the other consecrated element remain intact. Substance may be taken also in the sense of essence of the thing (that by which the thing is constituted in its species), being then divided into first and second. First substance (Aristotle: αὑσία πρώτη) is that which is individuated and subsisting in its physical reality, e.g., John; second substance (αὑσία δεύτερη) is the specific abstract essence of the individual subject, which is attributed to all the individuals of the same species, e.g., humanity, common to all men.

First substance coincides, in rational beings, with person (q.v.). In man there are two substance, one material (the body), the other spiritual (the soul), completing each other and forming together one composite substance or essence, to which the unique act of being gives a profound unity. In God there is only one and most simple substance, in which, however, subsist three Persons, constituted by three distinct relations (see Trinity).
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suffering. Like all things that are most simple and well known, it is difficult to adequately define suffering. It may, however, be described by opposing it to joy and pleasure. St. Thomas proposes a profound concept of pleasure, deriving it from the perfect activity of being as from its proper cause. Suffering, therefore, depends on a disorder of activity (impediment, deficiency, or excess of action). Like pleasure, suffering is sensible or spiritual: the former, called also physical, affects animal life and has only reference to present happenings, like sensation on which it depends; the latter is called moral, is proper to man, and saddens the spirit without limitation of time or space. In man, sense suffering is greater than in animals because of the presence of intellectual knowledge. Suffering dominates human life so as to constitute one of the most difficult enigmas. The problem of suffering is bound up with the problem of evil (q.v.), from which it stems like a sad flowering. The solutions attempted for these two problems are, therefore, analogous.

The chief extra-Christian solutions are:
1. Mazdaitism (theologico-religious solution): the religion of the Persians, reformed by Zarathustra (sixth century B.C.), who admires the Principle of good (Ahura Mazda) and a Principle of evil (Ahura Mainyu). The suffering of life lies in the conflict between these two Principles, and is reflected in man in the conflict between soul and body.

This dualism, which Manicheism (q.v.) adopted and spread, is metaphysically absurd and morally deleterious, as is witnessed also by history (see Albigenses).

2. Buddhism (ascetic-moral solution): Buddha (sixth century B.C.) starts with a pessimistic concept of life, detecting evil and suffering in every part of it. Since the root of suffering lies in desire, he proposes, as a remedy against it, the extinction of every desire and every passion and the renunciation of activity and life, so as to find refuge in a sort of egotistic contemplation.

This is a negative solution, anti-psychological (the passions cannot be destroyed, but disciplined) and anti-social (the desertion of life).

3. Greek philosophy: Several systems attempted a solution to the problem of suffering: the Socratic-Aristotelian solution of ethical rationalism (knowledge — good, happiness); the hedonistic solution of the Epicureans, the Stoic doctrine of virtue, consisting in indifference and imperturbability (ataraxia). All these solutions are unilateral and, therefore, defective.

4. Modern philosophy returns to the old motifs of the exaggerated optimism (Leibniz idealism) or of the excessive pessimism (Schopenhauer, Hartmann).

Christianity, coherently with its teaching on evil, sees in suffering a natural condition of the human being, aggravated by original sin. One should not attempt to escape suffering, but should face it; it is licit to fight it and eliminate it, inasmuch as possible, but it is better to endure it and make of it a powerful lever of the spirit. In Christ’s school the faithful learn not only to endure but to love suffering as a means of purification. The problem of individual and social suffering, as well as the problem of evil, cannot be solved except in the consideration of eternal life, as end and goal of our present existence.
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supernatural. That which surpasses and transcends, in being or in operation, all created nature. Nature (q.v.), being created, is finite and limited in its essential constitution, in its grade of being, and, consequently, in its capacity of acting and of receiving. An element is called supernatural: (a) when it is outside of and above the constitution of a created nature; (b) when it cannot be the term proportionate to the active potency of that nature; (c) when it is not due to that nature, either physically or morally. Such is divine grace, a gift gratuitously infused by God in the rational creature, which, therefore, becomes similar to God (deiform) in being and operation. The supernatural is a generous communication of God to His creature either by way of intuitive intellec tion, like the beatific vision (q.v.), or by way of an accidental modification of nature, like grace. Created nature with respect to the supernatural has no exigency or tendency of its own, but a mere passive capacity to receive the action of God, which elevates it to a superior order. This capacity is called obdessional potency, through which nature is obedient to the special influence of God. It represents the point of insertion of the supernatural in our nature.

In addition to the absolute supernatural (nature, miracle) there is the relative supernatural, which does not transcend all created being, but only one or another particular nature (e.g., infused knowledge, natural to the angel supernatural in man), and the preternatural, which, while surpassing created nature, does not transcend it, but perfects it in its own order (e.g., immortality of the body).

Thomism maintains a sharp line of distinction between created nature and the supernatural; Scotism, on the other hand, tends to bind, without discontinuity, one and the other (see desire of God).
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superstition. The act or practice of paying a divine worship to one to whom it should not be paid (that is, to creatures), or in worshipping God in an undue manner. He honors God in an undue manner who renders to
suppositum

Him a false worship (e.g., performing Jewish ceremonies which are definitely abrogated in the New Testament) or a superstitious worship (e.g., lighting a certain number of candles, holding a particular position, etc.). He, on the other hand, pays a divine worship to creatures (particularly to the devil), who abandons himself to acts of idolatry or indulges in divinations, in vain observation, or in magic.

Idolatry (q.e.), as the word indicates, is the adoration of idols. The idol is the material image of a false god, like Jupiter, Mercury, the moon, the sun. Whether the cult is paid to the image or to the thing or person represented by it, idolatry, no matter how elevated its object, always amounts to the adoration of a creature, animate or inanimate. There is nothing more contrary to reason and to faith.

Divination is the art of predicting the future or of knowing occult things by means not established by God, which always implies the invocation of diabolical intervention. St. Thomas distinguishes nine species of divination, in which the devil is directly called upon: tertidigitation, oneromancy, necromancy, pythomancy, geomancy, hydromancy, acromancy, pyromancy, haruspicy. We read in the Summa Theologiae (II-II, q. 95, a. 3) the explanation of these names. Theologians add six other species of divination, in which the devil is implicitly invoked: astrology, the observation of signs (augurium), presage (omen), chiroscopy, physiognomy, sortilege.

Vain observation is the use of means disproportionate for obtaining a determined effect, e.g., pretending to know all the knowable by pronouncing mysterious words, to heal all ills by using inefficacious medicines, to determine what will be the course of the day from some banal circum-

ences, e.g., meeting an old woman or a hunchback, etc. Magic is a kind of vain observation, being the art of working astounding effects by means of mysterious or disproportionate causes.
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suppositum. See person.

"Syllabus" (Gr. χρωματίον — I take together). An authentic collection of errors condemned by Pius IX. This collection is composed of 80 propositions taken from the many and diversified documents of the same Pontiff (allocutions, letters, encyclicals). The Syllabus was promulgated in 1864, together with the encyclical, Quanta cura.

The 80 propositions are divided into ten paragraphs: (1) pantheism, naturalism, and absolute rationalism; (2) moderate rationalism; (3) indifferentialism, latitudinarianism; (4) socialism, communism, secret societies, etc.; (5) errors on the Church and its rights; (6) errors on civil society, both in itself and its relations to the Church; (7) errors on natural and Christian ethics; (8) errors on Christian marriage; (9) errors on the civil power of the Roman pontiff; (10) liberal modernism.

Theologians disagree on the dogmatic value and the character of this pontifical document. Some (Franzelin among them) favor the opinion that both the Syllabus and the accompanying encyclical are documents of the infallible magisterium of the Pope. Others (e.g., Dupanloup) although recognizing the importance of the doctrinal value of the Sylla-

bus, do not attribute it to the character of infallibility. Still others attribute it to the only value of its sources.

All three opinions have an amount of probability; but, although the first is not most certain, the Syllabus is without doubt a very important document of the papal magisterium, and has become the object of the magis-
terium of the bishops who have ac-
cepted it. Therefore, its doctrine must be received at least with great respect and obedience as the voice of the Church, if not with the assent given to matters of divine faith. Neverthe-
less, several propositions in the Sylla-
bus require acceptance as matters of divine faith, not by force of the Syllabus itself, but of the previous documents from which they are derived.
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Symbol (Gr. συμβολή — I put together, I compare). Etymologically and according to the most common usage, even in classic works, it is equivalent to sign, countersign, mark of identification. In ecclesiastical language the same term was in early use to signify an official formula of faith, which was like the distinctive badge of the Christian. The most ancient and most important of all is the Symbol of the Apostles, which recently has given rise to animated discussions among critics from every sector.

The question presents many difficulties of detail, but substantially is resolved as follows. In the West, from the first half of the second century there had been in use a brief formula, called regula fidei, which served for the administration of baptism and for catechesis (cf. St. Justin and St. Irenaeus, later Tertullian). This formula, proper to the Roman Church, is found in Greek in the letter of Marcellus of Ancyra to Pope Julius (337), and in Latin in Nicetas of Remesiana (fifth century) and Rufinus of Aquilea (c. 400), who made a commentary on it, mentioning an ancient tradition according to which that formula was composed at the order of Jesus Christ by the Apostles as they were on the point of dispersing for the evangelization of the world. As regards the East, the matter is not clear, but it is certain that the Easterners had no fixed formula up to the fourth century, when the Council of Nicaea promulgated its Symbol, which is an enlarged version of the Roman formula.

Based on these and other data, some critics hold that the first Symbol of Faith was born in Rome, probably through the work of St. Peter and St. Paul, in a concise form, expressing only the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Passion and death of our Lord. From Rome the Symbol spread throughout the world, undergoing various changes and additions, as can be seen in the accurate collections made by Denzinger (DB, 1 ff.). Today we have two versions of the Symbol in use in the Church: the Roman-Latin (for catechetics and private recital) and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan (for the Mass), which was composed following the great Trinitarian heresy of Arius. Besides these two principal forms there are other less solemn ones, among them the so-called Athanasian Symbol (which is not of St. Athanasius), a limpid synthesis of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine, which the Church has inserted in the Breviary.
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symbolism (from Gr. σύμβολον — sign, mark, badge). A representation, through a sign or formula, of some truth which transcends the sensible world or even the common intellectual world. Symbolism has always been in use both in civil custom (e.g., flag, symbol of the fatherland) and, even more abundantly, in religious practices. Perhaps the Egyptian is the most symbolic of religions; also the mystery religions (Eleusis, Isis, Mithra, etc.), flourishing shortly before and after the beginning of the Christian era, have a remarkable symbolism in their rites. Christianity adopted and developed, especially in its liturgy, the symbolic character already current in the Synagogue under the influence of the ancient revelation, and did not disdain to use even pagan symbolic ceremonies, purifying them from any shadow of superstition. Actually, symbolism is dominant in all the sacramental life of the Church.

But with the modernists, symbolism became an abused and equivocal word and concept (see modernism), when they applied it to dogma (q.v.). According to them, a dogma or dogmatic formula, defined by the ecclesiastical magisterium, has not a theoretical value, i.e., a value adequate to the object which is signified, but only a symbolic and practical value, i.e., it is meant to be only the symbolic interpretation of a religious sentiment or fact, which becomes a rule of action. For example, when the Church defines the paternity of God, this expression does not have the value of a theoretical truth, because we cannot know what God is in Himself, but represents symbolically God as a Father, in order that we may behave toward Him like sons. Thus modernism tried to depreciate and eliminate the entire doctrine of faith, as determined in dogmatic formulas.

It is true that dogmatic language, being merely human and finite, can express divine things, not adequately, but only analogically (see analogy); it is, however, a miscomprehension and error to confuse the analogical with the equivocal, and thus fall into agnosticism (q.v.). When we say in the Creed that the glorious Christ sits at the right hand of the Father, the expression is to be understood in a figurative, symbolic sense, but by way of figure and symbol it encloses a sure and certain truth, namely: Christ, as incarnate Son of God, has in common with the Father regal glory, dignity, and power, in which also His humanity shares. Therefore, every dogma expresses primarily a truth to be believed, and, as a consequence, a rule of action; and its practical aspect is efficacious in direct proportion to the sureness and the firmness of its theoretical character. The Church, therefore, conforming to her principles in condemning the pragmatic symbolism of modernism with respect to dogma. Cf. the Decree of the Holy Office (Lamentabiles), DB, 1922 and 1926, Pius XII in his encyclical Humani generis warns against a tendency among Catholic theologians to exaggerate symbolism. See dogma.
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synod. See council.

temperance. See virtue.

temptation. An experiment made on a person to test his capacity, virtue, inclinations (St. Thomas). Temptation can have a good or an evil purpose. In Holy Scripture we read oftentimes that God tempts men; e.g., He induces Abraham to immolate his son in order to test his fidelity. Man also can tempt his fellow for good or for evil. But, strictly speaking, in Catholic doctrine temptation is proper to the devil, who, as St. Ambrose says, semper invitad ad meliora tendentibus ("always envies those striving for higher things"). It is a truth of divine faith that the devil tempts men to evil: Jesus Himself in the "Our Father" has us pray for this purpose, among other things, that God may not lead us into temptation. St. Peter describes vividly the threats of the tempter: "Be sober and watch; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. 5:8). The most disastrous temptation was that of Satan in the form of a serpent which brought about the fall of our first parents and of all humanity (Gen. 3).

After considering the fact of temptation, theology goes on to study of its mode. St. Thomas makes a fine and profound analysis of the influence of the angelic spirit on the human being. An angel can influence another angel intellectually by strengthening the intellecctive power of the other, and thus manifesting a truth which he, as a superior angel, knows more perfectly. With respect to the will, an angel can influence another less decisively, because its influence is restricted to presentation of the appetible object which, unless it is the supreme good, does not determine infallibly the will. Besides, God alone can move interiorly the angel's will, because God alone is Maker of the will and of its natural inclination. Based on these principles, St. Thomas proves that the devil can influence the human intellect, not by directly producing or arousing its thoughts, but by excited the imagination and, therefore, the phantasms, on which the intellect works. The devil can also exercise his influence on the will in two indirect ways, namely, either by way of persuasion, presenting to the will through the imagination and the intellect an appetible object, or by exciting the passions which solicit and disorientate the will. All this, however, is only an external influence, because internally it is God alone who always moves. Under any kind of diabolic influence the will does not lose its freedom and, therefore, tempted man is always responsible for his sin. He can and must resist, with the help of divine grace, as the Church teaches against the false doctrine of Molinos (DB, 1237, 1237, 1261 ff.). See Molinos.

Original sin makes human nature more susceptible to temptations, especially more serious ones; but God bestows on the man of good will grace proportionate to his needs and does not permit that he be tempted above his powers, as St. Paul attests (1 Cor. 10:13). Christ, too, was tempted by the devil; but His temptation was merely exterior and could not affect even the sensitive life of His soul, because His senses and passions were altogether subject to reason (see propensions).
Tertullian. See "Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology" (p. 301); traducianism.

Testament, New (see Bible). The body of 27 books relative to the history of Christ and His revelation and to the early years of the Church. By analogy with the books of the Old Testament (q.v.), they are divided into three categories:

Historical Books:
1. Gospel according to St. Matthew (28 chs.)
2. Gospel according to St. Mark (16 chs.)
3. Gospel according to St. Luke (24 chs.)
4. Gospel according to St. John (21 chs.)
5. Acts of the Apostles (28 chs.)

Didactic Books:
6. Epistle of St. Paul
7. To the Romans (16 chs.)
8. 1 to the Corinthians (13 chs.)
9. 2 to the Corinthians (13 chs.)
10. To the Galatians (6 chs.)
11. To the Ephesians (6 chs.)
12. To the Philippians (4 chs.)
13. To the Colossians (4 chs.)
14. 1 to the Thessalonians (3 chs.)
15. 2 to the Thessalonians (3 chs.)
16. 1 to Timothy (6 chs.)
17. 2 to Timothy (4 chs.)
18. To Titus (3 chs.)
19. To Philemon (1 ch.)

Testament, Old (see Bible). The body of 45 books which constitute the first part of the Bible and contain the history of the ancient revelation and of the preparation of men, through the people of Israel, for the coming of the Messiah. The following is a list of the books and their order, as designated by the Council of Trent in 1546 (see Canon of the Bible).

Historical Books:
1. Genesis (50 chs.)
2. Exodus (40 chs.)
3. Leviticus (40 chs.)
4. Numbers (36 chs.)
5. Deuteronomy (34 chs.)
6. Josue (24 chs.)
7. Judges (21 chs.)
8. Ruth (4 chs.)
9. 1 of Samuel or 1 of Kings (31 chs.)
10. 2 of Samuel or 2 of Kings (24 chs.)
11. 1 of Kings or 3 of Kings (32 chs.)
12. 2 of Kings or 4 of Kings (25 chs.)
13. 1 of Paralipomenon or Chronicles (29 chs.)
14. 2 of Paralipomenon or Chronicles (36 chs.)
and faithful religious practice, or poético, because of their literary form.

The prophetic books contain biographical episodes and résumés of discussions of the prophets which God sent between the eighth and the fifth centuries B.C. to preserve Israel in the faith and to rekindle the Messianic hopes (see prophet; Messias).

The books of the Old Testament are nearly all written and preserved in the Hebrew language; some passages of Daniel and of Esdras and some sporadic verses of other books are written in Aramaic. Some books were written originally in Greek (Wisdom and 2 Maccabees), while of others the originals have been lost and have come down to us in the Greek translation (1 Maccabees, Baruch, Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, of which two thirds of the original text was found in the last years of the past century).

The books of the Old Testament were written on papyrus or, to obtain greater durability, on parchment cut in the form of strips wound around sticks. At the present time about 3000 manuscripts of the Hebrew text are known, of which the most ancient dates from the ninth century A.D. The text we read today received its definite form in the first century B.C. and corresponds satisfactorily to the original (see Masoretic).

The arrangement into chapters dates from A.D. 1214 and is due to Stephen Langton; the division into verses dates from 1528 and is the work of Sante Pagnino.

The Old Testament forms an inseparable unity with the New, of which it was “the figure” (1 Cor. 10:6-11). It was the “pedagogue” which led Israel to Christ (Gal. 3:24), who was the end of the Old Testament (Rom. 10:4). Containing the multiple and fragmentary communications of the ancient, divine revelation, it necessarily postulates the New Testament which illumines and completes it with the full revelation brought by the Son of God (Heb. 11:2). St. Augustine says: “In the Old Testament is hidden the New and in the New the Old is manifested” (Quaest. in Hept., 2, 73).
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**Tetragrammaton** (Gr. τέταρτόγραμματον of four letters). It indicates the name by which God is commonly designated in the Hebrew Bible (about 6823 times). It consists of four letters: J H W H and is read Jehovah. While other names signify the nature of God (e.g., 'el, 'elohim), this one designates His very person and is the most holy and incomunicable name. After the exile (fifth century B.C.) the Hebrews, out of reverence, avoided pronouncing it; at the time of Christ it was licit for the high priest alone to mention it during the solemn annual ceremony of the expiation.

After the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem (a.d. 70), the sacred name was substituted in the Bible by Adonai (My Lord) and Elohim (God). The four original letters were preserved, but there were added to them the vowels of the other two names which were pronounced by the reader, substituting the consonants: in the Bible Jehovah or Jehovah were written, but one read Adonai and Elohim. By ignorance of such substitution the erroneous reading Jehovah entered into use in the fourteenth century.

The Tetragrammaton was revealed by God to Moses as a new name, when He entrusted to him the task of freeing the people from the slavery of Egypt (Exod. 3:13-16; 6:3-8). Its meaning is given by Exodus 3:14: "God said to Moses: I am who am. He said: Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: He who is, hath sent me to you." The name, in fact, derives from the Hebrew root HWH (hawah) or HWH (hawah) and is the first person singular of the imperfect tense, improperly so-called, and which would better be called preterite on account of its morphological property that it is formed by the root by means of a preforming letter J. From the verbal sentence "I am who am," spontaneous passage was made to the name represented by the third person: J HWH — "He who is," which signifies: He who truly is, He whose essential property is to be (see essence, divine). Some authors derive the name from the causal form of the verbal root, obtaining the meaning: "He who gives being," i.e., "the Creator."

In all the vast domain of the Semitic languages, to which the Hebrew belongs, no other divine name is formed from a verb, especially from a preterite tense; all the other names are of noun formation, for the most part substantive. This shows that the Tetragrammaton is not a spontaneous product of the popular religion or an invention of men; it is, as the Bible says, directly revealed by God.
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**Theandric operation** (from the Gr. θεάνης — God, and ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός — man, hence, human-divine, godly-manly). The expression theandric operation is found for the first time in a letter of Pseudo-Dionysius (end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries), to a monk, called Caius, and signifies the complex activity of Christ, God and man at once. It naturally led the mind to a monophysitic interpretation (see Monophysitism), suggesting the idea of a mixed and hybrid action, confusedly human and divine. Since Monophysitism had been condemned by the Council of Chalcedon (451), the ambiguous formula theandric operation was rejected by Catholic writers (St. Maximus Confessor), and by the Lateran Council of 649 (DB, 268).

St. John Damascene later on adopted and defined theandric operation as an orthodox expression. In reality that formula, rightly understood, has a correct dogmatic sense: Since there are two distinct natures in Christ, there are also two series of operations, the one divine (to create, to conserve the being of creatures), the other human (to speak, to move around). But the human nature, subsisting in the person of the Word, is sustained by it in being and operation. Therefore, every human operation of Christ can be called also divine as proper to the Word, which is the acting principle not only of the divine activity, but also of the human. Moreover, the Word used and still uses His humanity, as an instrument, for certain divine actions, e.g., in working miracles; therefore, also these actions are rightly called theandric.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Theology begins with fundamental principles taken without discussion from the sources of revelation (Holy Scripture and Tradition, interpreted by the living magisterium of the Church) and analyzing and comparing them with the principles of reason, develops all their richness into a body of derived truths, which are called theological conclusions. Theology, therefore, has the character of a true science, which derives from the science of God Himself, as a finite radiation of it.

Divisions: (a) Positive theology, which studies the data of revelation with a critico-historical method. (b) Speculative theology, which plunges those data with the light of reason illumined by faith, revealing in explicit concepts their virtual content. According to the unitary conception of the Middle Ages, all ecclesiastical knowledge is substantially theology, burgeoning forth from the sacred page, i.e., on the revealed word of God. A wonderful example of this unity is the Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas, which embraces everything from exegesis to law. Later, especially from the sixteenth century, the various disciplines (exegesis, patristics, history, archaeology, liturgy, law) began to be separated from the main block of theological science, which is constituted by the doctrine of faith (dogmatic theology) and the doctrine of morals (moral theology); finally moral theology, too, was distinguished from dogmatic theology (seventeenth century).
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Theodicy (Gr. ἰδεία — God, and ιδέη — justice). This term was used for the first time by Leibnitz in his work Essai de Théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal (Amsterdam, 1710). He chose this term, restricted to the divine attribute of justice, in view of the character and scope of his essay; but later it was used as the equivalent of one of the other truly classical terms: natural theology. In this sense, theodicy is the science of God and of divine things, acquired through the natural light of reason. It is distinct from true and proper theology (q.v.) because it proceeds from divine revelation and faith.

Through the study of the external world and of man, theology demonstrates rationally not only the existence of God, but also many of his properties and attributes which are reflected in created things. Therefore, theodicy is the apex of philosophy as well as a part of apologetics (q.v.).
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Toletus. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 303).

tonsure (Lat. tonsura, from tondere—to cut, to shave, to clip). A sacred ceremony, consisting in cutting the hair of the head, by which the Church intends to segregate the aspirant from the world, dedicate him to the divine cult, and render him capable of jurisdiction and of ecclesiastical benefices.

It is not an order, but a kind of preparation for receiving holy orders; as man is prepared for baptism by means of exorcisms and for matrimony by means of sacred engagements, so it is convenient that he be prepared for the service of God and holy orders by means of tonsure (cf. DB, 958).

Through this ceremony, the candidate becomes a cleric and enjoys the privileges of the ecclesiastical forum and of the canon. The privilege of the forum exempts the cleric from subjection to lay courts and puts him under the ecclesiastical court; the privilege of the canon prohibits violence against the cleric and punishes with excommunication any one who dares to strike him tradente diabolo, namely, unjustly or with malice.

The origin of tonsure can be traced definitely to the fourth or fifth century, when the Church was no longer hampered in the free exercise of divine cult, and hence was able to give it a determined organization and to distinguish with particular signs the persons regularly deputed to it.
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traducianism (Lat. tradus—vine branch bent and buried so that it becomes a plant). A theory which explains the origin of individual human souls through derivation, either material or spiritual, from parents to their offspring. Traducianism is, therefore, either corporeal or spiritual.

Tertullian was the author of corporeal traducianism. He speaks of it in an interesting book De anima (Chs. 25–27), the most ancient Christian treatise on psychology; it should be noted, however, that this book was written by Tertullian after his adherence to Montanism. The interpretation of this book is not easy, because the author was forced to coin Latin terms to express Christian concepts which up to that time had been expressed in Greek. Some writers do not find clearly formulated in Tertullian’s work the concept of the true
transmission of original sin

spirituality of the soul, and in this deficiency they see the seed of the theory of traductionism, which involves the materiality of the soul. Others, more lenient, excuse the inaccuracy of language, clearing the thought of the great Apologist of any materialistic intention and explaining his traducianistic doctrine by his pre-occupation of rendering more intelligible the transmission of original sin (vitium originis). However, the judgment of St. Augustine, a more authoritative interpreter than anyone else, is very severe: "Those who hold that individual souls derive from the first soul, given by God to the first man, and say that they are drawn from the parents, if they follow the opinion of Tertullian, certainly mean to say that the souls are not spirits, but bodies: and this is most false" (Epist. 109, No. 14). Corporeal traductionism, as proposed by Tertullian, is truly contrary to the spirituality of the soul, which cannot be multiplied and transmitted, as the body is, through the human seed, without losing its essential character of spirit, by which it is independent of matter in its being and in its operation.

The Church has condemned this traductionism as heretical (cf. Anastasius II, Epist. ad Gallos; DB, 170). Under the same preoccupation as Tertullian (i.e., in order to give an easier explanation of original sin), St. Augustine admits a spiritual traductionism, namely: a derivation of the soul of the child from the souls of its parents; however, the holy Doctor himself acknowledges that his opinion is difficult and obscure (Epist. 150).

Notwithstanding the authority of St. Augustine, traductionism, even merely spiritual, was gradually abandoned after the fifth century, and all writers conformed to the opinion held by the Church, which is decisively favorable to creationism (q.v.), as appears in several documents (cf. DB, 20, 348, 527, 533, etc.). Spiritual traductionism is absurd, for a spiritual substance, like the soul, being simple, cannot be divided or in any way transmitted into another.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ST. THOMAS, Summa Theol., I, q. 90 and 117. BAIWEL, PARETO, LAMY, ADDIT. DTC.
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transmission of original sin. St. Paul writes: "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; so also death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12).

This text, which re-echoes other Holy Scripture passages, reveals to us the mystery of the transmission of Adam's sin to all his descendants. Tradition enjoyed peaceful possession of this revealed truth until the fifth century, when Pelagius (see Pelagianism) began to deny it. The Church rose up against him, and St. Augustine gave many years of his life in attacking and refuting the new heresy.

The transmission of original sin is a truth of defined faith (cf. the Council of Carthage, approved by Pope Zosimus; the II Council of Orange, approved by Pope Boniface II; the Council of Trent, ss. 5; DB, 101, 174 ff., 577 ff.). But from the rise of Scholasticism (eleventh century), discussion began about the character and essence of original sin in Adam's descendants. At the time of Luther and of the Council of Trent, the discussion became even more intense, because Luther was teaching that the essence of original sin lay in concipueciscence (q.v.), which he claimed is intrinsically sinful and inexcusable to the point of extinguishing the use of reason and free will.

The Council of Trent condemned Luther's errors, affirming that in fallen man there still remain reason, free will, the substantial integrity of nature, and its possibility of being healed through the grace of Christ. Likewise, it determined the character of the transmitted sin, teaching, among other things, that by propagation "Adam's sin is inherent in each of us as his own sin." The theologians, commenting on this text, have proposed various opinions on the essence of original sin, as transmitted: e.g., God made a pact with Adam, as the moral head of the human race, that he might be able to transmit the supernatural gifts to his descendants, or lose them, both for himself and his children, or the will of his descendants was transferred, as it were, in Adam at the moment of sinning, etc.

St. Thomas' explanation, as illustrated by Bilbaut, is still the best: (a) Adam is the head and source, not moral but ontological, of mankind; in him was all our nature. (b) Original justice (see innocence) was in him as an accidental perfection of the human species, which united mankind to God. (c) Adam broke this bond voluntarily and deprived the nature that was in him of such accidental perfection. (d) The nature, thus deprived and destitute, i.e., reduced to a state of guilt and stain of sin (see sin, personal), is passed down to his descendants, who thus find themselves in a state of voluntary sin, not through their own will but through that of the sinful act committed by Adam. (e) The sin of the descendants consists formally in the privation of grace, materially in the privation of integrity (q.v.) and, therefore, in concipueciscence. (f) By baptism the stain of sin is taken away through the infusion of grace (formal element), while concipueciscence (the material element) remains.

Original sin is propagated by carnal generation, the term of which is the whole man, both as to his soul and to his body which is a part of the nature infected with guilt (destitute of sanctifying grace). Through original sin our nature is wounded, but not intrinsically corrupted (Lutheranism, Balanism, Jansenism). St. Thomas explains this wounded condition of our nature in the sense that the nature, infected by sin but remaining substantially whole, is sick in its faculties of action, which are weak and disoriented with respect to their proper object (truth and goodness). Since in the descendants original sin is not voluntary by their own will, but by the will of Adam, those who die with only original sin will suffer the pain of loss (poena damni), which stems from the sin itself (privation of the beatific vision), but cannot be subjected to the punishment of the senses (poena sensus), which is a positive pain inflicted by God, and cannot be conceived but as an effect of a voluntary sinful act of the sinner himself. St. Augustine maintained a punishment of the senses, although very light, but neither the Church nor the theologians agree with him in this contention.
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transubstantiation (fact) (Lat. trans — beyond, over, across; substantia — substance; therefore, passage from one substance into another). The manner in which the body of Christ is made present under the Eucharistic species. This word, which appeared in the first time in theological literature during the Berengarian controversy (eleventh to the twelfth centuries), was immediately adopted by the Church magisterium and became the identification card of orthodoxy, like the Homousian of Nicaea and the Theotocos of Ephesus. Its real content was proposed explicitly by the Council of Trent, in the following
transubstantiation

by reason of the succession of forms, both the term a quo (starting point) and the term ad quem (finishing point) undergo alterations (corruption and generation, respectively), in the Eucharistic conversion—since the matter does not remain—any succession of forms is excluded, and, therefore, while the conservative action affects the whole substance of bread which is instantly transmuted into the substance of the body of Christ, it does not reach in any way or affect the body of the Lord, which remains intact, unaffected, and impossible. For these reasons transubstantiation is a singular conversion, altogether outside the orbit of experience. For the same reason it is wondrous, i.e., mysterious, because it is foreign to experience from which the intellect ascends naturally to its ideas or concepts; we cannot conceive it adequately, but must satisfy ourselves with pallid images and analogies.

This doctrine stems logically from an attentive analysis of the words of institution: "This is My body," and from the teaching of Tradition, which created a new terminology in an effort to express this truth more adequately: "transmutation," "trans-substantiation," "transformation," which was the prelude to the happy term "transubstantiation," proposed by the Council of Trent as the "most suitable and apt" expression of the Catholic dogma (DB, 884).

Luther rejected transubstantiation, admitting only "compunction," i.e., co-existence of the substance of bread and of the body of Christ. Rupert of Deutz, John of Paris, and Bayma erred on the nature of transubstantiation, imagining a kind of hypostatic union of the bread with the body of the Lord (imposition); Durand, Descartes, and Rosmini, erroneously likened the Eucharistic conversion to physiological assimilation.
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transubstantiation (mode). Certain theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, having accepted as a point of faith the total conversion of the substance of bread and of wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, thought they could keep the formal concept of transubstantiation by understanding it in an improper or equivalent sense. They said that the substance of bread is annihilated directly or indirectly to make room for the body of Christ, which would be made present under the species of bread by a kind of reproduction (Suarez and Lessius) or by addition from heaven, without Christ leaving that blessed place or passing through the intermediate space (Bellarmine and Lugo).

These opinions, however, do not seem to run true with the Tridentine definitions. The Council teaches that transubstantiation is a singular and wondrous conversion, by which the glorious and impassible body of Christ is made present (DB, 884). But, given the annihilation of the bread and the reproduction or the aduction of the body of Christ, it is impossible to speak of a real conversion, which implies, in its formal concept, the passing of one thing into another, and not the falling of one thing into nothingness in order to make place for another, whether produced or adduced. Moreover, how could the glorious and impassible body of Christ be adduced under the Eucharistic species without undergoing a change, at least extrinsic, without leaving Its previous place in heaven, without traversing intermediary space? How, finally, could the same body of Christ be reproduced as many times as there are consecrations in the world and still remain the one and identical body which was born of the Virgin, died on the cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father?

For these reasons we must discard such theories and follow the doctrine of St. Thomas, which is the common opinion and the only one in perfect harmony with the definitions of the Church. According to the Angelic Doctor, in the Eucharist the substance of bread is not annihilated, and the body of Christ is made present not by reproduction or by aduction, but simply by the total conversion of the substance of bread into the pre-existing body of Christ, glorious and immutale (see the preceding entry).
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Trinity. The most sublime Christian mystery, revealing to us the intimate being and the innermost life of God. It can be expressed formally in these terms: God absolutely one in nature or essence, and relatively three in persons (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost), who are really distinct from each other, as opposite relative terms of the divine intellect and will, but
are consubstantial, i.e., identical with the divine substance. Hence, the three Persons are equal, and to each belongs all the divine attributes. The only thing that is proper and exclusive to the Persons are the opposite relations (Paternity, Filiation, Active Spiration, and Passive Spiration), which stem from the two immanent processes, that, namely, of the Son from the Father by way of intuition (which has the character of spiritual generation) and that of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son by way of volition and love.

By force of the relations, each of the three Persons has a distinct mode of possessing the divine essence, as happens in a triangle,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
F \\
S \\
HS
\end{array}
\]

in which every angle closes the same surface, but in its own proper direction (S, F, HS; F, S, HS; S, HS, F).

This mystery, only dimly foreshadowed in the Old Testament, is fully revealed in the New, especially in St. Paul and St. John. The baptismal formula, enjoined by Christ Himself, is the compendium of the Trinitarian mystery, which seals the rebirth of man. Arianism (see Arianism), the first to disturb the Trinitarian faith in the Church, was condemned by the Council of Nicaea (325).

The extreme errors concerning this mystery and constantly condemned by the Church are Modalism and tritheism (qq.v.). The Christian Trinity does not break comparison with the Babylonian, or the Persian, or the Egyptian (polytheistic groupings), or with the Indian Trimurti (Brahma, Visnu, Siva), a related cosmogonic elaboration of popular myths, built up on a polytheistic theme. Not even the Saccidananda (being, knowing, happiness) of the Hindu theology can be compared to our Trinity, because the clear concept of person is lacking in it.
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**Trinité** (Gr. τριάς — three, and βούς — God). A Trinitarian error, sprung up, it seems, in the sixth century in the East through the work of the Alexandrian John Philoponus. Adhering to the principles of the Antiochian School, he thought that, as there cannot be a real nature that is not hypothesized (i.e., in the case of a rational nature, subsisting as a person), so it is not possible to imagine a real person that does not have its own distinct nature; since there are in God three Persons really distinct, there must be also three distinct natures (i.e., three Gods — tritheism).

In the eleventh century the monolitist, Roscelin, in a different manner arrived at the same conclusion, as St. Anselm, who refused him with stringent dialectic in his Epistola de Incarnatione Verbi, informs us Roscelin was condemned by the Council of Soissons (1092). The Abbot Joachim of Flora also professed a kind of tritheism (in opposition to Peter Lombard, the famous master of sentences), by denying a common nature to the three persons, and corresponding to the principles of nominalism. His work, Libellus de unitate seu de essentia Trinitatis, has been lost, but his error is known to us through the second chapter of the IV Lateran Council (1215, DB, 431-433).
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**Truth.** Consists in the conformity of the intellect and the intelligible. The object of the intelligence is being, and, therefore, every being is true inasmuch as it has a reference to the intellect that knows it. This order or relationship can be logical or ontological. The first is had when the intelligible object does not depend in its being on the intellect that knows it; this is proper to the human intellect, which must become conformed to things. The relationship is ontological when the intelligible object depends in its being on the intellect that knows it and causes it; this is proper to the divine intellect, which, says St. Thomas, creates by thinking (see science, divine).

There is thus in man logical truth, which is conformity of the intellect to the thing, and ontological truth, which is conformity of the thing to the divine intellect. Our intellect is measured by the truth and fundamentally in things, inasmuch as they have relationship to an intellect that either only knows them or causes and knows them.

Idealism, in its conception of being and truth, has erroneously applied to man what is proper to God. In God there is perfect truth. He is the very subsisting Truth, because there is a perfect conformity, even complete identity, between His intellect and His essence (object), in which are also virtually found all things possible and real. And since intellection is the life of the spirit, there is in God, in addition to truth, life: what is more, He is Life.

**Unitarianism.** A Trinitarian error of the sixteenth century. The principal author of this error is Faustus Socinus († 1604), whence the sect of Socinians. By interpreting the Holy Scripture arbitrarily, according to the Lutheran principle (liberty of thought), the Socinians believed they could demonstrate that the mystery of the Trinity is foreign to the Gospel, which, they claimed, teaches only the doctrine of a unique God (Unitarianism). The error was spread in England and in America. Unitarianism is reductively a kind of modalism (q.v.).
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**Type,** See sense of Scripture.

**Ubiquitarianism (Ubiquism).** See henosis.

**Ubiquity,** See infinity; presence of God.

"Unigenitus." See Only-Begotten.

**Union, hypostatic,** See hypostatic union.

**Unitarianism.** A Trinitarian error of the sixteenth century. The principal author of this error is Faustus Socinus († 1604), whence the sect of Socinians. By interpreting the Holy Scripture arbitrarily, according to the Lutheran principle (liberty of thought), the Socinians believed they could demonstrate that the mystery of the Trinity is foreign to the Gospel, which, they claimed, teaches only the doctrine of a unique God (Unitarianism). The error was spread in England and in America. Unitarianism is reductively a kind of modalism (q.v.).
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unity (mark of the Church). The first endowment or property which the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol attributes to the Church, and which arises spontaneously from its nature and end. Since, indeed, the Church is “the union of man with Christ in a social form,” it cannot help being one, as Christ is one, and as also the human race is one, which Christ the Redeemer drew into the orbit of His divine influence.

The truth of this conclusion is confirmed by Holy Scripture in the images employed to represent the Church (all of which put in bold relief the unity of the Church): archetypic (“an edifice”), Matt. 16:18; social (“a kingdom”, Matt. 16:19), anthropological (“a body”, Rom. 12:14–5; 1 Cor. 12:12–27; Eph. 4:4); sacramental (“a spouse”, Eph. 5:22–32), pastoral (“a sheaf”, John 10:16). Christ Himself, in His sacrificial prayer, by asking the Father ut unum sint (“that they may be one,” John 17:20–22), points to the natural unity of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, as to the prototype of the mystical unity which must reign among the members of the Church.

This unity implies profession of the same faith (symbolico-dogmatic bond), participation in the same means of salvation (liturgical-sacramental bond), submission to the same pastors, especially to the Roman pontiff, the hinge, the center, and the acme of ecclesiastical unity (hierarchico-architectonic bond). To the unity of faith is opposed heresy (q.v.); to the unity of grace caused by the sacraments is opposed sin (which does not separate from the Church, but only paralyzes the member who is affected by it); to the unity of government is opposed schism (q.v.).

Unity does not suppress variety, does not destroy different human values, but rather enhances them by promoting those liberties which make the Church the spouse of Christ, adorned with a multifarious garment. Indeed, in dogmatic unity there reigns the theological freedom of the schools, in which the highest intellects are trained; the variety of rites which nourish the piety of the faithful shines forth in the unity of worship; in the unity of government thrive very many national and regional particularities, in which the hierarchy, imitating God who disponit nos cum magna reverentia respects the characteristics of the individual peoples.

Three splendid encyclicals were issued on the unity of the Church: Satis cognitum (1866), by Leo XIII, Mortalium animos (1928), by Pius XI, and Mystici corporis (1943), by Pius XII.
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unity of God. Unity, in the transcendental sense, is the absence of division; all that is undivided is one, and in this sense every being is one, i.e., undivided (even if it is divisible, i.e., composed, like man). In the predicamental sense, unity is a quantitative, numerical element.

Faith teaches that God is absolutely one in all senses of the word (pure monotheism). Reasons: (a) God is one in the transcendental sense, because He is absolutely simple and excludes from Himself all composition, all division, all divisibility. (b) God is one and unique numerically, because He is subsisting Being Itself, therefore infinite; now it is absurd to admit more than one Infinite.

Let us make the supposition of two Infinites, A and X, with their possible relationships:

\[(1) A = X; (2) A < X; (3) A > X\]

In the first case, \(A\) and \(X\) being equal would not be infinite because inferior to their sum total; in the second case, \(A\) less than \(X\) would be finite; in the third case, \(X\) less than \(A\) would be finite. All this proves mathematically—not to mention metaphysics—the absurdity of all forms of polytheism, as well as of pantheism which, by identifying God with the world, collection of many beings, falls back necessarily into a form of polytheism.

The Trinity does not destroy the unity of God, because unity is in the order of the absolute, while the Trinity is in the order of the relative (see Trinity).
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vain observation. See superstition.

Vasquez. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 303).

Vega. See “Outline of the History of Dogmatic Theology” (p. 303).

viceroy of Christ. The title used since the thirteenth century by which the pope has been commonly designated. The expression is, however, more ancient: used in the Roman Synod of 495 (Vicarium Christi et videmus), it was taken up by St. Peter Damian at the time of the investiture struggle in opposition to the imperial polemists, who attributed to the emperor the title Vicarius Dei. St. Bernard finally used the expression with particular insistence and applied it to the pope both in his celebrated work De Consideratione, dedicated to his former disciple Pope Eugene III, and in his letters. The authority of St. Bernard influenced not only authors like John of Salisbury, St. Thomas of Canterbury, Gerhard of Reichersberg, and Queen Eleanor of England, but also Innocent III, the first pontiff who used to a great extent that magnificent title whose dogmatic rightness and value is evident from all that is contained under the entry, Roman pontiff.
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virginity of Mary. Virginity, in the proper sense, is the physical integrity of the organs of generation. On several occasions the virginity of Mary was the target of heretics: first the Jews spread evil tales on the conception and birth of Jesus; they were followed by Cerinthus and Celsus, and later in the fourth century by other heretics, such as the Antidicomarians (q.v.), refuted by Epiphanius; Jovinians, condemned in the Roman Synod of 390; Bonosus, re-
proved by Pope Sisigius; Helvidius, impugned by St. Jerome. The Lutherans and the Socinians re-echo the ancient errors, while the modern rationalists hold the virginity of Mary to be a myth.

It is a truth of Catholic faith that our Lady maintained her state of perfect virginity at all times: before the birth, in the birth, and after the birth of Christ. The Apostles' Creed says: "Born of the Virgin Mary"; in the most ancient liturgies the title Mary desunplw (also virginit) is frequent. In the Roman Council of 696 (under Martin I) Mary is defined immaculate, always a virgin, who conceived without man's seed and remained intact even after childbirth (DB, 256). "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel" (Isa. 7:14). This name is certainly Messianic, and hence the Virgin is Mary; in Hebrew the reading is alma or almān (bahalmsah), which the rationalists say should be translated young woman, and not virgin, which would be expressed in Hebrew by bethulah or betulah. But biblical usage justifies the meaning "virgin" for alma, as is evident from the versions (the Seventy translate ἰδίος — virgin). The context also requires that sense, for a prodigious event is prophesied. The Gospel quotes this prophecy (Matt. 1:18–23) and relates with precise details the virginal conception of Jesus by virtue of the Holy Spirit. Christ putabatur (was thought or reputed to be) the son of Joseph (Luke 3:23). Luke, with delicate shading of language, suggests that the childbirth of Mary did not violate her virginity (2:7). The Fathers see the virginity of Mary after childbirth in the prophecy of Ezekiel: "This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall pass through it; because the Lord the God of Israel hath entered in by it" (44:2). Tradition is unanimous in defending the perpetual virginity of Mary: St. Augustine affirms (Sermon, 186): "a virgin conceiving, a virgin bearing, a virgin pregnant, a virgin with child, a virgin forever."

The theological reason is in the divinity of the Word and in the divine maternity of Mary, to which any corruption was repugnant.

Nor does the title first-born given to Jesus create any difficulty; it is evident from documents that this word signified the first-born, even when there were no other children. The brothers of Jesus, of which the Gospel speaks (Matt. 12:46; Luke 8:18), are only His relatives, according to the Hebrew use of the word.
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virtue. An operative habit which St. Thomas, following Aristotle, defines: "A good quality of the mind, by which we live rightly and which no one can use for evil." To virtue is opposed the bad habit, which is called vice.

The natural virtues are acquired by the constant repetition of good acts, and are distinguished into intellectual virtues (dianoetic) and moral virtues (ethic). The fundamental virtues, called also cardinal (cardo — hinge), are four: (1) Prudence: "right reason of actions to be done" (recta ratio agibilium), or the choice and order of means with respect to the end. It is the queen of the cardinal virtues and resides in the intellect. (2) Justice: "the constant and perpetual will of rendering to everyone his right." A habit which inclines the will to do what it ought, according to reason. It is a social virtue (i.e., having reference to others). (3) Temperance: moderates the appetite (passion of sense pleasure). (4) Fortitude: moderates and strengthens the irascible appetite against difficulties.

The supernatural virtues are habits infused by God in the faculties, together with sanctifying grace which is, however, infused in the very essence of the soul.

According to the common doctrine, the moral virtues listed above are to be placed also among the supernatural virtues; they are ordained to perfect and elevate the corresponding natural virtues. However, the principal infused virtues are the theological virtues, so called because they have God as their formal object (while the moral virtues have a finite good for their object). The theological virtues are three: (1) Faith, which inclines the intellect (and the will) to adhere firmly to the revealed word of God (see faith). (2) Hope, which inclines the will to trust in the good and omnipotent God for the obtaining of external life and the grace to merit it. (3) Charity, which inclines the will to love God for Himself, as well as ourselves and our neighbors for God's sake. It is the queen of the theological virtues, for it unites us to God, as God and as present. Since its proper and most formal object is God, as supreme end, charity may be considered, with St. Thomas, as the form, mother, and director of all the other virtues — a thought amply developed by St. Paul (1 Cor. 13; see charity).

Charity is intimately connected with sanctifying grace and, therefore, they are infused together and, through sin, are lost together. Faith and hope, on the contrary, can remain in the sinner without grace and charity; in such case they are called infirm faith and hope (i.e., without the form of charity), while they are called formed when they are united with charity.

At the moment of the infusion of grace all the virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit are also infused (see gifts of the Holy Ghost). Cf. Council of Vienne (DB, 483) and Council of Trent (DB, 800).
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vision, beatific. The supernatural end to which God has willed to dispense man gratuitously, elevating him by grace to an activity proportionate to that end. The beatific vision consists in the immediate and intuitive contemplation of the divine essence, of which the human intellect is made capable by the light of glory, which is a supernatural power infused in the blessed by God, proportionately to the degree of sanctifying grace possessed by each one of them at the moment of death. This supreme and ultimate term of the whole supernatural economy, is clearly enunciated in Holy Scripture: "We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known" (1 Cor. 13:12). From this last sentence it is evident that the beatific vision is a participation of the knowledge of God. St. John, also: "We shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). Although impossible in the natural order, the beatific vision is not absurd in the supernatural order, because the adequate object of our cognition is
voluntarism

being, and God as being, however transcendent, is not extraneous to that object; therefore the human intellect can be elevated through divine power to the point of reaching the essence of God, although, on account of its natural limitations, it cannot exhaust all the intelligibility of that essence. The theologians say that the blessed see God totum sed non totaller (“whole but not wholly”) and, moreover, they see in different degrees of intensity, according to the power of the light of glory proportionate to grace. Nevertheless, they are all equally happy, because each one sees as much as he is able to see.

The primary object of the intuitive vision is God in His unity and trinity and in His attributes; created things are the secondary object, seen in the divine essence, being an effect and an imitation of it. The Palamites (from Gregory Palamas, † 1359, schismatic archbishop of Thessalonica) distinguished in God essence and power, maintaining that the blessed see only a divine power, which is the uncreated splendor that shone on Christ on Mount Tabor (whence the name of Taborites). The doctrine of the Church on the beatific vision is defined in the Constitution Benedictus Deus of Benedict XII (DB, 530), and in the Councils of Vienne and Florence (DB, 475, 693) (see beatitude).
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voluntarism. A system or a philosophical tendency which overrates the function of the will. It is generally opposed to idealism. Plato, notwithstanding his exaltation of his noetic world, assigns the primacy to the subsisting idea of good and creates the dialectics of love for the conquest of good and truth. Through the works of Plotinus he influences the thought of St. Augustine, who, although an intellectualist, accentuates the activity and the importance of the appetitive and affective faculty. St. Bonaventure and the Franciscan School, influenced by St. Augustine, assert the primacy of the will in this life and in the other, subordinating the intellect to the will. Under the influence of Aristotle the intellectualist current, headed by St. Thomas, stands for the primacy of the intellect, placing beatitude essentially in an act of intuitive knowledge and contemplation, while Scotus assigns it to an act of love. The intellectualism and voluntarism of the Scholastics are not exactly two opposite systems, mutually exclusive, but two positions, two tendencies in the investigation of the same truth and in the construction of doctrinal systems. St. Thomas has written wonderful pages on the will and love, as Scotus has done on the intellect and truth.

In modern times, on the contrary, the voluntarist tendency has developed in the lines of intellectualism and voluntarism. Kant (see Kantianism) opens the way for this conflict when he seeks, in his Critique of Practical Reason, to rebuild by way of the will, of sentiment, and of faith what he had nullified in his Critique of Pure Reason. From Kantian practical reason stems the fideism of Herder and Jacobi, and the sentimentalism of Schleiermacher. Arthur Schopenhauer († 1860) builds his philosophy on the concept of a will as a blind appetite, unintelligent and unintelligible, which in man manifests itself as the will to live, always unsatisfied (pessimism); analogous is the philosophy of E. Hartmann († 1906), who as

signs an unconscious will, always avid of unattainable felicity, as principle of the life of the universe. Against these two pessimists, Nietzsche († 1900) affirms his optimistic voluntarism with the theory of the superman, who must struggle and triumph over the weak and inept. G. Wundt, too († 1920), a celebrated psychologist, reduces the life of man and of the universe to a universal will, in perpetual evolution and transformation of its reality. In religion, the voluntaristic tendency manifests itself in pragmatism (q.v.) and also in the philosophy of action of Blondel.

Exaggerated voluntarism, as a negation of the dignity and function of the intellect, is not reconcilable with Catholic doctrine.
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Vulgate (common). The Latin translation of the Bible, which the Church uses and prescribes officially in teaching, in preaching, and in the liturgy. Its name is derived from the wide circulation it had throughout the West since the seventh century. Its author is St. Jerome († 420), the greatest doctor in interpreting Holy Scripture. Not all the work, however, in the Vulgate is his; some books are still reproduced according to the older Latin translation, which was made, for the Old Testament, from the Greek translation (Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Machabees); others are revised from the Greek (New Testament and Psalms); the rest is a direct translation from the originals and the personal work of the great Doctor.

In 1546 the Council of Trent defined the Vulgate to be authentic, i.e., immune from all error in matters of faith and morals, a genuine source of revelation, and a faithful expression of the written word of God. The Council did not intend to prejudice, with this decree, the authority of the original text of the Bible or of the ancient translations. The decree was provoked by the uncertainties induced in the religious controversies of the sixteenth century, when scholars, with the flourishing of linguistic studies, wanted to substitute the ancient ecclesiastical translation with other translations, which were the fruit of private effort and often expressed the thought and trends proper to their various authors. At the same time the Council ordered the preparation of a corrected edition of the Vulgate, which was published after 50 years of work under Sixtus V in 1590, and again, after a successive revision, in 1592 under Clement XIII; for this reason the actual edition of the Vulgate is called Sixtine-Clementine Vulgate.

In 1907 Pius X entrusted to the Benedictine Fathers the task of preparing a critical edition of the Vulgate with the aim of eliminating the imperfections which accumulated in it in the course of long centuries of continuous transcriptions. Up to 1944, ten books of the Bible have been published in 5 tomes.
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Waldenses (or Waldensians). A religious sect founded by a merchant of Lyons, Peter Waldo (Lat. Valdus).

Deeply impressed by the sudden death of a friend, in 1176, this rich merchant abandoned the world, distributed his wealth to the poor, and dedicated himself to the evangelical life, preaching Christ and poverty. First the bishops, then the Holy See became concerned about this movement which was accompanied by rebellion against the official Church.

In 1184 the Waldenses were excommunicated, but this did not hinder them, and they continued to spread even in Italy, especially in Piedmont and Lombardy. Quickly their doctrine revealed its opposition to the hierarchy, the sacraments, and Catholic worship; the Holy Scripture was the subject of their particular study. Upon the advent of the Lutheran Reformation, the Waldenses adhered to the new heresy, and thus exposed themselves to bitter persecution during the Counter-Reformation, especially in the mountainous regions of Piedmont. Nowadays the Waldenses in large part follow Calvinism (q.v.).
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will, divine. The will is the rational appetite, namely: the faculty of tending to good, known as by the intellect. Where there is intelligence there is will, the one being inseparably related to the other: we know in order to love and we love in order to integrate the perfection of our own nature. The object of the will is good, i.e., being inasmuch as it is perfective of the subject that tends to it.

It is an article of faith that in God there is a will, and consequently a will as infinite as the divine nature, with which it is identical (Vatican Council, sess. 3, Ch. 1). Written and oral revelation exalts, together with the wisdom of God, His omnipotent will which nothing can resist (cf. Esth. 13:9). Reason dictates that whatever is in the effect, as such, must also be in the cause; moreover, the proof of the divine intellectuality carries implicitly the demonstration of the divine will. As the divine intellect, so the will, has for its primary object God Himself, His essence, in that it is infinite Goodness; its secondary object are all the creatures. As God does not know creatures, except by knowing His essence, so He does not will them except by willing Himself, with one sole most simple act, identical with His nature, Deus est sumum intelligere et summ vellem ("God is His act of understanding and of willing"), says St. Thomas.

Freedom of God was denied by the Stoics, and partially by Abelard, Arnold of Brescia, Eckart, Wycliffe, Luther, and Calvin. The optimists (Malebranche, Leibnitz), and somewhat also Gunther, Hermes, and Rosmini, have assigned a limit to it. The Church, basing her teaching on revelation, has always defended the divine liberty with respect to the world (Vatican Council, DB, 1783 and 1805). Truly God cannot help willing Himself, supreme Good, but He is free to will or not will creatures, since He is infinite and sufficient to Himself. Creation can be only a free effusion of love.

The divine will is the efficient, realizing cause of all things: it is fulfilled infallibly when it is absolute or consequent, not when it is only conditioned or antecedent.

Since in God there is infinite volition, there is also infinite love, rather, God is Love (St. John); He loves Himself infinitely, and in Himself and through Himself He loves all creatures.
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word of Christ. The will is the appetite proper to the rational creature, namely: the faculty that tends to good, known through the intellect. The adequate object of the will is absolute good, to which the will adheres naturally without possibility of hesitation, just as the intellect adheres to certain and evident truth. On account of this infinite potentiality, the will in the presence of limited particular goods is not dominated, but dominates and chooses, according to the practical judgment of reason. In this consists freedom of the will.

In Christ, in addition to the divine will, common to the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, there was the human will, which is an integrating part of human nature. Monothelitism (q.v.), by denying this truth, mutilates the humanity of Christ, which the Council of Chalcedon defined as perfect and integral. But there was no conflict between the two wills of Christ, because the human was subordinate to the divine. In Gethsemani He prays the Father that He remove the chalice of the passion: it is the human will that speaks as a natural tendency to its proper good, considered in se and per se. To this will, called by the philosophers voluntas ut natura (βολής), the passion was repugnant, because it was not a good in itself. But from the standpoint of reason, the passion was a means necessary for a great good, the Redemption, as it is a surgical operation for health; and in this sense Christ accepted it in harmony with the divine will, putting into action the human will, called ratio (βολής), which adheres to what is good not in itself, but for an extrinsic motive (the passion on account of the Redemption).

The subordination of the human will to the divine does not violate the freedom of Christ-Man. It was a precept of the Father that He should die on the cross: His perfect sanctity, rich in the light of the beatific vision, did not allow in Him the slightest hesitation with respect to that kind of death. Nonetheless, He faced it freely, with full consciousness, spontaneity, and loving adhesion, as a son carries out the categorical command of his father. And because the death of Christ was free, it was also meritorious.
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wisdom. See gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Word (Gr. λόγος). Psychologically, it is the term of intellective cognition (idea, concept, word of the mind); theologically, it is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, who proceeds from the Father by way of intellection and of true, spiritual generation. God, knowing Himself (Father), generates
ab aeterno the idea of Himself (Word-Son), His substance or divine nature remaining immutably identical. Therefore, the Word is really distinct from the Father, not in an absolute sense, but only in the order of relation, i.e., as term of filiation opposed to paternity. Absolutely speaking, the Word is consubstantial (παρατηρούμενος) to the Father, i.e., of the same substance or nature of the Father and, therefore, in everything equal to Him: the Father is God as thinking, the Son is the same God as thought.

The doctrine of the Word, vaguely foreshadowed in the Old Testament, is clearly revealed in the New, especially in the Prologue of the Gospel of St. John, who makes these statements about Him: (a) eternity: "In the beginning was the Word"; (b) personality: "And the Word was with God"; (c) divine nature: "And the Word was God"; (d) creative power: "All things were made by Him"; (e) the Incarnation: "And the Word was made flesh."

St. Paul, although not using the expression "Word," teaches the same truth, attributing the same divine prerogative to Christ, whom he calls Firstborn Son of the Father, substantial Image of Him, Creator, together with the Father, of the universe (Phil. 2:6; Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:2 ff.).

Arius, who taught that the Word is a creature, was condemned by the Council of Nicaea (325). As regards the origin of the doctrine of St. John, see Logos. Cf. also Trinity, Son, Only-Begotten, Arianism.
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worship. See cult.

Yahweh. See Tetragrammaton.

OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Theology is at once a human and a divine science, because it is an elaboration of the data of divine revelation, made by reason in the light of faith. The truths revealed by God are immutable and, therefore, are not subject to intrinsic evolution; the understanding of those truths by the human intellect, however, is not immediate or adequate from the beginning, and must therefore follow the natural laws of our knowledge, developing and progressing.

Consequently, theology has a history which marks the stages of the immense effort made by reason throughout the centuries in its study of the word of God, so as to understand it better and better and bring out explicitly its hidden riches.

According to the intensity and nature of such continuous study, the history of theology is usually divided into three epochs: the patristic, the scholastic, and the modern.

1. Patristic Epoch (period of fermentation). During this era the revealed truths were first condensed into concrete formulas, with simple expository style (Apostolic Fathers: Clement of Rome, Ignatius Martyr, Polycarp, Pseudo Barnabas, etc.); then they were put into contact with religious, political, and philosophical paganism in a polemical style (apologists: Justin, Athenagoras, Ariostes, Ireneus, Tertullian, etc.); finally, they were elaborated rationally with a scientific method under the influence of Hellenistic philosophical trends. This brings us to the beginning of the third century, when, after the apologetic-polemical test had been victoriously met, the Fathers gave themselves to studying more deeply the truths of faith and presenting them in a scientific manner, corresponding to the requirements of the culture of that time. Their minds polarized around two centers, which became the founldries of great theological works: the Alexandrian School, in Egypt, inspired by Neoplatonism and hence given to mysticism and symbolism; the Antiochian School, in Syria, adhering to Aristotelian thinking and, therefore, tending to concreteness and realism, even in matters of faith.

From these two schools came the geniuses of Christian orthodox thought, as well as the most famous heretics. A large part of patristic theology, especially Eastern, is connected with the vicissitudes of these two schools.

Alexandrian School: Clement (+ 211), Origen (+ 255), powerful genius who attempted the first vast synthesis of Christian thought with Greek, especially Platonic thought, Athanasius (+ 373) and Cyril (+ 444), who fought vigorously against the two great heresies (of Antiochian origin), Arianism and Nestorianism.

With the Alexandrian School are connected the three Cappadocian Fathers: Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus (second half of the fourth century).

From the same school, Apollinarism, Monophysitism, and Monotheletism, great Christological heresies, originated.

Antiochian School: Lucian and his disciples, among them Arius the heresiarch, Eusebius of Nicomedia, later Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, an acute writer with naturalistic tendencies who sowed the seeds of two great heresies of Antiochian origin: Nestorianism and Pelagianism (this last developed es-

1 Up to about the seventeenth century theology included all the ecclesiastical disciplines; in that epoch a distinction began to be made between dogmatic, moral, etc. (see theology).
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springtime of life, thought, and art. It is the age of St. Francis of Assisi, of Giotto, and of Dante, when the most beautiful of cathedrals flourish under blue Italian skies. The marvelous Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas is in the field of philosophy and theology what the Divine Comedy is in the field of art and literature: it can be said that Dante translates into poetry the robust thought of St. Thomas.

With the Englishman Duns Scotus, called the Subtle Doctor on account of his acumen, dialecticism touches its zenith and quickly afterward degenerates into formalism that marks a period of decadence in Scholasticism (fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries). Humanism and the Lutheran Reformation threw discredit on Scholasticism, which, however, did not die out, but, on the contrary, girded itself for a rebirth through John Capreolus († 1444), called the Prince of Thomists because of his lively defense of the thought of St. Thomas. This upsurge received still greater impetus through the influence exercised by two classical commentaries on the two Summae of St. Thomas, made by the powerful genius of Tommaso de Vio (Cajetan) († 1534), who wrote the commentary on the Summa Theologica, and of Francesco de Silvestris (Ferrariensis) († 1526), who produced the commentary on the Summa Contra Gentiles.

3. Modern Epoch (analyticism). After the Council of Trent Scholasticism, and especially Thomistic doctrine, resumed its upward movement, thanks to great theologians, most of them Spanish: Francisco de Victoria, Melchor Cano, Dominican Fray Domingo Báñez, Diego Alvez, Bart. Medina, John of St. Thomas, and others of the Dominican Order; Francisco de Toledo, Luis Molina, Gregorio de Valencia, Gabriel Vasquez, Francisco Suarez, of the Society of Jesus; A. Vega, Fr. Herrera, Bart. Masturi, Fr. da Mazzara, of the Franciscan Order.

But Lutheranism obliged the theologians to defend the correct interpretation of Holy Scripture and the doctrinal patrimony of the Fathers; hence the large development of exegesis and of the historical element of theology, as well as of its polemic character. In this triple field the Jesuit theologians deserve the greatest credit: it suffices to mention the great controversialist, Card. Bellarmine († 1622), the exegetes Salmeron and Maldonatus, and D. Petavius († 1652), who collected methodically the dogmatic thought of the Fathers in four volumes.

In the eighteenth century there was another period of decadence, from which Scholastic theology rose after the French Revolution, at the beginning of the past century. This revival is characterized by a renovation of Scholasticism upon contact with modern philosophy and by a flourishing of positive theology in harmony with progress in historic-biblical studies. The restoration began in Germany with Krutgen and Liebermann, and gained strength in Italy with the Jesuits, John Perrone († 1876), Dom. Palmieri, and Camillo Mazzella, professors at that same “Collegio Romano” which has been made illustrious more recently by the teaching of Franzelin and Billot, the former outstanding in positive theology, the latter, in speculative.

Neo-Thomism and Neo-Scholasticism have gained ground in all the Catholic universities; inculturating the grandeur of the classical, speculative theology, they call back to saner traditions philosophical thinking, lost in the labyrinths of the conflicting trends of the nineteenth century.

On the other hand, our positive theology has gained decided strength against rationalistic criticism. It integrates and illuminates with new light profound, medieval speculation, through serious exegetical, patristic, and historical study and research.

Conclusion. Theology born with patristics has its first milestone in the work

pecially in the Western Churches). The school of Theodore formed the heretic Nestorius and the great John Chrysostom, Father of the Church.

In the East, through the crucible of the great Trinitarian and Christological heresies, the science of God matured in its entirety, i.e., as a theology, in its most proper and highest sense, which the Fathers restricted to the study of the divine life in itself (Trinity), and as the science of the Incarnation, to which the ancients gave the beautiful Greek name of Economy.

In the West, by the side of some repercussions of these eastern currents, we find the development of a less speculative and more practical theology according to the traditions and the spirit of Rome. Hilary († 366) re-echoes the Trinitarian doctrine of Athanasius, Ambrose († 397), the thought of Basil and of other easterners; St. Jerome († 420), the Father of biblical exegesis, is outstanding for his passionate study of Holy Scripture.

But the greatest of all the Fathers was Augustine († 430), who, converted to Christianity, brought into it the treasure of a vast culture and the power of an incomparable genius. With these resources he was able to spread his wings over the whole patrimony of Christian doctrine, assimilate its soul, and, by means of the positive criterion of the Westerners, reduce to a grandiose and organic synthesis four centuries of doctrinal elaboration, matured especially in the eastern schools. He added of his own, in the dramatic struggle against Pelagian naturalism, a rich doctrine about original sin and grace, which can be called a vast and luminous supernatural anthropology. Augustine is the creator of systematic theology, which is the point of confidence of all patristics and the point of departure of Scholasticism.

The last faint glimmer of patristics appear in the West with Leo the Great († 461) and Gregory the Great († 604), in the East with Leontius Byzantinus († 513), Maximus Confessor († 662), Sophronius († 638), and finally with John Damascene († 749), who aptly summarizes the doctrine of the Greek Fathers.

2. Scholastic Epoch (systematic synthesis). This era begins in the eleventh century with St. Anselm, called the Father of Scholasticism, who opened the way for a fruitful speculation on dogmas by stressing the use of reason in the sphere of faith. Following in the footsteps of St. Augustine, he was inspired by the motto, fides quaerens intellectum, i.e., holding firmly to the divine truth by lively and unconditioned faith, he sought to penetrate its content by exercising all the power and all the resources of natural intelligence. The work of St. Anselm has two aspects: the supernatural (mystical adhesion to truth), the other human (dialectical elaboration of the faith). Hence, the two trends that dominate in turn all Scholasticism: the mystic current of Augustinian inspiration, which, through St. Bernard and the French school of St. Victor (Hugh and Richard), passes in the twelfth century into the Franciscan Order and culminates in the teaching of St. Bonaventure; the dialectic current, which threatens to degenerate in Abelard (the strongest philosopher of the twelfth century), but is happily tempered by Peter Lombard, the author of four books of Sentences, in which is gathered and winnowed the choicest growth of patristic doctrine (this work is the basic text on which the later Summae Theologicae are modeled). Thus moderated by the force of the authority of the Fathers, the dialectical trend grows increasingly stronger and more decided under the impulse of Aristotelianism incorporated into Scholasticism through Arabic philosophy (Avicenna, Averroes), and triumphs first with Albert the Great, and then with the greatest of the Scholastics, St. Thomas Aquinas.

With St. Thomas we reach the thirteenth century, when Italy was a valuable
of St. Augustine; with Scholasticism it attains the highest peaks of acute and serene speculation, in full harmony of reason with faith (St. Thomas). It is shaken profoundly by Humanism and the Lutheran Reformation and rises with a polemic and positive historical character (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries); then it loses its compact unity, due to the apologetic exigencies of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. On contact with philosophical, historical, and biblical rationalism, it resumes its march on new roads, in an endeavor to put its precious and classical content in harmony with the requirements and forms of modern thought.

The reform of ecclesiastical studies, urged by Pius XI in his constitution, Deus Scientiarum Dominus, has stepped up the rhythm of ecclesiastical studies which are marching with efficacious methods toward new progress in the understanding and illustration of the immutable divine truth.
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